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## Characterization

X-ray powder diffraction (XRD) analysis was recorded by using a Rigaku Miniflex 600 device equipped with copper $\mathrm{K} \alpha$ radiation source $(\lambda=0.154178$ nm ), which was performed within $2 \theta$ range from $20^{\circ}$ to $80^{\circ}$ with a scanning rate of $10^{\circ} \mathrm{min}^{-1}$. The morphology and microstructure of the sample were visualized using a FEI Quanta 200F scanning electron microscope (SEM) with an accelerated voltage of 20 kV . For transmission electron microscopy (TEM) observation, a FEI Tecnai G20 UTwin transmission electron microscope with an acceleration voltage of 200 kV was employed. X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) measurements were acquired with a Kratos XSAM 800 spectrophotometer. Additionally, the analysis for inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectroscopy (ICP-AES) was carried out employing a Thermo IRIS Intrepid II XPS atomic emission spectrometer. Thermogravimetric analysis and differential scanning calorimetry (TG-DSC) are performed using the DZSTA200 synchronous thermal analyzer.

## Electrochemical investigation

Electrochemical tests were performed by using CHI730E electrochemistry workstation. $\mathrm{A} \mathrm{Hg} / \mathrm{Hg}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ electrode filled with 0.1 M KOH was employed as the reference electrode. The counter electrode utilized is a graphite rod with a diameter of 4 mm . The employed working electrode is a glass carbon (GC) rotating disk electrode with a diameter of 4 mm , which was modified by the catalyst. To prepare the catalyst ink, combine 4.0 mg of catalyst with $960 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of ethanol and $40 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of $5 \mathrm{wt} \%$ Nafion solution. The resulting mixture was subjected to ultrasonication for 30 minutes to achieve a homogeneous catalyst ink. $10 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of the catalyst ink was applied onto the working electrode to provide catalyst mass loading of $0.318 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{cm}_{\text {disk }^{-2}}$. To ensure consistency, all measured potentials
were converted to values referenced to the reversible hydrogen electrode (RHE). No iR compensation was implemented.

Cyclic voltammetry (CV) test was conducted initially in an Ar-saturated 0.1 M KOH aqueous solution, spanning a potential range of -0.05 to 1.05 V (vs RHE) to acquire a stable current-potential curve. Subsequently, polarization curves were obtained in an $\mathrm{H}_{2}$-saturated electrolyte through rotating disk electrode (RDE) immersed, which with a rotation speed of 1600 rpm and a scanning rate of $5 \mathrm{mV} \cdot \mathrm{s}^{-1}$.

## Supplementary methods

Supplementary methods HOR polarization curves at different rotating rates (400, $900,1600,2500$ and 3600 rpm ) were conducted to extract the kinetic current density $\left(\mathrm{j}^{\mathrm{k}}\right)$ of each catalyst from the Koutecky-Levich equation (Eq. 1) [S1-S3],

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{j}=\frac{1}{j^{k}}+\frac{1}{j^{d}}=\frac{1}{j^{k}}+\frac{1}{B C_{0} \omega^{1 / 2}} \tag{Eq. 1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $j$ is the measured current density, $j^{d}$ is the diffusion limited current density, $B$ is the Levich constant, $C_{0}$ is the solubility of $\mathrm{H}_{2}\left(7.33 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{~mol} \mathrm{L-1}\right), \omega$ is the rotating speed, respectively. Among them, $B$ could be calculated from Eq. 2 [S1-S4],

$$
B=0.62 n F D^{2 / 3} v^{-1 / 6} \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots . . \text { Eq. } 2
$$

where $n$ is the electron transfer number, $F$ is the Faraday constant $\left(96485 \mathrm{C} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}\right), D$ is the diffusivity of $\mathrm{H}_{2}\left(3.7 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{~cm}^{2} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right)$, and $v$ is the kinematic viscosity $\left(1.01 \times 10^{-2}\right.$ $\mathrm{cm}^{2} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ ).

Exchange current density $\left(j^{0}\right)$ was deduced from the Butler-Volmer equation (Eq. 3) [S3-S7],

$$
\begin{equation*}
j^{0}=\frac{R T j}{F \eta} \tag{Eq. 3}
\end{equation*}
$$

$j^{0}$ can be obtained by fitting the kinetic current into the linearized Butler-Volmer equation (Eq. 3), where $R$ is the universal gas constant ( $8.314 \mathrm{~J} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1} \mathrm{~K}^{-1}$ ), $T$ is the operating temperature ( 298.15 K ), $F$ is the Faraday constant $\left(96485 \mathrm{C} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}\right.$ ).

Electrochemical active surface areas (ECSAs) were estimated via Cu underpotential deposition (UPD) stripping for all samples after HOR tests. The catalysts were firstly cycled in Ar-saturated $0.1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ solution to guarantee a repeatable voltammogram curve as the background, and then were kept at 0.30 V (vs RHE) for 100 s in an Ar-saturated $0.1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$ solution containing 2 mM CuSO 4 . UPD Cu oxidation polarization curve was performed from 0.30 to 1.10 V with a scan rate of 10 $\mathrm{mV} \mathrm{s}^{-1}$. The ECSAs were calculated via Eq. 4 [S5-S7],

$$
\begin{equation*}
E C S A=\frac{Q_{C u}}{Q_{s} m_{\text {metal }}} \tag{Eq. 4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $Q_{C u}$ stands the measured integral charge, $Q_{s}$ represents the surface charge density of $420 \mu \mathrm{C} \mathrm{cm}_{\text {metal }}{ }^{-2}$ for monolayer adsorption of Cu -UPD stripping, $m_{\text {metal }}$ is the mass of the metal on GC.

The calculation methods of $\mathrm{j}^{\mathrm{k}, \mathrm{m}}, \mathrm{j}^{0, \mathrm{~m}}$ and $\mathrm{j}^{\mathrm{j}, \mathrm{s}}$ are as follows:
$j^{k, m}=\frac{j^{k}}{m_{\text {metal }}}$
$j^{0, m}=\frac{j^{0}}{m_{\text {metal }}}$
$j^{0, s}=\frac{j^{0, m}}{E C S A}$

## Supplementary figures



Fig. S1. Microstructure analysis of the $\mathrm{Ni} / \mathrm{NiO} / \mathrm{C}$ product. a) SEM image, b, c) TEM image, $\mathrm{d}-\mathrm{g}$ ) element mapping analysis for $\mathrm{Ni}, \mathrm{C}$, and O elements.


Fig. S2. HRTEM analysis of the $\mathrm{Ni} / \mathrm{NiO} / \mathrm{C}$ product.


Fig. S3. HRTEM analysis of the $\mathrm{Ni} / \mathrm{NiO} / \mathrm{C}$ product.


Fig. S4. SEM of the a) $\mathrm{Ir}-\mathrm{Ni} / \mathrm{C}$ and b) $\mathrm{Ir}-\mathrm{NiO} / \mathrm{C}$ product.


Fig. S5. XPS analysis of the $\mathrm{Ir}-\mathrm{Ni} / \mathrm{NiO} / \mathrm{C}-3$ samples of C .


Fig. S6. Cu-UPD stripping voltammograms of a) $\mathrm{Ir}-\mathrm{Ni} / \mathrm{NiO} / \mathrm{C}-3, \mathrm{~b}) \mathrm{Pt} / \mathrm{C}$ and c$) \mathrm{Ir}-\mathrm{C}$. The scan rates are $10 \mathrm{mV} \mathrm{s}^{-1}$.


Fig. S7. Chronoamperometry method (i-t) analysis of the $\mathrm{Ir}-\mathrm{Ni} / \mathrm{NiO} / \mathrm{C}-3$ samples and $\mathrm{Pt} / \mathrm{C}$.

## Supplementary tables

Table S1. ICP-AES data of different materials

| Catalysts | Ir (wt\%) | $\mathbf{N i}(\mathbf{w t \%})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{Ir}-\mathrm{Ni} / \mathrm{NiO} / \mathrm{C}-1$ | $2.99 \%$ | $45.51 \%$ |
| $\mathrm{Ir}-\mathrm{Ni} / \mathrm{NiO} / \mathrm{C}-2$ | $5.87 \%$ | $44.23 \%$ |
| $\mathrm{Ir}-\mathrm{Ni} / \mathrm{NiO} / \mathrm{C}-3$ | $8.33 \%$ | $43.10 \%$ |
| $\mathrm{Ir}-\mathrm{Ni} / \mathrm{NiO} / \mathrm{C}-4$ | $11.91 \%$ | $42.01 \%$ |
| $\mathrm{Ir}-\mathrm{Ni} / \mathrm{C}$ | $10.26 \%$ | $45.62 \%$ |
| $\mathrm{Ir}-\mathrm{NiO} / \mathrm{C}$ | $8.96 \%$ | $40.94 \%$ |
| $\mathrm{Ir}-\mathrm{C}$ | $19.96 \%$ | - |

Table S2. Summary of ECSA, $\mathbf{j}^{\mathbf{k}}, \mathbf{j}^{\mathbf{j}}, \mathbf{j}^{\mathbf{k}, \mathrm{m}}, \mathbf{j}^{0, \mathrm{~m}}$, and $\mathbf{j}^{0, s}$ of various catalysts.

| Catalysts | $\begin{gathered} \text { ECSA } \\ \left(\mathrm{cm}^{2} \mu \mathrm{~g}_{\mathrm{Ir} \mathrm{or} \mathrm{Pt}}{ }^{-1}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{j}_{@ 50 \mathrm{mV}} \\ \left(\mathrm{~mA} \mathrm{~cm}_{\text {disk }}^{-2}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{j}^{\mathrm{k}, \mathrm{~m}_{@ 50 \mathrm{mV}}} \\ \left(\mathrm{~mA} \mu \mathrm{~g}_{\mathrm{Ir} \mathrm{or} \mathrm{Pt}}{ }^{-1}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{j}^{0} \\ (\mathrm{~mA} \mathrm{~cm} \\ \text { disk } \left.^{-2}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{j}^{0, \mathrm{~m}} \\ \left(\mathbf{A} \mathrm{~g}_{\mathrm{Ir} \text { or } \mathrm{Pt}^{-1}}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{j}^{0, \mathrm{~s}} \\ \left(\mu \mathrm{~A} \mathrm{~cm}_{\mathrm{Ir} \mathrm{or} \mathrm{Pt}}{ }^{-2}\right) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pt/C | 0.492 | 3.176 | 0.050 | 1.394 | 21.886 | 44.484 |
| Ir-C | 0.511 | 2.028 | 0.034 | 1.337 | 21.033 | 41.160 |
| Ir-Ni/C | 0.239 | 0.134 | 0.005 | 0.093 | 2.846 | 11.908 |
| Ir-NiO/C | 0.727 | 1.302 | 0.052 | 0.866 | 30.349 | 41.746 |
| Ir-Ni/NiO/C-1 | 0.694 | 1.576 | 0.165 | 0.883 | 92.730 | 133.646 |
| Ir-Ni/NiO/C-2 | 0.622 | 3.766 | 0.201 | 1.625 | 86.925 | 139.751 |
| Ir-Ni/NiO/C-3 | 0.489 | 3.984 | 0.151 | 1.870 | 70.490 | 144.151 |
| Ir-Ni/NiO/C-4 | 0.477 | 3.342 | 0.088 | 1.548 | 40.812 | 85.560 |
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