## **Electronic Supplementary Information**

**Materials:** Cobalt nitrate (Co(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>·6H<sub>2</sub>O, AR, 99.0%), sodium nitrate (NaNO<sub>3</sub>, AR, 99.0%), sodium nitrite (NaNO<sub>2</sub>, AR, 99.0%), sodium sulfate (Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>, AR, 99.0%), ammonium chloride (NH<sub>4</sub>Cl, AR, 99.5%), sodium hydroxide (NaOH, AR, 97%), sodium salicylate (C<sub>7</sub>H<sub>5</sub>NaO<sub>3</sub>, AR, 99.5%), trisodium citrate dihydrate (C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>5</sub>Na<sub>3</sub>O<sub>7</sub>·2H<sub>2</sub>O, AR, 99.0%), p-dimethylaminobenzaldehyde (C<sub>9</sub>H<sub>11</sub>NO, AR, 99.0%), sodium nitroferricyanide dihydrate (C<sub>5</sub>FeN<sub>6</sub>Na<sub>2</sub>O·2H<sub>2</sub>O, AR, 99.0%) and sodium hypochlorite solution (NaClO, available chlorine  $\geq$  5.0%) were purchased from Aladdin Ltd. (Shanghai, China). Sulfuric acid (H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>, ~98%), hydrogen peroxide (H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, 30%), hydrochloric acid (HCl, ~37%), hydrazine monohydrate (N<sub>2</sub>H<sub>4</sub>·H<sub>2</sub>O, 98%) and anhydrous ethyl alcohol (C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>OH, 95%) were bought from Beijing Chemical Corporation (Chengdu, China). Carbon cloth (CC) was provided by Hongshan District, Wuhan instruments business. All chemicals were used as received without further purification. The ultrapure water used throughout all experiments was purified through a Millipore system.



Fig. S1. XRD patterns of  $V_{\rm O}\text{-}Co_3O_4/CC$  and  $Co_3O_4/CC.$ 



Fig. S2. SEM images of (a) Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>/CC and (b) V<sub>O</sub>-Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>/CC.



Fig. S3. Chronoamperometry curves of  $V_0$ -Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>/CC at different potentials in 0.1 M NaOH with 0.1 M NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>.



Fig. S4. (a) UV-vis absorption spectra and corresponding (b) calibration curve used for  $NH_3$  quantification.



Fig. S5. Cyclic voltammograms of (a) Vo-Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>/CC and (b) Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>/CC at different scanning rates for double layer capacitance calculation.



Fig. S6. (a) UV-vis spectra and corresponding (b) calibration curve used for  $N_2H_4$  quantification.



Fig. S7. (a) UV-vis spectra and corresponding (b) calibration curve used for  $NO_2^-$  quantification.



Fig. S8. UV-vis spectra of the electrolytes estimated by the method of Watt and Chrisp after electrolysis at each given potential for  $N_2H_4$  detection.



Fig. S9. UV-vis spectra of the electrolytes after electrolysis colored with Griess reagent for  $NO_2^-$  detection.



Fig. S10. NH<sub>3</sub> yields and FEs of  $V_0$ -Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>/CC for alternating cycle tests between NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>-containing and NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>-free 0.1 M NaOH at -0.5 V.



Fig. S11. Chronoamperometry curves for  $V_0$ -CO<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>/CC during consecutive cycling tests toward NO<sub>3</sub>RR at -0.5 V in 0.1 M NaOH with 0.1 M NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>.



Fig. S12. Long-term stability test of  $V_O$ -Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>/CC at -0.5 V for two cycles.



Fig. S13. (a) EPR spectrum and (b, c) XPS spectra of  $V_0$ -Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>/CC after 12-h electrolysis.



Fig. S14. Chronoamperometry curves of  $V_O$ -Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>/CC at different potentials in alkaline wastewater.

Table S1. Comparison of catalytic performances comparison of  $V_O$ -Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>/CC with other reported NO<sub>3</sub>RR electrocatalysts.

Catalyst	Electrolyte	Performance	Ref.
V <sub>0</sub> -Co <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> /CC	0.1 M NaOH (0.1 M NO₃ <sup>−</sup> )	NH <sub>3</sub> yield rate: 12,157 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> cm <sup>-2</sup> FE <sub>NH3</sub> : 96.9 %	This work
TiO <sub>2-x</sub>	0.5 M Na <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> (50 ppm NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> )	NH <sub>3</sub> yield rate: 850 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> cm <sup>-2</sup> FE <sub>NH3</sub> : 85.0 %	1
PTCDA/O-Cu	0.1 M PBS (500 ppm NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> )	NH <sub>3</sub> yield rate: $436 \pm 85 \ \mu g \ h^{-1} \ cm^{-2}$ FE <sub>NH3</sub> : 85.9 %	2
Co/CoO NSA	3.28 mM Na <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> (200 ppm NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> )	NH <sub>3</sub> yield rate: 3305 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> cm <sup>-1</sup> FE <sub>NH3</sub> : 93.8 %	3
Co <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> @NiO HNTs	0.5 M Na <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> (200 ppm NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> )	NH <sub>3</sub> yield rate: 6.93 mmol h <sup>-1</sup> g <sup>-1</sup> FE <sub>NH3</sub> : 54.97 %	4
NiPc complex	0.1 M KOH, in the presence of NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	NH <sub>3</sub> yield rate: n/a FE <sub>NH3</sub> :85 %	5
Cu nanosheets	1 М КОН	NH <sub>3</sub> yield rate: 390.1 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup> FE <sub>NH3</sub> :99.7 %	6
Cu <sub>50</sub> Ni <sub>50</sub>	1 M KOH (10 mM KNO <sub>3</sub> )	NH <sub>3</sub> yield rate: n/a FE <sub>NH3</sub> :84 $\pm$ 2 %	7
Ti/GC	KOH (~0.1 to 0.6 M NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> )	NH <sub>3</sub> yield rate: n/a FE <sub>NH3</sub> :82 %	8
NTEs	NaCl $(0.65 \text{ mM NaNO}_3)$	NH <sub>3</sub> yield rate: n/a FE <sub>NH3</sub> :5.6 %	9
CoO@NCNT/GP	0.1 M NaOH (0.1 M NO3⁻)	NH <sub>3</sub> yield rate: 9041.6 $\pm$ 370.7 $\mu g \ h^{-1} \ cm^{-2}$ FE <sub>NH3</sub> : 93.8 $\pm$ 1.5 %	10
ZnCo <sub>2</sub> O <sub>4</sub>	0.1 M KOH (0.1 M NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>−</sup> )	NH3 yield rate: 2100 $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup> FE <sub>NH3</sub> :95.4 %	11
PP-Co	0.1 M NaOH (0.1 M NO <sub>3</sub> -)	NH <sub>3</sub> yield rate: 1.1 mmol $\mu$ g h <sup>-1</sup> mg <sup>-1</sup> FE <sub>NH3</sub> :90.1 %	12
Co <sub>0.5</sub> Cu <sub>0.5</sub>	1 M KOH (50 mM KNO <sub>3</sub> )	NH <sub>3</sub> yield rate: n/a FE <sub>NH3</sub> :95 %	13
Co <sub>2</sub> AlO <sub>4</sub>	0.1 M PBS (0.1 M NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> )	NH <sub>3</sub> yield rate: 7.9 mg h <sup>-1</sup> cm <sup>-2</sup> FE <sub>NH3</sub> :92.6 %	14

## References

- R. Jia, Y. Wang, C. Wang, Y. Ling, Y. Yu and B. Zhang, ACS Catal., 2020, 10, 3533-3540.
- G. Chen, Y. Yuan, H. Jiang, S. Ren, L. Ding, L. Ma, T. Wu, J. Lu and H Wang, *Nat. Energy*, 2020, 5, 605–613.
- 3 Y. Yu, C. Wang, Y. Yu, Y. Wang and B. Zhang, *Sci. China Chem.*, 2020, **63**, 1469-1476.
- 4 Y. Wang, C. Liu, B. Zhang and Y. Yu, *Sci. China Mater.*, 2020, **63**, 2530–2538.
- 5 N. Chebotareva and T. Nyokong, J. Appl. Electrochem., 1997, 27, 975–981.
- X. Fu, X. Zhao, X. Hu, K. He, Y. Yu, T. Li, Q. Tu, X. Qian, Q. Yue and M. R.
  Wasielewski, *Appl. Mater. Today*, 2020, 19, 100620.
- Y. Wang, A. Xu, Z. Wang, L. Huang, J. Li, F. Li, J. Wicks, M. Luo, D. H. Nam, C. Tan, Y. Ding, J. Wu, Y. Lum, C. T. Dinh, D. Sinton, G. Zheng and E. H. Sargent, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2020, 142, 5702–5708.
- J. M. McEnaney, S. J. Blair, A. C. Nielander, J. A. Schwalbe, D. M. Koshy, M. Cargnello and T. F. Jaramillo, ACS Sustainable Chem. Eng., 2020, 8, 2672–2681.
- X. Ma, M. Li, C. Feng, W. Hu, L. Wang and X. Liu, J. Electroanal. Chem., 2016, 782, 270–277.
- Q. Chen, J. Liang, L. Yue, Y. Luo, Q. Liu, N. Li, A. A. Alshehri, T. Li, H.
   Guo and X. Sun, *Chem. Commun.*, 2022, 58, 5901–5904.
- P. Huang, T. Fan, X. Ma, J. Zhang, Y. Zhang, Z. Chen and X. Yi, *ChemSusChem*, 2022, 15, e202102049.
- Q. Chen, J. Liang, Q. Liu, K. Dong, L. Yue, P. Wei, Y. Luo, Q. Liu, N. Li, B. Tang, A. A. Alshehri, M. S. Hamdy, Z. Jiang and X. Sun, *Chem. Commun.*, 2022, 58, 4259–4262.
- T. H. Jeon, Z.-Y. Wu, F.-Y. Chen, W. Choi, P. J. J. Alvarez and H. Wang, *The J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2022, **126**, 6982–6989.

Z. Deng, J. Liang, Q. Liu, C. Ma, L. Xie, L. Yue, Y. Ren, T. Li, Y. Luo, N. Li,
B. Tang, A. Ali Alshehri, I. Shakir, P. O. Agboola, S. Yan, B. Zheng, J. Du, Q.
Kong and X. Sun, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 2022, 435, 135104.