Supporting Information

Promoting the four electrocatalytic reactions of OER/ORR/HER/MOR by using

multi-component metal sulfide heterostructure for the zinc-air batteries and

water splitting

Jiaxin Dang^a, Genman Chen^a, Bingen Yuan^a, Fuyue Liu^a, Qin Wang^b, Fu Wang^a,

He Miao^{a, *}, Jinliang Yuan^a

^a Faculty of Maritime and Transportation, Ningbo University, Ningbo 315211, PR

China

^b Department of Microelectronic Science and Engineering, Faculty of Science,

Ningbo University, Ningbo 315211, PR China

* Corresponding authors:

Prof. He Miao, E-mail: miaohe@nbu.edu.cn

1. Reagents and chemicals

nitrate $(Co(NO_3)_2 \cdot 6H_2O)$, Sodium sulphate Cobalt $(Na_2SO_4),$ Aminothiourea (CH₅N₃S), Nafion (5 wt.%), polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE), anhydrous ethanol (C₂H₅OH), carbon (XC-72), acrylamide (AM), ammonium persulfate (APS), N, N'-Methylenebis (acrylamide) (MBA), acrylic acid (AA), dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO), glycerol (C₃H₈O₃), cellulose nanofibers, polyvinyl alcohol (PVA), potassium hydroxide (KOH), anhydrous methanol (CH₃OH), zinc acetate $(Zn(Ac)_2)$, and zinc foil (thickness of 0.15 mm) were supplied by Aladdin Industrial Co., Ltd. (Shanghai, China). Among them, all chemical reagents were analytical grade. Iron-nickel foam (INF, Ni: Fe = 3: 7, thickness of 1.5 mm) was obtained from Suzhou Keshenghe Metal Materials Co., Ltd. Cobalt foil (thickness of 0.1 mm) was purchased from Qinghe County Lisheng Metal Materials Co., Ltd. (Purity of 99.9%). All chemicals were used as received without further purification. The water used in all experiments was ultrapure (18.2 M Ω ·cm). Seawater was taken from the East China Sea, 29°52000.00" N, 121°31000.00" E.

2. Material characterizations

X-ray diffraction (XRD) patterns were obtained on a Bruker D8 Advance X-ray diffract meter (Cu K α = 1.5418 Å) at a scanning rate of 0.02° s⁻¹ from 20° to 90°. The microstructure and elemental distribution of the synthesized samples were observed using field emission scanning electron microscopy (FESEM, Hitachi S4800, 5 kV), transmission electron microscopy (TEM, JF-20, Hitachi), and high-resolution transmission electron microscopy (HRTEM, JF-20, Hitachi). X-ray photoelectron

spectroscopy (XPS) was performed on an AXISULTARDLD spectroscopy spectrometer with an Al-Kα X-ray source.

3. Electrochemical measurements

The working electrode was subjected to electrochemical LSV testing using a standard three-electrode system on the electrochemical workstation CHI 760 E (Shanghai Chenhua Instrument Co., Ltd.) at room temperature of 25 ± 0.2 °C. The working electrode was either a self-supported sample (1 x 1 cm²) prepared in the experiment or a catalyst-coated rotating disc electrode (RDE) (0.196 cm²). The reference electrode was Hg/HgO, and the counter electrode was a graphite rod. The graphite rod and Hg/HgO electrodes were provided by Shanghai Ledun Industrial Co., Ltd and CHI Instruments, Inc, respectively. 0.1/1.0 M KOH solution was used as electrolyte. The catalyst slurry for preparing the working electrode with RDE was a mixed solution containing 5 mg sample powder (scraped from INF), 5 mg carbon (Vulcan XC-72), 80 µL 5 wt.% Nafion and 2 mL ethanol. After sufficiently ultrasonic mixing, 20 µL of the dispersion was extracted and uniformly dropped on the glassy carbon (GC) electrode.

For the preparation of the Pt/C ink, 5 mg Pt/C (20 wt.%) and 80 μ L Nafion (5 wt.%) were dispersed in 2 mL ethanol solution through ultrasonic treatment. For the preparation of the RuO₂ ink, 5 mg RuO₂, 5 mg carbon (Vulcan-XC72) and 80 μ L Nafion (5 wt.%) were dispersed in 2 mL ethanol solution through ultrasonic treatment. The inks were evenly dropped on INF (1 × 1 cm²) to prepare the working electrodes with catalyst loading of 2 mg cm⁻²,

and marked as 20% Pt/C-INF and RuO₂-INF, respectively.

The OER LSV tests were performed in an O₂-saturated 1.0 M KOH solution with a potential range of 0.2 to 1.0 V (vs. Hg/HgO) and a scan rate of 5 mV s⁻¹. The electrodes were activated by the CV scanning before measuring the OER performances. Similarly, the ORR LSV tests were carried out in O₂-saturated 0.1 M KOH solution with a potential range of -0.8 to 0.2 V (vs. Hg/HgO). The HER LSV tests were carried out in N₂saturated 1.0 M KOH solution with a potential range of -1.6 to -0.8 V (vs. Hg/HgO). The MOR LSV tests were performed in an N₂-saturated in 1.0 M KOH + 1.0 M methanol mixed solution with a potential range of 0.2 to 1.0 V (vs. Hg/HgO) and a scan rate of 5 mV s⁻¹. In the above tests, the LSV curves of OER, ORR, HER and MOR were all tested in the electrolytic cell with the self-supported catalysts, and the ORR LSV curves of the samples were also tested with RDE for comparing with the self-supported catalysts. IR compensation was performed on all the working electrodes, and the following formula was used to convert all recorded potentials into RHE [1]: $E_{RHE} = E_{Hg/HgO} + 0.059 \times pH + 0.098$. Among them, at 25 °C, the overpotential of OER (η) can be determined by the formula: η $= E_{RHE} - 1.23.$

The Tafel slopes were obtained from their corresponding linear sweep voltammetry (LSV) by plotting overpotential (η) to the log current (j). The Tafel slopes were calculated from equation $\eta = b^* \log j + a$ ('b' is the Tafel slope, and 'a' is a constant) [2]. Chronopotentiometry (CP) tests were adopted to analyze the voltage variation of the working electrode over time within 40000 s to evaluate the OER and HER stability in 1.0 M KOH at a constant current density (100 mA cm⁻²). Chronoamperometry (CA) tests were used to record the changes in current density of the working electrode over 60000 s to evaluate the ORR durability of the catalysts in 0.1 M KOH solution at the constant voltage (-0.5 V (vs. Hg/HgO)). The CP tests were adopted to analyze the voltage variation of the working electrode over 100000 s to evaluate the MOR durability in 1.0 M KOH + 1.0 M methanol at a constant current (100 mA cm⁻²).

In order to measure the electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) of catalysts, the same testing conditions with LSV were configured. The catalysts were used as the working electrode, and an anodic polarization potential of 1.462 V (vs. RHE) was applied to the working electrode. The frequency collection range was set to $10^{-2} - 10^5$ Hz, and the amplitude was set to 5 mV. The tests were conducted on the electrochemical workstation CHI 760 E. Then, the key electrochemical kinetic parameters to evaluate the performance of the catalysts were obtained, that is, the charge transfer resistance (R_{ct}) between the electrode interface and the electrolyte. For EIS testing during MOR, the electrolyte was adopted to a 1.0 M KOH + 1.0 M methanol mixed solution with the applied an anode potential of 1.55 V (vs. RHE), while the other testing conditions remained unchanged. For the

measurement of the electrochemical double-layer capacitance (C_{dl}) of catalysts, CV scans of the samples at different scanning rates (10 to 100 mV s⁻¹) in the potential range of 0.877 to 0.977 V (vs. RHE) were performed in 1.0 M KOH solution. The scanning rate was used as the x-axis, and half of the upper and lower current density corresponding to the intermediate potential values in the scanning interval ($\Delta j = (j_{anode} - j_{cathode})/2$) was used as the y-axis. Then, by fitting the curve, the slope that is the C_{dl} can be obtained. In general, the electrochemically active surface area (ECSA) is

$$C d l$$

proportional to C_{dl} [3, 4]: ECSA = \overline{C} \$ Among them, C_s is the specific
capacitance per unit of actual surface area, often replaced by empirical
values under assumed conditions.

As mentioned above, the capacitance value of the double layer is related

to current density and scanning rate [5]: $C_{dl} = \overline{v}$. Where Δj represents the capacitance current density, v stands for the scanning rate.

For the ECSA tests toward MOR, the electrolyte was uses as 1.0 M KOH+1.0 M methanol mixed solution, and the potential range of 0.867 to 0.967 V (vs. RHE) was set, while the other test conditions kept unchanged. 4. Synthesis of hydrophobic layer

200 g of ethanol was mixed with 6 g of carbon black (Vulcan XC72), and stirred thoroughly at room temperature $(25 \pm 0.2 \text{ °C})$ for half an hour. Heat the solution to 35 °C and drop polytetrafluoroethylene concentrated dispersion (PTFE, 60 wt.%) into it. After the flocculent precipitate was formed, press it into the sheets (0.5 mm thickness), and heat it in a annealing furnace at 350 °C for 2 h to finally obtain the hydrophobic layer.

5. Synthesis of solid gel electrolyte

The preparation method of alkaline gel electrolyte was as the follows: 8 mg MBA, 10 mg APS, 10 g AM and 8 g cellulose nanofibers were added into a mixed solution of 8 g glycerin and 8 g deionized water at room temperature, and fully stirred to form solution A. Mix 0.64 g of PVA with 5.76 g of deionized water in a high-temperature water bath to form the PVA solvent, and then mix 0.96 g of PVA solvent with 8.64 g of DMSO solution in a high-temperature water bath to form solution B. At room temperature, mix the A and B solution, and then add 1 g AA (acrylic acid) into the mixed solution. After the completely stirring, pour it into a petri dish, and heat it in an oven at 80 °C for 1 h to form solid gel (4 mm thickness). Soak it into 6 M KOH + 0.2 M Zn(Ac)₂ solution for 20 h at room temperature to obtain the solid gel electrolyte.

6. Assemblies and measurements of ZABs

To estimate the practical applications of the prepared catalysts, they were used as the cathode materials and assembled into aqueous and flexible ZABs. In aqueous ZABs, zinc foil (0.15 mm thickness, 3×3 cm²), 6 M KOH+0.2 M Zn(Ac)₂, and Co-S-INF (or other sample, 1×1 cm²) electrode were sequentially assembled as the anode, electrolyte, and cathode of the battery, respectively. In the flexible battery, zinc foil (0.15 mm thickness, 2 x 2 cm²), gel electrolyte and Co-S-INF (1 × 1 cm²) electrode were assembled as anode, electrolyte and cathode, respectively [6].

All battery tests were conducted at room temperature by using a multichannel battery testing system (LAND CT2001A, Wuhan Land Electronics Co., Ltd., China). The charge/discharge polarization curves and corresponding power density curves of ZABs at different current densities (mA cm⁻²) were obtained. To evaluate the cycling stability of ZABs, the tests were conducted at different current densities and cycling times. In aqueous ZAB, the cycle was conducted for 30 min (15 min charge and 15 min discharge) at a current density of 10 mA cm⁻². Additionally, the high current and long-term cycling tests were also conducted (at different current densities of 25 and 50 mA cm⁻², each cycle lasted for 60 min). In flexible solid-state batteries, in addition cycling for 30 min (15 min charge and 15 min discharge) at 10 mA cm⁻², the cycling measurements were also conducted at 5 mA cm⁻² for 10 min (5 min charge and 5 min discharge) per cycle. The specific capacity (mAh g_{Zn}^{-1}) of aqueous and flexible ZABs at different current densities of 50 and 10 mA cm⁻² were measured by using

the formula: $C = \frac{lt}{m}$.

Where, C, I, t and m represent specific capacity (mAh g_{Zn}^{-1}), current (mA), discharge time (h), and consumed zinc mass (g), respectively.

7. Product analysis

Nuclear magnetic resonance (Ascend 600) was used to analyze the product contents of MOR. First, a series of potassium formate (HCOOK) solutions with the different concentrations (0.5 mM, 1 mM, 1.5 mM, 2 mM, 2.5 mM) were prepared. 500 μ L of potassium formate solution and 200 μ L of D₂O (deuterium oxide) were added into a NMR tube, and mixed thoroughly for NMR test. A standard curve was drawn based on the proportional relationship between the integrated intensity of the formate ion signal peak and the concentration of formate ion. Typically, for the analysis of the product in the electrolyte, 500 μ L of electrolyte and 200 μ L of D₂O were added in a NMR tube, and mix them thoroughly. Then the nuclear magnetic resonance test was performed to obtain the integrated intensity of the formate ion signal. The content of formate produced was calculated according to the standard curve [7].



Fig. S1. SEM images of INF (a), Co-INF (b), INF-S (c), and Co-S-INF (d).



Fig. S2. XPS spectrum of Co-S-INF and INF-S.



Fig. S3. OER (a) and ORR (d) LSV curves of Co-S-INF synthesized at the different electrodeposition times. OER (b) and ORR (e) LSV curves of Co-S-INF synthesized at different hydrothermal temperatures. OER (c) and ORR (f) LSV curves of Co-S-

INF synthesized at different hydrothermal times.



Fig. S4. CV curves of Co-S-INF (a), INF-S (b), Co-INF (c), RuO₂-INF (d), and INF

(e) at the scan rates of 10-100 mV s⁻¹



Fig. S5. (a) ORR LSV curves of Co-S-INF, INF-S, Co-INF, 20% Pt/C, and INF measured on RDE. (b) E_{onset} and $E_{1/2}$ of Co-S-INF, INF-S, Co-INF, 20% Pt/C, and

INF measured on RDE.



Fig. S6. CV curves of Co-S-INF (a), INF-S (b), Co-INF (c) and INF (d) at scan rates

of 10-100 mV s⁻¹ in 1.0 M KOH + 1.0 M methanol solution.



Fig. S7. XRD patterns of (a) FeNi-S-C and (b) Co-S-C.



Fig. S8. (a) ORR, (b) OER, (c) HER, (d) MOR LSV curves after iR-compensated of FeNi-S-C, Co-S-C and carbon cloth.

we have synthesized the single Co_3S_4 and $(Fe, Ni)_9S_8$ phases on the inactive carbon cloth substrate, which named as Co-S-C and FeNi-S-C,

respectively (Fig. S7), and subsequently tested their LSV curves toward OER, ORR, HER and MOR. As can be seen in Fig. S8, the OER and MOR activities of FeNi-S-C are higher than that of Co-S-C. While, the ORR and HER activities of Co-S-C are higher than that of FeNi-S-C.



Fig. S9. Cyclic stability curves of the aqueous ZAB with Co-S INF as cathode: 30 min charge and 30 min discharge at 25 mA cm⁻² and 50 mA cm⁻², respectively.



Fig. S10. Cyclic stability curves of the flexible ZAB with Co-S INF as cathode: 5 min charge and 5 min discharge at 5 mA cm⁻².



Fig. S11. Schematic illustration of the electrolysis cell with Co-S-INF as both cathode and anode (a). Stability curves of the electrolysis cell with Co-S-INF// Co-S-INF and INF//INF at 100 mA cm⁻² in the natural seawater. The inset shows polarization curves

of overall water splitting before and after stability tests (b).



Fig. S12. Standard curve for the formate quantification.

Samples	Co ²⁺ (%)	Co ³⁺ (%)	Co ³⁺ /Co ²⁺	Average valence of Co
Co-S-INF	44.99%	55.01%	1.22	2.55
Co ₃ O ₄	39.12%	60.88%	1.56	2.61

Tab. S1. Co 2p XPS quantitative analyses of Co-S-INF and Co_3O_4 .

Tab. S2. Fe 2p XPS quantitative analyses of Co-S-INF and INF-S.

Samples	Fe ²⁺ (%)	Fe ³⁺ (%)	Fe ³⁺ /Fe ²⁺	Average valence of Fe
Co-S-INF	50.18%	49.82%	0.99	2.50
INF-S	55.97%	44.03%	0.79	2.44

Tab. S3. Ni 2p XPS quantitative analyses of Co-S-INF and INF-S.

Samples	Ni ²⁺ (%)	Ni ³⁺ (%)	Ni ³⁺ /Ni ²⁺	Average valence of Ni
Co-S-INF	55.49%	44.51%	0.80	2.45
INF-S	67.14%	32.86%	0.49	2.33

Samples	solutions	OER overpotential (mV) @100 mA cm ⁻²	References
Co-S-INF	1 M KOH	248	This work
B-TS-H@T-B	1 M KOH	420	[8]
(Ni, Fe)S ₂ @MoS ₂	1 M KOH	330	[9]
Ni ₃ S ₂ /FeNi ₂ S ₄ -NiFe foam	1 M KOH	239	[10]
Fe _{0.9} Ni _{2.1} S ₂ @NF	1 M KOH	252	[11]
CuCo-Ni ₃ S ₂ /NF	1 M KOH	400	[12]
Cu@CoS _x /Cu Foam	1 M KOH	310	[13]
$Ni_xCo_{3\text{-}x}S_4\!/Ni_3S_2\!/NF$	1 M KOH	320	[14]
$Fe_{0.8}Ni_{0.15}S_{1.05}$	1 M KOH	330	[15]
Cu ₂ O@Fe-Ni ₃ S ₂ /Cu foam	1 M KOH	250	[16]
Fe-Ni ₃ S ₂ /OXs	1 M KOH	260	[17]

Tab. S4. Comparisons of the OER catalytic performances of the different metal sulfides including our Co-S-INF.

Catalysts	R_{ct}/Ω
INF	35.6
INF-S	1.5
Co-INF	2.1
Co-S-INF	1.1
RuO ₂ -INF	17.7

Tab. S5. $R_{\rm ct}$ values of the samples.

	Peak			
	power	Charge/discharge voltage gap	Charge/discharge voltage gap	
Electrodes	density	(V)	(V)	References
	(mW cm ⁻	$@ 100 \text{ mA cm}^{-2}$	$@200 \text{ mA cm}^{-2}$	
	2)			
Co-S-INF	332.3	0.57	1.05	This work
Fe ₁ Co ₁ S _x @NSPC	159.0			[18]
CoMn ₂ O ₄ -S ₂	108.3	-	-	[19]
$CoMn_{1.5}Ni_{0.5}O_4$	147.4	1.40	1.90	[20]
BSCCF-NF-H	130.5	1.25	1.65	[21]
Co ₉ S ₈ -FeS ₂ @N-CNFs	214.0	1.40	1.50	[22]
NiCo ₂ Se ₄ /NiCoS ₄	83.5	1.36	1.87	[23]
Ni ₃ S ₄ @CoS _x -NF	143.0	0.69	2.30	[24]
(Fe, Co, Ni) ₉ S ₈ /NSCFs	158	1.29	-	[25]
SNCF-Mn-S ₄	129.4	1.37	1.87	[26]
CoFe@NC/KB-800	160	0.98	1.42	[27]

Tab. S6. Property comparisons of ZABs with the Co-S-INF and otherreported catalysts.

Electrodes	Peak power	Charge/discharge voltage gap (at 100 mA	Specific capacity (mAh	References
	density (mW	cm ⁻²)	g_{Zn}^{-1})	
	cm ⁻²)			
Co-S-INF	160.5	1.00	778.9	This work
INF-FeCuS	130.0	0.92	777.1	[28]
Fe ₁ Co ₁ S _x @NSPC	71.0		770.0	[18]
CoFe-SNC	51.5			[29]
Mn-Ni ₃ S ₂ /NF	75.8	1.42	598.0	[6]
$CoMn_{1.5}Ni_{0.5}O_4$	85.8	1.25		[20]
BSCCF-NF-H	81.7	1.33	705.0	[21]
MnCo ₂ O ₄	60.3	1.63		[30]
Ni ₃ S ₄ @CoS _x -NF	100.1	1.22	775.0	[24]
CoxSy/SNC-800	136.0	1.35	777.0	[31]

Tab. S7. Property comparisons of the flexible solid-state ZABs with the Co-S-INF and other reported catalysts.

Tab. S8. Calculation of Faradaic efficiencies of the cathode and anode products in the electrolysis cell with Co-S-INF//Co-S-INF during the alkaline water splitting.

G			D 1	Faradaic	Theoretical	Detected O ₂	Faradaic
Current	Time (min)	Theoretical	Detected	efficiency	O ₂ (mmol)	(mmol)	efficiency (O ₂ ,
density				(H ₂ , %)			%)
	10	0.311	0.306	98.39	0.156	0.152	97.44
100	20	0.622	0.614	98.71	0.311	0.305	98.07
100	30	0.933	0.922	98.82	0.466	0.458	98.28
mA	40	1.244	1.234	99.20	0.622	0.617	99.20
cm ⁻²	50	1.555	1.540	99.04	0.777	0.771	99.23
	60	1.866	1.846	98.93	0.933	0.919	98.50

The Faradaic efficiencies of H_2 and O_2 in the electrolysis cell with Co-S-INF as both anode and cathode in 1.0 M KOH electrolyte are measured in a closed electrochemical cell, and the collected H_2 or O_2 gas products are measured by the drainage method. Each collection is repeated at least three times, and the average value is presented. Then, the value of the Faradaic efficiency is calculated based on the following formula [32, 33] :

Faraday efficiency = $(m_{\text{Detected}} / m_{\text{Theoretical}}) * 100\%$

$$m_{\text{Theoretical}} = (I * t) / (n * F)$$

Where the *m* is the actual mole numbers of the product, *n* is the number of transferred electrons (n = 4 for O₂, n = 2 for H₂), *F* is the Faraday constant (*F*=96485.3 C mol⁻¹), *I* is current (100 mA cm⁻²), *t* is time, and the measurement is at ambient temperature.

Current density	Time (min)	Theoretical	Detected H ₂	Faradaic efficiency $(H_2, \%)$
	l ime (min)	H ₂ (mmol)	(mmol)	
100 mA cm ⁻²	5	0.1555	0.1540	99.04
	10	0.3109	0.3094	99.52
	15	0.4664	0.4603	98.69
	20	0.6219	0.6205	99.77
	25	0.7773	0.7723	99.36
	30	0.9328	0.9241	99.07
	35	1.0883	1.0759	98.86
	40	1.2437	1.2277	98.71

Tab. S9. Calculation of Faradaic efficiency of cathode products during the MOR-assisted water splitting.

The Faradaic efficiency of H_2 produced in the electrolysis cell with Co-S-INF// Co-S-INF in the mixed solution of 1.0 M KOH + 1.0 M methanol is measured in a closed electrochemical cell, and the collected H_2 gas products is measured by the drainage method.

References

- H. Ge, G. Li, J. Shen, W. Ma, X. Meng, L. Xu, Co₄N nanoparticles encapsulated in N-doped carbon box as tri-functional catalyst for Zn-air battery and overall water splitting, Appl. Catal., B. 275 (2020) 119104. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcatb.2020.119104</u>.
- [2] D. Chinnadurai, S.J. Lee, Y. Yu, S.Y. Nam, M.Y. Choi, Cation modulation in dual-phase nickel sulfide nanospheres by pulsed laser irradiation for overall water splitting and methanol oxidation reaction, Fuel 320 (2022) 123915. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2022.123915</u>.
- [3] H. Deng, C. Zhang, Y. Xie, T. Tumlin, L. Giri, S.P. Karna, J. Lin, Laser induced MoS₂/carbon hybrids for hydrogen evolution reaction catalysts, J. Mater. Chem. A 4 (2016) 6824-6830. <u>https://doi.org/10.1039/c5ta09322h</u>.
- [4] N. Jiang, Q. Tang, M. Sheng, B. You, D. Jiang, Y. Sun, Nickel sulfides for electrocatalytic hydrogen evolution under alkaline conditions: a case study of crystalline NiS, NiS₂, and Ni₃S₂ nanoparticles, Catal. Sci. Technol. 6 (2016) 1077-1084. <u>https://doi.org/10.1039/c5cy01111f</u>.
- [5] F. Zhang, T. Liu, J. Zhang, E. Cui, L. Yue, R. Jiang, G. Hou, The potassium hydroxide-urea synergy in improving the capacitive energy-storage performance of agar-derived carbon aerogels, Carbon 147 (2019) 451-459. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.carbon.2019.03.011</u>.
- [6] M. Yin, H. Miao, B. Chen, R. Hu, L. Xia, C. Zhang, F. Wang, H. Zhang, J. Yuan, Self-supported metal sulfide electrode for flexible quasi-solid-state zinc-air batteries, J. Alloys Compd. 878 (2021) 160434. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jallcom.2021.160434</u>.
- [7] Y. Qi, Y. Zhang, L. Yang, Y. Zhao, Y. Zhu, H. Jiang, C. Li, Insights into the activity of nickel boride/nickel heterostructures for efficient methanol electrooxidation, Nat. Commun. 13 (2022) 4602. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-32443-5</u>.

- [8] T.T. Li, T.Y. Jing, D.W. Rao, X.T. Jia, Y.P. Zuo, S. Kment, R. Zboril, In situ coating amorphous boride on ternary pyrite-type boron sulfide for highly efficient oxygen evolution, J. Mater. Chem. A 9 (2021) 12283-12290. <u>https://doi.org/10.1039/d0ta10633j</u>.
- Y.K. Liu, S. Jiang, S.J. Li, L. Zhou, Z.H. Li, J.M. Li, M.F. Shao, Interface engineering of (Ni, Fe)S₂@MoS₂ heterostructures for synergetic electrochemical water splitting, Appl. Catal., B 247 (2019) 107-114. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcatb.2019.01.094</u>.
- [10] Y.Y. Wu, Y. Li, M.K. Yuan, H.R. Hao, X.J. San, Z. Lv, L.L. Xu, B. Wei, Operando capturing of surface self-reconstruction of Ni₃S₂/FeNi₂S₄ hybrid nanosheet array for overall water splitting, Chem. Eng. J. 427 (2022) 131944. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2021.131944</u>.
- [11] B. Fei, Z.L. Chen, J.X. Liu, H.B. Xu, X.X. Yan, H.L. Qing, M. Chen, R.B. Wu, Ultrathinning nickel sulfide with modulated electron density for efficient water splitting, Adv. Energy Mater. 10 (2020) 2001963. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/aenm.202001963</u>.
- [12] J.F. Qin, M. Yang, S. Hou, B. Dong, T.S. Chen, X. Ma, J.Y. Xie, Y.N. Zhou, J. Nan, Y.M. Chai, Copper and cobalt co-doped Ni₃S₂ grown on nickel foam for highly efficient oxygen evolution reaction, Appl. Surf. Sci. 502 (2020) 144172. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsusc.2019.144172</u>.
- [13] Y.P. Liu, Q.J. Li, R. Si, G.D. Li, W. Li, D.P. Liu, D.J. Wang, L. Sun, Y. Zhang, X.X. Zou, Coupling sub-nanometric copper clusters with quasi-amorphous cobalt sulfide yields efficient and robust electrocatalysts for water splitting reaction, Adv. Mater. 29 (2017) 1606200. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/adma.201606200</u>.
- [14] Y.Y. Wu, Y.P. Liu, G.D. Li, X. Zou, X.R. Lian, D.J. Wang, L. Sun, T. Asefa, X.X. Zou, Efficient electrocatalysis of overall water splitting by ultrasmall Ni_xCo_{3-x}S₄ coupled Ni₃S₂ nanosheet arrays, Nano Energy 35 (2017) 161-170. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nanoen.2017.03.024</u>.

- [15] Z.X. Jing, Q.Y. Zhao, D.H. Zheng, L. Sun, J.H. Geng, Q.N. Zhou, J.J. Lin, Nickel-doped pyrrhotite iron sulfide nanosheets as a highly efficient electrocatalyst for water splitting, J. Mater. Chem. A 8 (2020) 20323-20330. <u>https://doi.org/10.1039/d0ta07624d</u>.
- [16] L.L. Wu, Y.X. Yang, X.H. Chen, J. Luo, H.C. Fu, L. Shen, H.Q. Luo, N.B. Li, Cu₂O@Fe-Ni₃S₂ nanoflower in situ grown on copper foam at room temperature as an excellent oxygen evolution electrocatalyst, Chem. Commun. (Camb.) 56 (2020) 12339-12342. https://doi.org/10.1039/d0cc04893c.
- [17] W. Xu, C. Zhang, H.T. Shen, X.X. Ma, Z.H. Cheng, J. Wu, Q.Z. Zhu, J. Lin, Z.G. Fu, H.Y. Deng, Surface oxalate coordination: facilitating basic OER activity by regulating the electronic structure of Fe-Ni₃S₂, ACS Sustainable Chem. Eng. 10 (2022) 14396-14406. <u>https://doi.org/10.1021/acssuschemeng.2c02456</u>.
- [18] W. Fang, P. Dai, H. Hu, T. Jiang, H. Dong, M. Wu, Fe_{0.96}S/Co₈FeS₈ nanoparticles co-embedded in porous N, S codoped carbon with enhanced bifunctional electrocatalystic activities for all-solidstate Zn-air batteries, Appl. Surf. Sci. 505 (2020) 144212. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsusc.2019.144212.
- [19] Z. Zhang, H. Sun, J. Li, Z. Shi, M. Fan, H. Bian, T. Wang, D. Gao, S-doped CoMn₂O₄ with more high valence metallic cations and oxygen defects for zinc-air batteries, J. Power Sources 491 (2021) 229584. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpowsour.2021.229584</u>.
- [20] B. Chen, H. Miao, M. Yin, R. Hu, L. Xia, C. Zhang, J. Yuan, Mn-based spinels evolved from layered manganese dioxides at mild temperature for the robust flexible quasi-solid-state zinc-air batteries, Chem. Eng. J. 417 (2021) 129179. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2021.129179</u>.
- [21] X.Y. Wu, H. Miao, M.M. Yin, R.G. Hu, F. Wang, H.C. Zhang, L. Xia, C.F. Zhang, J.L. Yuan,

Biomimetic construction of bifunctional perovskite oxygen catalyst for zinc-air batteries, Electrochim. Acta 399 (2021) 139407. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electacta.2021.139407</u>.

- [22] L. Sun, S. Huang, X. Zhao, L. Li, X. Zhao, W. Zhang, Synergistic effect of Co₉S₈ and FeS₂ inlaid on N-doped carbon nanofibers toward a bifunctional catalyst for Zn-air batteries, Langmuir 38 (2022) 11753-11763. <u>https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.langmuir.2c01882</u>.
- [23] K.K. Wang, Z.S. Lin, Y. Tang, Z.H. Tang, C.L. Tao, D.D. Qin, Y. Tian, Selenide/sulfide heterostructured NiCo₂Se₄/NiCoS₄ for oxygen evolution reaction, hydrogen evolution reaction, water splitting and Zn-air batteries, Electrochim. Acta 368 (2021) 137584. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electacta.2020.137584.
- [24] M. Yin, H. Miao, J. Dang, B. Chen, J. Zou, G. Chen, H. Li, High-performance alkaline hybrid zinc batteries with heterostructure nickel/cobalt sulfide, J. Power Sources 545 (2022) 231902. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpowsour.2022.231902</u>.
- [25] T. Jiang, P. Dai, W. Zhang, M. Wu, Fish bone-derived N, S co-doped interconnected carbon nanofibers network coupled with (Fe, Co, Ni)₉S₈ nanoparticles as efficient bifunctional electrocatalysts for rechargeable and flexible all-solid-state Zn-air battery, Electrochim. Acta 373 (2021) 137903. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electacta.2021.137903</u>.
- [26] J. Zou, D. Qiu, G. Chen, H. Miao, J. Dang, L. Xia, Q. Wang, H. Zhang, J. Yuan, Greatly enhancing the bifunctional oxygen catalytic activities of cobalt-based perovskites by anchoring metal sulfides, J. Alloys Compd. 933 (2023) 167817. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jallcom.2022.167817</u>.
- [27] S. Ren, X. Duan, F. Ge, Z. Chen, Q. Yang, M. Zhang, H. Zheng, Novel MOF-derived hollow CoFe alloy coupled with N-doped ketjen black as boosted bifunctional oxygen catalysts for Zn-air batteries, Chem. Eng. J. 427 (2022) 131614. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2021.131614</u>.

- [28] J.X. Dang, M.M. Yin, D.H. Pan, Z.Q. Tian, G.M. Chen, J.Q. Zou, H. Miao, Q. Wang, J.L. Yuan, Four-functional iron/copper sulfide heterostructure for alkaline hybrid zinc batteries and water splitting, Chem. Eng. J. 457 (2023) 141357. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2023.141357</u>.
- [29] C.-C. Weng, J.-T. Ren, H.-Y. Wang, X.-W. Lv, Y.-J. Song, Y.-S. Wang, L. Chen, W.-W. Tian, Z.-Y. Yuan, Triple-phase oxygen electrocatalysis of hollow spherical structures for rechargeable Zn-Air batteries, Appl. Catal., B 307 (2022) 121190. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcatb.2022.121190</u>.
- [30] J. Zou, B. Chen, B. Li, M. Yin, H. Miao, F. Wang, C. Zhang, H. Zhang, J. Yuan, Achieving high energy efficiency of alkaline hybrid zinc battery by using the optimized Co–Mn spinel cathode, Int. J. Hydrogen Energy 47 (2022) 27470-27480. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2022.06.082</u>.
- [31] Z. Yang, J. Gao, P. Zhu, X. Zhao, G. Wang, S. Liu, Encapsulated Co_xS_y nanoparticles decorated S, N-doped mesoporous carbon as effective bifunctional oxygen electrocatalyst in rechargeable Znair battery, J. Alloys Compd. 858 (2021) 157665. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jallcom.2020.157665</u>.
- [32] R. Li, X.J. Liu, W.H. Liu, Z.B. Li, K.C. Chan, Z.P. Lu, Design of hierarchical porosity via manipulating chemical and microstructural complexities in high-entropy alloys for efficient water electrolysis, Adv. Sci. 9 (2022) 2105808. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/advs.202105808</u>.
- [33] R.G. Hu, F.Y. Liu, H.Q. Qiu, H. Miao, Q. Wang, H.C. Zhang, F. Wang, J.L. Yuan, High-property anode catalyst compositing Co-based perovskite and NiFe-layered double hydroxide for alkaline seawater splitting, Processes 10 (2022) 668. <u>https://doi.org/10.3390/pr10040668</u>.