Supplementary Information (SI) for Journal of Materials Chemistry A. This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2024

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

## **Supporting Information**

Integrating Transition Metal Phosphide Catalysts on WO<sub>3</sub> Photoanodes Enabling Robust Photoelectrocatalytic Water Oxidation <sup>†</sup>

Biao Yang, ‡ Changlong Ru, ‡ Yuye Jiao, ‡ Lihua Gao, Yurou Song, Zhiqiang Hu and Jungang Hou \*

State Key Laboratory of Fine Chemical, Frontiers Science Center for Smart Materials Oriented

Chemical Engineering, School of Chemical Engineering, School of Chemistry, Dalian University of

Technology, 116024 Dalian, P. R. China. E-mail: jhou@dlut.edu.cn.

‡ These authors contributed equally to this work.

# Experimental

## **Chemical Reagents.**

Citric acid anhydrous (C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>8</sub>O<sub>7</sub>, 99.5%), hydrogen peroxide (H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, 30 wt% in H<sub>2</sub>O), sodium hypophosphite (NaH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>2</sub>, 99.0%), nickel (II) chloride hexahydrate (NiCl<sub>2</sub> 6H<sub>2</sub>O, 98.0%), cobalt (II) chloride hexahydrate (CoCl<sub>2</sub> 6H<sub>2</sub>O, AR), ferric (III) chloride hexahydrate (FeCl<sub>3</sub> 6H<sub>2</sub>O, 99.0%), cobalt (II) nitrate hexahydrate (Co(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub> 6H<sub>2</sub>O, 99.0%), cobalt (II) sulphate heptahydrate (CoSO<sub>4</sub> 7H<sub>2</sub>O,  $\geq$ 99.0%), copper (II) chloride dihydrate (CuCl<sub>2</sub> 2H<sub>2</sub>O, AR), nickel (II) nitrate hexahydrate (Ni(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub> 6H<sub>2</sub>O, 98.0%), ferric (III) nitrate nonahydrate (Fe(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub> 9H<sub>2</sub>O, AR), sodium hydroxide (NaOH, 97.0%) were purchased from Aladdin. FTO Glass (SnO<sub>2</sub>: F, 1×2 cm<sup>2</sup>) was bought from Advanced Election Technology Co. Ltd. Ammonium tungstate (H<sub>40</sub>N<sub>10</sub>O<sub>41</sub>W<sub>12</sub> xH<sub>2</sub>O, 85~90%) was purchased from Sinopharm Group. Hydrochloric acid (HCl, 37 wt%) and nitric acid (HNO<sub>3</sub>, 68 wt%) were brought from Tianjin Third Chemical Reagent Factory. Ultrapure water (H<sub>2</sub>O, 18.2 MΩ) was purchased from Dalian University of Technology.

## Preparation of WO<sub>3</sub> photoanode

The WO<sub>3</sub> photoanode was prepared by hydrothermal method.<sup>1</sup> Firstly, dissolved 1.0 g ammonium tungstate in 95 mL deionized water, then added 0.7 mL concentrated hydrochloric acid, and stirred thoroughly. Then, 2 mL hydrogen peroxide and 0.46 g anhydrous citric acid were added to the mixed solution, and the solution was continuously stirred until clear and transparent. Then, the obtained precursor solution was transferred to a Teflon-lined autoclave, the FTO conductive side down immersed in the solution, and heated at 160 °C for 5 h. After cooling to room temperature, the electrode was washed by deionized water and dried. Finally, the prepared photoanodes were annealed in air at 500 °C for 2 h.

## Preparation of MP<sub>x</sub> nanoparticles

The Ni<sub>2</sub>P cocatalysts were prepared based on reported processes.<sup>2</sup> Specifically, the NaH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>2</sub> H<sub>2</sub>O and NiCl<sub>2</sub>  $6H_2O$  (molar ratio 5:1) were mixed by grinding, and then the mixture was heated at 250 °C for 2 h under nitrogen atmosphere. The black solids obtained were cleaned by centrifugation and dried overnight. The preparation steps of the Cu<sub>3</sub>P and Co<sub>2</sub>P were similar to the Ni<sub>2</sub>P, except that the NiCl<sub>2</sub>  $6H_2O$  was replaced by the CoCl<sub>2</sub>  $6H_2O$  and CuCl<sub>2</sub>  $2H_2O$ .

For the preparation of the FeP, the  $Fe(NO_3)_3$  5H<sub>2</sub>O and NaOH (molar ratio 1:3), excessive NaOH were dissolved in deionized water, stirred for 30 min, and centrifuged with deionized water and ethanol to obtain the  $Fe(OH)_3$  precipitate. The  $Fe(OH)_3$  and  $NaH_2PO_2$  H<sub>2</sub>O were mixed at the molar ratio of 5:1, and the resulting mixture was calcined at 300 °C in nitrogen atmosphere for 2 h. The black solids obtained were cleaned by centrifugation and dried overnight.

### Construction of WO<sub>3</sub>/MP<sub>x</sub> photoanode

The obtained MP<sub>x</sub> particles were ultrasonic dispersed in anhydrous ethanol (the concentration was  $1.0 \sim 5.0 \text{ mg mL}^{-1}$ ), then the suspension was loaded onto the surface of the WO<sub>3</sub> photoanode through spin coating (1000 rpm), and finally annealed at 120 °C in air for 2 h to obtain the WO<sub>3</sub>/MP<sub>x</sub> photoanode.

### Construction of WO<sub>3</sub>/OECs photoanode

The WO<sub>3</sub>/NiOOH photoanode was prepared by electrodeposition.<sup>3</sup> The electrodeposited solution was 0.1 M NiSO<sub>4</sub> (using 1 M NaOH solution to adjust the pH = 6.5-7.2. The photodeposition was first carried out under simulated solar illumination of AM 1.5 G (100 mW cm<sup>-2</sup>) at 0.15 V vs. Ag/AgCl for 10 min. Subsequently, the photoanodes were deposited for 1 min at 1.23 V vs. Ag/AgCl under dark conditions, then washed and dried.

The WO<sub>3</sub>/Ni-Pi photoanode was prepared by the reported method.<sup>4</sup> The electrodeposition solution was prepared by dissolving 0.2 M Ni(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub> 6H<sub>2</sub>O in 0.5 M phosphate buffer (pH  $\approx$  7), and then deposited for 200 s under simulated solar illumination of AM 1.5 G (100 mW cm<sup>-2</sup>) and 0.2 V vs. Ag/AgCl. The obtained photoanodes were rinsed with deionized water and dried.

## Characterization

Scanning electron microscope (SEM, JSM-7900F), transmission electron microscope (TEM) and energy dispersive spectrometer (EDS) characterizations were used for morphology and elemental analysis. X-ray photoelectron spectrometer (XPS) with an ESCALAB 250Xi analyzer using monochromatic Al Kα radiation (225 W, 15 mA, 15 kV), powder X-ray diffraction (XRD, a Bruker D8 advance diffractometer with Cu Kα radiation) were adopted to characterize the as-prepared samples. Ultraviolet–visible (UV-vis, UV-3600 Plus) absorption and photoluminescence/timeresolved transient photoluminescence decay (PL/TRPL, FLS 1000 fluorescence spectrometer with both continuous (450 W) and pulsed Xenon lamps) measurements were carried out to record the optical properties of samples. Raman spectroscopy (DXR Microscope) was used for structural confirmation of samples. Surface photovoltage spectroscopy (SPV, CEL-SPS1000) was used to test photogenerated carrier separation.

### Measurements of Photoelectrochemical (PEC) Performance

The PEC measurements were carried out on an electrochemical workstation (CH Instruments, CHI 660E) with a three-electrode system. WO<sub>3</sub> based photoanodes were utilized as the working electrodes, Pt wire as the counter electrode and Ag/AgCl electrode as the reference electrode, respectively. The 0.5 M Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> electrolyte (pH = 6.9) was used for WO<sub>3</sub> photoanodes. All the photoanodes with working area of 1 cm<sup>2</sup> were irradiated by simulated sunlight (100 mW cm<sup>-2</sup>, 300 W Xe lamp with AM 1.5 G filter). The linear sweep voltammery (LSV) was proceeded with a scanning rate of 0.05 V s<sup>-1</sup> under a potential from 0.4 V to 1.4 V versus reversible hydrogen electrode (vs. RHE). The potential vs. RHE (*E*<sub>RHE</sub>) was calibrated using the Nernst equation:

$$E_{RHE} = E_{Ag/AgCl} + 0.059 \times pH + E_{Ag/AgCl}^{0}$$
(1)

where  $E_{Ag/AgCl}$  is the applied potential vs. Ag/AgCl electrode and  $E_{Ag/AgCl}^{0}$  is 0.197 V at 25 °C.

The electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) were measured via the electrochemical workstation (frequency of 0.01 Hz to 100 kHz).

## Incident Photon-to-Electron Conversion Efficiencies (IPCE) Calculation

IPCE spectra were obtained by calculation at each monochromatic wavelength according to the following equation:

$$IPCE(\%) = \left[\frac{1240 \times J_{light}}{\lambda \times P_{light}}\right] \times 100\%$$
(2)

where  $\lambda$ ,  $J_{light}$ , and  $P_{light}$  are the wavelength (nm) of incident light, the photocurrent density under corresponding  $\lambda$  and the irradiance intensity (mW cm<sup>-2</sup>) of incident light, respectively.

#### Applied bias photon-to-current efficiency (ABPE) Calculation

ABPE curves were derived from the following equation:

ABPE(%) = 
$$\left[\frac{(1.23 - V_S) \times (J_{light} - J_{dark})}{P_{light}}\right] \times 100\%$$
 (3)

where  $V_s$  is the applied bias versus RHE,  $P_{light}$  is the incident light intensity (100 mW cm<sup>-2</sup>),  $J_{light}$  and  $J_{dark}$  are the current densities (mW cm<sup>-2</sup>) measured under AM 1.5 G illumination and dark conditions, respectively.

#### **Mott-Schottky Measurements**

To further detect the photogenerated carrier recombination behavior, the Mott-Schottky measurement was carried out. The capacitance was obtained by the expression:

$$\frac{1}{C_{SC^2}} = \frac{2}{eN_d A^2 \varepsilon \varepsilon_0} \times (E - E_{fb} - \frac{TK_B}{e})$$

$$N_d = \frac{2}{e\varepsilon \varepsilon_0} \times \left[\frac{d(1/C^2)}{dV_S}\right]^{-1}$$
(5)

where  $C_{SC}$  is the capacitance of space charge layer (obtained from MS curves), Vs is the applied potential,  $\varepsilon_0$  is the vacuum permittivity (8.86 × 10<sup>-12</sup> F m<sup>-1</sup>),  $\varepsilon$  is the dielectric constant of semiconductor, A is the working area of photoanode (1 cm<sup>2</sup>), *e* is the electronic charge (1.6 × 10<sup>-19</sup> C), N<sub>d</sub> is the carrier density, E<sub>fb</sub> is the flat-band potential, K<sub>B</sub> is the Boltzmann constant (1.38 × 10<sup>-23</sup> J K<sup>-1</sup>), T is the temperature.

#### **Current-Time Curves**

The stability of different photoanodes can be evaluated by current-time curves (i-t). A long-time current density test was performed under simulated solar illumination at AM 1.5 G (100 mW cm<sup>-2</sup>) at 1.23 V vs. RHE.

#### Charge Transfer Efficiency ( $\eta_{\text{trans}}$ ) Calculation

The charge transfer ( $\eta_{\text{trans}}$ ) efficiency was calculated according to the equations below:

$$\eta_{\rm trans} = \frac{J_{H_2O}}{J_{Na_2SO_3}} \times 100\% \tag{6}$$

where  $J_{H_2O}$  is the measured photocurrent density without Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>3</sub> hole scavengers in the electrolyte,  $J_{Na_2SO_3}$  is the photocurrent density with 0.2 M Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>3</sub> hole scavengers in the electrolyte.

## **Faraday Efficiency Calculation**

In photoelectrocatalytic systems, the Faraday efficiency (FE%) is commonly used to evaluate the performance of catalysts, it was calculated according to the equations below:

$$FE(\%) = \frac{Q_{product}}{Q_{total}} = \frac{n \times F \times N_{product}}{J \times A \times t}$$
(7)

where n is the number of electrons transferred during the reaction, F is Faraday constant (96485 C mol<sup>-1</sup>),  $N_{product}$  is the molar amount of product actually produced (mol), J is the measured optical current density (mA cm<sup>-2</sup>), A is the working area of photoanode (1 cm<sup>2</sup>), t is the reaction time (s).

## Fitting of Time-Resolved Transient Photoluminescence Lifetime

Biexponential function fitting was employed to analyze the time-resolved photoluminescence decay curves:

$$L(t) = A_1 e^{(\frac{-t}{\tau_1})} + A_2 e^{(\frac{-t}{\tau_2})} + y_0$$
(8)

The average carrier lifetime  $(\tau_{ave})$  was calculated by the following :

$$\tau_{ave} = \frac{A_1 \tau_1^2 + A_2 \tau_2^2}{A_1 \tau_1 + A_2 \tau_2} \tag{9}$$

where  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$  are defined as the decay time for the fluorescence intensity, representing the speed of carrier recombination. The fitting parameters are given in Table S2.

Samples (photoanodes)	$R_s(\Omega)$	$R_{ct}$ ( $\Omega$ )	$N_d ({\rm cm}^{-3})$
WO <sub>3</sub>	32.16	1781	$1.17 \times 10^{22}$
WO <sub>3</sub> /Co <sub>2</sub> P	32.42	876.9	$2.44 \times 10^{22}$
WO <sub>3</sub> /FeP	30.85	670.6	$3.75 \times 10^{22}$
WO <sub>3</sub> /Cu <sub>3</sub> P	30.99	584.6	$5.05 \times 10^{22}$
WO <sub>3</sub> /Ni-Pi	31.08	767.9	$1.64 \times 10^8$
WO <sub>3</sub> /NiOOH	31.43	651.9	4.69×10 <sup>22</sup>
WO <sub>3</sub> /Ni <sub>2</sub> P	30.43	499.6	$7.04 \times 10^{22}$

**Table S1**. Fitting EIS data and  $N_d$  of WO<sub>3</sub>, WO<sub>3</sub>/Co<sub>2</sub>P, WO<sub>3</sub>/FeP, WO<sub>3</sub>/Cu<sub>3</sub>P, WO<sub>3</sub>/Ni-Pi, WO<sub>3</sub>/NiOOH and WO<sub>3</sub>/Ni<sub>2</sub>P photoanodes.

Samples (photoanodes)	$\tau_1$ (ns)	$A_1$	$\tau_2$ (ns)	A <sub>2</sub>	$\tau_{\rm ave}$ (ns)
WO <sub>3</sub>	0.82	0.90	10.18	0.52	9.03
WO <sub>3</sub> /Co <sub>2</sub> P	0.95	0.95	16.71	0.43	14.95
WO <sub>3</sub> /FeP	1.01	0.50	18.33	0.47	17.37
WO <sub>3</sub> /Cu <sub>3</sub> P	1.53	0.34	25.01	0.44	23.95
WO <sub>3</sub> /Ni <sub>2</sub> P	2.02	1.05	30.86	0.56	27.71

Table S2. Biexponential decay-fitted parameters of TRPL decay curves for WO<sub>3</sub> and WO<sub>3</sub>/MP<sub>x</sub> photoanodes.



Fig. S1 XRD patterns of and (a, b)  $MP_x$  nanoparticles. (c) Structure diagram of  $MP_x$  nanoparticles.



**Fig. S2** (a) Top-view SEM image of WO<sub>3</sub> photoanode, (b) top-view SEM images of WO<sub>3</sub>/Ni<sub>2</sub>P photoanode. (c) TEM image of WO<sub>3</sub> photoanode, (d) TEM image of WO<sub>3</sub>/Ni<sub>2</sub>P photoanode.



Fig. S3 (a) Top-view SEM image of  $Ni_2P$ , (b) and (c) TEM images of  $Ni_2P$  catalyst.



Fig. S4 (a) SEM and (b-f) EDS images of  $WO_3/Co_2P$  photoanode.



Fig. S5 (a) SEM and (b-f) EDS images of  $WO_3$ /FeP photoanode.



Fig. S6 (a) SEM and (b-f) EDS images of  $WO_3/Cu_3P$  photoanode.



Fig. S7 (a) SEM and (b-e) EDS images of  $WO_3/Ni_2P$  photoanode after the reaction.



**Fig. S8** (a) EIS curves, (b) M-S plots, and (c) LSV curves in darkness of WO<sub>3</sub> and WO<sub>3</sub>/MP<sub>x</sub> photoanodes, (d) LSV curves, (e) IPCE curves measured at 1.23 V vs. RHE, (f) ABPE curves, (g)  $\eta_{\text{trans}}$  curves, (h) EIS curves and (i) M-S plots of WO<sub>3</sub>/Ni<sub>2</sub>P, WO<sub>3</sub>/NiOOH and WO<sub>3</sub>/Ni-Pi photoanodes.



Fig. S9 The OCP transient decay curves of  $WO_3$  and  $WO_3/MP_x$  photoanodes after passing oxygen for 30 min prior to the test and extending the test time.

# References

- X. Y. Feng, Y. B. Chen, Z. X. Qin, M. L. Wang and L. J. Guo, ACS Appl. Mater. Inter., 2016, 8, 18089-18096.
- 2. L. A. Stern, L. G. Feng, F. Song and X. L. Hu, Energ. Environ. Sci., 2015, 8, 2347-2351.
- 3. L. F. Li, S. N. Xiao, R. P. Li, Y. N. Cao, Y. Chen, Z. C. Li, G. S. Li and H. X. Li, *ACS Appl. Energ. Mater.*, 2018, **1**, 6871-6880.
- 4. Z. C. Hao, Z. F. Liu, Y. T. Li, M. N. Ruan and Z. G. Guo, *Int. J. Hydrogen Energ.*, 2020, **45**, 16550-16559.