## Supporting Information

Constructing amorphous/amorphous heterointerfaces in nickel borate/boride composites for efficient electrocatalytic methanol oxidation

Ping Chen, Sai Zhang, Yu Fan, Wenlong Yang\*, and Xiliang Luo\*

P. Chen, S. Zhang, Y. Fan, Dr. W. L. Yang, Prof. X. L. Luo

Key Laboratory of Optic-electric Sensing and Analytical Chemistry for Life Science, MOE,

Key Laboratory of Analytical Chemistry for Life Science in Universities of Shandong,

College of Chemistry and Molecular Engineering,

Qingdao University of Science and Technology,

Qingdao 266042, P. R. China

E-mail: wlyang@qust.edu.cn; xiliangluo@qust.edu.cn

Supporting information: DFT calculation method and Figures S1-S10.



**Figure S1**. TEM image of the a-Ni-B<sub>i</sub>/Ni<sub>x</sub>B hybrid sample, from which the thickness of nanosheets can be identified to be about 5.0 nm.



**Figure S2.** The pore size distribution curve of a-Ni-B<sub>i</sub>/Ni<sub>x</sub>B hybrid sample.



**Figure S3**. TEM image of the ultrathin a-Ni-B<sub>i</sub> nanosheets, where abundant nanopores can be clearly observed.



**Figure S4.** (a) XRD pattern and (b) TEM image of the as-prepared a-Ni<sub>x</sub>B sample.



**Figure S5.** CV curves of (a) a-Ni-B<sub>i</sub> and (d) a-Ni<sub>x</sub>B samples recorded in 1 M KOH solution at different scan rates of 10, 20, 30, 50, 75, 100, 120 and 150 mV s<sup>-1</sup>. The linear relationship between anodic and cathodic peak current densities and scan rates: (b) a-Ni-B<sub>i</sub> sample and (e) a-Ni<sub>x</sub>B sample. Linear relationship between anodic and cathodic peak current densities and square root of the scan rate: (c) a-Ni-B<sub>i</sub> sample and (f) a-Ni<sub>x</sub>B sample.

The surface coverage of Ni(II)/Ni(III) redox species ( $\Gamma^*$ ) in a-Ni-B<sub>i</sub>/Ni<sub>x</sub>B hybrid, a-Ni<sub>x</sub>B and a-Ni-B<sub>i</sub> samples are determined according to the following equation:

$$I_p = (n^2 F^2 / 4RT) v A \Gamma^*$$

where  $I_p$ , n, F, R, T, A and v are respectively the peak current, the number of transferred electron (supposed to be 1 in this case), the Faraday constant, the gas constant, the temperature (298 K), the geometric area of glassy carbon electrode and the sweep rate of potential. Based on the average of the anodic and the cathodic data in Figure S3b and S3e, the calculated  $\Gamma^*$  values for the a-Ni-B<sub>i</sub>/Ni<sub>x</sub>B hybrid, a-Ni<sub>x</sub>B and a-Ni-B<sub>i</sub> samples are  $3.77 \times 10^{-7}$ ,  $3.96 \times 10^{-8}$  and  $4.86 \times 10^{-8}$  mol cm<sup>-2</sup>, respectively. Moreover, the linear dependences between the anodic and cathodic peak current densities and the square root of sweep rate for a-Ni-B<sub>i</sub>/Ni<sub>x</sub>B hybrid, a-Ni<sub>x</sub>B and a-Ni-B<sub>i</sub> electrodes are presented in Figure S3c and S3f. In terms of these results, the proton diffusion coefficient (D) can be calculated by the Randles-Sevcik equation:

$$I_p = 2.69 \times 10^5 n^{3/2} A D^{1/2} C v^{1/2}$$

where  $I_p$ , *n*, *A*, *D*, *C*, and *v* represent respectively the peak current, the number of transferred electron, the geometric area of glassy carbon electrode, the proton concentration (estimated to be 0.043 mol cm<sup>-3</sup> in this case)<sup>[6]</sup>, and the sweep rate of potential. According to the average of the anodic and the cathodic results the linear dependences, the D values of for the a-Ni-B<sub>i</sub>/Ni<sub>x</sub>B hybrid, a-Ni<sub>x</sub>B and a-Ni-B<sub>i</sub> samples are found to be  $2.35 \times 10^{-7}$ ,  $2.58 \times 10^{-9}$  and  $3.82 \times 10^{-9}$  cm<sup>2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>, respectively.



Figure S6. CV curves of (a) a-Ni-B<sub>i</sub> and (b) a-Ni<sub>x</sub>B samples obtained at a scan rate of 50 mV  $s^{-1}$  in 1 M KOH solution with and without 0.5 M methanol.



**Figure S7**. Cyclic voltammetry curves of a-Ni- $B_i/Ni_xB$  hybrid, a-Ni<sub>x</sub>B and a-Ni- $B_i$  samples measured in 1 M KOH solution at different scan rates from 1 to 10 mV s<sup>-1</sup>.



**Figure S8**. Cyclic voltammetry curves normalized by the  $C_{dl}$  values of a-Ni-B<sub>i</sub>/Ni<sub>x</sub>B hybrid, a-Ni<sub>x</sub>B and a-Ni-B<sub>i</sub> samples.



**Figure S9**. TEM image of a-Ni- $B_i$ /Ni<sub>x</sub>B hybrid sample after the chronoamperometry test in 1 M KOH solution containing 0.5 M methanol.



**Figure S10**. (a) Double-potential-step chronoamperograms of a-Ni-B<sub>i</sub> sample obtained in 1 M KOH solution with different concentrations of methanol. (b) Dependence of charge density (C cm<sup>-2</sup>) on time and (c) the linear plots of  $I_C/I_L$  ratio against (time)<sup>1/2</sup> derived from the corresponding chronoamperograms in (a). (d) Double-potential-step chronoamperograms of a-Ni<sub>x</sub>B sample obtained in 1 M KOH solution with different concentrations of methanol. (e) Dependence of charge density (C cm<sup>-2</sup>) on time and (f) the linear plots of  $I_C/I_L$  ratio against (time)<sup>1/2</sup> derived from the corresponding chronoamperograms in (d).

Table S1. Comparison of the electrocataltyic MOR performance between the a-Ni- $B_i/Ni_xB$  hybrid sample and recently reported efficient non-noble catalysts.

Catalyst	Electrolyte	Scan rate (mV s <sup>-1</sup> )	Current density (mA cm <sup>-2</sup> ) at 1.62 V vs. RHE	Onset potential (V vs. RHE)
a-Ni-B <sub>i</sub> /Ni <sub>x</sub> B this work	1.0 M KOH + 0.5 M CH <sub>3</sub> OH	50	213	1.40
NiO/CNT <sup>[1]</sup>	1.0 M KOH + 0.5 M CH₃OH	50	~ 140	1.37
Ni <sub>0.75</sub> Cu <sub>0.25</sub> <sup>[2]</sup>	1.0 M NaOH + 0.5 M CH <sub>3</sub> OH	50	~ 75	1.37
CuO NS/CF <sup>[3]</sup>	1.0 M KOH + 1.0 M CH <sub>3</sub> OH	50	180	1.38
Ni <sub>3</sub> C <sup>[4]</sup>	1.0 M KOH + 1.0 M CH <sub>3</sub> OH	50	127	~ 1.40

NiO/CuO MOF <sup>[5]</sup>	1.0 M KOH + 3.0 M CH <sub>3</sub> OH	50	190	1.40
Ni97Bi3 <sup>[6]</sup>	1.0 M KOH + 1.0 M CH <sub>3</sub> OH	50	~ 200	1.33
rGO-FeO/NiO <sup>[7]</sup>	1.0 M NaOH + 3.0 M CH <sub>3</sub> OH	50	170	1.40
NiCo <sub>2</sub> O <sub>4</sub> /rGO <sup>[8]</sup>	1.0 M KOH + 0.5 M CH <sub>3</sub> OH	50	78	1.36
NiCo <sub>2</sub> O <sub>4</sub> <sup>[9]</sup>	1.0 M KOH + 0.5 M CH <sub>3</sub> OH	50	148	1.43

## References

[1] X. L. Tong, Y. Qin, X. Y. Guo, O. Moutanabbir, X. Y. Ao, E. Pippel, L. B. Zhang, M. Knez, *Small* **2012**, *8*, 3390.

[2] X. Cui, P. Xiao, J. Wang, M. Zhou, W. L. Guo, Y. Yang, Y. J. He, Z. W. Wang, Y. K. Yang,
Y. H. Zhang, Z. Q. Lin, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2017, 56, 4488.

[3] X. F. Wei, Y. Li, L. S. Chen, J. L. Shi, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 2021, 60, 3148.

[4] J. S. Li, R. L. Wei, X. Wang, Y. Zuo, X. Han, J. Arbiol, J. Llorca, Y. Y. Yang, A. Cabot, C. H. Cui, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2020, *59*, 20826.

[5] T. Noor, S. Pervaiz, N. Iqbal, Nanomaterials 2020, 10, 1601.

[6] A. A. Dubale, Y. Y. Zheng, H. L. Wang, R. Hübner, Y. Li, J. Yang, J. W. Zhang, N. K. Sethi,

L. He, Z. K. Zheng, W. Liu, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2020, 59, 13891.

[7] T. Noor, M. Mohtashim, N. Iqbal, S. R. Naqvi, N. Zaman, L. Rasheed, M. Yousuf, J. *Electroanal. Chem.* 2021, 890, 115249.

[8] N. Narayanan, N. Bernaurdshaw, ChemCatChem 2020, 12, 771.

[9] Y. Yu, B. Yang, Y. Wang, ACS Appl. Energy Mater. 2020, 3, 9076.