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The apparent quantum yield (AQY) measurement

The apparent quantum yield of TAPT-BT-COF was measured under 300 W Xe lamp irradiation (with a bandpass glass filter of 420 nm). The light intensity at 420 nm is measured by an optical power meter. The AQY was calculated as follows:

\[
AQY(\%) = \frac{(\text{Number of produced } H_2O_2 \text{ molecules}) \times 2}{\text{number of incident photons}} \times 100
\]

\[
= \frac{(\text{Number of produced } H_2O_2 \text{ molecules}) \times 2}{I\lambda S t \frac{h}{c}}
\]

Where \( I = \) light power intensity (W cm\(^{-2}\)); \( S = \) the irradiation area (cm\(^2\)); \( t = \) reaction time (s); \( \lambda = \) wavelength (m); \( h = 6.63 \times 10^{-34} \text{ m}^2 \text{ kg s}^{-1} \) (Planck’s constant); \( c = 3 \times 10^8 \text{ m s}^{-1} \) (speed of light).

Electrode preparation

To prepare the working electrodes, 5 mg ground sample was dispersed in 1 mL as-prepared solution (ethanol: Nafion =100:1). After sonication for 10 min, the solution was dropped on the surface of FTO glass with an exposed area of \( 1 \times 1 \text{ cm}^2 \), and then dried in air at 40˚C. This step was repeated three times to achieve a uniform coverage.

Transmission electron microscopy (TEM) and scanning transmission electron microscopy energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (STEM-EDS) mapping

The samples were dispersed in ethanol at room temperature and drop cast on an amorphous carbon coated Cu TEM grid. TEM images were collected on a JEOL JEM-2200FS transmission electron microscope with a HAADF detector, and operated at 200 kV and equipped with a Cs corrector. The composition of the materials was studied using EDS in the HAADF-STEM mode.

Electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) and Mott-Schottky measurement

All electrochemical measurements were performed in a standard three-electrode system. Pt foil served as the counter electrode and Ag/AgCl was used as reference electrode. The working electrodes were immersed in the electrolyte for 60 s before any measurement was conducted. Impedance measurements were collected in a 0.1 mol/L \( \text{Na}_2\text{SO}_4 \) solution at a bias potential of -0.5 V over a frequency range from \( 10^6 \) to \( 10^1 \) Hz. The photocurrents were tested under 300 W Xe lamp irradiation with light on-off cycles at a time interval of 30 s and the scan rate was 150 mV/s, while the working electrodes were irradiated from the back side to minimize the influence of the thickness of the semiconductor layer. The Mott–Schottky plots with frequency of 1 kHz, 2 kHz, 3 kHz in dark condition to determine the flat-band potential. The applied potentials vs.
Ag/AgCl were converted to NHE (Normal Hydrogen Electrode) or RHE (Reversible Hydrogen Electrode) potentials using the following equations:

$$E_{NHE} = E_{Ag/AgCl} + E_{\theta}^\text{Ag/AgCl} \left( E_{\theta}^{\text{Ag/AgCl}} = 0.199 \text{ V} \right) \quad (2)$$

$$E_{RHE} = E_{Ag/AgCl} + 0.0591pH + E_{\theta}^\text{Ag/AgCl} \left( E_{\theta}^{\text{Ag/AgCl}} = 0.199 \text{ V} \right) \quad (3)$$

**Quantification of H$_2$O$_2$**

The concentration of H$_2$O$_2$ was quantified using the Ti reagent solution by UV-visible spectroscopy. An aqueous Ti reagent solution was prepared by diluting 640 mg of Titanium (IV) oxysulfate-sulfuric acid hydrate in sulfuric acid (40 mL, 16 M) with milli-Q water to give 750 mL of solution (TiOSO$_4$.xH$_2$O+H$_2$SO$_4$). This acidic aqueous solution of titanium oxysulfate reacts in the presence of H$_2$O$_2$, resulting in the formation of a yellow peroxotitanium complex [Ti(O$_2$)OH(H$_2$O)$_3$]$^{+}$aq(Eq. S4-5), the absorbance of which can be measured at 409 nm.

$$\text{TiOSO}_4(s) + 5\text{H}_2\text{O} \leftrightarrow [\text{Ti(OH)3(H2O)}]^{+} + \text{aq} + \text{HSO}_4^{-} \text{(aq)} \quad \text{(Eq. S4)}$$

$$[\text{Ti(OH)}3(\text{H2O)}]^{+} + \text{aq} + \text{H2O2 (aq)} \leftrightarrow [\text{Ti(O2)OH(H2O)}]^{+} + \text{(aq)} + 2\text{H}_2\text{O} \quad \text{(Eq. S5)}$$

After the photocatalytic reaction, we transferred 1 mL of sample solution (after syringe filtration to remove photocatalysts) into a quartz tube and then add 1 mL of Ti reagent solution. Then measure the absorbance of this solution by using Shimadzu UV-1800 UV-visible scanning spectrophotometer (see Fig. S19).

**Zeta potential measurement**

The isoelectric point was determined using a Malvern Panalytical Zetasizer Ultra equipped by zeta potential measurements. To this end, 2 mg of COFs was dispersed in 2 ml Milli-Q water and sonicated for 1 h to give a mixed solution. Then 1 ml of mixed solution was used for a zetapotential titration measurement. The pH was adjusted to either acidic or basic values using aqueous HCl (0.01 M) or aqueous NaOH (0.01 M) respectively, starting each time from the natural pH to minimise salt loading.

**Femtosecond transient absorption (TA) spectroscopy**

TA experiments are carried out using a 5 kHz Yb:KGW laser source (1030 nm, Carbide, Light Conversion) where pump light is generated through third harmonic generation in a sequence of BBO crystals and probe light is generated by focusing the fundamental into a sapphire crystal of 5 mm thickness. In short, a 220 fs pump pulse at 343 nm excites a thin film of the COF system under ambient conditions. At a time delay $t$ (0-1000 ps) generated through a mechanical delay line, a broadband probe pulse measures the change in absorption $\Delta A$ over the wavelength range from 525 to 850 nm. Due to the
high optical density (OD) of the film above the band gap, no direct bleach of the band gap transitions can be observed in transmission.

Theoretical studies

The theoretical HOMO-LUMO of the materials and free-energy calculations for the catalysis were conducted on BIOVIA Materials Studio. The molecular orbitals of TAPT-BT and TAPB-BT were obtained by the VAMP module using AM1 Hamiltonian and Restricted Hartee-Fock methods. The geometry and energy optimized structures were used to calculate their electron density and potential energy surface. The same module was used to further optimize the geometry and energy of the reaction intermediates, followed by their thermodynamic properties’ computation at 298 K. The free-energy change (ΔG) was calculated at this temperature (T) from the computed change in enthalpy (ΔH) and entropy (ΔS) using the equation ΔG = ΔH + TΔS

Synthesis of 4,4’-(benzothiadiazole-4,7-diyl)dibenzaldehyde (BT)

4,4’-(benzothiadiazole-4,7-diyl)dibenzaldehyde was synthesized according to a previously reported procedure\(^1\). Generally, 4,7-dibromo-2,1,3-benzothiadiazole (4 mmol, 1.18 g), 4-formylphenylboronic acid (12 mmol, 1.8 g) sodium carbonate (24 mmol, 2.55 g), and tetrakis(triphenylphosphine)palladium(0) were introduced into a 100 mL three-neck flask and degassed for three times. Then, dioxane/water (50 mL, v/v = 4/1) was slowly added into the flask under a N\(_2\) atmosphere. After reflux for 48h under N\(_2\), the mixture was poured into distilled water. The yellow solid was filtered and washed with water giving the crude compound which was further purified by flash chromatography with dichloromethane as eluent to afford the title product as a yellowish green powder (1.03 g, 73%). \(^1\)H NMR (400 MHz, CDCl\(_3\)): \(\delta\) 10.07 (s, 2H, CHO), 8.12 (d, 4H, Ph-H), 8.02 (d, 4H, Ph-H), 7.85 (s, 2H, Ph-H) ppm.
Fig. S1 $^1$H NMR spectrum of 4,4'-(Benzothiadiazole-4,7-diyl)dibenzaldehyde (BT) in CDCl$_3$ (The peak at 7.2 ppm originates from CDCl$_3$).

Fig. S2 Comparison of the experimental PXRD pattern of TAPT-BT-COF with the simulated possible stacking models, where the AA-d, AB-d, AA, AB, and ABC stackings are related to the formation of regular hexagonal pores. The AA-d stacking model represents the distortions of TAPT-BT-COF.
**Fig. S3** Comparison of the experimental (black) and simulated AA-d stacking PXRD patterns of TAPT-BT-COF and the top view of the simulated structure of AA-d stacking.

**Fig. S4** Localized unit cell structure of TAPT-BT-COF in AA-d stacking to demonstrate the rotation (ca. 30°) of the benzene rings due to repulsion between hydrogen atoms.

**Fig. S5** Comparison of the experimental (black) and simulated AB-d stacking PXRD patterns of TAPT-BT-COF and the top view of the simulated structure of AB-d stacking.
stacking.

**Fig. S6** Comparison of the experimental (black) and simulated AA stacking PXRD patterns of TAPT-BT-COF and the top view of the simulated structure of AA stacking.

**Fig. S7** Comparison of the experimental (black) and simulated ABC stacking PXRD patterns of TAPT-BT-COF and the top view of the simulated structure of ABC stacking.

**Fig. S8** Comparison of the experimental (black) and simulated ABC stacking PXRD patterns of TAPT-BT-COF and the top view of the simulated structure of ABC stacking.
Fig. S9 FT-IR spectra of TAPT-BT-COF and TAPB-BT-COF and their monomers.

Fig. S10 N$_2$ adsorption-desorption analyses and pore size distribution of TAPT-BT-COF
**Fig. S11** $N_2$ adsorption-desorption analyses and pore size distribution of TAPB-BT-COF

**Fig. S12** TGA curves of TAPT-BT-COF and TAPB-BT-COF under (a) $N_2$ and (b) air.
Fig. S13 TEM images of TAPT-BT-COF (left) and TAPB-BT-COF (right).

Fig. S14 STEM-EDS element mapping of TAPT-BT-COF. (a) TEM image, (b) Carbon element, (c) Nitrogen element and (d) Sulfur element.
**Fig. S15** STEM-EDS element mapping of TAPB-BT-COF. (a) TEM image, (b) Carbon element, (c) Nitrogen element and (d) Sulfur element.

**Fig. S16** Zeta potential of TAPT-BT-COF and TAPB-BT-COF as a function of pH showing the isoelectric point of the COFs around pH 6.
Fig. S17 Mott-Schottky plots of TAPT-BT-COF.

Fig. S18 Mott-Schottky plots of TAPB-BT-COF.
Fig. S19 (a) The adsorption spectra of different concentrations of H₂O₂ in the presence of Ti reagent solution at wavelengths of 325-550 nm. (b) The H₂O₂ concentration-absorbance calibration curve.

Fig. S20 PXRD patterns of TAPT-BT-COF before and after catalysis.
Fig. S21 PXRD patterns of TAPB-BT-COF before and after catalysis.

Fig. S22 FTIR of TAPT-BT-COF before and after catalysis.
Fig. S23 FTIR of TAPB-BT-COF before and after catalysis.

Fig. S24 GC chromatogram of TAPT-BT-COF. A vial was charged with 3 mM AgNO₃ aqueous solution (5 mL) and 10 mg COF. Oxygen is removed by bubbling N₂ in dark condition. Before starting the reaction, the gas headspace of the vial was measured by GC to ensure that no oxygen was present in the vial.
**Tab. S1** The charge transfer resistance ($R_{CT}$) and the bulk resistance ($R_{Bulk}$) of the COFs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>$R_{bulk}$ (Ω)</th>
<th>$R_{CT}$ (Ω)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAPT</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAPB</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>1255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tab. S2** Comparison with other representative materials in photocatalytic H$_2$O$_2$ production.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>H$_2$O$_2$ production rate</th>
<th>Irradiation conditions</th>
<th>Solvent</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAPD-(Me)$_2$-COF</td>
<td>$97 \text{ μmol g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\lambda &gt; 420 \text{ nm}$</td>
<td>H$_2$O: EtOH = 9:1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAPD-(OMe)$_2$-COF</td>
<td>$91 \text{ μmol g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\lambda &gt; 420 \text{ nm}$</td>
<td>H$_2$O: EtOH = 9:1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-COF</td>
<td>$516 \text{ μmol g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\lambda &gt; 400 \text{ nm}$</td>
<td>H$_2$O: EtOH = 9:1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF-COF</td>
<td>$1239 \text{ μmol g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\lambda &gt; 400 \text{ nm}$</td>
<td>H$_2$O: EtOH = 9:1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF$_{50}$-COF</td>
<td>$1739 \text{ μmol g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\lambda &gt; 400 \text{ nm}$</td>
<td>H$_2$O: EtOH = 9:1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoPc-BTM-COF</td>
<td>$2096 \text{ μmol g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\lambda &gt; 400 \text{ nm}$</td>
<td>H$_2$O: EtOH = 9:1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoPc-DAB-COF</td>
<td>$1851 \text{ μmol g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\lambda &gt; 400 \text{ nm}$</td>
<td>H$_2$O: EtOH = 9:1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBA-COF</td>
<td>$1820 \text{ μmol g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\lambda &gt; 400 \text{ nm}$</td>
<td>H$_2$O: EtOH = 9:1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTF-NS-5BT</td>
<td>$1630 \text{ μmol g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\lambda &gt; 400 \text{ nm}$</td>
<td>H$_2$O: BA = 9:1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COF-TfpBpy</td>
<td>$1042 \text{ μmol g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\lambda &gt; 400 \text{ nm}$</td>
<td>H$_2$O</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPB-DMTP-COF</td>
<td>$606 \text{ μmol g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ (O$_2$-presaturated water)</td>
<td>$\lambda &gt; 420 \text{ nm}$</td>
<td>H$_2$O</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1565 \text{ μmol g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ (continuous O$_2$ bubble)</td>
<td>$\lambda &gt; 420 \text{ nm}$</td>
<td>H$_2$O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTF-BDDBN</td>
<td>$97 \text{ μmol g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\lambda &gt; 420 \text{ nm}$</td>
<td>H$_2$O</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g-C$_3$N$<em>4$/PDI-BN0.2-rGO$</em>{0.05}$</td>
<td>$30.8 \text{ μmol g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\lambda &gt; 420 \text{ nm}$</td>
<td>H$_2$O</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Py-Da-COF</td>
<td>$1242 \text{ μmol g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\lambda &gt; 420 \text{ nm}$</td>
<td>H$_2$O: BA = 9:1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTF-BT-COF</td>
<td>$2760 \text{ μmol g}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$</td>
<td>$\lambda &gt; 420 \text{ nm}$</td>
<td>H$_2$O</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bpy-TAPT & 4038 μmol g\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\) & \(\lambda > 420\) nm & H\(_2\)O & 12 \\
FS-COFs & 3904 μmol g\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\) & \(\lambda > 420\) nm & H\(_2\)O & 13 \\
TpDz & 7327 μmol g\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\) & \(\lambda > 420\) nm & H\(_2\)O & 14 \\
TpMd & 6034 μmol g\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\) & \(\lambda > 420\) nm & H\(_2\)O & 14 \\
TpPz & 1418 μmol g\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\) & \(\lambda > 420\) nm & H\(_2\)O & 14 \\
TaptBtt COF & 1407 μmol g\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\) & \(\lambda > 420\) nm & H\(_2\)O & 15 \\
TAPT-TFPACOFs@Pd ICs & 2143 μmol g\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\) & \(\lambda > 420\) nm & H\(_2\)O & 16 \\
TD-COF & 4620 μmol g\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\) & \(\lambda > 420\) nm & H\(_2\)O & 17 \\
TAPT-BT-COF & 1360 ± 30 μmol g\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\) & \(\lambda > 420\) nm & H\(_2\)O & This work \\
TAPB-BT-COF & 730 ± 30 μmol g\(^{-1}\) h\(^{-1}\) & \(\lambda > 420\) nm & H\(_2\)O & This work \\

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Catalyst</th>
<th>Solvent system</th>
<th>Gas</th>
<th>Irradiation conditions</th>
<th>H(_2)O(_2) production rate(μmol/g/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>O(_2)</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TAPT-BT-COF</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Ar</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TAPT-BT-COF</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>O(_2)</td>
<td>Dark</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TAPT-BT-COF</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>BQ: radical scavenger</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TAPT-BT-COF</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>AgNO(_3): electron scavenger</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TAPT-BT-COF</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>O(_2)</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>1363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TAPT-BT-COF</td>
<td>Water/EtO H=9:1</td>
<td>O(_2)</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>1740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TAPT-BT-COF</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>TBA: hydroxyl radical scavenger</td>
<td>Light</td>
<td>1357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab. S3 Comparison of reaction rates under different solvent, gas and light conditions.
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