SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Supporting Information

Highly Efficient H₂ Production and Size-Selective AgCl Synthesis via Electrolytic Cell Design

Yanqiu Wu, ^{a,b} Muzaffar Ahmad Boda,^a and Zhiguo Yi*a,^b

^aState Key Laboratory of High Performance Ceramics and Superfine Microstructure, Shanghai Institute of Ceramics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Shanghai 200050, China
E-mail: zhiguo@mail.sic.ac.cn
^bDepartment Center of Materials Science and Optoelectronics Engineering University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China

Table of Contents

Cell Voltage Calculations.

Figure S1. Effect of KNO₃ in electrolyte on silver oxidation reaction.

Figure S2. Photograph showing the changes of the silver rod during positive scanning from +0.7V (vs. RHE).

Figure S3. Photograph showing surface of the silver rod when the reaction is over.

Figure S4. The polarization curves of silver electrode with different chloride ions concentration.

Figure S5. The phenomenon of silver electrode reaction with different chloride ions concentration.

Figure S6. Photograph of the actual electrochemical device.

Figure S7. XRD patterns and SEM images of silver-based compounds synthesized using the asymmetric neutral-acidic electrolytic cell.

Figure S8. Photograph showing the difference of Pt sheet electrode surface with and without chloride ions in electrolyte.

Figure S9. SEM images of silver rod after the reaction.

Figure S10. Durability measurement when silver and graphite rods are used as the anode and cathode, respectively. The measurements are carried out at a galvanostatic current of 10 mA.

Table S1. Comparison of the electrolytic voltage between our work and the overall water splitting.

Video S1. The generation of white sol at anode and bubbles at cathode when applying a voltage of 1.23V to the first cell.

Video S2. The electrolysis without chloride ions in electrolyte when applying a voltage of 1.3V to the second cell.

Video S3. The electrolysis with chloride ions in electrolyte when applying a voltage of 1.3V to the second cell.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Cell Voltage Calculations.

The theoretical applied voltage for water splitting is 1.23 V. This conclusion applies only to the electrolyte with the same pH value in the anode and cathode chambers. However, assuming that OER is carried out in a neutral electrolyte (1.0 M KNO₃) and HER in an acidic electrolyte (1 M HNO₃) forming an asymmetric neutral-acidic electrolytic cell, the applied voltage for water splitting can be obtained by the following Nernst formula:

For water electrolysis in asymmetric neutral-acidic cell

OER at the anode (1M KNO₃, pH=7)

$$4OH^{-} - 4e^{-} \rightarrow 2H_2O + O_2$$

$$E_{a} = E_{O_{2}/OH^{-}}^{\theta} - 2.303 \frac{RT}{4F} log \left[\frac{\alpha (OH^{-})^{4}}{\alpha (H_{2}O)^{2} \alpha (O_{2})} \right] = 1.229 V - 0.059 V \times pH = 0.8153 V$$

HER at the cathode (1M HNO₃, pH=0)

$$\mathrm{H}^{+} + \mathrm{e}^{-} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{H}_{2}$$

$$E_{c} = E_{H^{+}/H_{2}}^{\theta} - 2.303 \frac{RT}{4F} log \left[\frac{\alpha_{H_{2}}}{\alpha(H^{+})_{H^{+}}^{2}} \right] = 0V - 0.0591 \times pH = 0V$$

The overall reaction:

$$4H^{+} + 4OH^{-} \rightarrow 2H_{2}O + 2H_{2} + O_{2}$$
$$V_{\text{theoretical required}} = E_{a} - E_{c} = 0.815V$$

when the anode OER was replaced by silver oxidation reaction (AOR) AOR at the anode (1M KNO₃ with 0.01 M KCl, pH=7):

$$Ag - e^- \rightarrow Ag^+$$

Ag⁺ will react with Cl⁻ spontaneously:

$$Ag^{+} + Cl^{-} \rightarrow AgCl$$

$$E_{a} = E_{AgCl/Ag}^{\theta} - \frac{RT}{nF} \ln \left[\frac{\alpha_{Ag} \times \alpha_{Cl^{-}}}{\alpha_{AgCl}} \right] = 0.222V - \frac{8.314 \times 298.15}{1 \times 96485} \ln \left[\frac{0.01}{1} \right] = 0.340V$$

$$E_{AgCl/Ag}^{\theta} = 0.222V$$

HER at the cathode (1M HCl, pH=0)

$$H^{+} + e^{-} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} H_{2}$$

$$E_{c} = E_{H^{+}/H_{2}}^{\theta} - \frac{RT}{nF} \ln \left[\frac{1}{\alpha_{H^{+}}^{2}}\right] = 0V - \frac{8.314 \times 298.15}{1 \times 96485} \ln \left[\frac{1}{1^{2}}\right] V = 0V$$

$$E_{H^{+}/H_{2}}^{\theta} = 0V$$

Overall reaction:

$$Ag + HCl \rightarrow AgCl + \frac{1}{2}H_2$$
$$V_{\text{theoretical required}} = E_a - E_c = 0.340V$$

where R is 8.314 J K⁻¹ mol⁻¹ (molar gas constant), T is 298.15 K, n is 1 (the number of electrons transferred per mole of product), F is 96485 C mol⁻¹ (Faradaic constant), and is the corresponding activity.

If AOR at the anode (1M KNO₃ with 0.025 M KCl, pH=7):

$$E_{a} = E_{AgCl/Ag}^{\theta} - \frac{RT}{nF} \ln \left[\frac{\alpha_{Ag} \times \alpha_{Cl^{-}}}{\alpha_{AgCl}} \right] = 0.222V - \frac{8.314 \times 298.15}{1 \times 96485} \ln \left[\frac{0.025}{1} \right] = 0.317V$$
$$V_{\text{theoretical required}} = E_{a} - E_{c} = 0.317V$$

If AOR at the anode (1M KNO₃ with 0.05 M KCl, pH=7):

$$E_{a} = E_{AgCl/Ag}^{\theta} - \frac{RT}{nF} \ln \left[\frac{\alpha_{Ag} \times \alpha_{Cl^{-}}}{\alpha_{AgCl}} \right] = 0.222 V - \frac{8.314 \times 298.15}{1 \times 96485} \ln \left[\frac{0.05}{1} \right] = 0.299 V$$
$$V_{\text{theoretical}_{required}} = E_{a} - E_{c} = 0.299 V$$

If AOR at the anode (1M KNO₃ with 0.075 M KCl, pH=7):

$$E_{a} = E_{AgCl/Ag}^{\theta} - \frac{RT}{nF} \ln \left[\frac{\alpha_{Ag} \times \alpha_{Cl^{-}}}{\alpha_{AgCl}} \right] = 0.222 V - \frac{8.314 \times 298.15}{1 \times 96485} \ln \left[\frac{0.075}{1} \right] = 0.289 V$$

$$V_{\text{theoretical} required} = E_{a} - E_{c} = 0.289 V$$

If AOR at the anode (1M KNO₃ with 0.1 M KCl, pH=7):

$$E_{a} = E_{AgCI/Ag}^{\theta} - \frac{RT}{nF} \ln \left[\frac{\alpha_{Ag} \times \alpha_{CI^{-}}}{\alpha_{AgCI}} \right] = 0.222V - \frac{8.314 \times 298.15}{1 \times 96485} \ln \left[\frac{0.1}{1} \right] = 0.281V$$
$$V_{\text{theoretical} required} = E_{a} - E_{c} = 0.281V$$

According to theoretical calculation, the potential of practical application for asymmetric neutralacidic cell using AOR instead of OER is much lower than that of water splitting.



Figure S1. (a) LSV curves with different electrolytes. (b) Chronoamperometry curve for silver in 0.025 M KCl at 2.5 V vs. RHE. (c) Photograph showing surface of the silver rod during the reaction. The silver electrode surface was covered with a thick white material, making it difficult to continue the reaction.



Figure S2. Photograph showing the changes of the silver rod during positive scanning from +0.7V (vs. RHE).



Figure S3. Photograph showing surface of the silver rod when the reaction is over.



Figure S4. The polarization curves of silver electrode with different chloride ions concentration.



Figure S5. The phenomenon of silver electrode reaction with different chloride ions concentration.



Figure S6. Photograph of the actual electrochemical device.



Figure S7. (a) XRD pattern of $Ag_3PO_4/AgCl$. (b) XRD pattern of $Ag_2O/AgCl$. (c) SEM images of $Ag_3PO_4/AgCl$. (d) SEM images of $Ag_2O/AgCl$. $Ag_3PO_4/AgCl$ appears as a flake and $Ag_2O/AgCl$ as a polyhedron.



Figure S8. Photograph showing the difference of Pt sheet electrode surface with and without chloride ions in electrolyte during the reaction: (a) no chloride ions in the electrolyte, (b) 0.01M chloride ions in the electrolyte.



Figure S9. SEM images of silver rod after the reaction.



Figure S10. Durability measurement when silver and graphite rods were used as the anode and cathode, respectively. The measurements were carried out at a current of 10 mA.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Table S1: Comparison of the electrolytic voltage between our work and the overall water splitting

Electrode materials	Medium	${ m E}$ (overall reaction)	Reference
Anode : Sliver rod	Anode: 1M KNO ₃ +0.025M KCl	1.1 at 10 mA cm ⁻²	This work
Cathode: Pt sheet	Cathode: 1M HCl		
Anode : Sliver rod	1M HNO ₃ +0.01M KCl	0.95 at 10 mA cm ⁻²	This work
Cathode: Graphite rod		1.37 at 250 mA cm ⁻²	
NiFe LDH /DG	1.0 M KOH	1.5 at 20 mA cm ⁻²	[1]
NiFeRu-LDH	1.0 M KOH	1.52 at 10 mA cm ⁻²	[2]
NiFe LDH	1.0 M KOH	1.54 at 10 mA cm ⁻²	[3]
NiVIr-LDH	1.0 M KOH	1.42 at 10 mA cm ⁻²	[4]
NiFe(OH)x/FeS	1.0 M KOH	1.42 at 10 mA cm ⁻²	[5]
FeP/Ni2P	1.0 M KOH	1.42 at 10 mA cm ⁻²	[6]
Ni ₂ P-NiP ₂ HNPs NiFe-LDH	1.0 M KOH	1.48 at 10 mA cm ⁻²	[7]
N-Ni ₃ S ₂ /NF N-Ni ₃ S ₂ /NF	1.0 M KOH	1.48 at 10 mA cm ⁻²	[8]
Cu@NiFe LDH Cu@NiFe LDH	1.0 M KOH	1.54 at 10 mA cm ⁻²	[9]
MoS ₂ /Ni ₃ S ₂	1.0 M KOH	1.56 at 10 mA cm ⁻²	[10]
Ni _{0.1} Co _{0.9} P	1.0 M PBS	1.89 at 10 mA cm ⁻²	[11]
CoO/CoSe ₂	1.0 M PBS	2.18 at 10 mA cm ⁻²	[12]

References

- 1. Y. Jia, L. Z. Zhang, G. P. Gao, H. Chen, B. Wang, J. Z. Zhou, M. T. Soo, M. Hong, X. C. Yan, G. R. Qian, J. Zou, A. J. Du and X. D. Yao, *Adv. Mater.*, 2017, **29**, 1700017.
- 2. G. B. Chen, T. Wang, J. Zhang, P. Liu, H. J. Sun, X. D. Zhuang, M. W. Chen and X. L. Feng, *Adv. Mater*, 2018, **30**, 1706279.
- 3. L. Yu, H. Q. Zhou, J. Y. Sun, F. Qin, F. Yu, J. M. Bao, Y. Yu, S. Chen and Z. F. Ren, *Energy Environ. Sci*, 2017, **10**, 1820-1827.
- 4. D. W. Wang, Q. Li, C. Han, Q. Q. Lu, Z. C. Xing and X. R. Yang, *Nat. Commun.*, 2019, **10**, 3899.
- 5. S. Niu, W. J. Jiang, T. Tang, L. P. Yuan, H. Luo and J. S. Hu, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2019, **29**, 1902180.
- 6. F. Yu, H. Q. Zhou, Y. F. Huang, J. Y. Sun, F. Qin, J. M. Bao, W. A. Goddardiii, S. Chen and Z. F. Ren, *Nat. Commun.*, 2018, **9**, 2551.
- 7. T. Liu, A. R. Li, C. B. Wang, W. Zhou, S. J. Liu and L. Guo, *Adv. Mater.*, 2018, **30**, 1803590.
- 8. P. Z. Chen, T. P. Zhou, M. X. Zhang, Y. Tong, C. G. Zhong, N. Zhang, L. D. Zhang, C. Z. Wu and Y. Xie, *Adv. Mater.*, 2017, **29**, 1701584.
- 9. Y. P. Zhu, T. Y. Ma, M. Jaroniec and S. Z. Qiao, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2017, 56, 1324-1328.
- 10. J. Zhang, T. Wang, D. Pohl, B. Rellinghaus, R. H. Dong, S. H. Liu, X. D. Zhuang and X. L. Feng, *Angew. Chem.*, *Int. Ed.*, 2016, **55**, 6702-6707.
- 11. R. Wu, B. Xiao, Q. Gao, Y. R. Zheng, X. S. Zheng, J. F. Zhu, M. R. Gao and S. H. Yu, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2018, **57**, 15445-15449.
- 12. K. D. Li, J. F. Zhang, R. Wu, Y. F. Yu and B. Zhang, *Adv. Sci.*, 2016, **3**, 1500426.