# **Electronic Supplementary Information**

### **Experimental Section**

#### Chemicals and materials

Cobalt nitrate hexahydrate (Co(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>·6H<sub>2</sub>O), urea (CH<sub>4</sub>N<sub>2</sub>O), ammonium chloride (NH<sub>4</sub>Cl), ammonium fluoride (NH<sub>4</sub>F), yttrium chloridehexahydrate (YCl<sub>3</sub>·6H<sub>2</sub>O), ammoniumchloride-<sup>15</sup>N (<sup>15</sup>NH<sub>4</sub>Cl-<sup>15</sup>N), potassium nitrate-<sup>15</sup>N (K<sup>15</sup>NO<sub>3</sub>-<sup>15</sup>N), potassium sulfate (K<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>), sulfamic acid, phosphoric acid, p-aminobenzenesulfonamide, N-(1-Naphthyl) ethylenediamine dihydrochloride, potassium sodium tartrate, NaNO<sub>2</sub> and Nessler's reagent and potassium nitrate (KNO<sub>3</sub>) were purchased from Aladdin (Shanghai, China). Hydrochloric acid and ethanol (C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>5</sub>OH) were purchased from Beijing Chemical Works.

### Synthesis of Y-Co(OH)F/CF and Co(OH)F/CF

A one-step hydrothermal method with some modifications was applied to prepare Y-Co(OH)F/CF catalysts. First, the cleaned Cu foam  $(2 \times 4 \text{ cm}^2)$  was submerged in an aqueous solution with 30 mL of the following: 5 mmol Co(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>·6H<sub>2</sub>O, 5 mmol urea, 400 mg NH<sub>4</sub>F and 0.05 mmol YCl<sub>3</sub>·6H<sub>2</sub>O. After being transferred into a 50 mL Teflon autoclave, the solution was heated at 120 °C for 12 hours. In the end, deionized water was used to clean up the generated Y-Co(OH)F/CF sample, and then dried at 50 °C in the oven. With the exception of adding 0.05 mmol YCl<sub>3</sub>·6H<sub>2</sub>O, the Co(OH)F/CF counterpart was synthesized similarly to Y-Co(OH)F/CF.

#### **Materials Characterization**

The morphology of Y-Co(OH)F/CF was investigated with a Zeiss Gemini 500 scanning electron microscope. Images from transmission electron microscopy (TEM), high-resolution transmission electron microscopy (HRTEM) and high-angle annular dark-field scanning transmission electron

microscopy (HAADF-STEM) were recorded on a TalosS-FEG. Using a PANalytical X'Pert-PRO X-ray diffractometer with Cu K radiation, the powder X-ray diffraction(XRD) patterns of Y-Co(OH)F/CF were examined. The X-ray photoelectron spectrometer (XPS) manufactured by Kratos Analytical was used for studying the chemical valence states and elemental makeup of Y-Co(OH)F/CF. On a Bruker Avance NEO 600 NMR spectrometer, the spectra of <sup>1</sup>H NMR were analyzed.

### **Electrochemical NO<sub>3</sub>RR measurements**

A three-electrode setup was used for the electrochemical technique, and the CHI 660 electrochemical workstation was used for all electrochemical tests. A Pt foil, Y-Co(OH)F/CF (1×1 cm<sup>2</sup>), and SCE were used in the three-electrode setup as the counter electrode, working electrode and reference electrode, respectively. 35 mL of 0.5 M K<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> was placed separately to the H-cell's anode and cathode chambers for the nitrate reduction tests. From -0.7 to -1.5 V (vs. SCE), linear sweep voltammetry (LSV) curves were captured at a scan rate of 10 mV s<sup>-1</sup>. After the LSV curves had stabilized, the 35 ml of 0.5 M K<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> was swapped out for 0.5 M K<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> with 200 mg L<sup>-1</sup> KNO<sub>3</sub>-N. Pass argon gas through the electrolyte for 30 minutes, and two hours of chronoamperometry (i-t) investigates were conducted at various potentials with a 500 rpm mixing rate. Nitrate and ammonia concentrations were determined by UV-VIS spectroscopy. Electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) measurements were performed in a 0.5 M K<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> aqueous solution with 200 mg L<sup>-1</sup> of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>-N at -1.3 V (vs. SCE) with frequency from 0.1 Hz to 100 kHz and an amplitude of 5 mV.

#### Determination of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>-N

First, the electrolyte was withdrawn and diluted to 5 ml according to the measurement range after

the two hours of testing. Than 0.1 mL of HCl solution (1 M) and 0.01 mL of 0.8 wt% sulfamic acid solutionare then added to the electrolyte in sequence. After a thorough shake, the color was produced in drak for ten minutes. The absorbance was measured by UV-Vis spectrophotometry in the wavelength range of 200 nm and 300 nm. The final absorbance of  $NO_3$ -N was calculated by the following formula: A = A220nm-2A275nm. The calibration curve is created by measuring the absorbance corresponding to the reference concentration of KNO<sub>3</sub> solution.

### Determination of NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup>-N

First, 5 mL of deionized water was used to dissolve 0.02 g of N-(1-naphthyl) ethylenediamine dihydrochloride and 0.4 g of p-aminobenzene sulfonamide. Add 1 mL of phosphoric acid (= 1.70 g mL<sup>-1</sup>) next to act as a color developing agent. For 20 minutes, 5 mL of diluted electrolyte was combined with 0.1 mL of color developing agent. UV-Vis spectrophotometry was used to get the peak absorption spectrum at a wavelength of 540 nm. By using NaNO<sub>2</sub> standard solution, the calibration curve was produced.

#### **Determination of NH<sub>3</sub>-N**

The diluted electrolyte was added Potassium sodium tartrate solution (0.1 mL,  $\rho$ =500 g/L) and asprepared Nessler's reagent (0.1 mL). After shaking well, the color was developed for 20 min in drak. UV-Vis spectrophotometry was used to detect the absorbance between the wavelengths of 380 nm and 530 nm. The absorbance at 420 nm is the absorbance of NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>-N. The calibration curve is created by measuring the absorbance corresponding to the reference concentration of NH<sub>4</sub>Cl solution.

#### <sup>15</sup>N Isotope Labeling Experiments

Isotope labelling experiments using K<sup>15</sup>NO<sub>3</sub> as the raw nitrogen source. Before the NO<sub>3</sub>RR test, a

0.5 M K<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> electrolyte solution containing 200 mg L<sup>-1</sup> K<sup>15</sup>NO<sub>3</sub>-<sup>15</sup>N was added to the cathode chamber as the reactant. The pH of the tested electrolyte was adjusted to 1-2 with 4 M H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> solution. In order to further quantify the NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>–N concentration, a standard curve of <sup>15</sup>NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>–<sup>15</sup>N concentration versus integrated area (<sup>15</sup>NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>–<sup>15</sup>N/C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>4</sub>O<sub>4</sub>) was obtained using <sup>1</sup>H NMR with maleic acid (C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>4</sub>O<sub>4</sub>) as the external standard. First, different concentrations of <sup>15</sup>NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>–<sup>15</sup>N (50, 100, 150, 200 and 250 mg L<sup>-1</sup>) were dissolved in 0.5 M K<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>, using 120 mg L<sup>-1</sup> C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>4</sub>O<sub>4</sub> as a standard solution. Next, 0.05 mL of deuterium oxide (D<sub>2</sub>O) was mixed with 0.5 mL of the acidified electrolyte or standard solution and the <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum was further obtained by nuclear magnetic resonance detection.

Calculation equations of conversion ratio of  $NO_3^-$ , the selectivity of product, the yield rate of  $NH_4^+$  and the Faradaic efficiency (FE):

 $Conversion(_{NO3-}) = \Delta c_{NO3-} / c0 \times 100\%$ (1)

Selectivity<sub>(NH4+)</sub>=
$$c_{\text{NH4+}}/\Delta c_{\text{NO3-}} \times 100\%$$
 (2)

$$\operatorname{Yield}_{(\mathrm{NH4+})} = (c_{\mathrm{NH4+}} \times V) / (M_{\mathrm{NH3}} \times t \times S)$$
(3)

$$FE = (8F \times c_{\text{NH4+}} \times V) / (M_{\text{NH4+}} \times Q)$$
(4)

where  $\Delta c_{NO3^-}$  is the concentration difference of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> before and after reduction,  $c_0$  is the initial concentration of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>,  $c_{NH4+}$  is the measured NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> concentration, V is the electrolyte volume in the cathode chamber (35 mL), t is the electrolysis time (2 h), M<sub>NH3</sub> is the molar mass of NH<sub>3</sub>, S is the geometric area of working electrode (1 cm<sup>2</sup>), F is the Faraday constant (96485 C mol<sup>-1</sup>), and Q is the total charge during electrolysis.



Fig. S1 Schematic illustration of the synthesis procedures for the Y-Co(OH)F/CF.



Fig. S2 SEM image of Co(OH)F/CF.

![](_page_4_Figure_4.jpeg)

Fig. S3 EDS spectrum of the Y-Co(OH)F/CF.

![](_page_5_Figure_0.jpeg)

Fig. S4 (a) Full XPS spectrum and (b) high-resolution Co 2p XPS spectrum for Co(OH)F.

![](_page_5_Figure_2.jpeg)

**Fig. S5** (a) High-resolution O 1s XPS spectrum for Y-Co(OH)F; (b) High-resolution F 1s XPS spectra for different samples.

![](_page_5_Figure_4.jpeg)

Fig. S6 The i-t curves of the Y-Co(OH)F/CF in 0.5 M  $K_2SO_4$  with 200 mg L<sup>-1</sup> KNO<sub>3</sub>-N at different potentials.

![](_page_6_Figure_0.jpeg)

Fig. S7 (a) Corresponding calibration curve for calculating the concentration of  $NH_4^+$ –N. (b) Corresponding calibration curve for calculating the concentration of  $NO_3^-$ –N.

![](_page_6_Figure_2.jpeg)

**Fig. S8** (a) Selectivity of  $NO_2$ <sup>-</sup>-N over the Y-Co(OH)F/CF at different potentials. (b) Calibration curve used to estimate the concentrations  $NO_2$ <sup>-</sup>-N.

![](_page_6_Picture_4.jpeg)

Fig. S9 SEM image of Y-Co(OH)F/CF after NO<sub>3</sub>RR testing.

![](_page_7_Figure_0.jpeg)

Energy (kEV)

Fig. S10 EDS spectrum of Y-Co(OH)F/CF after NO<sub>3</sub>RR testing.

![](_page_7_Figure_3.jpeg)

**Fig. R11** (a) High-resolution Co 2p XPS spectra, (b) high-resolution Y 3d XPS spectra, (c) high-resolution O 1s XPS spectra, (d) high-resolution F 1s XPS spectra of Y-Co(OH)F/CF before and after NO<sub>3</sub>RR testing

![](_page_8_Figure_0.jpeg)

Fig. S12 XRD patterns of Y-Co(OH)F/CF before and after NO<sub>3</sub>RR testing.

![](_page_8_Figure_2.jpeg)

**Fig. S13** (a) Yield rates of ammonia from Y-Co(OH)F/CF in a K<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> electrolyte with and without nitrate. (b)  $NO_3^-$ -N and NH<sub>3</sub>-N concentrations over the Y-Co(OH)F/CF at -1.3 V vs. SCE change with time. (c) <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectra of the electrolytes after electrolysis using <sup>15</sup>NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and <sup>14</sup>NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> as the nitrogen source. (d) UV-Vis and <sup>1</sup>H NMR measurements of generated NH<sub>3</sub> concentrations using <sup>14</sup>NO<sub>3</sub>- and <sup>15</sup>NO<sub>3</sub>- as nitrogen sources.

![](_page_9_Figure_0.jpeg)

Fig. S14 (a) <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectra of <sup>15</sup>NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+-15</sup>N with different concentrations. (b) The standard curve of integral area ( $^{15}$ NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+-15</sup>N/C<sub>4</sub>H<sub>4</sub>O<sub>4</sub>) against <sup>15</sup>NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+-15</sup>N concentration.

![](_page_9_Figure_2.jpeg)

**Fig. S15** CV curves of (a) Y-Co(OH)F/CF and (c) Co(OH)F/CF at different scanning rates; Capacitance current densities of (b) Y-Co(OH)F/CF and (d) Co(OH)F/CF at -0.53 V (vs. SCE).

![](_page_10_Figure_0.jpeg)

Fig. S16 EIS spectra of Y-Co(OH)F/CF, Co(OH)F/CF and CF.

Electrocatalyst	Electrolyte	Faradaic Efficiency (Potential)	Ref.
Y-Co(OH)F/CF	0.5mol K <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> +	91.81% (-1.3V vs. SCE)	This work
Co <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> /Ti mesh	200 mg L <sup>-1</sup> KNO <sub>3</sub>		
	$0.1 M Na_2 SO_4 +$	1.23% (2.19 V vs. RHE)	1
	100 g L <sup>-1</sup> NO <sub>3</sub> -		
Co <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> @NiO HNTs	$0.5 mol K_2 SO_4 +$	54.97% (-0.7V vs. RHE)	2
	200 mg L <sup>-1</sup> KNO <sub>3</sub>		
Co/NC-800	$0.1 M Na_2 SO_4 +$	81.2 % (-1.2 V vs. Ag/AgCl)	3
	100 mg L <sup>-1</sup> NO <sub>3</sub> -		
Co <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> /CF	$50 \text{ mM } \text{Na}_2 \text{SO}_4 +$	22.19% ( -1.3 V vs. Ag/AgCl)	4
	50 mg L <sup>-1</sup> NO <sub>3</sub> -		
[Bim]NTf <sub>2</sub> -Co <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4-x</sub>	$0.1 M Na_2 SO_4 +$	84.74% (-1.41 V vs. Ag/AgCl)	5
	500 mg L <sup>-1</sup> KNO <sub>3</sub>		
PP-Co	0.1 M NaOH +	90.1% (-0.6 V vs. RHE)	6
	0.1 M KNO <sub>3</sub>		
Co <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub> /Co	0.1 M Na <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> +	88.7% (-0.8 vs. RHE)	7
	1 mg mL <sup>-1</sup> NO <sub>3</sub> -		
Co–CuO <sub>x</sub>	$500 \text{ mg } L^{-1} \text{ Na}_2 \text{SO}_4 +$	53.5%( -1.1 V vs. Ag/AgCl)	8
	144.4 mg $L^{-1}$ KNO <sub>3</sub>		

**Table S1** Comparison of electrochemical nitrate-to-ammonia performance between the Y-Co(OH)F/CF and some other reported Co-based electrocatalysts.

## References

- 1. Y. Wang, Y. Yu, R. Jia, C. Zhang and B. Zhang, Natl. Sci. Rev., 2019, 6, 730-738.
- 2. Y. Wang, C. Liu, B. Zhang and Y. Yu, Sci. China Mater., 2020, 63, 2530-2538.
- 3. H. Liu, J. Qin, J. Mu and B. Liu, J. Colloid Interface Sci., 2023, 636, 134-140.
- 4. W. Fu, X. Du, P. Su, Q. Zhang and M. Zhou, ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces, 2021, 13, 28348-28358.
- 5. D. Qin, S. Song, Y. Liu, K. Wang, B. Yang and S. Zhang, Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 2023, 62.
- 6. 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.
- 7. F. Zhao, G. Hai, X. Li, Z. Jiang and H. Wang, Chem. Eng. J., 2023, 461, 141960.
- 8. Y. Li, J. Ma, Z. Wu and Z. Wang, Environ. Sci. Technol., 2022, 56, 8673-8681.