Supporting Information

Continuous g-C3N⁴ layer coated porous TiO² fibers with enhanced photocatalytic activity toward H² evolution and dye degradation

Jing Liu,^a Jinxiao Zheng,^b Guichu Yue,^a Huaike Li,^a Zhaoyue Liu,^a Yong Zhao,^a Nü Wang^{*a}, Chenghua Sun*^b and Zhimin Cui*^a

a. Key Laboratory of Bioinspired Smart Interfacial Science and Technology of Ministry of Education, Beijing Key Laboratory of Bioinspired Energy Materials and Devices, School of Chemistry, Beijing Advanced Innovation Center for Biomedical Engineering, Beihang University, Beijing, 100191 (P. R. China). E-mail: wangn@buaa.edu.cn; cuizhm@buaa.edu.cn

b. Key Laboratory of Photochemical Conversion and Optoelectronic Materials, Technical Institute of Physics and Chemistry, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100029 (P. R. China).

c. Inner Mongolia Key Laboratory of Industrial Catalysis, Chemical Engineering College. Inner Mongolia University of Technology, Hohhot, 010051 (P. R. China).

Fig. S1 a) SEM image of CNPs. b) SEM image and magnified image of P-TiO₂ fibers. d, e) TEM and HRTEM images of P-TiO₂ fibers. f) Diameter distribution of P-TiO₂ fibers. The average diameter is 1.08 µm.

Fig. S2 SEM images of a) P-TiO₂ fibers, b-d) PTCN-30%, PTCN-70% and PTCN-90% fibers. Scale bars are 1 µm.

CY solution with different concentration was used to prepare PTCN composite fibers to explore the effect of $g - C_3N_4$ content in the heterojunction. The synthesized HPCN fibers are labelled as HPCN-x ($x = 30\%$, 70%, 90%), x is the volume concentration of CY solution. At the same time, P-TiO₂ fibers and g-C₃N₄ were fabricated by the traditional calcination as the previously mentioned method. Surface SEM image of P-TiO₂ fibers and PTCN fibers are shown in Fig. S3. When the concentration of CY is 30%, the porous structure keeps well in the PTCN fibers. When the concentration of CY is 70%, g-C₃N₄ almost form a full coverage on the surface of P-TiO₂. The thin $g - C_3N_4$ layer wraps around the P-TiO₂ fiber and exhibit a core-shell structure. The thickness of the shell increases with increasing the CY concentration to 90%. However, cracks emerged in g -C₃N₄

layer due to the agglomeration of g-C₃N₄. Porous structure disappeared on the surface when the CY concentration is more than 70%. It is ascribed to plenty of $g-C_3N_4$ wrap around TiO₂ grains forming a core-shell structure and blocking the pores.

Fig. S3 Optical images of P-TiO₂, PTCN-30%, PTCN-70%, PTCN-90% and pristine g-C₃N₄.

 $G-C₃N₄$ exhibits conventional faint yellow and P-TiO₂ fibers presents pure white. PTCN composite fibers show different shades of yellow. The color ranges from light to dark correspond to the amount of $g-C_3N_4$ is changed from small quantity to large quantity in PTCN composite.

Fig. S4 SEM images of a) S-TiO₂ fibers, b) S-TiO₂/C₃N₄-90% fibers, c) PTCN-90% fibers. Inset shows amplified image of PTCN-90% fibers.

Fig. S5 XRD patterns and FTIR images of P-TiO₂, g-C₃N₄, PTCN-30%, PTCN-70% and PTCN-

90%.

Fig. S6 N_2 adsorption-desorption isotherms and corresponding pore size distributions of P-TiO₂,

and $S-TiO₂$.

Fig. S7 N₂ adsorption-desorption isotherms and corresponding pore size distributions of PTCN-

30%, PTCN-70% and PTCN-90%.

Fig. S8 a) XPS survey spectra of PTCN, indicating the existence of C, N, Ti and O elements. b, c) High resolution XPS spectra of C 1s and Ti 2p of PTCN-90%, g-C₃N₄ and P-TiO₂.

Fig. S9 a) XRD pattern and b) SEM image of PTCN-90% after four times H₂ evolution

experiments.

Fig. S10 The adsorption peak changes of RhB solution in a) P-TiO₂, b) g-C₃N₄, c) STCN-90% and d) PTCN-90% with increasing of irradiation time under visible light ($\lambda \ge 420$ nm).

Fig. S11 Photocatalytic curves of PTCN-90% for photodegradation of RhB and MB solution in

visible light.

Fig. S12 Photocatalytic phenol degradation performance of P-TiO₂ g-C₃N₄ and PTCN with different g-C3N⁴ content (PTCN-30%, PTCN-70% and PTCN-90%) in visible light irradiation. b) Phenol photocatalytic degradation performance for P-TiO₂, g-C₃N₄, PTCN-90% and STCN-90% in visible light irradiation.

After stirring in dark for 60 min to build adsorption-desorption equilibrium, the concentration of phenol almost unchanged with the exist of bare P-TiO₂, indicating that phenol could not act as photoactivator with TiO2. PTCN-90% still exhibits the highest photodegradation performance for phenol when compared with PTCN-30% and PTCN-70%. The phenol solution was completely degraded by PTCN-90% in 3.5 h. When compared with STCN-90%, PTCN-90% also shows better photodegradation activity, due to the core/shell structure and strong heterojunction between $TiO₂$ and $g - C_3N_4$.

The band structures of TiO_2 and $g-C_3N_4$ in the nanocomposite are calculated by the DRS results and the following formulas:

$$
E_{CB} = \chi - E^{C} - 0.5E_{g} \# \text{O}_{1}.
$$

$$
E_{VB} = E_{CB} + E_{g} \# \text{O}_{2}.
$$

where E_{CB} and E_{VB} stand for the conduction and valence band potential. χ represents the electronegativity obtained by the geometrical mean of every element. The χ values for TiO₂ and g- C_3N_4 are 5.81 and 4.72 eV, respectively. E^C is the free electron energy on the hydrogen scale, which is 4.5 eV. Therefore, E_{CB} and E_{VB} values of TiO₂ are calculated to be -0.23 eV and 2.85 eV, respectively. Correspondingly, E_{CB} and E_{VB} values of $g-C_3N_4$ are -1.08 eV and 1.52 eV, respectively.

Samples	BET Surface Area $(cm^2 \cdot g^{-1})$	Pore Volume $(cm^2 \cdot g^{-1})$
$S-TiO2$	36.25	0.10
$P-TiO2$	53.71	0.21
PTCN-90%	22.85	0.10
$g - C_3 N_4$	13.20	0.05

Tab. S1 S_{BET} and pore volume of samples

Photocatalyst	Size	Cocatalyst	Light Condition	H_2 Production $(\mu mol \cdot g^{-1} \cdot h^{-1})$	Ref.
$TiO2/g-C3N4$	150 nm	$1 wt\%$ Pt	300W Xe lamp	63.7	$\left[\begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix} \right]$
nanowire			$(\lambda > 420 \text{ nm})$		
$TiO2/g-C3N4$	150 nm	$1 wt\%$ Pt	300W Xe lamp	64.0	$[$ 2]
nanosphere			$(\lambda > 400 \text{ nm})$		
$TiO2/g-C3N4$		$1 wt\%$ Pt	300W Xe lamp	80.4	$[^3]$
nanoparticle	250 nm		$(\lambda > 420 \text{ nm})$		
$TiO2/g-C3N4$		0.5 wt % Pt	300W Xe lamp	219.9	$[$ ⁴ $]$
nanoparticle	18 nm		$(\lambda > 420 \text{ nm})$		
$TiO2/g-C3N4$		unknown	350W Xe lamp	210.0	$[^5]$
nanosheet			$(\lambda > 420 \text{ nm})$		
$TiO2/g-C3N4$		0.5 wt% ${\rm Pt}$	300W Xe lamp	250.0	[6]
microsphere	$10 \mu m$		$(\lambda > 420 \text{ nm})$		
$TiO2/g-C3N4$	250 nm	unknown	300W Xe lamp	195.0	[7]
hollow nanosphere			(AM 1.5)		
$TiO2/g-C3N4$		unknown	350W Xe lamp	296.4	$[^8]$
hollow nanosphere	100 nm		$(\lambda > 420 \text{ nm})$		
$TiO2/g-C3N4$	330 nm	$1 wt\%$ Pt	300W Xe lamp	251.7	$[$ ⁹]
nanofiber			(400~780~nm)		
$C@TiO2-x/g-C3N4$		$3 wt\%$ Pt	350W Xe lamp	417.2	$[$ 10]
nanosheet			$(\lambda > 420 \text{ nm})$		
$TiO2/g-C3N4$	1.41	$1 wt\%$ Pt	300W Xe lamp	436.3	our
porous nanofiber	μm		$(\lambda > 420 \text{ nm})$		work

Tab. S2 Visible light performance of $TiO_2/g-C_3N_4$ photocatalyst with different structures

with about 6.8 times higher than the nanowire and nanosphere structure,^{$1, 2$ $1, 2$ $1, 2$} 5.5 times the nanoparticle structure,^{[3](#page-10-2)} and 3.2 times the nanosheet structure.^{[5](#page-10-3)} When compared with STCN-90% (prepared in the same method by ourselves), PTCN-90% improves H_2 evolution performance by 40.6%.

In comparation with other $TiO₂/C₃N₄$ photocatalyst, PTCN-90% exhibits high performance,

References

- 1. H. Chen, Y. Xie, X. Sun, M. Lv, F. Wu, L. Zhang, L. Li and X. Xu, *Dalton Trans.*, 2015, **44**, 13030-13039.
- 2. X. Wei, C. Shao, X. Li, N. Lu, K. Wang, Z. Zhang and Y. Liu, *Nanoscale*, 2016, **8**, 11034-11043.
- 3. C. Li, Z. Lou, Y. Yang, Y. Wang, Y. Lu, Z. Ye and L. Zhu, *Langmuir*, 2019, **35**, 779-786.
- 4. B. Zhang, X. Peng and Z. Wang, *Nanomaterials*, 2020, **10**.
- 5. Y. Li, X. Feng, Z. Lu, H. Yin, F. Liu and Q. Xiang, *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, 2018, **513**, 866-876.
- 6. J. Ma, X. Tan, T. Yu and X. Li, *Int. J. Hydrogen. Energ*, 2016, **41**, 3877-3887.
- 7. N. Guo, Y. Zeng, H. Li, X. Xu, H. Yu and X. Han, *J. Hazard. Mater.*, 2018, **353**, 80-88.
- 8. X. W. Shi, M. Fujitsuka, Z. Z. Lou, P. Zhang and T. Majima, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2017, **5**, 9671-9681.
- 9. X. Zhou, C. Shao, X. Li, X. Wang, X. Guo and Y. Liu, *J. Hazard. Mater.*, 2018, **344**, 113-122.
- 10. C. Liu, P. Wu, J. Wu, J. Hou, H. Bai and Z. Liu, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 2019, **359**, 58-68.