## **Supporting information**

## **Experiment Section**

## Materials

Indium nitrate  $(In(NO_3)_3)$  was purchased from Macklin. Cadmium nitrate tetrahydrate  $(Cd(NO_3)_2 \cdot 4H_2O)$  were supplied from Sinopharm Chemical Reagent Co., Ltd. (China).

## Characterizations

X-ray powder diffraction (XRD) patterns were characterized using Bruker D8 Advanced X-ray diffractometer. The surface morphology and structure of the samples were recorded on transmission electron microscopy (Tecnai G2 F20 S-TWIN, FEI). UV-vis diffuse reflectance spectra (DRS) were obtained by UV-3600 spectrophotometer (Tokyo, Japan). The morphology and local atomic structure were determined using transmission electron microscopy (TEM, JEOL-2100F) and aberration-corrected high-angular annular dark field scanning transmission electron microscopy operated at 80 kV (HAADF-STEM, JEM-ARM200F). Ultrafast transient absorption (TA) spectra are collected over a femtosecond laser amplifier system (Pharos PH2 SP, Light Conversion). The curves show multi-exponential fitting that includes consideration of the instrument response function (~190 fs). X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) was measured on PHIQUANTERA II. The TS-SPV signal was recorded by using a 500 MHz digital phosphor oscilloscope (TDS 5054, Tektronix). The effective surface areas of the as-prepared samples were measured by nitrogen adsorption-desorption isotherms on the Micrometrics ASAP 2020 system, employing a fitting analysis based on the Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) equation.



Figure S1. XRD of CIS and Ti-CIS.



Figure S2. X-ray photoelectron spectra: (a) Cd 3d, (b) In 3d, (c) S 2p, (d) Ti 2p of CIS and 0.4Ti-CIS.



**Figure S3.** (a) TEM of CIS (b-c) HRTEM of CIS, (d) TEM of 0.4Ti-CIS (e-f) HRTEM of 0.4Ti-CIS.



Figure S4. (a) EXAFS spectra in K space for 0.4Ti-CIS, Ti foil and TiO<sub>2</sub>, (b) K-space fitting curve K-space fitting curve.



Figure S5. (a) The R-space fitting curve, (b) K-space fitting curve and (c) wavelet transform of Ti foil.



**Figure S6**. (a) The R-space fitting curve, (b) K-space fitting curve and (c) wavelet transform of TiO<sub>2</sub>.



Figure S7. The  $NO_2^-$  formation during the  $NO_3^-$  photoreduction process over 0.4Ti-



Figure S8. XRD result of 0.4Ti-CIS after cycles.



**Figure S9.** (a) UV-vis DRS of all catalysts and TiOPc. (b) Tauc-Plot of CIS and 0.4Ti-CIS.



Figure S10. Mott-Schottky curves of (a) CIS and (b) 0.4Ti-CIS.



Figure S11. Band structure of CIS and 0.4Ti-CIS.



Figure S12. TRPL spectra of (a) CIS and (b) 0.4Ti-CIS.



**Figure S13.** (a) Transient photocurrent density curves, and (b) Nyquist plots of CIS and 0.4Ti-CIS.



Figure S14. Surface photovoltage of CIS and 0.4Ti-CIS.



**Figure S15.** (a) Nitrogen adsorption-desorption isotherms of CIS and 0.4Ti-CIS (b) pore size distribution of CIS and 0.4Ti-CIS.



Figure S16. Water contact Angle of (a) CIS and (b) 0.4Ti-CIS.



Figure S17. Zeta potential of CIS and 0.4Ti -CIS.



Figure S18. Transient photocurrent density curves with or without  $NO_3^-$  for 0.4Ti-CIS.

Sample	Shell	$CN^a$	$R(\text{\AA})^b$	$\sigma^2({ m \AA}^2)^c$	$\Delta E_0(\mathrm{eV})^d$	R factor
Ti K-edge						
T: 6-11	Ti-Ti1	2*	2.73±0.01	0.0048	9.3	0.002
11 1011	Ti-Ti2 12* 2.92±0.01 0.0059	6.2	0.002			
TiO <sub>2</sub>	Ti-O	6.0±0.1	$1.96 \pm 0.01$	0.0098	5.4	0.005

**Table S1.** EXAFS fitting parameters at the Ti K-edge for various samples  $(S_0^2=0.80)$ .

0.4Ti-CIS	Ti-N	2.2±0.1	2.02±0.01	0.0066	3.1	
	Ti-O	1.1±0.1	$1.95 \pm 0.01$	0.0034	4.2	0.008
	Ti-S	1.2±0.1	2.25±0.01	0.0061	5.4	

<sup>*a*</sup>*CN*, coordination number; <sup>*b*</sup>*R*, distance between absorber and backscatter atoms; <sup>*c*</sup> $\sigma^2$ , Debye-Waller factor to account for both thermal and structural disorders; <sup>*d*</sup> $\Delta E_0$ , inner potential correction; *R* factor indicates the goodness of the fit. *S*0<sup>2</sup> was fixed to 0.80, according to the experimental EXAFS fit of Ti foil by fixing CN as the known crystallographic value. \* This value was fixed during EXAFS fitting, based on the known structure of Ti-foil. Fitting range:  $3.0 \le k$  (/Å)  $\le 12.0$  and  $1.0 \le R$  (Å)  $\le 3.0$  (Ti foil);  $3.0 \le k$  (Å<sup>-1</sup>)  $\le 11$  and  $1.0 \le R$  (Å)  $\le \sim 3.0$  (0.4Ti-CIS, TiO<sub>2</sub>). A reasonable range of EXAFS fitting parameters:  $0.700 < S_0^2 < 1.000$ ; *CN* > 0;  $\sigma^2 > 0$  Å<sup>2</sup>;  $\Delta E_0 < 10$  eV; *R* factor < 0.02.

 

 Table S2. Comparison of the photocatalytic ammonia synthesis performance with other reported metal sulfides.

Catalyst	Optimal	Conditions	Reference
	ammonia		
	synthesis		
	rate		
0.4Ti-CIS	2572.8	300 W Xenon lamp, 10 mg catalyst and	This work
	$\mu$ mol g <sup>-1</sup> h <sup>-1</sup>	100 mL of 10 mg $L^{-1}$ NO <sub>3</sub> <sup></sup> N and 10 mL	
		glycol	
Mn <sub>x</sub> In <sub>2</sub> S <sub>y</sub>	515.8 µmol	300 W Xe lamp, 10 mg catalyst and 100	ACS Nano, 2024,
	$g^{-1} h^{-1}$	mL solution containing $10 \text{ mg } \text{L}^{-1} \text{ of } \text{NO}_3^{-1}$	18, 21585-21592.
		and 10 mL ethylene glycol	
PML-Cu-CdIn <sub>2</sub> S <sub>4</sub>	1979 µmol	300 W Xenon lamp, 10 mg catalyst and	Adv. Funct.
	$g^{-1} h^{-1}$	100 mL of nitrate (0.16 M) and 10 mL	Mater. 2025, 35,
		ethylene glycol	2421669
$V_{\text{Cu-S}}$ rich $\text{CuIn}_2\text{S}_4$	975.9 µmol	300 W Xe lamp, 10 mg catalyst and 100	Appl. Catal. B,
	$g^{-1} h^{-1}$	mL 10 mg $L^{-1}$ NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> , 10 mL ethylene	2025, 362, 124776
		glycol	
Defect-rich	406 µmol	300 W Xenon lamp, 10 mg catalyst was	Small, 2024, 20,
CaIn <sub>2</sub> S <sub>4</sub>	$g^{-1} h^{-1}$	dispersed in 100 mL of reaction solution	2402808.
		containing 10 mg L <sup>-1</sup> of NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> and 10 mL	
		ethylene glycol	
Mo <sub>0.1</sub> Ni <sub>0.1</sub> Cd <sub>0.8</sub> S	$3.2 \text{ mg } \text{L}^{-1}$	0.2 g of photocatalyst was added to a 500	RSC Adv., 2016,
	$h^{-1} g_{cat}^{-1}$	mL solution of 0.789 g $L^{-1}$ ethanol as a hole	6, 49862-49867
		scavenger	

MoS <sub>2</sub> /In-	90 µmol g <sup>-1</sup>	100 mg photocatalyst was sonicated in 100	ACS Catal. 2024,
Bi <sub>2</sub> MoO <sub>6</sub>	$h^{-1}$	mL of deionized water for 10 min and then	14, 6292-6304
		dispersed with a constant temperature of 25	
		°C under a 300 W Xe lamp	
Cu/Ta <sub>3</sub> N <sub>5</sub> /CdIn <sub>2</sub> S	256 µmol	250 W Xe lamp, 50 mg catalyst and 10 ml	Appl. Catal. B,
4	$g^{-1} h^{-1}$	formic acid were dispersed into 75 mL	2023, 327,
		nitrate solution (0.4 mmol L <sup>-1</sup> )	122416.
MXene QDs-	360.5 µmol	300 W Xe lamp, photocatalyst (0.1 g) was	InfoMat, 2024, 6,
ZnIn <sub>2</sub> S <sub>4</sub>	$g^{-1} h^{-1}$	added to 200 mL of deionized water	e12535
In <sub>2</sub> S <sub>3-X</sub> @ZnS	58.988 mg	300 W Xe lamp, 30 mg of obtained	Appl. Surf. Sci.
	$L^{-1} h^{-1} g_{cat}^{-1}$	samples were dissolved in 50 mL of 1	2024, 656, 159658
		mmol L <sup>-1</sup> CH <sub>3</sub> OH aqueous solution,	
		continuous N <sub>2</sub>	
FeMoS <sub>x</sub>	99.79 µmol	100 W Hg lamp, 1 mg mL <sup>-1</sup> catalyst was	ACS Omega
	$g^{-1} h^{-1}$	added into an aqueous solution containing	2024, 9, 20629-
		pyridinium chloride (50 mM) and sodium	20635
		ascorbate (5 mM)	