## **Supporting Information**

## Interface Engineering with $AlO_x$ dielectric layer enabling an ultrastable $Ta_3N_5$ photoanode for photoelectrochemical water

## oxidation

Yongle Zhao<sup>a, b</sup>, Guiji Liu<sup>a, b</sup>, Hong Wang<sup>a, b</sup>, Yuying Gao<sup>a,b</sup>, Tingting Yao<sup>a</sup>, Wenwen Shi<sup>a, b</sup>, Can Li<sup>\*a</sup>

a. State Key Laboratory of Catalysis, Dalian Institute of Chemical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Dalian National Laboratory for Clean Energy, Zhongshan Road 457, Dalian 116023, P. R. China. E-mail: canli@dicp.ac.cn

b. University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, P. R. China

\*Corresponding author. E-mail address: canli@dicp.ac.cn (Prof. Can Li)



**Fig. S1** a) Current density of  $Ta_3N_5$  photoanodes modified with different thickness of  $AlO_x$  layer at 1.23 V vs. RHE under AM 1.5G simulated sunlight at 100 mW cm<sup>-2</sup> in the 1 M NaOH aqueous solution (pH = 13.6). b) Current-potential curves of  $Ta_3N_5$ ,  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-25 photoanodes at 1.23V vs. RHE under AM 1.5G simulated sunlight at 100 mW cm<sup>-2</sup> in the 1 M NaOH aqueous solution (pH = 13.6).



Fig. S2 a) XPS spectra of Al 2p for Ta<sub>3</sub>N<sub>5</sub>-AlO<sub>x</sub> photoanode. b) XPS spectra of O 1s for Ta<sub>3</sub>N<sub>5</sub>-AlO<sub>x</sub> photoanode.



**Fig. S3** Cyclic voltammogram measurements for NiFeO<sub>x</sub> cocatalyst on FTO under scan rates of 20, 50, 100 mV s<sup>-1</sup> in 1 M NaOH aqueous solution (pH = 13.6).



**Fig. S4** Chronoamperometry measurement of  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-Fh-NiFeO<sub>x</sub> photoanode under AM 1.5G simulated sunlight at 1.23V in 1 M NaOH aqueous solution (pH = 13.6).



Fig. S5 a) The SEM image of  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-Fh-NiFeO<sub>x</sub> photoanode. b) The SEM image of  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-Fh-NiFeO<sub>x</sub> photoanode after stability test for 10min.



**Fig. S6** a) Cyclic voltammogram measurements for  $CeO_x$  film on FTO under scan rates of 20, 50, 100 mVs<sup>-1</sup>. b) Light transmittance test for  $CeO_x$  film on FTO.



Fig. S7 ICP-OES analysis of NaOH solution before and after J-t measurement.



Fig. S8 Oxygen evolution measurement of the  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-Fh-NiFeO<sub>x</sub>-CeO<sub>x</sub> photoanode at 1.23 V in 1 M NaOH aqueous solution (pH = 13.6).



**Fig. S9** a) The SEM image of  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-Fh-NiFeO<sub>x</sub>-CeO<sub>x</sub> photoanode. b) The SEM image of  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-Fh-NiFeO<sub>x</sub>-CeO<sub>x</sub> photoanode after stability test for 120 hours.



Fig. S10 Topography and CPD map of the  $Ta_3N_5$  and  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub> photoanodes with different bias voltage in the dark.



Fig. S11 a)  $\triangle$  CPD values as a function of bias voltage applied to the tip. b) SPV responses of Ta<sub>3</sub>N<sub>5</sub>, Ta<sub>3</sub>N<sub>5</sub>-AlO<sub>x</sub> photoanodes.

Kelvin probe force microscopy was also performed to further clarify the role of AlO<sub>x</sub> layer. Different bias voltage of -1, 0, and 1 V were applied at the atomic force microscopy (AFM) tip in dark (Fig. S7) and contact potential difference (CPD) can be detected. Fig. S11a shows  $\Delta$ CPD value of the sample with AlO<sub>x</sub> layer is significantly lower than that of reference sample by about 400 mV, which shows that the interface trap states can be passivated.  $\Delta$ CPD increased for both the samples at a bias of +1 V and -1 V, but the change rate is higher for control samples. In addition,  $\Delta$ CPD value tends to be saturated after AlO<sub>x</sub> layer modification, rather than fluctuating obviously with bis voltage changes. This indicates that the trap states of samples seem to be less sensitive to the electric field with AlO<sub>x</sub> dielectric layer. Accordingly, the AlO<sub>x</sub> dielectric layer can effectively passivate trap states of Ta<sub>3</sub>N<sub>5</sub> photoanode, which corresponds to the result in Fig. 3. This also confirmed by surface photovoltage spectroscopy (SPV) measurement results. As shown in Fig. S11b, the SPV response of Ta<sub>3</sub>N<sub>5</sub>-AlO<sub>x</sub> photoanode is significantly higher than that of pristine one.



**Fig. S12** Chopped light chronoamperometry measurements of  $Ta_3N_5$  (black curve),  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub> (blue curve),  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-Fh (green curve) photoanodes in the 1 M NaOH aqueous solution (pH = 13.6). The potential is scanned from 0.45 to 1.45 V vs. RHE with a 0.1 V step and with a 60 s light on/off cycle on each step.



Fig. S13 The applied bias photon-to-current efficiency (ABPE) of  $Ta_3N_5$ ,  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>,  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-Fh,  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-Fh-NiFeO<sub>x</sub>-CeO<sub>x</sub> photoanodes.



Fig. S14 The corresponding dark current and chopped light chronoamperometry measurement of  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-Fh-NiFeO<sub>x</sub>-CeO<sub>x</sub> at 1.23 V in 1 M NaOH solution.



**Fig. S15** IPCE curves of  $Ta_3N_5$ ,  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>,  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-Fh,  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-Fh-NiFeO<sub>x</sub>-CeO<sub>x</sub> photoanodes at 1.23 V in 1 M NaOH solution.



Fig. S16 Current-potential curves of  $Ta_3N_5$ ,  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>,  $Ta_3N_5$ -Fh,  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-Fh,  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-Fh,  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-Fh-NiFeO<sub>x</sub>-CeO<sub>x</sub> photoanodes in 1 M NaOH-0.5M H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> solution.



Fig. S17 XPS spectra of Al 2p for  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub> photoanode through oxygen production test.



Fig. S18 Current-potential curves of  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-NiFeO<sub>x</sub>,  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-Fh-NiFeO<sub>x</sub> photoanodes in 1 M NaOH-0.5M H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> solution.



Fig. S19 XPS spectra of Fe 2p and Ni 2p for NiFeO<sub>x</sub>.



Fig. S20 The high-resolution cross section SEM characterizations with EDX mapping of the  $Ta_3N_5$ -AlO<sub>x</sub>-Fh-NiFeO<sub>x</sub>-CeO<sub>x</sub> photoanode.

Ref. 1
1
2
3
4
is work

Table S1 Representative  $Ta_3N_5$  based photoanode systems

## References

- Y. Li, L. Zhang, A. Torres-Pardo, et al. Nature Communications, 2013, 4, 2566.
  G. Liu, S. Ye; P. Yan, et al. Energy & Environmental Science, 2016, 9, 1327.
  Y. Pihosh, T. Minegishi, V. Nandal, et al. Energy & Environmental Science, 2020, 5, 1519.
  Y. Xiao, C. Feng, J. Fu, et al. Nature Catalysis, 2020, 3, 932.