Supporting information

In-situ growth of NiSe₂ nanoparticles on g-C₃N₄ nanosheets for efficient hydrogen evolution reaction

Somnath R. Khaladkar¹, Oshnik Maurya¹, Girish Gund², Bhavesh Sinha⁴, Girish kamble³, R. R. Deshmukh^{1*}, Jin Hyeok Kim^{3*}, Archana Kalekar^{1*}

¹Department of Physics, Institute of Chemical Technology (ICT), Matunga, Mumbai, Maharashtra, 400019, India.

²Department of Physics, M.P.A.S.C. College, Panvel, Maharashtra, 410206, India.

³Optoelectronics Convergence Research Center and Department of Material Sciences and Engineering, Chonnam National University, 200, Yongbong-Dong, Buk-Gu, Gwangju, 61186, South Korea.

⁴National Center for Nanoscience and Nanotechnology, University of Mumbai, Mumbai, Maharashtra, 400032, India.

Corresponding author: *Jin Hyeok Kim* Email Address: jinhyeok@chonnam.ac.kr Corresponding author: *R. R. Deshmukh* Email Address: rr.deshmukh@ictmumbai.edu.in Corresponding author: *Archana Kalekar* Email Address: as.kalekar@ictmumbai.edu.in, archanaphysics2017@gmail.com



Fig. S1. XPS survey spectra of (a) NiSe₂ and XPS high resolution spectra of (b) Ni2p, and (c) Se3d of bare NiSe₂. XPS survey spectra of (d) $g-C_3N_4$ and XPS high resolution spectra of (e) C1s and (f) N1s. XPS survey spectra of (g) NiSe₂/ $g-C_3N_4$. (h) Energy dispersive spectroscopy (EDS) spectrum of NiSe₂/ $g-C_3N_4$.



Fig. S2. (a) Time dependence of current density under static potential for NiSe₂ and g-C₃N₄ respectively (*b-d*) *CV curves of g-C*₃N₄, *NiSe*₂, and *NiSe*₂/*g-C*₃N₄, *electrodes in 1 M KOH*.

Table S1. The electroactivity comparison of various catalysts towards HER (measured at current density 10 mA cm⁻²)

| Sample | Electrolyte | Overpotential | Tafel Slope | Ref. |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| | | (mV) | (mV dec ⁻¹) | |
| NiSe ₂ | 0.5 M H ₂ SO ₄ | 198 | 72.1 | 1 |
| NiSe NWs | 1.0 M KOH | 96 | 120 | 2 |
| NiSe ₂ NCs | 0.5 M H ₂ SO ₄ | 190 | 44 | 3 |
| NiSe ₂ /NFs | 1.0 M KOH | 252 | 59.3 | 4 |
| NiSe ₂ @NG | 0.5 M H ₂ SO ₄ | 163 | 74.2 | 5 |
| NiSe ₂ /CNT | 0.5 M H ₂ SO ₄ | 159 | 35.6 | 6 |
| NiSe ₂ -T@NC | 0.5 M H ₂ SO ₄ | 196 | 45 | 7 |
| F/P-NiSe ₂ /CC | 1.0 M KOH | 53 | 95.6 | 8 |
| Ni _{0.8} Fe _{0.2} Se ₂ | 0.5 M H ₂ SO ₄ | 64 | 43 | 9 |
| NiSe ₂ @Ru | 1.0 M KOH | 136 | 48.7 | 10 |
| NiSe ₂ /MoS ₂ | 0.5 M H ₂ SO ₄ | 143 | 45 | 11 |
| MoS ₂ /NiSe ₂ /rGO | 1.0 M KOH | 152 | 73 | 12 |
| NiSe ₂ /Ti ₃ C ₂ T _x | 0.5 M H ₂ SO ₄ | 200 | 37.7 | 13 |
| NiSe ₂ -NPs/CNTs/Ni- | 1.0 M KOH | 95 | 82 | 14 |
| MOF NS | | | | |
| NiSe ₂ /MoSe ₂ | 0.5 M H ₂ SO ₄ | 147 | 43.5 | 15 |
| MoSe ₂ /SnS ₂ | 1.0 M KOH | 285 | 109 | 16 |
| CoSe ₂ /rGO/MWCNT | 0.5 M H ₂ SO ₄ | 125 | 52 | 17 |
| MXene-F,N-gCW- | 1 M KOH | 116.8 | 81 2 | 18 |
| CoSe ₂ | | 110.0 | 07.2 | |
| NiSe ₂ /g-C ₃ N ₄ | 1 M KOH | 87 | 64 | This work |

Calculation

1) The Fowkes approach:

To calculate the surface free energy of the substrate, three or more liquids with known surface tension parameters (polar and dispersion components) must be used. To limit the potential of inaccuracy, it is recommended to use more liquids.

The equation to calculate surface free energy using the Fowkes approximation is as follows:

$$\left[\frac{1+\cos\theta}{2}\right] \times \left[\frac{\gamma_l}{\sqrt{\gamma_l^a}}\right]_{=\sqrt{\gamma_s^p}} \times \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_l^p}{\gamma_l^a}} + \sqrt{\gamma_s^a}$$
(S1)

The equation is of the form

$$Y(LHS) = mX (RHS) + C$$
 (S2)

Where LHS can be derived by measuring for the liquids utilised. The values of γ_l and γ_l^d can be found in the standard table of surface tension parameters. Similarly, RHS can be determined using the polar and dispersion components of liquids. Plotting LHS vs. RHS yields a straight line with the intercept on the Y-axis. The slope and intercept are squared and combined to yield the total surface energy ¹⁹.

2) ECSA calculation:

The double layer capacitance (Cdl) can be calculated from a cyclic voltammetry (CV) experiment using the formula: $Cdl = \Delta j$ (ja-jc)/2v, where ja and jc represent the anodic and cathodic current densities respectively, measured at a potential difference $\Delta E = 0.1$ V and v denotes the scan rate in mVs⁻¹. The non-Faradic current density-based electrochemically active surface area (ECSA) can be estimated as: ECSA = Cdl/Cs, represents the specific capacitance of the electrode, taken as 0.04 mFcm⁻² in 1 M KOH electrolyte solution ^{20–23}.

| Sample Name | Cdl | ECSA |
|--|------|--------|
| NiSe ₂ | 10.9 | 275.5 |
| g-C ₃ N ₄ | 6.45 | 161.25 |
| NiSe ₂ /g-C ₃ N ₄ | 22.7 | 567.5 |

References

- 1 K. S. Bhat and H. S. Nagaraja, *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, 2018, **43**, 19851–19863.
- 2 C. Tang, N. Cheng, Z. Pu, W. Xing and X. Sun, 2015, 9351–9355.
- 3 I. H. Kwak, H. S. Im, D. M. Jang, Y. W. Kim, K. Park, Y. R. Lim, E. H. Cha and J. Park, , DOI:10.1021/acsami.5b12093.
- Z. Feng, H. Zhang, L. Wang, B. Gao, P. Lu and P. Xing, *J. Electroanal. Chem.*, 2020, 876, 114740.
- 5 W. Li, B. Yu, Y. Hu, X. Wang, D. Yang and Y. Chen, *ACS Sustain. Chem. Eng.*, 2019, 7, 4351–4359.
- B. Wang, X. Wang, B. Zheng, B. Yu, F. Qi, W. Zhang, Y. Li and Y. Chen, 2017, 83, 51–
 55.
- 7 N. Sahu, J. K. Das and J. N. Behera, *Inorg. Chem.*, 2022, **61**, 2835–2845.
- W. Yuan, Y. Li, L. Liang, F. Wang and H. Liu, ACS Appl. Energy Mater., 2022, 5, 5036– 5043.
- 9 T. Wang, D. Gao, W. Xiao, P. Xi, D. Xue and J. Wang, *Nano Res.*, 2018, **11**, 6051–6061.
- 10 A. T. Swesi, J. Masud, W. P. R. Liyanage and S. Umapathi, 2017, 1–11.
- Y. Huang, L. Liu, J. Lv, J. Huang and K. Xu, *Nanotechnology*, DOI:10.1088/1361-6528/abdced.
- 12 X. Bai, T. Cao, T. Xia, C. Wu, M. Feng, X. Li, Z. Mei, H. Gao, D. Huo, X. Ren, S. Li, H. Guo and R. Wang, *Nanomaterials*, DOI:10.3390/nano13040752.
- H. Jiang, Z. Wang, Q. Yang, L. Tan, L. Dong and M. Dong, *Nano-Micro Lett.*, 2019, 11, 1–14.
- 14 J. Yu, W. J. Li, G. Kao, C. Y. Xu, R. Chen, Q. Liu, J. Liu, H. Zhang and J. Wang, J. Energy Chem., 2021, 60, 111–120.
- 15 T. J. Dai, J. Sun, X. S. Peng, J. N. Gong, Z. Y. Zhou and X. Q. Wang, Energy Sci. Eng.,

2022, 10, 4061–4070.

- Y. Huang, Y. Sun, X. Zheng, T. Aoki, B. Pattengale, J. Huang, X. He, W. Bian, S.
 Younan, N. Williams, J. Hu, J. Ge, N. Pu, X. Yan, X. Pan, L. Zhang, Y. Wei and J. Gu,
 Nat. Commun., 2019, 10, 1–11.
- 17 R. Samal, P. Mane, M. Bhat, B. Chakraborty, D. J. Late and C. S. Rout, ACS Appl. Energy Mater., 2021, 4, 11386–11399.
- K. S. Ranjith, S. Y. Lee, S. M. Ghoreishian, N. R. Chodankar, G. S. Rama Raju, S. J.
 Patil, Y. S. Huh, S. J. Park and Y. K. Han, *Carbon N. Y.*, 2023, 206, 246–259.
- 19 R. R. Deshmukh and A. R. Shetty, J. Appl. Polym. Sci., 2008, 107, 3707–3717.
- P. Connor, J. Schuch, B. Kaiser and W. Jaegermann, *Zeitschrift fur Phys. Chemie*, 2020, 234, 979–994.
- 21 A. Sengeni and S. Noda, J. Mater. Chem. A, 2024, 5793–5804.
- 22 C. C. L. McCrory, S. Jung, J. C. Peters and T. F. Jaramillo, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 2013, 135, 16977–16987.
- 23 H. Rajan, S. Anantharaj, J. K. Kim, M. J. Ko and S. C. Yi, J. Mater. Chem. A, 2023, 11, 16084–16092.