## **Supporting Information**

# **A fluorinated metal-organic framework-based quasi-solid electrolyte for stabilizing Li metal anode**

Xiang Wang,<sup>a</sup> Mengxi Bai,<sup>a</sup> Qiufen Li,<sup>a</sup> Jiashuai Li,<sup>a</sup> Dongze Li,<sup>a</sup> Xiaoyan Lin,<sup>a</sup> Siyuan Shao,<sup>a</sup> Ziqi Wang<sup>\*a</sup>

a: Department of Materials Science and Engineering, College of Chemistry and Materials Science, Jinan University, Guangzhou 511443, P. R. China. E-mail: wangzq $\omega$ jnu.edu.cn.

# Experimental Section

### Synthesis of MIL-125

The preparation of MIL-125 was based on previous reports.<sup>1</sup> In a three-necked flask, 3.53 g of terephthalic acid (TPA) was combined with 56 mL of N,Ndimethylformamide (DMF). The mixture was heated at 105 °C for 1 hour to remove residual moisture, to which 15 mL of MeOH was added. Then a reflux condenser was attached to initiate the reflux process. After boiling for 1 h, 4.85 mL of tetrabutyl titanate (TBOT) was added to the solution. The mixture was continuously stirred and refluxed at 100 °C for 48 hours. After cooling to room temperature, the white solid was collected by centrifugation, washed with ethanol, and heated at 200 °C in nitrogen for 12 hours to remove excess DMF.

## Synthesis of NH<sub>2</sub>-MIL-125

In brief, 1.81 g of 2-aminoterephthalic acid (2-ATA) was dissolved in 30 mL of DMF and 3.2 mL of MeOH. Subsequently, 0.8 mL of TBOT was added to the solution and stirred for half an hour. The suspension was transferred to a Teflon-lined stainless-steel autoclave and heated at 150 °C for 24 hours. The obtained light yellow solid was collected by centrifugation, washed three times with ethanol, and heated at 200  $^{\circ}$ C in a nitrogen atmosphere for 12 hours to remove residual DMF.

#### Synthesis of MIL-125-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>

To prepare the MIL-125-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>, a flask was filled with 20 mL of CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>, 260 µL of triethylamine (Et<sub>3</sub>N), and 0.276 g of NH<sub>2</sub>-MIL-125. The flask was cooled to 0 °C and 252 μL of trifluoromethanesulfonic anhydride was added dropwise. The mixture was stirred at 0 ℃ for 30 minutes and then reacted at room temperature for 72 h. The MIL-125-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub> was collected by centrifuging and washed with CH<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub>. About 14 wt% F is contained in the modified MOF.

### Preparation of the QSEs

 $0.2$  g of MIL-125-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub> and 22 mg of polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) suspension (60 wt% in water) were dispersed in ethanol and stirred for 5 h. Then the mixture was ground to evaporate the ethanol and rolled to form a free-standing membrane of about 200 μm. Then the membrane was heated at 120  $^{\circ}$ C under vacuum for 12 hours and wetted with 30 μL of PC solution with 1 mol L<sup>-1</sup> lithium bis(trifluoromethanesulphonyl)imide (LiTFSI). Additional liquid was wiped out with a tissue to obtain the M-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub> QSE. The M-125 QSE was prepared by a similar procedure using the MIL-125 MOF.

#### Battery assembly

All cells were assembled in an Ar-purified glovebox. The electrochemical performance was investigated by CR2032 coin type cells. The M-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub> and M-125 QSEs were cut into 10 mm round pieces for battery assembly. To prepare the cathode, LiFePO<sub>4</sub> (LFP), super-P, and poly(vinylidene fluoride) (PVDF) were mixed in N-methyl pyrrolidone (NMP) with a mass ratio of 7:2:1 to obtain the cathode mixture, and was coated on an aluminum current collector. The prepared electrode films were dried at 60 ℃ for 24 hours under vacuum and punched into disks with a diameter of 7 mm. The LFP loading in the cathode is about 2.5 mg cm<sup>-2</sup>. Coin type LFP LMBs were assembled

with LFP cathodes, lithium anodes, and the OSEs.

### Characterization

XRD patterns of the MIL-125-NH<sub>2</sub> and MIL-125-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub> were recorded by a Miniflex 600 X-ray diffractometer with Cu Kα radiation. SEM tests of the cycled Li and deposited Li were performed with a Hitatchi TM3030 Tabletop Microscope. FTIR data of the MIL-125-NH<sub>2</sub> and MIL-125-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub> were collected with a PerkinElmer Spectrum Two spectrometer. NMR data of the MIL-125-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub> were obtained by an AVANCE NEO Ascend 400 spectrometer. XPS results of the deposited Li were tested with a Thermo Scientific K-Alpha+ equipment. The ionic conductivity, electrochemical window, Li<sup>+</sup> transference number, and CV profiles were determined by a IviumStat.h electrochemical workstation. The plating/stripping performance of the symmetric cells and charge/discharge properties of the full cells were tested with a LANHE CT3002A battery tester at room temperature. To following equation was used to calculate the ionic conductivity (σ) of the QSEs,

$$
\sigma = \frac{L}{R \cdot A}
$$

where R is the total resistance of the SS|QSE|SS. L and A are the thickness and area of the QSE pellet, respectively. The activation energy  $(E_a)$  for ionic conduction was determined by the following Arrhenius relationship between  $\sigma$  and temperature (T)

$$
\sigma = \sigma_{\infty} \cdot exp[\overline{m}(-\frac{E_a}{RT})]
$$

where  $\sigma_{\infty}$  is the conductivity at infinite temperature, and R is the gas constant. The electronic conductivity  $(\sigma_e)$  was determined from

$$
\sigma_e = \frac{L}{S} \cdot \frac{I}{E}
$$

where  $\sigma_e$  is electronic conductivity. L is the thickness of the QSE. S is the area of the QSE. E is the polarization voltage, and I is the steady-state current. A potentiostatic polarization method was used to obtain the  $t_{Li}$ <sup>+</sup> of the QSEs as follows

$$
t_{Li} = \frac{I_s(\Delta V - I_0 R_0)}{I_0(\Delta V - I_s R_s)}
$$

where  $\Delta V$  (10 mV) is the applied voltage. I<sub>0</sub> and R<sub>0</sub> are the initial current and interfacial resistance, respectively. I<sub>s</sub> and R<sub>s</sub> represent the steady-state current and interfacial resistance, respectively. The average CE of the Li|QSE|Cu cells for the first 20 cycle was calculated by the following equation,

$$
ACE = \frac{20Q_c + Q_s}{20Q_c + Q_r}
$$

where  $Q_r$  is the initial plating capacity.  $Q_c$  is the capacity for the 20 plating/stripping cycles.  $Q_s$  is the final stripping capacity.



Fig. S1. Schematic illustration of the synthetic procedure of the MIL-125-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>.



Fig. S2. XRD patterns of the simulated and synthesized MIL-125-NH<sub>2</sub> and MIL-125-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>.



Fig. S3. FTIR of the MIL-125-NH<sub>2</sub> and MIL-125-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>.



Fig. S4. <sup>19</sup>F NMR spectra of the MIL-125-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>.



Fig. S5. (a) N<sup>2</sup> adsorption/desorption isotherm at 77 K and (b) corresponding BJH pore size distribution.



Fig. S6. Photograph of the free-standing M-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub> QSE membrane.



Fig. S7. EIS plots of (a) M-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub> and (b) M-125 QSEs from 30 to 90 °C.



Fig. S8. Electronic conductivity measurement of the QSEs using a two-blocking-electrode cell. The bias voltage is 1.0 V.





Fig. S10. Cycling performance of the Li symmetric cells with different QSEs under 0.5 mA cm<sup>-2</sup>.



Fig. S11. SEM images of the cycled Li with (a) M-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub> and (b) M-125 QSEs.



Fig. S12. Average Coulombic efficiency test of liquid cells.



Fig. S13. Li 1s XPS spectra of the deposited Li with different QSEs.



Fig. S14. Typical Nyquist plot of the resistance of the Li|M-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>|Li cell. R<sub>b</sub>, R<sub>int</sub>, R<sub>SEI</sub>, R<sub>ct</sub>, and R<sub>SM</sub> represent bulk, interfacial, SEI, charge transfer, and sacrificed MOF layer resistance, respectively.



Fig. S15. EIS evolution of the Li symmetric cells with  $(a, b)$  M-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub> and (c) M-125 QSEs during cycling.



Fig. S16. The variation of  $R_{SEI}$  and  $R_{ct}$  of the Li|M-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub>|Li cell with cycling.



Fig. S17. Charge/discharge voltage profiles of the Li|M-125|LFP cells at different rates.



Fig. S18. Charge/discharge voltage profiles of the (a) M-NHSO<sub>2</sub>CF<sub>3</sub> and (b) M-125 cells at 5 C.

Electrolytes	$\sigma$ (S cm <sup>-1</sup> )	Description	Refs.
$MOF-525(Cu)$	$3.0 \times 10^{-4}$		$\sqrt{2}$
	(25 °C)	MOF+Li-IL	
HKUST-1	$1.2 \times 10^{-4}$		$\overline{3}$
	(30 °C)	MOF+PEO+IL	
$ZIF-67$	$2.29 \times 10^{-3}$		$\overline{4}$
	(30 °C)	MOF+Li-IL	
PEO-n-UIO	$1.3 \times 10^{-4}$	MOF+PEO+IL	5
	(30 °C)		
UiO-66-LiSS	$6.0 \times 10^{-5}$		6
	(25 °C)	MOF+DMSO	
MIL-125	$1.35 \times 10^{-3}$		$\tau$
	(25 °C)	MOF+LiTFSI+LiBF <sub>4</sub>	
P-PETEA-ZIF-8	$6.52\times10^{-4}$	MOF+PEGDA+	8
	(25 °C)	PETEA+LiTFSI	
$M-NHSO2CF3$	$2.32 \times 10^{-3}$		This work
	(30 °C)	MOF+LiTFSI+PC	

Table S1. Comparison of the ionic conductivity of different MOF-based electrolytes.

Electrolytes	Specific capacity $(mAh g-1)$	Cycling life	Refs
Li-IL@UiO- 67/PVDF-HFP	118.1 (1C, 30 °C)	300	9
ZIF-8/PEO-LiTFSI	109 (1C, $60 °C$ )	350	10
UiO/Li-IL	119 (1C, 60 °C)	380	11
UiOLiTFSI/PVDF	132 (1C, 30 °C)	500	12
$D-UiO-66NH2/PEO$	91.5 (1C, $60 °C$ )	60	13
UiO-67/PTFE	94 (1C, 30 °C)	500	14
ZIF-8/PEO	110 (1C, 30 °C)	300	15
MOF- CN/DPPG/PEGDE	126 (1C, 30 °C)	500	16
$M-NHSO_2CF_3/PTFE$	133.2 (1C, 30 °C)	1546	This work

Table S2. Comparison of electrochemical performance of the Li|LFP cells with MOF-based electrolytes.

## References

- Y. J. Fu, K. J. Zhang, Y. Zhang, Y. Q. Cong and Q. Wang, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 2021, **412**, 128722.
- Z. Wang, R. Tan, H. Wang, L. Yang, J. Hu, H. Chen and F. Pan, *Adv. Mater.*, 2018, **30**, 1704436.
- Z. Wang, H. Zhou, C. Meng, W. Xiong, Y. Cai, P. Hu, H. Pang and A. Yuan, *ACS Appl. Energy Mater.*, 2020, **3**, 4265-4274.
- N. Chen, Y. Li, Y. Dai, W. Qu, Y. Xing, Y. Ye, Z. Wen, C. Guo, F. Wu and R. Chen, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2019, **7**, 9530-9536.
- J.-F. Wu and X. Guo, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2019, **7**, 2653-2659.
- H. Yang, B. Liu, J. Bright, S. Kasani, J. Yang, X. Zhang and N. Wu, *ACS Appl. Energy Mater.*, 2020, , 4007-4013.
- Q. Liu, L. Yang, Z. Mei, Q. An, K. Zeng, W. Huang, S. Wang, Y. Sun and H. Guo, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2024, **17**, 780-790.
- J. Zhou, X. Wang, J. Fu, L. Chen, X. Wei, R. Jia and L. Shi, *Small*, 2024, **20**, 2309317.
- L. Liu and C. Sun, *ChemElectroChem*, 2020, **7**, 707-715.
- Z. Lei, J. Shen, W. Zhang, Q. Wang, J. Wang, Y. Deng and C. Wang, *Nano Res.*, 2020, **13**, 2259- 2267.
- J.-F. Wu and X. Guo, *Small*, 2019, **15**, 1804413.
- F. L. Zhu, H. F. Bao, X. S. Wu, Y. L. Tao, C. Qin, Z. M. Su and Z. H. Kang, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2019, **11**, 43206-43213.
- H. Huo, B. Wu, T. Zhang, X. Zheng, L. Ge, T. Xu, X. Guo and X. Sun, *Energy Storage Mater.*, 2019, **18**, 59-67.
- L. Shen, H. B. Wu, F. Liu, J. L. Brosmer, G. Shen, X. Wang, J. I. Zink, Q. Xiao, M. Cai, G. Wang, Y. Lu and B. Dunn, *Adv. Mater.*, 2018, **30**, 1707476.
- G. Wang, P. He and L.-Z. Fan, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2021, **31**, 2007198.
- Q. Zhang, B. Liu, J. Wang, Q. Li, D. Li, S. Guo, Y. Xiao, Q. Zeng, W. He, M. Zheng, Y. Ma and S. Huang, *ACS Energy Lett.*, 2020, **5**, 2919-2926.