Electronic Supplementary Material (ESI) for Journal of Materials Chemistry A. This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2024

Supporting Information

An *in situ* hydrothermally self-crystallized dense ceria-based barrier layer for solid oxide fuel cells[†]

Qiuqiu Lyu¹, Haoyu Zhao¹, Jianyu He¹, Yuhao Wang², *, Yongkang Xiang³, Hongxia

Qu¹, Qin Zhong¹, Yifei Sun^{3,4,}*, Tenglong Zhu^{1,*}

1. School of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Nanjing University of Science and

Technology, Nanjing 210094, China

2. Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, The Hong Kong

University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Hong Kong SAR, China

3. College of Energy, Xiamen University, Xiamen 361005, China

4. State Key Laboratory of Physical Chemistry of Solid Surface, Xiamen University, Xiamen 361005, China

*Correspondence: yuhao.wang@connect.ust.hk, yfsun@xmu.edu.cn,

zhutenglong@njust.edu.cn



Figure S1 Flow chart of single cells preparation.



Figure S2 Hydrophilicity test on the surface of GDC barrier after different reaction times.



Figure S3 XRD patterns evolutions of GDC barrier layer as hydrothermal duration

prolongs.



Figure S4 The atomic ratio of Ce to Gd in Figure 1b



Figure S5 Surface morphology of GDCs grown in aqueous solutions with Ce:Gd ratios

of 9:1, 8:2, 7:3, 6:4.



Figure S6. XPS spectra of Gd3d, Ce3d and O1s with different Ar+ etching times



Figure S7 The image of Raman spectroscopy(a), point signals(b) and surface signals(c).



Figure S8 The surface morphology of GDC film grown on polished glass substrate.



Figure S9 Hydrophilicity test on the surface of GDC barrier layer with three different crystal orientations.



Figure S10 Schematic diagram illustrating the interface contact between the cathode and the GDC barrier layer in Cell-SP and Cell-HY.



Figure S11 EIS spectra and Bode plot of Cell-HY-12 h (a, b) and Cell-HY-24 h (c, d);

Arrhenius plots of ohmic (e) and polarization (g) resistances of four cells.



Figure S12 j-V-P curves of Cell-HY-12 h (a) and Cell-HY-24 h (b); the comparison of

peak power densities (c) and power densities at 0.8 V (d) of four cells.



Figure S13 Cross-sectional images and Line scan results of Cell-HY-12 h, Cell-HY-24 h and Cell-HY-36 h after testing.



Figure S14 Cross-sectional SEM images and EDX mappings of Cell-HY after aging.



Figure S15 AFM image of GDC films surface,(a) 2D; (b) 3D.



Figure S16 The surface SEM image of the GDC barrier layer by hydrothermal method (a)

and after calcination at 1075 °C for 2 hours (b).

	Before	After
3 h	5.0	3.5
6 h	5.0	3
12 h	5.0	3.5
18 h	5.0	2.5
24 h	5.0	2.0
30 h	5.0	1.5
36 h	5.0	1.0

Table S1 The pH of solutions after different reaction times

Solution composition	Gd ³⁺ content	Ce:Gd in GDC films
Gd(NO ₃) ₃ ·6H ₂ O: Ce(NO ₃) ₃ ·6H ₂ O=0.1: 0.9	10%	98.5:1.5
Gd(NO ₃) ₃ ·6H ₂ O: Ce(NO ₃) ₃ ·6H ₂ O=0.2: 0.8	20%	97:3
Gd(NO ₃) ₃ ·6H ₂ O: Ce(NO ₃) ₃ ·6H ₂ O=0.3: 0.7	30%	96.3:3.7
Gd(NO ₃) ₃ ·6H ₂ O: Ce(NO ₃) ₃ ·6H ₂ O=0.4: 0.6	40%	94:6

Table S2 Aqueous solutions containing different Gd³⁺ contents

Peak Area	100s	600s	1200s	2400s
Ce3d	982614.9	1031412.3	1113756	1143228
Gd3d	184725.1	217864.16	236575	259520.5
Gd3d:Ce3d	0.188	0.211	0.212	0.227

Table S3 the peak area of Ce3d and Gd3d with different Ar+ etching times

	100 s	600 s	1200 s	2400 s
Gd ³⁺ : Gd ⁴⁺	0.220	0.217	0.209	0.239
Ce ³⁺ :Ce ⁴⁺	0.648	0.692	0.634	0.738
O1 _{lattice} :O1 _{defects}	0.324	0.297	0.302	0.294

Table S4 The Gd³⁺: Gd⁴⁺, Ce³⁺:Ce⁴⁺, O1_{lattice}:O1_{defects} with different Ar+ etching times

Crystal face		2 Theta	Spacing (d _{hkl} , d(Å))	Mismatch
100	GDC	33.212	2.695	5 40/
100	YSZ	35.057	2.558	5.4%
110	GDC	47.565	1.910	- 20/
110	YSZ	50.240	1.814	5.3%
	GDC	28.735	3.104	- 00/
111	YSZ	30.449	2.933	5.8%

Table S5 Mismatch between YSZ single crystals and GDC crystals in Figure 2b.

	Ea(Rohm)/(kJ/mol)	Ea(Rp)/ (kJ/mol)
Cell-SY	61.9	80.5
Cell-HY-12 h	53.5	63.2
Cell-HY-24 h	46.3	57.5
Cell-HY-36 h	64.7	57.7

Table S6. $E_{a,ohm}$ and $E_{a,p}$ of four cells.