## **Supporting Information**

## Engineering Multinary Heterointerfaces in Two-Dimensional Cobalt Molybdenum Phosphide Hybrid Nanosheets for Efficient Electrocatalytic Water Splitting

Yuan Teng,<sup>1</sup> Jia-Xin Gao,<sup>1</sup> Jun-Yan Li, Hong-Yan Chen,\* Xu-Dong Wang, and Dai-Bin Kuang

MOE Key Laboratory of Bioinorganic and Synthetic Chemistry, School of Chemistry, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510275, P R China

1: Yuan Teng and Jia-Xin Gao contributed equally to this work

\*Corresponding Author.

E-mail: chenhy33@mail.sysu.edu.cn (H.-Y. Chen).



Figure S1 (a) XRD patterns and SEM images of (b) Co-S/CC, (c) Mo-S/CC and (d) Co-Mo-S/CC precursors. The scale bar is 10  $\mu$ m. The inset represents its magnified images. The scale bar is 1  $\mu$ m.



**Figure S2** (a) SEM image and (d) energy dispersive spectroscopy (EDS) of the Co-Mo-S precursor and the elemental mapping images (b) Co, (c) Mo, (e) S and (f) overlayer. It shows the even distribution of Co, Mo and S elements onto the nanosheet. The scale bar is 100 nm.



Figure S3 The thickness statistical chart of the Co-Mo-P NSs in Figure 1a.



**Figure S4** (a) SEM images and (b) XRD patterns of individual MoP/CC prepared without the Co salts. The scale bar is 5  $\mu$ m and 500 nm, respectively. (c, d) TEM and High-resolution TEM images. The scale bar is 50 and 1 nm, respectively.



Figure S5 (a) SEM images and (b) XRD patterns of individual CoP/CC prepared without Mo salts. The scale bar is 5  $\mu$ m and 500 nm, respectively. (c, d) TEM and HRTEM images. The scale bar is 50 and 1 nm, respectively.



**Figure S6** XRD refinement results of the Co-Mo-P NSs/CC samples with different molar mole ratio of (a) 2.5:5:20, (b) 5:5:20, (c) 10:5:20 and (d) the histogram of the CoP, MoP and CoMoP<sub>2</sub> content with the increasing of Co content. It confirms that this hybrid is consisted of CoP, MoP and CoMoP<sub>2</sub>, and the proportion of heterogenous components are adjustable within a certain range.



**Figure S7** FTT images and the corresponding lattice spacing of the Co-Mo-P hybrid in Figure 1f: (a, d) represent the (100) and (106) planes and its lattice spacing of CoMoP<sub>2</sub>, corresponding to the III area in Figure 1f; (b, e) display the (200) and (001) planes of CoP, which is assigned to the I area. (c) shows the (100) plane and corresponding lattice spacing of MoP, which corresponds to the II area. (f) reflects the IV area in Figure 1f, which shows the amorphous component. All the scale bars are 2 nm.



**Figure S8** (a) XRD patterns of Co-Mo-P NSs/CC prepared by different raw molar ratio. SEM images of hybrid with different molar ratios: (b) 2.5:5:20, (c) 5:5:20, (d) 7.5:5:20 and (e) 10:5:20. The scale bar is 500 nm.



**Figure S9** XRD pattern of Co-Mo-P NSs/CC prepared by different phosphorization temperatures. SEM images of Co-Mo-P NSs/CC prepared by the different phosphorization temperature: (a) 650 °C, (b) 700 °C, (c) 750 °C and (b) 800 °C. The inset are their related high-resolution SEM images. The scale bar is 3  $\mu$ m and 300 nm, respectively.



Figure S10 XPS spectra of the CoP/CC, MoP/CC and Co-Mo-P/CC: (a) Co 2p spectra

for CoP/CC and Co-Mo-P/CC; (b) Mo 3d spectra for MoP/CC and Co-Mo-P/CC; (c) P

2p spectra of them.



**Figure S11** The structure model of the CoP (101) surface. (a) H atom is adsorbed on the P site. (b) The corresponding plots of charge density difference.



**Figure S12** The structure model of the MoP (001) surface. (a) H atom is adsorbed on the P site and (b) the plots of charge density difference.



**Figure S13** The structure model for the  $CoMoP_2$  (106) surface. (a) H atom is adsorbed on the P site. (b) The corresponding charge density difference plots.



**Figure S14** HER polarization curves for Co-Mo-P NSs/CC in 0.5 M  $H_2SO_4$  electrolytes prepared by (a) different molar ratio of CoCl<sub>2</sub>·6H<sub>2</sub>O, Na<sub>2</sub>MoO<sub>4</sub>·2H<sub>2</sub>O and thiourea, and (b) different calcination temperatures.



**Figure S15** XRD patterns of the Co-Mo-P NSs after 20 h HER stability test. No other peaks of impurity were observed, indicating a superior structure stability.



**Figure S16** (a) SEM and (b) AFM images of the Co-Mo-P NSs after 20 h HER stability tests. The scale bar is 500 and 200 nm, respectively.



Figure S17 XPS spectrum of Co-Mo-P NSs: (a) the survey spectrum, (b) Co 2p, (c)

Mo 3d and (d) P 2p region after long-term HER stability.



**Figure S18** HER polarization curves and the corresponding Tafel plots for Co-Mo-P NSs/CC (a, c) in 1.0 M PBS and (b, d) in 1.0 M KOH with 2 mV s<sup>-1</sup>, respectively.



**Figure S19** Cyclic voltammograms in the non-faradaic region of 0.1-0.3 V *vs*. RHE at various scan rates of (a) CoP/CC, (b) MoP/CC, (c) Co-Mo-P NSs/CC and (d) the capacitive currents densities at 0.2 V *vs*. RHE as a function of scan rates in 0.5 M  $H_2SO_4$ , which illustrate the Co-Mo-P NSs/CC holds large ECSA value than that of the individual ones.



**Figure S20** XPS spectra of Co-Mo-P NSs/CC after 200 and 5000 cycles: (a) Co 2p, (b) Mo 3d, (c) P 2p and (d) O 1s region. The peaks in the P 2p spectra at  $\approx$ 133.5 eV can be assigned to the phosphate (PO<sub>x</sub>) or P-O signals.



Figure S21 LSV curves of the hybrid for OER before and after 5000 CV cycles in 1.0 M KOH solution.

Catalysts (The molar ratio of CoCl <sub>2</sub> ·6H <sub>2</sub> O, Na <sub>2</sub> MoO <sub>4</sub> ·2H <sub>2</sub> O and thiourea)	Co (at.%)	Mo (at.%)	S (at.%)	P (at.%)	The atom ratio of Co:Mo
Co-Mo-S/CC (2.5:5:20)	5.97	58.01	36.02	-	0.10:1
Co-Mo-S/CC (5:5:20)	15.17	52.76	32.07	-	0.28:1
Co-Mo-S/CC (7.5:5:20)	30.44	38.54	31.02	-	0.79:1
Co-Mo-S/CC (10:5:20)	42.77	26.09	31.14	-	1.64:1
Co-Mo-P NSs/CC (2.5:5:20)	6.77	72.08	-	21.15	0.09:1
Co-Mo-P NSs/CC (5:5:20)	8.94	71.95	-	19.11	0.12:1
Co-Mo-P NSs/CC (7.5:5:20)	23.71	58.37	-	17.93	0.41:1
Co-Mo-P NSs/CC (10:5:20)	58.26	14.04	-	27.70	4.15:1

 Table S1. Chemical composition of the Co-Mo-S/CC precursors and Co-Mo-P NSs/CC

 samples with different Co contents by ICP-AES analysis.

ICP-AES results evaluated the chemical composition of Co-Mo-S/CC and Co-Mo-P NSs/CC prepared by different molar ratio of  $CoCl_2 \cdot 6H_2O$ ,  $Na_2MoO_4 \cdot 2H_2O$  and thiourea. The atomic percent content of Co among precursors is from 5.97 to 42.77% with the increasing of Co salts. After phosphating treatment, the atomic percent content of Co is from 6.77 to 58.26%, and the atomic ratio of Co:Mo is between 0.09:1 and 4.15:1 with the increase of Co salts.

Materials	Density of states at Fermi level/eV
СоР	0.0729
MoP	0.1275
CoMoP <sub>2</sub>	0.1070
CoP-CoMoP <sub>2</sub>	0.1072
CoP-MoP	0.1106
MoP-CoMoP <sub>2</sub>	0.1080

Table S2. Density of states at Fermi level of the various materials or heterointerface.

Catalysts (the substrate)	Tafel slope (mV dec <sup>-1</sup> )	Current density (j, mA cm <sup>-2</sup> )	η (mV) at the j	TOF (s <sup>-1</sup> )	Ref.
Co-Mo-P NSs/CC	52.6	10/100	69.6/124.4	0.33	This work
CoP/CC	71.2	10/100	156.7/268.3	0.11	This work
MoP/CC	59.0	10/100	134.4/219.8	0.06	This work
MoP@NPCS (GCE)	83	10	113	-	Appl. Catal. B: Environ. 2020, 263, 118352.
MoP@C (CC)	54	10	49	-	<i>Adv. Energy Mater.</i> 2018, 8, 1801258.
m-CoP-NiCoP/CC	57.2	10	75	-	<i>J. Mater. Sci.</i> 2021, 56, 3375.
FLNPC@MoP- NC/MoP-C/CC	50	10	74	1.0	Adv. Funct. Mater. 2018, 28, 801527.
Co <sub>0.85</sub> Se NSs@Co	54	10	121	-	Nano Res. 2020, 13, 2950
N-MoP@C (GCE)	62	10	150	-	<i>Chem. Commun.</i> 2018, 54, 2502.
α-MoC <sub>1-x</sub> -MoP/C (GCE)	57	10	173	~0.325	<i>Electrochim. Acta</i> 2020, 334, 135624.
NiMoP <sub>2</sub> /CC	56	100	199	0.15	J. Mater. Chem. A 2017, 5, 7191.
Carbon-coated Co-Mo-P/CC	52.9	10	96	-	<i>Int. J. Hydrogen Energy</i> , 2020, 45, 544.
SnO <sub>2</sub> nanotubes (GCE)	) 104	10	147	-	J. Alloy. Compd. 2021, 865, 158597
MoP-RGO (GCE)	62	10	117	-	<i>Electrochim. Acta</i> 2017, 232, 254.
Ru@Co/N-CNTs (GCE)	33	10	92	-	ACS Sustainable Chem. Eng. 2020, 8, 9136.
HiHo-NiCoP (GCE)	52	10	103	-	<i>Chem. Commun.</i> 2020, 56, 90.
MoP@PC (GCE)	59.3	10	258	- 40	<i>CS Appl. Mater. Interfaces</i> 2018, 10, 17140.
Fe <sub>3</sub> S <sub>4</sub> (52.1wt%)/ MIL-53 (GCE)	60	10	92	-	<i>Chem. Commun.</i> 2019, 55, 4570
N-MoP (GCE)	68	10	175	-	<i>Electrochim. Acta</i> 2020, 342, 136059.
FeMoS <sub>(mw)</sub> (GDE)	57	10	140	-	ACS Catal. 2020, 10, 14336.
Mo <sub>2</sub> N-Mo <sub>2</sub> C (GCE)	55	10	157	0.086	<i>Adv. Mater.</i> 2018, 30, 1704156.
CoP@PCM (Cu wire)	75.4	10	155	-	<i>ChemCatChem</i> 2020, 12, 3929.
RuTe <sub>2</sub> /Gr (GCE)	33	10	72	-	Chem Asian J. 2020, 15, 2886
Mo <sub>x</sub> C (GCE)	-	10	239	~0.03	J. Catal. 2019–371–325

**Table S3**. Comparison of HER performance in acid electrolytes for the electrocatalysts in the literatures and this work.

Table S4. Comparison of HER performance in neutral or near-neutral medium for electrocatalysts

in tl	ne l	literatures	and	this	work.
-------	------	-------------	-----	------	-------

Catalysts (the substrate)	Tafel slope (mV dec <sup>-1</sup> )	Current density (j, mA cm <sup>-2</sup> )	η (mV) at the j	Loading mas (mg·cm <sup>-2</sup> )	s Ref.
Co-Mo-P NSs/CC	82.9	10	91.2	2.5	This work
CoP/CC	115.5	10	418.0	2.5	This work
MoP/CC	96.5	10	169.4	2.5	This work
MoP/MoS <sub>2</sub> /CC	48	10	96	0.029	ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces, 2019, 11, 25986.
Ti-CoSP (Ni-foam)	118	10	132	-	<i>Chem. Mater.</i> 2020, 32, 9591
Ni-Co-Fe-P/NF	121.7	10	104	-	Int J Hydrogen Energy 2020, 45, 2504.
MoP700 (GCE)	79	10	196	-	ACS Catal. 2019, 9, 8712-8718.
W-Mo <sub>x</sub> C/C (GCE)	54.3	10	178	-	<i>Electrochim. Acta,</i> 2021 370, 137796
v-NiFe LDH (Ni foam)	46.3	10	87	-	ACS Energy Lett. 2019, 4, 1412.
CoO/Co <sub>4</sub> N/NF	80	10	145	-	J. Mater. Chem. A 2018, 6, 24767
CN-Ru- RuO <sub>2</sub> /C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub> (GCE)	92	10	342	-	Nano Energy, 2020, 76, 105079
Ni(OH) <sub>2</sub> /Ni:Pi (Ni foam)	175	10	340	-	Inorg. Chem. Front. 2019, 6, 3093.
Co, Mo <sub>2</sub> C-CNF	92.8	10	206	-	<i>Chem. Eur. J</i> , 2020, 397, 125481
Fe-NiS/Ni(OH) <sub>2</sub> (FTO glass)	118	10	196	-	Appl. Catal. A: Gen, 2019, 586, 117226.
NiCu@C (Graphite plate)	80	10	164	0.38	Adv. Energy Mater. 2018, 8, 1701759.
Co-HNP/CC	38	10	87	1.0	Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2016, 55, 6725.
Cu-PDA CPs (GCE)	83	10	290	-	Catal. Sci. Technol., 2019, 9, 4347.
Ru-S-Sb/antimonen (Carbon paper)	ne 118	10	153	-	<i>Chem. Commun.</i> 2019, 55, 10884
Fe@N-CNT/IF	199.6	10	130	-	Adv. Sci. 2019, 6, 1901458.
Mn-Ni-S/NF	65	10	84	-	J. Mater. Chem. A, 2019, 7, 25628.
PdP <sub>2</sub> @CB (GCE)	72.3	10	84.6	0.285	Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2018, 57, 14862.
Ni <sub>0.1</sub> Co <sub>0.9</sub> P (CFP)	103	10	125	0.58	Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2018, 57, 15671.
Co-Fe-P (GCE)	138	10	138	0.285	Nano Energy 2019, 56, 225.

**Table S5**. Comparison of HER performance in alkaline electrolytes for electrocatalysts in the
 literatures and this work.

Catalysts (the substrate)	Tafel slope (mV dec <sup>-1</sup> )	Current density (j, mA cm <sup>-2</sup> )	η (mV) at the j	loading mas (mg∙cm²)	s Ref.
Co-Mo-P NSs/CC	99.1	10	108.9	2.5	This work
CoP/CC	183.5	10	306.0	2.5	This work
MoP/CC	143.4	10	204.4	2.5	This work
CoP/Ni <sub>2</sub> P@HP NCP (GCE)	65.5	10	294	-	Nanoscale 2020, 12, 23851.
NiP <sub>2</sub> (Graphite)	85.5	10	178	-	<i>Electrochim. Acta</i> 2020, 344, 136116
NiWO <sub>4</sub> /Ni <sub>3</sub> S <sub>2</sub> (Nickel foam)	112	10	136	- 4	<i>Appl. Catal. B: Environ.</i> 2020, 274, 119120.
c-CoSe <sub>2</sub> /CC	85	10	190	-	<i>Adv. Mater.</i> 2016, 28, 7527.
Co-BDC/MoS <sub>2</sub> (GCE)	86	10	248	-	<i>Small</i> 2019, 15, 1805511.
Co <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> -CuO (GCE)	65	10	288	-	Int J Hydrogen Energy 2019, 44, 26148.
N-doped Ni <sub>3</sub> S <sub>2</sub> /NF	113	10	155	0.59	Adv. Energy Mater. 2018, 8, 1703538.
MoP/CD (GCE)	77.49	10	70	-	Nano Energy 2020, 72, 104730
CoB@MoS <sub>2</sub> (GCE)	80.9	10	146	-	<i>Nanoscale,</i> 2020, 12, 10158.
MoS <sub>x</sub> @NiO (GCE)	43	10	406	-	<i>Adv. Funct. Mater.</i> 2019, 29, 1807562.
Fe-CoP/Ti	75	10	78	1.03	<i>Adv. Mater.</i> 2017, 29, 1602441.
CoP NWs/CC	42.8	10	65	-	<i>Adv. Mater.</i> 2018, 30, 1703322.
CoMoOS (Copper foam)	86	10	130	-	<i>Nanoscale</i> , 2019, 11, 3500.
10% Ni-WSe <sub>2</sub> (GCE)	109	10	215	-	J. Mater. Chem. A 2020, 8, 403.
Co doped ReS <sub>2</sub> (GCE)	61.0	10	240	-	Chem. Commun. 2020, 56, 8472-8475
MoS <sub>2</sub> /CoS <sub>2</sub> (GCE)	86.2	10	75	-	J. Mater. Chem. A, 2020, 8, 11435
MoSe <sub>2</sub> /SnS <sub>2</sub> (GCE)	109	10	285	-	Nano energy 2019, 64, 103918.
Ni-Co-P HNBs (Ni foam)	88	10	107	2.0	Energy Environ. Sci. 2018, 11, 872.
MoP/NF	54.6	10	114	-	Small Methods 2018, 2, 1700369.

Catalysts (the substrate)	Tafel slope (mV dec <sup>-1</sup> )	Current density (j, mA cm <sup>-2</sup> )	η (mV) at the <i>j</i>	TOF (s <sup>-1</sup> )	Ref.
Co-Mo-P NSs/CC	67.6	10/100	261.9/331.0	1.14	This work
CoP/CC	116.7	10/100	390.5/586.1	0.022	This work
MoP/CC	101.0	10/100	345.9/468.0	0.038	This work
Ni <sub>3</sub> C/C (Carbon fiber)	46.0	10/100	316/390	0.099	<i>Adv. Mater.</i> 2016, 28, 3326.
FeNiCoP	38.0	10	281	-	<i>Electrochim. Acta</i> 2021, 368, 137618.
Co <sub>x</sub> Fe <sub>1-x</sub> P (GCE)	37.0	10	277	0.0107	ChemSusChem 2019, 12, 4461.
Co/CoP (GCE)	79.5	10	340	-	Adv. Energy Mater. 2017, 7, 1602355.
Co <sub>2</sub> Mo <sub>3</sub> O <sub>8</sub> @ NC-800 (GCE)	87.5	10/40	331/422	-	Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2020, 59, 11948.
CoMnP (GCE)	61.0	10	330	-	J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2016, 138, 4006.
MoS <sub>2</sub> /CoB-Se/CC	86	10	270	-	Sustain. Energy. Fuel 2020, 4, 5036.
Ni <sub>2(1-x)</sub> Mo <sub>2x</sub> P MWs/NF	-	50/100	323/346	0.452	Nano Energy 2018, 53, 492.
Ag@Co(OH) <sub>x</sub> /CC	76.0	10	250	-	Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2020, 59, 7245.
CdP <sub>2</sub> -CDs-CoP (Ni foam)	82.94	10	285	- 1 - 1	ACS Sustainable Chem. Eng. 2021, 9, 1297-1303
P-Co <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> (Ti mesh)	51.6	10	280	0.0158	Energy Environ. Sci. 2017, 10, 2563.
PA-PPy/CC	54.9	10	340	-	Angew.Chem.Int. Ed. 2019, 58, 4318.
SrIrO <sub>3</sub> (GC/CC)	42	10	300	-	Chem. Mater. 2020, 32, 11, 4509.
SrCo <sub>0.85</sub> Fe <sub>0.1</sub> P <sub>0.05</sub> O <sub>3-δ</sub> (NF)	52.4	10	280	-	Appl. Catal. B: Environ. 2020, 272, 119046
Co(OH) <sub>2</sub> - TCNQ/CF	101.0	25/50	296/315	0.97	<i>Adv. Mater.</i> 2018, 30, 1705366.
P/Mo-Co <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> @C C	59.4	10	265	-	<i>Adv. Sci.</i> 2020, 7, 1902830.
Co-Ni <sub>3</sub> N (CC)	57.0	10	307	0.0134	<i>Adv. Mater.</i> 2018, 30, 1705516.
FeNi <sub>3</sub> @NC (GCE)	77.0	10	277	-	Appl. Catal. B: Environ. 2020, 268, 118729

**Table S6**. Comparison of OER performance in alkaline electrolytes for electrocatalysts in the
 literatures and this work.

Catalysts (the substrate)	Current density (j, mA cm <sup>-2</sup> )	η (mV) at the <i>j</i>	Ref.
Co-Mo-P NSs/CC	10	1.56	This work
Ni-Co-P HNBs (Ni foam)	10	1.62	Energy Environ. Sci. 2018, 11, 872.
NiCo <sub>2</sub> O <sub>4</sub> (Ni foam)	10	1.65	Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2016, 55, 6290.
Co-NC@Mo <sub>2</sub> C (GCE)	10	1.685	Nano Energy 2019, 57, 746
CdS@Co <sub>9</sub> S <sub>8</sub> /Ni <sub>3</sub> S <sub>2</sub> (Co/Ni alloy)	10	1.56	J. Mater. Chem. A 2020, 8, 3083
Co <sub>0.75</sub> Ni <sub>0.25</sub> (OH) <sub>2</sub> (Carbon fiber paper)	10	1.56	Small 2019, 15, 1804832.
V-CoP@ a-CeO (CC)	10	1.56	Adv. Funct. Mater. 2020, 30, 1909618
$Co_6W_6C@NC$ (CC)	10	1.585	Small 2020, 16, 1907556
IrNi-FeNi <sub>3</sub> /NF	10	1.47	Appl. Catal. B: Environ. 2021, 286, 119881
Co <sub>2</sub> Mo <sub>3</sub> O <sub>8</sub> @NC-800 (GCE)	10	1.67	Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2020, 59, 11948.
MoS <sub>2</sub> /CoB-Se/CC	10	1.58	Sustain. Energy. Fuel 2020, 4, 5036.
Pt/C/NFIRuO2/NF	10	1.53	<i>Chem. Commun.</i> 2016, 52, 1486.
Co-Mo-P-O (Ni foam)	10	1.57	ACS Sustainable Chem. Eng 2020, 8, 2835.
CuSe (NF/FTO)	10	1.68	<i>ChemSusChem</i> 2020, 13, 3222.

Table S7. Comparison of overall water splitting perfromance in alkaline electrolytes for

electrocatalysts in the literatures and this work.