Supplementary Information for

Non-metal boron atoms on CuB₁₂ monolayer as efficient catalytic

sites for urea production

Changyan Zhu,^a Chaoxia Wen,^a Miao Wang,^a Min Zhang,^{*a}

Yun Geng,^a Zhongmin Su*^{ab}

^aInstitute of Functional Material Chemistry, Faculty of Chemistry, National & Local United Engineering Laboratory for Power Batteries, Northeast Normal University, Changchun 130024, China

^bSchool of Chemistry and Environmental Engineering, Changchun University of

Science and Technology, Changchun 130022, China

Email: <u>mzhang@nenu.edu.cn; zmsu@nenu.edu.cn</u>

Supplementary Methods

Global-minimum structure searching: The model sreaching for the global-minimum strctures of the CuB₁₂ monolayer was performed by employing a particle-swarm optimization (PSO) algorithm¹ within the evolutionary scheme as implemented in the Crystal structure AnaLYsis by Particles Swarm Optimization (CALYPSO) code,² which can efficiently and rapidly find reliable structures via the imput of chemical composition. Its validity has been confirmed by the application of a diverse variety of two-dimensional B-containg monolayers, such as MM'B₇,³ Ni₂B₅,⁴ B_7P_2 ,⁵ ScB₁₂,⁶ FeB₂,⁷ FeB₆,⁸ Cu₂B₂,⁹ AlB₆¹⁰ and TiB₄¹¹. In our PSO simulation, the number of generation and the population size was set to be 30 and 50 for the CuB_{12} monolayer. In the first step, random structures with certain symmetry are constructed, in which atomic coordinates are generated by the crtstallographic symmetry operations. Then the structure optimizations are performed using the VASP code, in which the lane-wave cutoff energy, the energy converged, the force converged are set to be 400 eV, 10^{-5} eV and 10^{-1} eV Å⁻¹, respectively. After processing the first generation structures, 60% of them with the lower Gibbs free energies are selected to construct the next generation structure by PSO, and 40% of the structures in the new generation are again randomly generated. A structure fingerprinting technique of bond characterization matrix is applied to the generated structures, so that these identical structures are strictly forbidden. These procedures significantly enchance the diversity of the structures, which is crucial for structural global search efficiency.

Electrochemical reaction computations: The Gibbs free energy change (ΔG) for each elementary step in the electrochemical synthesis of urea was obtained by the

compatational hydrogen electrode (CHE) model proposed by Nørskov et al,^{12,13} which can be computed by:

$$\Delta G = \Delta E + \Delta E_{zpe} - T\Delta S + \Delta G_U + \Delta G_{pH}$$

where ΔE is the electronic energy difference between the free standing and adsorption states of reaction intermediates, which can be directly obtained from DFT calculations. ΔE_{zpe} and ΔS are the changes between the adsorbed species and the gas phase molecules in zero-point energy and entropy, respectively, which can be obtained from the vibrational frequency. For each adsorbed species, its E_{zpe} and TS can be calculated by the following equations,^{14,15} respectively:

$$E_{zpe} = 1/2\Sigma h\upsilon_i$$
$$TS = k_B T \left[\sum_i \ln \left(\frac{1}{1 - e^{-h\nu_i/k_B T}}\right) + \sum_i \frac{h\nu_i}{k_B T} \frac{1}{e^{h\nu_i/k_B T} - 1} + 1\right]$$

where k_B is the Boltzmann's constant; h represents the Planck constant; v_i denotes the frequency of the normal mode of the adsorbed species; T is the thermodynamic temperature of the reaction (298.15 K). Moreover, the corresponding E_{zpe} and S of the gas phase molecules are taken from the NIST database (Supplementary Table 1).¹⁶ Furthermore, the corrections for zero point energy and entropy of reaction intermediates are only needed for the adsorbed species because the contribution of the substrate can be offset, which has been verified in the previous report. ΔG_U is the free energy contribution related to applied potential U, and U is the operating electrochemical potential relative to the reversible hydrogen electrode (RHE), which is determined by the potential-limiting step with the most positive ΔG_{max} value (U = $-\Delta G_{max}/e$). $\Delta G_{pH} = 2.303 \times k_B \times T \times pH$, which represents the free energy correction due

to the variations in the H concentration. Moreover, the pH will not change the overpotential, and in this work the value of pH was assumed to be zero in a highly acidic solution.

Table S1. Total energy (E_{tot}), zero-potential correction energy (Ezpe), entropy contribution (TS, T=298.15 K) of free molecules from NIST database.

Speciese	E _{tot} (eV)	Ezpe (eV)	TS (eV)
H ₂ (g)	-6.67	0.27	0.40
$H_2O(l)$	-14.54	0.56	0.58
$N_2(g)$	-16.32	0.14	0.59
NH ₃ (g)	-19.73	0.60	0.89
CO(g)	-14.78	0.13	0.61
CH ₃ OH (g)	-30.44	1.35	0.74
CH ₄ (g)	-24.03	1.18	0.58

Table S2. Structural information of the global-minimum CuB₁₂ monolayer.

Phase	Space	Lattice	Coordinates	
	Group	Parameters (Å, 9		
CuB ₁₂	P4/MMM	a =b =6.183863	Cu(0.50000000,0.50000000,0.50000000)	
		c=20.00000	B(0.857930005,0.500000000,0.50000000)	
		α=β=γ=90.00000	B(0.142069995,0.50000000,0.50000000)	
			B(0.50000000,0.857930005,0.50000000)	
			B(0.50000000,0.142069995,0.50000000)	
			B(0.257779986,0.257779986,0.50000000)	
			B(0.742220044,0.742220044,0.500000000)	
			B(0.742220044,0.257779986,0.50000000)	
			B(0.257779986,0.742220044,0.50000000)	
			B(0.737800002,0.000000000,0.50000000)	
			B(0.262199998,0.000000000,0.50000000)	
			B(0.00000000,0.737800002,0.50000000)	
			B(0.00000000,0.262199998,0.50000000)	

Intermediates	E _{tot} (eV)	E _{ZPE} (eV)	TS (eV)
*CO ₂ +*N ₂	-355.19	0.58	0.18
*CO ₂ +*NNH	-359.71	0.94	0.17
*CO ₂ +*NHNH	-364.00	1.23	0.21
*CO ₂ +*NNH ₂	-363.07	1.27	0.18
*CO ₂ +*NHNH ₂	-368.12	1.61	0.19
*CO ₂ +*NH ₂ NH ₂	-372.96	1.78	0.27
*OCOH+*NNH	-363.18	1.26	0.17
*OCOH+*NHNH	-367.70	1.59	0.17
*OCOH+*NNH ₂	-366.52	1.59	0.19
*OCOH+*NHNH ₂	-371.37	1.93	0.20
*OCOH+*NH ₂ NH ₂	-376.46	2.12	0.28
*OCOH+*N ₂	-358.76	0.91	0.17
*CO+*N ₂	-347.19	0.45	0.16
*CO+*NNH	-351.60	0.80	0.17
*CO+*NHNH	-356.39	1.15	0.14
*CO+*NNH ₂	-355.79	1.18	0.13
*CO+*NHNH ₂	-359.93	1.48	0.18
*CO+*NH ₂ NH ₂	-365.46	1.72	0.20
*NCON	-348.13	0.48	0.14
*NCONH	-353.59	0.81	0.16
*NHCONH	-358.79	1.17	0.16
*NCONH ₂	-357.65	1.15	0.18
*NHCONH ₂	-362.26	1.52	0.19
*NH ₂ CONH ₂	-365.35	1.81	0.24

Table S3. Total energy (E_{tot}), zero-potential correction energy (E_{zpe}) and entropy contribution (TS, T=298.15 K) of the optimized intermediates for urea production on the CuB₁₂ monolayer.



Figure S1. The phonon densities of states (PDOS) of the CuB_{12} monolayer using PBE functional.



Figure S2. Snapshots of the CuB_{12} monolayer equilibrium structures at 300 K, 600 K, 900 K, 1200 K and 1500 K at the end of 10 *ps* AIMD simulations.



Figure S3. Snapshots of the CuB_{12} monolayer equilibrium structures at 300 K at the end of 5 *ps* AIMD simulations.



Figure S4. (a-b) Geometries, interlayer interaction energies and the shortest interlayer distance of the CuB_{12} bilayer with AA and AB stacking patterns. The interlayer interaction energies are defined as $E_B = (2E_{CuB_{12}} - E_T)/n$, in which the $E_{CuB_{12}}$ and E_T are the energies of the CuB_{12} monolayer and bilayer, n is the number of atoms in CuB_{12} bilayer. (c-d) Isosurface of ELF plotted with a value of 0.50 for the AA and AB stacked bilayers.



Figure S5. Top view of all optimized possible reaction intermediates for urea production on the CuB_{12} monolayer.



Figure S6. Thirteen possible configurations and computed Gibbs free energy change values (ΔG) of CO₂ adsorbed on the CuB₁₂ monolayer.



Figure S7. Thirteen possible configurations of N_2 adsorbed on the CuB₁₂ monolayer. The first five N_2 configurations are the final structures after optimizing, and the computed Gibbs free energy change values (ΔG) are also shown. The last eight N_2 configurations are the initial structures, and the N_2 removes away the surface after optimizing.



Figure S8. Gibbs free energy diagrams for urea production through three possible mixed pathways on the CuB_{12} monolayer at different applied potentials.



Figure S9. Four possible configurations and computed Gibbs free energy change values (ΔG) of H adsorbed on the CuB₁₂ monolayer.



Figure S10. Top and side views of all optimized possible reaction intermediates for CO_2 reduction reaction to C1 products (CO_2RR-C1) on the CuB_{12} monolayer.

Figure S11. Kinetic energy barrier for CO desorption from the CuB_{12} monolayer.

Figure S12. The optimized structures for the process of CO desorption from the CuB_{12} monolayer. The corresponding distances of B-C are presented.

Figure S13. Kinetic energy barrier \rightarrow on the CuB₁₂ monolayer.

Figure S14. The structures for reduction process of $*CO + H^+ + e^- \rightarrow *CHO$. The corresponding distances of C-H are presented.

Figure S15. Top and side views of all optimized possible reaction intermediates for CO_2 reduction reaction to C2 products (CO_2RR-C2) on the CuB_{12} monolayer.

Figure S16. Top and side views of all optimized possible reaction intermediates for N_2 reduction reaction (NRR) on the CuB₁₂ monolayer.

Supplementary References

1 Y. Wang, J. Lv, L. Zhu and Y. Ma, Phys. Rev. B., 2010, 82, 094116.

2 Y. Wang, J. Lv, L. Zhu and Y. Ma, Comput. Phys. Commun., 2012, 183, 2063-2070.

3 C. Zhu, C. Wen, C. Wang, M. Zhang, Y. Geng and Z. Su, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2021, **9**, 10855-10868.

4 C. Zhu, C. Wang, M. Zhang, H. Chen, Y. Geng and Z. Su, ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces, 2021, **13**, 3845-3855.

5 C. Zhu, S. Lin, M. Zhang, Q. Li, Z. Su and Z. Chen, J. Mater. Chem. A, 2020, 8, 10301-10309.

6 C. Zhu, H. Chen, C. Wang, M. Zhang, Y. Geng, Q. Li and Z. Su, J. Phys. Chem. C, 2020, **124**, 23221-23229.

7 H. Zhang, Y. Li, J. Hou, A. Du, and Z. Chen, Nano Lett., 2016, 16, 6124-6129.

8 H. Zhang, Y. Li, J. Hou, K. Tu and Z. Chen, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2016, 138, 5644-5651.

9 J. Jia, H. Zhang, Z. Wang, J. Zhao and Z. Zhou, J. Mater. Chem. A, 2020, 8, 9607-9615.

10 B. Song, Y. Zhou, H. Yang, J. Liao, L. Yang, X. Yang and E. Ganz, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2019, **141**, 3630-3640.

11 X. Qu, J. Yang, Y. Wang, J. Lv, Z. Chen and Y. Ma, *Nanoscale*, 2017, **9**, 17983-17990.

12 J. Nørskov, J. Rossmeisl, A. Logadottir, L. Lindqvist, J. Kitchin, T. Bligaard and H. Jonsson, *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 2004, **108**, 17886-17892.

13 J. Rossmeisl and A. Logadottir, J. Chem. Phys., 2005, 319, 178-184.

14 Y. Wang, H. Yuan, Y. Li and Z. Chen, *Nanoscale*, 2015, 7, 11633.

15 X. Zou, L. Wang and B. Yakobson, Nanoscale, 2018, 10, 1129.

16 Johnson, R. III, Ed. Computational chemistry comparison and benchmark database; NIST standard reference database number 101; national institute of standards and technology, 2015. <u>http://cccbdb.nist.gov</u>.