# **Thermodynamically favored stable hydrogen storage reversibility of**

## **NaBH<sup>4</sup> inside of bimetallic nanoporous carbon nanosheets**

Wei Chen<sup>a</sup>, Shunlong Ju<sup>a</sup>, Yahui Sun<sup>a</sup>, Tianren Zhang<sup>b</sup>, Juan Wang<sup>b</sup>, Jikai Ye<sup>a</sup>, *Guanglin Xia\*<sup>a</sup> , Xuebin Yu\*<sup>a</sup>*

Department of Materials Science, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China. Zhejiang Tianneng Battery Co., Ltd., Changxing 313100, Zhejiang, China. \*E-mail: [xiaguanglin@fudan.edu.cn](mailto:xiaguanglin@fudan.edu.cn) (G. L. Xia), [yuxuebin@fudan.edu.cn](mailto:yuxuebin@fudan.edu.cn) (X. B. Yu)

#### **Experimental**

**Chemicals:**  $Ni(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>·6H<sub>2</sub>O$ ,  $Co(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>·6H<sub>2</sub>O$ , terephthalic acid (PTA), and dimethoxyethane (DME) were purchased from Aladdin Industrial Corporation. N, Ndimethylformamide (DMF) and ethanol were purchased from Sinopharm Chemical reagent Co., Ltd. Triethylamine (TEA) was purchased from Macklin Biochemical Co., Ltd. NaBH<sup>4</sup> was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich. All chemicals were used directly without further purification.

**Synthesis of ultrathin NiCo-MOFs nanosheets (NiCo-MOFs):** The preparation process of ultrathin NiCo-MOFs nanosheets was modified according to the previously published method.<sup>S1, S2</sup> In a typical synthesis procedure,  $0.75$  mmol Ni $\text{(NO3)}_2\text{·}6\text{H}_2\text{O}$ ,  $0.75$  mmol Co(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>·6H<sub>2</sub>O and 1.5 mmol PTA were dissolved in the mixed solvent mixture, containing 4 mL of ethanol, 4 mL of water and 64 mL of DMF. Subsequently, 1.6 mL TEA was quickly injected into the solution. After that, the mixture was stirred for 5 min to obtain a uniform colloidal suspension which was then continuously ultrasonicated for 8 h at room temperature. After washing with ethanol for 3 times, the as-obtained product was dispersed in water and ultrasonicated for 30 min. Finally, the obtained aqueous dispersion was subjected to freeze-drying for 72 h to obtain NiCo-MOFs.

**Synthesis of bimetallic (NiCo) nanoporous carbon nanosheets (NiCo-NC):** The NiCo-NC was prepared by the annealing of thus-obtained NiCo-MOFs at elevated temperature. Briefly, the as-prepared NiCo-MOFs was carbonized at 900 ℃ in a tube furnace for 1 h with a heating rate of  $2^{\circ}C$  min<sup>-1</sup> under Ar atmosphere. After cooling to room temperature, the black powers collected were collected and denoted as NiCo-NC.

**Synthesis of NaBH4@NiCo-NC:** The synthesis of NaBH4@NiCo-NC was realized according to the solution infiltration method. Typically, 50 mg of NaBH<sup>4</sup> was dissolved in 25 mL DME and stirred for 2h. Subsequently, 50 mg of NiCo-NC was added into the sol and the thus-obtained mixture was ultrasonically treated for 1 h to achieve the homogeneous contact between NaBH<sub>4</sub> and NiCo-NC. The suspension was finally dried at 80 °C under vacuum for 12 h to remove the solvent to obtain  $N$ a $BH_4$ @NiCo-NC.

**Synthesis of nanoporous carbon nanosheets (NC):** NC was prepared by etching NiCo from NiCo-NC. Certain amount of NiCo-NC was dispersed in 8 mol L-1 HCl solution and ultrasonicated for 1 h, followed by stirring for another 24 h. The product was washed with water for 4 times and dried in a drying oven at 80 ℃ for 12 h. The thus-obtained powder was denoted as NC.

**Synthesis of ball-milled samples:** The ball-milled composite of NaBH<sup>4</sup> and NiCo-NC (denoted as  $NaBH<sub>4</sub>/NiCo-NC$ ) was prepared by ball milling the mixture of  $NaBH<sub>4</sub>$  and NiCo-NC with a weight ratio of 1:1 at 300 rpm for 2 h on a planetary ball mill (QM-3SP4, Nanjing Nanda Instrument Plant). The ball-to-powder ratio was approximately 50:1.

## **Characterization**

The hydrogen absorption and desorption performance of materials were quantitatively determined using a high-pressure gas sorption apparatus (HPSA-auto). Isothermal dehydrogenation measurements were conducted at several constant temperatures (*i.e.* 380 ℃, 400 ℃, 420 ℃, and 440 ℃) under static vacuum for 6 h. In the term of cycling hydrogen storage tests, the as-prepared materials were heated to 400 ℃ rapidly and hold for 6 h with an initial pressure lower than 0.001 bar, and the rehydrogenation of the dehydrogenated products was performed under a hydrogen pressure of 60 bar at 350 ℃ for 10 h.

Morphologies of the materials were observed by scanning electron microscopy (SEM, JEOL 7500FA) and transmission electron microscopy (TEM, JEOL JEM-2100F), while TEM-associated energy-dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (EDS) was used for elemental analysis. Phase compositions of the materials were identified by X-ray diffraction (XRD; D8 advance, Bruker AXS) with Cu K*α* radiation at 50 kV and 30 mA. In order to avoid any possible oxidation during XRD measurement, all materials were pre-sealed on sample stages with scotch tape in an Ar-filled glovebox. Mass spectrometry (MS) was conducted using a mass spectrometer (HIDEN, QIC-20) from room temperature to 600 °C with a heating rate of 3 °C min<sup>-1</sup> under Ar flow. The signals at m/e = 2 and 27 were recorded in order to detect  $H_2$  and  $B_2H_6$ . Chemical bonds in the materials were examined by Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FT-IR, Bruker Tensor 27). X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) was carried out on a Thermo Scientific K-Alpha+ with Al X-ray radiation source.

## **DFT calculations**

Density functional theory (DFT) calculations were carried out using projectoraugmented wave (PAW) method as implemented in Vienna ab initio simulation package (VASP).<sup>S3-S5</sup> A generalized gradient approximation (GGA) of Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof (PBE) functional was employed to describe the exchange-correlation interaction.S6 The DFT-D3 method was also adopted to evaluate the van der Waals interactions.S7 In all calculations, the energy cutoff was set as 500 eV, and Gamma centered k-points mesh with mesh point spacing less than 0.05 Å-1 were applied. The structures were relaxed until the forces and total energy on all atoms were converged to less than 0.05 eV Å  $^{-1}$  and 1 × 10<sup>-5</sup> eV. To evaluate the difficulty of various re-/dehydrogenation reactions thermodynamically, the Gibbs free energy change ( $\Delta G$ ) was calculated as follows,

$$
\Delta G = \sum G_{product} - \sum G_{reactant}
$$

where G*product* and G*reactant* are the total energy of every product and reactant in the re- /dehydrogenation reaction formula, respectively. A reaction with lower ∆G is more likely to occur thermodynamically.



Figure S1. XRD patterns of the as-synthesized samples.



Figure S2. High-resolution Ni 2p (a) and Co 2p (b) XPS spectra of NiCo-NC.



Figure S3. FTIR spectra of the as-prepared samples.



Figure S4. The isothermal dehydrogenation kinetics of (a)  $N$ a $BH$ <sub>4</sub> $@$ NC and (b) NaBH4/NiCo-NC at various temperatures.



Figure S5. XRD patterns of the dehydrogenation products of (a) bulk NaBH4, (b) NaBH4/NiCo-NC, (c) NaBH4@NC and (d) NaBH4@NiCo-NC.



Figure S6. High-resolution Ni 2p, Co 2p, and B 1s XPS spectra of NaBH4@NiCo-NC after the first cycle of dehydrogenation process (a, b, c) and the 2nd cycle of rehydrogenation process (d, e, f).



Figure S7. FTIR spectra of the dehydrogenation products of (a) NaBH4/NiCo-NC and (b) NaBH4@NiCo-NC.



Figure S8. (a) SEM images and (b) STEM image and the corresponding EDS mapping of NaBH4@NiCo-NC after the initial dehydrogenation process.



Figure S9. Arrhenius profiles of the dehydrogenation kinetics of (a) NaBH<sub>4</sub>@NC, (b) NaBH4/NiCo-NC, and (c) NaBH4@NiCo-NC.



Figure S10. SEM image and the relative element content analysis of bulk NaBH<sub>4</sub> after the release of  $H_2$  with a capacity of 9.0 wt.%.



Figure S11. Cycling  $H_2$  desorption performance of bulk NaBH<sub>4</sub> at 550 °C.



Figure S12. Cycling  $H_2$  desorption performance of (a) NaBH<sub>4</sub>/NiCo-NC and (b) NaBH<sub>4</sub>@NC at 400 °C.



Figure S13. SEM images of the dehydrogenation product of (a) NaBH4/NiCo-NC and (b)  $NaBH<sub>4</sub>( $\omega$ )NC.$ 



Figure S14. SEM images and the relative element content analysis of (a) NaBH4/NiCo-NC, (c) NaBH<sub>4</sub>@NiCo-NC and the dehydrogenation products of (b) NaBH<sub>4</sub>@NiCo-NC, (d) NaBH4/NiCo-NC.



Figure S15. XRD patterns of the (a) NaBH<sub>4</sub>/NiCo-NC and (b) NaBH<sub>4</sub>@NiCo-NC after rehydrogenation.



Figure S16. FTIR spectra of the (a) NaBH4/NiCo-NC and (b) NaBH4@NiCo-NC after rehydrogenation.



Figure S17 HRTEM image of NaBH4@NiCo-NC after rehydrogenation.



Figure S18. XRD patterns of NaBH<sub>4</sub>@NiCo-NC after the 2nd dehydrogenation.



Figure S19. The optimized configurations of NaBH<sup>4</sup> molecule with and without the interaction of Co<sub>2</sub>B/Ni<sub>2</sub>B



Figure S20. Isothermal  $H_2$  desorption kinetics of NaBH<sub>4</sub>@NiCo-NC for the 2nd cycle at 400 °C, with the initial dehydrogenation kinetics of NaBH<sub>4</sub>@NC at 400 °C and bulk NaBH<sub>4</sub> at 440 °C included for comparison.

Scaffolds	Peak temperature, ramping rate	Cycling performance	References
Nanoporous	350 °C, 5 °C/min	43% of the initial capacity,	S <sub>8</sub>
carbon		2 cycles	
Graphene	400 °C, 3 °C/min	$\sim$ 7.0 wt%, 6 cycles	S <sub>9</sub>
Ni coating	418 °C, 10 °C/min	$\sim$ 2.5 wt%, 5 cycles	S <sub>10</sub>
Co coating	450 °C, 10 °C/min	$0.3$ wt.%, 2cycles	S11
Fe coating	~460 °C, 10 °C/min	$0.8$ wt.%, 2cycles	S <sub>11</sub>
Cu coating	$\sim$ 460 °C, 10 °C/min	$0.1 \text{ wt.}\%$ , 2cycles	S <sub>11</sub>
$MCM-41$	511 °C, 10 °C/min		S <sub>12</sub>
Mesoporous	400 °C, 2 °C/min		S13
silica			
NiCo-NC	356 °C, 3 °C/min	4.5 wt.%, 5 cycles	This work

Table S1. The comparison of hydrogen storage performance of various nanoconfined

 $\rm NaBH_4$ 

#### References

- S1 S. L. Zhao, Y. Wang, J. C. Dong, C.-T. He, H. J. Yin, P. An, K. Zhao, X. F. Zhang, C. Gao, L. J. Zhang, J. W. Lv, J. X. Wang, J. Q. Zhang, A. M. Khattak, N. A. Khan, Z. X. Wei, J. Zhang, S. Q. Liu, H. J. Zhao and Z. Y. Tang, *Nat. Energy*, 2016, **1**, 16184.
- S2 Y. Z. Wang, Y. X. Liu, H. Q. Wang, W. Liu, Y. Li, J. F. Zhang, H. Hou and J. L. Yang, *ACS Appl. Energy Mater.*, 2019, **2**, 2063-2071.
- S3 G. Kresse and J. Hafner, *Phys. Rev. B*, 1993, **47**, 558-561.
- S4 G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, *Phys. Rev. B*, 1996, **54**, 11169-11186.
- S5 P. E. Blöchl, *Phys. Rev. B*, 1994, **50**, 17953-17979.
- S6 J. P. Perdew, K. Burke and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1996, **77**, 3865-3868.
- S7 S. Grimme,J. Antony, S. Ehrlich and H. Krieg, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2010, **132**, 154104.
- S8 P. Ngene, R. V. D. Berg, M. H. W. Verkuijlen, K. P. de Jong and P. E. de Jongh, *Energ. Environ. Sci.*, 2011, 4, 4108-4115.
- S9 L. N. Chong, X. Q. Zeng, W. J. Ding, D. J. Liu and J. X. Zou, *Adv. Mater.*, 2015, **27**, 5070–5074.
- S10 M. L. Christian and K. F. Aguey-Zinsou, *ACS nano*, 2012, **6**: 7739-7751.
- S11 M. L. Christian and K. F. Aguey-Zinsou, *Chem. Commun.*, 2013, **49**, 6794-6796.
- S12 X. Luo, A. Rawal and K. F. Aguey-Zinsou, *Inorganics*, 2021; **9**:2.
- S13 F. Perua, S. Garronia, R. Campesib, C. Milanesec, A. Marinic, E. Pellicerd, M. D. Baród and G. Mulas, *J. Alloys Compd.*, 2013, **580**, 309-312.