# **Electronic Supplementary Information (ESI) for**

# Efficient Asymmetrical Silicon-Metal Dimer Electrocatalysts for Nitrogen

# **Reduction Reaction**

Chuangwei Liu,<sup>1</sup> Haoren Zheng,<sup>1</sup> Tianyi Wang,<sup>1, 2</sup> Xiaoli Zhang,<sup>3</sup> Zhongyuan Guo,<sup>2,\*</sup> Hao Li <sup>2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Key Lab for Anisotropy and Texture of Materials, School of Materials Science and Engineering, Northeastern University, Shenyang 110819, China.

<sup>2</sup> Advanced Institute for Materials Research (WPI-AIMR), Tohoku University, Sendai 980-8577, Japan.

<sup>3</sup> School of Material Science and Engineering, Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou 450001, China.

*Keywords*: *g*-C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>; Si-Metal dimer; ENRR; Electrocatalysis; DFT

\*Corresponding author:

### Dr. Zhongyuan Guo

Email: zhongyuanguo2022@163.com

### Prof. Hao Li

Email: li.hao.b8@tohoku.ac.jp

#### 1. Catalysts models

A 2D (2×2) supercell of *g*-C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> was built and then optimized to the stable strucutre (a = 14.36, b = 14.35,  $\alpha$  =  $\beta$  = 90°,  $\gamma$  = 120°), including the lattice constant. Then, heteroatom (Si or Metal) was substituted into the N<sub>v1</sub> site and the optimized catalysts models were denoted as Si@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> (shown in Fig. 1a) and M@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> (including Mo@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> and Ru@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> as shown in Fig. S8). Additionally, Si and Metal were both substituted into two N<sub>v1</sub> sites to build asymmetrical dimer catalysts and the optimized catalyst models were denoted as SiM@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>. The vacuum thickness of catalyst models along the z direction is set to 20 Å to avoid false interactions between periodic structures during geometry optimizations.

#### Distal pathway \*N<sub>2</sub> \*N<sub>2</sub>H $N_2H_2$ \*NH \*N \*NH<sub>2</sub> \*NH<sub>3</sub> Alternating pathway **UN**U \*N<sub>2</sub> \*N<sub>2</sub>H \*NHNH \*NHNH, \*NH,NH, \*NH, \*NH<sub>3</sub> **Enzymatic** pathway \*NHNH $\implies$ \*NHNH<sub>2</sub> $\implies$ \*NH<sub>2</sub>NH<sub>2</sub> $\implies$ \*N<sub>2</sub>H \*NH<sub>2</sub> \*NH<sub>3</sub> \*N<sub>2</sub> $\rightarrow$

#### 2. Scheme of ENRR on Si@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>

Fig. S1 The widely-proposed ENRR mechanisms, including distal, alternating and enzymatic ones.

#### 3. Interstitial Si-doping into g-C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>



Fig. S2 The configuration of optimized Si-C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>.

The formation energy of the configuration of Si-C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> is -0.02 eV, derived from the  $E_f = E_{Si-C3N4} - \mu_{Si} - E_{g-C3N4}$ , where  $E_{Si-C3N4}$ , and  $E_{g-C3N4}$  represent the electronic energies of the catalyst and the pristine g-C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> substrate, and  $\mu_{Si}$  refers to the chemical potential of Si, obtained by  $1/n * E_{Si-cell}$ . In comparison with the above configuration, the Si-doping into the Nv site (N<sub>v1</sub>), named as Si@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>, is more energetically favorable.

## 4. SiM@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> models



Fig. S3 The concept catalysts of  $SiM@C_3N_4$ .

# 5. Characteristics of SiM@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>

Catalysts	Adsorption energy <i>E</i> <sub>ads</sub> /eV		Binding energies	Cohesive energies, $E_{co}/eV$	Si-M bond	
·	end-on side-on		of dopants, <i>E</i> <sub>b</sub> /eV		length/Å	
Si@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	0.54	1.09	-6.51	-4.55 (E <sub>co.Si</sub> )	_	
$Mo@C_3N_4$	-0.77	0.01	-6.98	-5.86 (Е <sub>со.Мо</sub> )	—	
$Ru@C_3N_4$	-0.24	—	-7.95	-6.77 (E <sub>co.Ru</sub> )	—	
SiFe@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	—	0.16	-13.51	-5.14 (E <sub>co.Fe</sub> )	2.82	
SiCo@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	—	-0.04	-13.91	-5.02 (E <sub>co.Co</sub> )	3.23	
SiNi@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	—	0.43	-14.08	-4.70 (E <sub>co.Ni</sub> )	2.99	
SiNb@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	—	0.12	-15.44	-6.78 (E <sub>co.Nb</sub> )	2.86	
SiMo@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	—	-0.38	-14.18	-5.86 (E <sub>co.Mo</sub> )	2.67	
SiRu@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	—	-0.29	-14.53	-6.77 (E <sub>co.Ru</sub> )	3.11	
SiRh@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	—	0.34	-14.31	-5.66 ( $E_{\rm co.Rh}$ )	3.24	
SiW@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	—	0.06	-15.58	$-8.59 (E_{\rm co.W})$	2.68	
SiRe@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	—	_	-15.09	-7.80 ( $E_{\rm co.Re}$ )	2.67	

Table S1 Characteristics of  $SiM@C_3N_4$ .

6. N<sub>2</sub> adsorption on SiRe@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> model



Fig. S4  $N_2$  adsorption on SiRe@C\_3N\_4.

### 7. Adsorption kinetics of $N_2$ on SiM@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>



Fig. S5 The kinetics analysis of N<sub>2</sub> adsorption on SiM@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> (inserts are the transition states). It is noticed that the TS was not analyzed for SRe@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> because N<sub>2</sub> can merely be activated in the end-on configuration. The 'IS' and 'FS' terms refer to the initial and final states during the adsorption.

## 8. ENRR mechanisms on dimer catalysts



Fig. S6 The ENRR mechanisms on dimer catalysts.

9. ENRR pathways on SiRu@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>



Fig. S7 ENRR enzymatic and consecutive pathways on SiRu@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>.

# 10. \*N<sub>2</sub>H on SiMo@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> and SiRu@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>



Fig. S8 The Si site VS. metal site (Mo/Ru) for the adsorption of  $N_2H$ : the H<sup>+</sup>/ $e^-$  pair tends to attack the N adatoms bound to the metal site energetically. The dash circles indicate different H adsorption sites on N adatom.

# 11. Mo@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> and Ru@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>



Fig. S9 The single-atom Mo/Ru catalysts supported on g-C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>, named Mo@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> and Ru@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>.

# 12. N<sub>2</sub> adsorption on Mo@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> and Ru@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>



Fig. S10 The adsorption configurations of  $*N_2$  on Mo@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> and Ru@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> with N-N bond lengths and energy changes.

13. ENRR on Mo@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> and Ru@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>



Fig. S11 ENRR intermediates along the distal and alternating pathways on (a)  $Mo@C_3N_4$  and (b)  $Ru@C_3N_4$ .

# 14. Hirshfeld charge and N-N bond length analyses

Catalysts	N-N b	ond/Å	Hirshfeld charges/e		
	End-on	Side-on	End-on	Side-on	
Si@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	1.13	1.21	0.06	-0.14	
$Mo@C_3N_4$	1.14	1.16	-0.13	_	
$Ru@C_3N_4$	1.13	_	-0.01	_	
SiMo@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	_	1.21	_	-0.20	
SiRu@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	_	1.20	_	-0.18	

Table S2 The Hirshfeld charge and N-N bond length analyses towards  $*N_2$ .

### 15. DOS and orbital analyses for $N_2$



Fig. S12 DOS and orbital analyses for  $N_2$ .

From the above DOS image, it is noticed that the  $3\sigma$  molecular orbital (MO) crosses the Fermi level. This image is produced by DMol<sup>3</sup> package, where the HOMO level is automatically corrected to the Fermi level. Therefore, it does not indicate that N<sub>2</sub> possesses metallic properties. Also, we did the orbital analysis shown in the above image, again evidencing the accuracy of DOS collected.

#### 16. Evolution of Hirshfeld charges



Fig. S13 (a, c) Evolution of Hirshfeld charges on  $SiMo@C_3N_4$  and  $SiRu@C_3N_4$  along the consecutive

pathways; (b, d) Evolution of Hirshfeld charges on  $Mo@C_3N_4$  and  $Ru@C_3N_4$  along the distal pathway.

17. Energetically favorable configuration of dual Si-M dimer catalysts



Fig. S14 Configurations of SiMo@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> and SiRu@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> vs. SiMo-C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> and SiRu-C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>.

Here, we analyzed the formation energies of the above catalysts to evaluate the synthetic availability in labs. The dual-atom SiMo@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> and SiRu@C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub> catalysts designed by doping two dopant atoms into Nv1 vacancies are more energetically favorable than directly embedded into the hole of g-C<sub>3</sub>N<sub>4</sub>.

<b>Concept-catalysts</b>	Si@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	Si-C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	SiMo@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	SiRu@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	SiMo-C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>	SiRu-C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub>
Formation energy/eV	-0.08	-0.02	2.19	1.36	4.04	3.44

Table S3 Analyses of formation energies.

#### 18. Thermodynamics calculated by DFT

Gases	$E_{ m DFT}/ m eV$	ZPE/eV	$\int C_P dT$	TS/eV	G/eV
H <sub>2</sub>	-32.07	0.27	0.09	0.40	-32.11
$N_2$	-2981.80	0.15	0.09	0.59	-2982.15
NH <sub>3</sub>	-1539.82	0.89	0.10	0.60	-1539.43

**Table S4** Thermodynamic quantities for  $H_2$ ,  $N_2$ , and  $NH_3$  gases at standard conditions ( $N_2 + 3H_2 \rightarrow 2NH_3$ ).

For the gas molecules, the Gibbs free energy calculation should be performed as follows:

 $\mu = E_{\text{DFT}} + ZPE + \int C_P dT - TS$ , where  $\mu$ , E, and  $C_P$  denote the chemical potential, electronic energy, and heat capacity, respectively.

Intermediates	Catalysts (SiMo@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub> )		Catalysts (SiRu@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub> )		Catalysts (Mo@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub> )		Catalysts (Ru@C <sub>3</sub> N <sub>4</sub> )	
	E <sub>DFT</sub> /eV	ZPE/eV	E <sub>DFT</sub> /eV	ZPE/eV	E <sub>DFT</sub> /eV	ZPE/eV	E <sub>DFT</sub> /eV	ZPE/eV
*N2	-83069.63	0.20	-83898.67	0.22	-76683.90	0.22	-77512.97	0.22
*N <sub>2</sub> H	-83085.84	0.55	-83914.68	0.56	-76699.45	0.50	-77528.42	0.51
*N <sub>2</sub> H <sub>2</sub>	-83102.79	0.91	-83931.17	0.91	-76715.83	0.84	-77544.55	0.84
*N	-81579.12	0.11	-82407.32	0.095	-75192.60	0.10	-76020.32	0.09
*NH	-81595.77	0.40	-82425.16	0.43	-75209.12	0.37	-76037.32	0.36
*NH <sub>2</sub>	-81612.72	0.53	-82442.03	0.75	-75225.72	0.68	-76054.91	0.70
*NH <sub>3</sub>	-81629.54	1.08	-82457.92	0.90	-75242.59	1.06	-76071.55	1.08
*NHNH	-83102.39	0.86	-83931.14	0.86	-76715.42	0.86	-77544.53	0.66
*NHNH <sub>2</sub>	-83118.94	1.22	-83947.86	1.24	-76732.20	0.99	-77561.17	1.18
*NH <sub>2</sub> NH <sub>2</sub>	-83135.28	1.37	-83963.92	1.38	-76748.51	1.54	-77577.83	1.34

 Table S5 Calculated data for ENRR.