

Cite this: *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2024, 12, 5319

Electrosynthesis of ruthenium nanocluster incorporated nickel diselenide for efficient overall water splitting†

Vipin Yadav,^a Megha,^b Prasenjit Sen^b * and M. M. Shaijumon^a *

Design of effective catalyst activation strategies that enable efficient electrocatalytic activity towards overall water splitting is necessary for the development of clean energy conversion technologies. Incorporation of metal nanoclusters effectively increases the active site exposure leading to enhanced electrocatalytic activity. Here, we present an energy-efficient and scalable single-step approach for the electrosynthesis of ruthenium nanocluster decorated nickel diselenide catalysts for high-performance and stable alkaline water splitting application. The catalyst exhibits exceptional bifunctional activity for both hydrogen and oxygen evolution, and we demonstrate remarkable full-cell performance with a cell potential of 1.45 V to deliver a current density of 10 mA cm⁻², along with impressive long-term stability over 400 h. Density functional theory (DFT) calculations are carried out, which demonstrate that the ruthenium nanocluster decoration facilitates the exothermic dissociation of water into H and OH species, while also optimizing the adsorption energies of H⁺ and OH⁻ when compared to bare NiSe₂. The present approach could be extended to a variety of catalytically active materials that would potentially be of interest for alkaline water-splitting applications.

Received 13th November 2023
Accepted 20th January 2024

DOI: 10.1039/d3ta06988e

rsc.li/materials-a

Introduction

Hydrogen is considered as a promising energy carrier to replace the existing energy infrastructure, owing to its high gravimetric energy density (120 kJ kg⁻¹) and zero carbon emission features.^{1,2} There are several methods for hydrogen production, based on the applied energy sources, such as high-temperature thermolysis, coal refining, electrocatalysis, photocatalysis, *etc.*^{3–8} The electrochemical water cycle, which involves electrolysis of water for H₂ generation and subsequent utilization in fuel cells, is a significant approach towards a sustainable energy future. The energy conversion process involves two half-cell reactions, namely, the hydrogen evolution reaction (HER) happening at the cathode side, and the oxygen evolution reaction (OER) happening at the anode side.^{9–12} Owing to the multistep reaction processes in alkaline media, the HER and OER suffer from high activation barriers, resulting in large overpotentials leading to the slow kinetics of water electrolysis.^{13,14} Noble metal (Pt, Ir)-based electrocatalysts are currently regarded as the most active materials for the HER and OER.

However, their high cost, limited availability, and poor stability hinder their large-scale applications.^{15–17} Therefore it is highly essential to develop cost-effective, highly active, and highly stable commercial bifunctional electrocatalysts for overall water splitting.^{18,19}

Currently, transition metal compounds including chalcogenides, oxides, hydroxides, carbides, phosphides, *etc.*, are studied as potential candidates for HER and OER activity towards water splitting.^{20–26} Recently, transition metal selenides have gained much more attention because of their d-orbital configuration and better conductivity.^{27–30} However, their electrochemical activity is still far from that of the benchmark catalysts because of their high adsorption energy, low number of electrochemically active sites, *etc.* In this context, several approaches such as forming heterostructures, creating defects, doping with other elements, strain modulation, *etc.*, are adopted to improve the overall activity of such catalysts.^{31–35} Most importantly it is essential to improve the water dissociation ability to achieve enhanced alkaline HER activity.³⁶ Incorporation of another component, such as a sub-nanometer-sized metal or metal oxide cluster with strong water dissociation ability is an effective strategy for hydrogen production because of its strong quantum confinement effects.^{37,38} Sub-nanometer metal nanocluster decoration effectively increases the active site exposure leading to enhanced electrocatalytic activity for overall water splitting.^{39–42} There have been efforts devoted to developing non-platinum-based bifunctional electrocatalysts for water splitting. Ruthenium, belonging to the class of noble

^aSchool of Physics, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Thiruvananthapuram, Maruthamala PO, Vithura, Kerala, 695551, India. E-mail: shaiju@iisertvm.ac.in

^bHarish-Chandra Research Institute, HBNI, Chhatnag Road, Jhansi, Allahabad, 211019, India

† Electronic supplementary information (ESI) available. See DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1039/d3ta06988e>

metal elements, exhibits similar metal–hydrogen-bond strength of $\sim 65 \text{ kcal mol}^{-1}$ activity to that of platinum and has a much lower price ($\sim 4\%$ of platinum).^{43,44} Ruthenium nanoclusters were shown to exhibit good ability for water dissociation by shifting the d-band center closer to the Fermi level, which is an important parameter for efficient alkaline water splitting.⁴⁵ Ruthenium nanocluster decoration over nickel diselenide following a two-step process of hydrothermal and selenization methods has been reported to lead to enhanced electrocatalytic water splitting in alkaline media.⁴⁶ However, the reported synthesis method involves multistep processes and high-temperature requirements, posing severe concerns toward practical implementation. Pu *et al.*, reported the electrodeposition of nickel diselenide nanoparticles over titanium foil for overall water-splitting application.⁴⁷ Ru-nanocluster growth on NiSe₂ over conducting substrates such as nickel foam (NF) or carbon material *via* a single-step process would enable high metal utilization and improved electronic conductivity, resulting in efficient catalytic activity towards overall water splitting.

Herein, we demonstrate an energy-efficient and scalable single-step approach for the electrosynthesis of ruthenium nanocluster decorated nickel diselenide catalysts for high-performance and stable alkaline water splitting application. We optimize catalyst synthesis, and the sample with 50 mmol Ru (50-Ru-NiSe₂) is shown to exhibit excellent bifunctional electrocatalytic activity with the lowest overpotential of 13 mV at a current density of 10 mA cm^{-2} for the HER and 260 mV at a current density of 30 mA cm^{-2} for the OER. We further demonstrate remarkable full-cell performance with a cell potential of 1.45 V to deliver a current density of 10 mA cm^{-2} , along with impressive long-term stability over 400 h. Density functional theory (DFT) calculations are carried out, which demonstrate that the ruthenium nanocluster decoration facilitates the exothermic dissociation of water into H and OH species, while also optimizing the adsorption energies of H⁺ and OH[−] when compared to that of bare NiSe₂.

Experimental section

Materials and reagents

Nickel acetate tetrahydrate (Ni(CH₃COOH)₂·4H₂O, 98%), selenium dioxide (SeO₂, 99.8%), ruthenium(III) chloride hydrate (RuCl₃·xH₂O, 99.98%), nickel foam (NF, 1.6 mm thickness), hydrochloric acid (HCl, 37%), potassium hydroxide pellets (KOH, 99.95%), platinum over carbon (20 wt% Pt/C), and iridium oxide (IrO₂, 99.9%) were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich. High-purity Milli-Q water was used for preparing the samples.

Synthesis of Ru-NiSe₂

A piece of NF (0.5 cm × 1 cm) was initially treated with HCl for 10 min under sonication and then washed with DI water followed by drying at 60 °C overnight. For electrodeposition, we used a typical steady-state three-electrode setup in which HCl pretreated NF is used as the working electrode, a platinum coil is used as the counter electrode, and silver/silver chloride (Ag/

AgCl) is used as the reference electrode. A constant potential of -1 V vs. Ag/AgCl is applied for 10 min at the working electrode for electrodeposition. First, we synthesized nickel diselenide (NiSe₂) using an electrolyte of 65 mmol of Ni(CH₃COOH)₂·4H₂O, and 35 mmol of SeO₂ was dissolved in 40 mL DI water and stirred for 5 min. After this, we added a few drops of 37% HCl to maintain the pH in the range of 2–3. The electrodeposited sample was washed several times with DI water and then dried at 60 °C overnight. Furthermore, the dried sample was annealed at 200 °C in an argon environment for 2 h. Similarly, we fabricated a ruthenium cluster decorated nickel diselenide sample under similar experimental conditions. Additionally, the concentration of RuCl₃·xH₂O in the solution was changed to 20 mmol, 30 mmol, 40 mmol, 50 mmol, and 60 mmol. Ru nanocluster decorated nickel diselenide samples are denoted as 20-Ru-NiSe₂, 30-Ru-NiSe₂, 40-Ru-NiSe₂, 50-Ru-NiSe₂, and 60-Ru-NiSe₂, respectively.

Materials characterization

An X-Ray diffractometer (Empyrean, PANalytical) instrument with Cu K α 1.54 Å is used to characterize the phase composition of all the prepared samples with a scan rate of 0.5 degree per min in the range of 20 to 80 degrees. A Nova scanning electron microscope (Nova Nano SEM 450) and transmission electron microscope (FEI Tecnai G2 F30 S-Twin TEM 300 kV) are used to analyze the surface morphology and elemental mapping of the samples. X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (Omicron Nano Tech. XPS) with a Mg K α source was performed to investigate the elemental composition and electronic state of all present elements. Finally, we performed inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectroscopy (PerkinElmer Optima 5300 DV ICP-OES) to analyze the ratio of ruthenium to nickel diselenide.

Electrochemical characterization

The electrochemical performance of all the catalysts for the HER and OER was evaluated using a Biologic SAS VMP3 electrochemical workstation in nitrogen-saturated 1.0 M KOH solution, at room temperature, using a typical three-electrode setup. All prepared electrodes are used as working electrodes, a graphite rod, as the counter electrode, and a Hg/HgO electrode, as the reference electrode. The working electrode potential was converted to RHE using the Nernst equation ($E_{\text{RHE}} = E_{\text{Hg/HgO}}^0 + 0.059 \times \text{pH}$).⁹ All the polarization curves were recorded with 85% IR corrected by LSV at a scan rate of 2 mV s^{-1} . We carried out electrochemical impedance spectroscopy to calculate the charge transfer resistance of the materials in the frequency range of 50 mHz to 100 kHz. We obtained the electrochemically active surface area (ECSA) of all the prepared electrodes from the double-layer capacitance (C_{dl}), which was evaluated by scanning the CV in the non-faradaic potential region vs. Hg/HgO with different scan rates from 10 mV s^{-1} to 100 mV s^{-1} . Pt/C and IrO₂ electrodes were studied as benchmark catalysts for the HER and OER, respectively, with 4 mg of Pt/C or IrO₂ in 1 mL solution (750 μL of DI water, 200 μL of IPA, and 50 μL of Nafion). The solution is



sonicated for 2 h to make a proper dispersion and then drop-coated over HCl-pretreated NF.

Density functional theory calculations

All density functional theory calculations were performed using the Vienna *ab initio* simulation package (VASP)^{48–51} within the framework of the generalized gradient approximation (Perdew–Burke–Ernzerhof (PBE) exchange–correlation functional).⁵² To account for the core–valence electron interactions, we employed the projector augmented wave (PAW) method.⁵³ Furthermore, we incorporate the effects of van der Waals interactions *via* Grimme's D3 dispersion correction.⁵⁴ The kinetic energy cutoff for plane wave expansions, convergence criteria for energy, and forces on each atom were set to 550 eV, 10–5 eV and 0.01 eV Å^{−1}, respectively. To minimize possible interactions between the periodic images, a vacuum layer of 16 Å was added in the non-periodic direction. For a pure NiSe₂ system, a (210) surface slab with seven layers, consisting of 28 Ni and 56 Se atoms, was used. All layers were relaxed during geometry optimization. However, for the Ru nanocluster decorated NiSe₂ surface, a Ru₈ cluster was adsorbed on the NiSe₂ (210) surface slab with five layers, comprising 60 Ni, 120 Se, and 8 Ru atoms. For the pure NiSe₂ (210) and Ru₈–NiSe₂ (210) systems, the Brillouin zone integrations were carried out using Γ -centred *k*-point meshes of 4 × 9 × 1 and 5 × 5 × 1, respectively.

Results and discussion

Synthesis of Ru nanocluster decorated nickel diselenide (Ru–NiSe₂) supported on nickel foam was performed through a single-step electrodeposition process, followed by low-temperature thermal annealing in an argon atmosphere, as illustrated in ESI Fig. S1.† The process involved a co-electrodeposition strategy using precursors of nickel and selenium along with varying concentrations of ruthenium(III) chloride of 20 mmol, 30 mmol, 40 mmol, 50 mmol, and 60 mmol, as detailed in the ESI Methods section.† We applied −1 V vs. Ag/AgCl for 10 min to obtain a mass loading of 2.42 mg cm^{−2}. Pristine NiSe₂ samples are grown under controlled conditions on Ni foam. All the electrodeposited samples are washed with DI water and annealed in an argon atmosphere at 200 °C for 2 h.

Fig. 1a shows the crystal structure of Ru nanocluster decorated nickel diselenide, which was confirmed from the X-ray diffraction (XRD) analysis (Fig. 1b). Three high-intensity peaks at 44.44, 51.78, and 76.27 correspond to the reflections from nickel foam (PDF no.-98-012-3812) (Fig. S2†).⁵⁵ The other marked peaks correspond to the cubic phase of NiSe₂ (PDF no.-00-041-1495),⁵⁶ which seems to have remained unchanged with Ru decoration, indicative of no structural changes in NiSe₂. We performed inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectroscopy (ICP-OES) to analyze the ruthenium content in nickel




Fig. 1 Phase and morphology analyses of Ru nanocluster decorated nickel diselenide. (a) Crystal structure of ruthenium nanocluster decorated nickel diselenide. (b) XRD pattern of NiSe₂ and 50-Ru–NiSe₂. (c) SEM images of 50-Ru–NiSe₂. (d) TEM image of 50-Ru–NiSe₂. (e) HRTEM image of 50-Ru–NiSe₂. (f and g) HRTEM images showing the interplanar spacing for NiSe₂ and Ru nanoclusters, respectively. (h–j) Elemental mapping of Ru, Ni, and Se, respectively. (k) Elemental mapping of Ru, Ni, and Se, together.



diselenide. For the 50-Ru-NiSe₂ sample (with an initial concentration of 50 mmol ruthenium(III) chloride), a Ru content of 3.9 wt% was confirmed.

The morphology of all the prepared catalysts was further analyzed by scanning electron microscopy (SEM) and transmission electron microscopy (TEM). For instance, Fig. 1c shows the SEM image of the surface of nickel foam which is fully covered with electrodeposited 50-Ru-NiSe₂. Fig. 1d shows the TEM image of 50-Ru-NiSe₂. The corresponding high-resolution TEM (HR-TEM) images given in Fig. 1e–g clearly reveal interplanar spacing of NiSe₂ and Ru nanoclusters with the corresponding lattice planes.^{46,57} SEM images of electrodeposited NiSe₂ over NF (Fig. S3†) with uniform growth of NiSe₂ over the NF surface and the corresponding energy-dispersive spectroscopy (EDX) mapping showed uniform distribution of nickel and selenium over the surface (Fig. S4†). The TEM image shown in Fig. S5† displays the morphology of NiSe₂ along with the corresponding *d* spacing. Besides the morphological studies, energy-dispersive spectroscopy (EDX) analysis is also performed in order to confirm the elemental composition in the sample. The uniform distribution of Ru, Ni, and Se over the surface was confirmed from the elemental mapping images shown in Fig. 1h–k, respectively. X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) is a powerful technique to analyze the chemical composition and chemical state of the elements present in the sample. XPS measurements were carried out for NiSe₂, and 50-Ru-NiSe₂. Due to the spin-orbit coupling, Ni, Ru, and Se peaks split into Ni 2p_{1/2}, Ni 2p_{3/2}, Ru 3p_{1/2}, Ru 3p_{3/2}, Se 3d_{5/2}, and Se 3d_{3/2}, respectively.^{46,47,56} In Fig. 2a, the XPS survey spectrum of NiSe₂ shows the presence of Ni and Se, while that of 50-Ru-NiSe₂ shows the presence of Ru, Ni, and Se. Fig. 2b and c show the

high-resolution XPS spectra of NiSe₂, and Fig. 2d–f show the high-resolution XPS spectra of 50-Ru-NiSe₂. The peaks at 854.5 eV and 872.3 eV are assigned to Ni²⁺ 2p_{3/2} and Ni²⁺ 2p_{1/2}, respectively, while the two broad peaks at 859.4 eV and 877.8 eV correspond to the satellite peak of Ni 2p (Fig. 2b).⁵⁸ Fig. 2c shows the XPS peaks at 55.3 eV and 56.4 eV which correspond to Se 3d_{5/2} and Se 3d_{3/2}, and a broad peak observed at 59.4 eV reveals partial oxidation of selenium.^{59,60} Fig. 2d shows the high-resolution XPS peaks at 461.8 eV and 484.2 eV, corresponding to Ru⁰ 3p_{3/2} and Ru⁰ 3p_{1/2} from metallic Ru,⁶¹ which further indicates the formation of ruthenium nanoclusters. High-resolution XPS peaks observed at 854.8 eV and 872.6 eV in Fig. 2e are assigned to Ni²⁺ 2p_{3/2} and Ni²⁺ 2p_{1/2}, respectively, and the two broad peaks at 860.2 eV and 878.6 eV correspond to the satellite peak of Ni 2p.^{58,62} Fig. 2f shows XPS peaks at 55.3 eV and 56.4 eV which correspond to Se 3d_{5/2} and Se 3d_{3/2}, respectively, and a broad peak seen at 59.3 eV reveals partial oxidation of selenium.^{59,60,63} A positive shift of +0.3 eV is observed in the high-resolution nickel spectra of 50-Ru-NiSe₂ upon Ru incorporation. This indicates that there is charge transfer happening from nickel to ruthenium in 50-Ru-NiSe₂, which is originated from the high electronegativity of Ru (2.5) compared to that of Ni (1.2).^{46,64} This further indicates the presence of an electrostatic interaction between Ni and Ru in the Ru nanocluster incorporated sample.

The electrochemical performance of the catalysts was studied in nitrogen-saturated 1.0 M KOH electrolyte using linear sweep voltammetry (LSV) at 2 mV s^{−1}. Improvement in the electrocatalytic performance of the Ru-incorporated NiSe₂ catalysts in comparison with their pristine counterpart towards the HER was clearly confirmed through detailed LSV studies






Fig. 2 XPS analysis. (a) Survey spectra of NiSe₂ and 50-Ru-NiSe₂. (b and c) High-resolution XPS spectra of Ni and Se of NiSe₂. (d–f) High-resolution XPS spectra of Ru, Ni, and Se of 50-Ru-NiSe₂.



performed on the catalysts with varying molar ruthenium contents (Ru = 10 mmol, 20 mmol, 30 mmol, 40 mmol, 50 mmol, and 60 mmol), as shown in Fig. S6.† The catalyst with an initial molar Ru content of 50 mmol (50-Ru-NiSe₂) showed the best performance among all the studied catalysts. Based on this, detailed electrocatalytic performance evaluation on bare NF, NiSe₂ sheets and 50-Ru-NiSe₂ was carried out along with 20 wt% Pt/C (Pt/C) as the reference. As shown in Fig. 3a, *IR*-compensated linear sweep voltammetry was performed to analyze the alkaline HER activity of all the prepared catalysts. 50-Ru-NiSe₂ showed excellent activity with a very low overpotential of 13 mV and 103 mV at current densities of 10 mA cm⁻² and 100 mA cm⁻², respectively. The obtained values are much better in comparison to those of the benchmark Pt/C catalyst, which showed overpotentials of 28 mV and 151 mV, at the respective current densities of 10 mA cm⁻² and 100 mA cm⁻². While NiSe₂ showed an overpotential of 180 mV and 338 mV, NF exhibited poor activity with overpotentials of 293 mV and 483 mV at the respective current densities of 10 mA cm⁻² and 100 mA cm⁻². To understand the electrochemical kinetics for the HER, we investigated the Tafel slopes for all the catalysts. In general, there are three steps involved in the HER process;⁶⁵



The Tafel slopes obtained from the corresponding LSV plots of all the studied samples are depicted in Fig. 3b, which further

confirmed the superior HER activity of 50-Ru-NiSe₂ (21 mV dec⁻¹), compared to Pt/C (29 mV dec⁻¹), NiSe₂ (128 mV dec⁻¹), and, NF (137 mV dec⁻¹). The low Tafel slopes of 50-Ru-NiSe₂ and Pt/C reveal that the HER process for these two systems follows the Volmer–Tafel mechanism. As further indicated in Fig. 3c, from the comparison of overpotentials for the HER at different current densities of 10 mA cm⁻², 50 mA cm⁻², and 100 mA cm⁻² for all the studied catalysts, 50-Ru-NiSe₂ exhibits the lowest overpotential, which is better than all the best-reported values for alkaline HER (Table S1, ESI†). Electrochemical impedance spectroscopy was performed to understand the reaction kinetics for charge transfer between the interface of the catalyst surface and the electrolyte. 50-Ru-NiSe₂ showed a lower charge transfer resistance (*R*_{ct}) of 4.03 ohms, as compared to NiSe₂, at an overpotential of −100 mV (Fig. 3d). Chronoamperometry was performed to understand the electrochemical stability of the catalyst. 50-Ru-NiSe₂ showed excellent stability with negligible change in current density after a 20 h stability test at a current density of 65 mA cm⁻² (Fig. 3e). This clearly indicates the catalyst's exceptional durability in alkaline media for high current density performance. In Fig. 3f, we showed a comparison of LSV plots recorded for 50-Ru-NiSe₂ at the initial cycle and after the 20 h chronoamperometry test. The overlapping curves further indicate the high durability of the catalyst under long-term operating conditions, which is an essential parameter for the overall water-splitting process. High electrocatalytic activity and stability of 50-Ru-NiSe₂ in alkaline media make this catalyst an efficient candidate for the HER.

We further explored the OER activity of all the catalysts in 1.0 M KOH electrolyte. The *IR*-compensated LSVs are plotted in Fig. 4a to analyze the OER activity of all the studied catalysts. 50-Ru-NiSe₂ showed the best OER performance with a low




Fig. 3 HER studies. (a) LSV polarization curves recorded for NF, NiSe₂, 50-Ru-NiSe₂, and Pt/C. (b) The corresponding Tafel plots. (c) Overpotential measured at current densities of 10, 50, and 100 mA cm⁻². (d) Comparison of Nyquist plots of NF, NiSe₂, 50-Ru-NiSe₂ and Pt/C. (e) Stability plot of 50-Ru-NiSe₂ obtained using chronoamperometry measurements. (f) Initial and post LSV plots of 50-Ru-NiSe₂.






Fig. 4 OER studies. (a) LSV polarization curves of NF, NiSe₂, 50-Ru-NiSe₂, and IrO₂ and (b) the corresponding Tafel plots. (c) Corresponding overpotential recorded at current densities of 10, 50, and 100 mA cm⁻². (d) Nyquist plots of NF, NiSe₂, IrO₂ and 50-Ru-NiSe₂. (e) Stability plots of 50-Ru-NiSe₂ obtained using chronoamperometry measurements. (f) Initial and post LSV plots of 50-Ru-NiSe₂.

overpotential of 313 mV and 352 mV at current densities of 50 mA cm⁻² and 100 mA cm⁻², respectively, as compared to NiSe₂ (378 mV and 431 mV) and NF (403 mV and 488 mV). The OER performance of the studied catalyst was better than that of the benchmark catalyst IrO₂. The electrochemical kinetics of these materials for the OER mechanism was investigated by using Tafel slopes.

Fig. 4b shows the Tafel slopes of all the studied catalysts. 50-Ru-NiSe₂ exhibited a low Tafel slope (135 mV dec⁻¹), compared to IrO₂ (232 mV dec⁻¹), NiSe₂ (164 mV dec⁻¹), and NF (327 mV dec⁻¹), indicative of its high OER kinetics. The overpotentials for the OER of all the catalysts recorded at different current densities of 50 mA cm⁻², 100 mA cm⁻², and 200 mA cm⁻² are plotted in Fig. 4c, which showed that 50-Ru-NiSe₂ exhibits the lowest overpotential compared to the other three electrodes (IrO₂, NiSe₂, and NF), which is also better than the recently reported values for alkaline OER from the literature (Table S2, ESI†). Electrochemical impedance spectroscopy was performed (Fig. 4d) to understand the reaction kinetics for charge transfer between the interface of the catalyst surface and the electrolyte. 50-Ru-NiSe₂ showed a lower charge transfer resistance (R_{ct}) of 0.34 ohm as compared to NiSe₂ and IrO₂ at an overpotential of 300 mV.

The chronoamperometry test was performed (Fig. 4e) to evaluate the stability of the catalyst. 50-Ru-NiSe₂ showed a very small change in current density after a 20 h stability test at a current density of 50 mA cm⁻², confirming its very good durability in alkaline media for high current density performance. In Fig. 4f, we compared the LSVs recorded for 50-Ru-NiSe₂ after a 20 h chronoamperometry test along with that of the initial cycle, which did not show much significant change,

clearly revealing the high durability of the catalyst under long-term operating conditions. High electrocatalytic activity and stability of 50-Ru-NiSe₂ in alkaline media make this catalyst an efficient and stable candidate for the OER. After the stability test, we further performed XPS and SEM characterization studies to understand the surface reconstruction process. The post-cycling high-resolution XPS spectra show several changes in peak intensity and peak positions. The Ru 3p peaks show a slight positive shift as compared to those of metallic ruthenium (Fig. S7†), which indicates the oxidation of ruthenium.⁶¹ Similarly, the Ni 2p peak also exhibits a positive shift, indicating the formation of Ni³⁺ species from Ni²⁺ as shown in Fig. S8.†⁶⁶ This positive shift confirms the conversion of the surface of nickel diselenide to nickel oxyhydroxide. Furthermore, there is a stronger oxidation peak observed in the Se 3d spectrum (Fig. S9†) compared to the initial state. This suggests that the selenium surface has undergone reconstruction to form SeO_x species.⁶⁷ To gain a better understanding of the surface reconstruction, the upper surface of the catalysts was etched with argon, and XPS analysis data were recorded from the inner layer of the catalysts. After 10 minutes of etching, the metallic ruthenium peak becomes clearly visible, indicating the presence of metallic ruthenium. The Ni²⁺ oxidation peaks corresponding to Ni 2p_{3/2} and Ni 2p_{1/2} are also observed. However, the oxidation peak for selenium disappears, indicating the absence of selenium oxide formation. Based on this XPS analysis, it can be concluded that the surface of NiSe₂ has been converted from NiSe₂ to Ni(OOH)_x, while the inner core of the catalyst still remains in the NiSe₂ phase. The Ni(OOH)_x species serve as the active sites during the OER process, while the highly conductive inner core of NiSe₂ facilitates charge migration.



Additionally, we performed the SEM analysis after the OER stability tests (Fig. S10†). Fig. S10a–d† show the SEM images of 50-Ru–NiSe₂ before and after the OER stability test. Few changes occurred after the OER stability test during the surface reconstruction process. Inspired by the enhanced bifunctional electrochemical HER and OER activities of 50-Ru–NiSe₂ in alkaline media, we designed an electrolyzer for overall alkaline water splitting with 50-Ru–NiSe₂ as both the anode and cathode (50-Ru–NiSe₂//50-Ru–NiSe₂). The polarization curves recorded for the 50-Ru–NiSe₂//50-Ru–NiSe₂ and NiSe₂//NiSe₂ system are compared with that of Pt/C//IrO₂, the benchmark catalyst (Fig. 5a). 50-Ru–NiSe₂//50-Ru–NiSe₂ showed a remarkably low cell potential of 1.45 V to achieve a current density of 10 mA cm^{−2}, while Pt/C//IrO₂ delivers the same current density at a higher potential of 1.58 V. NiSe₂//NiSe₂ required a much higher potential of 1.66 V to achieve 10 mA cm^{−2} current density. The full cell potentials required to obtain current densities of 10 mA cm^{−2}, 50 mA cm^{−2}, and 100 mA cm^{−2} for 50-Ru–NiSe₂//50-Ru–NiSe₂, NiSe₂//NiSe₂, and benchmark Pt/C//IrO₂ are depicted in Fig. 5b. We performed the durability test for the full cell in Fig. 5c, and 50-Ru–NiSe₂//50-Ru–NiSe₂ showed impressive long-term durability with high current retention even after 400 h at an applied potential of 1.45 V, clearly

revealing excellent performance for overall water splitting. We compared the performance of our system with that of most recently reported alkaline bifunctional electrocatalysts (at 10 mA cm^{−2}), and the present data were found to be superior (Fig. 5d). The details are provided in Table S3 (ESI)†. The long-term stability test was extended for a month with continuous operation, and 50-Ru–NiSe₂//50-Ru–NiSe₂ exhibited exceptional stability for alkaline water splitting (Fig. S7†). To understand the intrinsic activity of the catalyst, we calculated the electrochemically active surface area (ECSA) of the synthesized catalysts from the charge double layer capacitance *C*_{dl} (ESI, Note S2†). CV is carried out in the non-faradaic region of the potential with different scan rates in the alkaline electrolyte (Fig. S8†). The CVs recorded at 10 mV s^{−1} for 50-Ru–NiSe₂ showed a much higher current density than those of NiSe₂, suggesting higher *C*_{dl} of 50-Ru–NiSe₂ compared to NiSe₂. The *C*_{dl} of NF, NiSe₂, and 50-Ru–NiSe₂ is measured to be 1.2 mF cm^{−2}, 11.6 mF cm^{−2}, and, 71.3 mF cm^{−2}, respectively (Table S4, ESI†).

Theoretical studies

To obtain further insights on the remarkably enhanced bifunctional catalytic activity of Ru nanocluster-decorated NiSe₂ over pristine NiSe₂ towards the HER and OER in an alkaline




Fig. 5 Overall water splitting studies. (a) Comparison of LSV plots of 50-Ru–NiSe₂//50-Ru–NiSe₂, and NiSe₂//NiSe₂ with those of benchmark Pt/C//IrO₂. (b) Cell potentials required to obtain current densities of 10 mA cm^{−2}, 50 mA cm^{−2}, and 100 mA cm^{−2} for 50-Ru–NiSe₂//50-Ru–NiSe₂, NiSe₂//NiSe₂ and Pt/C//IrO₂. (c) Stability plots of 50-Ru–NiSe₂//50-Ru–NiSe₂ were obtained using a chronoamperometry test. (d) Comparison of the full-cell performance of our work with those of the best reported alkaline catalysts (Table S4, ESI†).



medium, we employed first-principles DFT calculations. Since the as-prepared samples are large and computationally challenging to handle with DFT, we chose to study systems of reasonable sizes that can be feasibly analyzed. We believe that our model systems are sufficient to capture the fundamental chemical processes that underlie the observed catalytic behavior. Specifically, we investigated the HER and OER catalytic activities of the clean NiSe₂ (210) surface and NiSe₂ (210) surface decorated with a Ru nanocluster. The reason for choosing the (210) plane of NiSe₂ is that the experimentally observed XRD pattern for NiSe₂ indicates that the peak with the maximum intensity corresponds to the (210) plane (see Fig. 1b). Furthermore, it is clear from this figure that the XRD pattern remains unchanged with Ru nanocluster decoration. Therefore, for both pristine NiSe₂ and Ru nanocluster-decorated NiSe₂, we opted to study the (210) plane. Moreover, to examine the effect of Ru nanocluster decoration on the catalytic activity of NiSe₂ (210) towards the HER and OER, we chose an 8-atom Ru nanocluster. In the absence of a clear indication from the experiments about how the Ru dopants are arranged on the surface, we consider a Ru₈ nanocluster adsorbed NiSe₂ (210) surface as a model catalyst. The choice of this particular size for the nanocluster is guided by the findings in published literature,^{68–70} which suggest that Ru₈ is relatively more stable when compared to neighboring nanocluster sizes, and also takes into consideration the computational tractability. To compare the catalytic activities of clean and Ru₈ adsorbed NiSe₂ (210) surfaces, we consider the structures shown in Fig. S9.† We adsorbed all the relevant intermediate atoms/molecules involved in these reactions on all the available high-symmetry sites of these two systems. In the case of pure NiSe₂, these sites include Se-top, Ni-top, and Se–Se bridge positions. However, in Ru₈–NiSe₂, there exists additional sites referred to as Ru-top and Ru–Ru bridge. All of these sites are marked in Fig. S9.† The complete HER in an alkaline medium is $4\text{H}_2\text{O} + 4\text{e}^- \rightarrow 2\text{H}_2 + 4\text{OH}^-$. As shown by Nørskov *et al.*, the free energy of H adsorption, ΔG_{H^*} , is a good descriptor for characterizing the catalytic activity of transition metal-based materials towards the HER in acidic electrolytes.^{71,72} According to their results, adsorption-free energy of H, ΔG_{H^*} close to zero is a necessary criterion for a catalyst to be considered suitable for acidic HER. We adopt the criterion of $|\Delta G_{\text{H}^*}| \leq 0.2$ eV to identify the potential candidates for the HER in an acidic medium. However, in an alkaline medium, ΔG_{H^*} alone is insufficient to fully characterize the HER activity. This is because of the low availability of H⁺ ions in an alkaline medium, where the dissociation of H₂O into H⁺ and OH[−] becomes an essential part of the HER and contributes additional energy to the overall reaction Gibbs free energy. Furthermore, there is currently no single descriptor in the literature that adequately describes the HER activity of a material in an alkaline medium. Therefore, in addition to the $|\Delta G_{\text{H}^*}| \leq 0.2$ eV criterion, we consider the following factors to assess the HER activity in alkaline environments:

(i) The binding energy of H₂O with the material surface, (ii) the feasibility of H₂O dissociation into H⁺ and OH[−], and (iii) the free energy of OH adsorption, ΔG_{OH^*} , which should ideally be

close to zero according to the Sabatier principle.⁷³ First, we calculate the value of ΔG_{H^*} using the following equation:

$$\Delta G_{\text{H}^*} = E_{\text{ads}}(\text{H}) + 0.24 \text{ eV}, \quad (4)$$

where $E_{\text{ads}}(\text{H})$ represents the adsorption energy of the H atom on either the pure or Ru₈ cluster decorated NiSe₂. Please check the ESI (Note S3)† for more details. The visual representation of ΔG_{H^*} at different sites on both pristine NiSe₂ and Ru₈–NiSe₂ is given in Fig. 6a. We observe from this figure that in both the pristine and Ru₈–NiSe₂ materials, the value of ΔG_{H^*} lies close to zero. The value of ΔG_{H^*} closest to zero is 0.08 eV for the pristine material, while it is 0.04 eV for Ru₈–NiSe₂. We also note that, in the case of the pristine material, the $|\Delta G_{\text{H}^*}| \leq 0.2$ eV criterion is satisfied only at the Se-top sites. On the other hand, for Ru₈–NiSe₂, in addition to a few Se-top positions, almost all sites, including Ru-top and Ru–Ru bridge positions of the Ru cluster, are HER active in terms of ΔG_{H^*} . Therefore, based on the H adsorption free energy plot, we can conclude that both pristine and Ru₈–NiSe₂ (210) are HER active; however, the number of active sites is more in the case of the Ru cluster-decorated surface. Next, we examine the binding of H₂O molecules with the pristine and Ru₈-decorated NiSe₂ (210) surfaces. To characterize this interaction, we calculate the adsorption energy, $E_{\text{ads}}(\text{H}_2\text{O})$, of an H₂O molecule using the following equation.

$$E_{\text{ads}}(\text{H}_2\text{O}) = E(\text{H}_2\text{O}^*) - E(*) - E(\text{H}_2\text{O}) \quad (5)$$

In this equation, $E(\text{H}_2\text{O}^*)$ represents the total energy of the adsorbed H₂O molecule on either NiSe₂ or Ru₈–NiSe₂. $E(*)$ is the total energy of these systems prior to H₂O adsorption, and $E(\text{H}_2\text{O})$ represents the total energy of a free H₂O molecule. A negative value of $E_{\text{ads}}(\text{H}_2\text{O})$ would indicate that the adsorption of H₂O on the catalyst surface is exothermic. Values of $E_{\text{ads}}(\text{H}_2\text{O})$ at some of the possible sites of NiSe₂ and Ru₈–NiSe₂ (210) are given in Table S5 (ESI).† From this table, it is clear that the maximum H₂O adsorption energy is −0.83 eV on one of the Ni-top sites of pristine NiSe₂. However, in the case of Ru₈–NiSe₂, the strongest binding ($E_{\text{ads}}(\text{H}_2\text{O}) = -1.08$ eV) occurs on one of the Ru-top positions. This shows that an H₂O molecule is significantly more strongly adsorbed on Ru₈–NiSe₂ (210) compared to on the pristine material. While the optimal value is not known, it is conceivable that the strong binding energy of H₂O could facilitate its dissociation at the surface, subsequently aiding the Heyrovsky or Tafel steps in the HER process. Next, we proceed to assess whether the dissociation of an H₂O molecule is energetically favorable on NiSe₂ (210) and Ru₈–NiSe₂ (210). The reaction energy, ΔE , determines whether a reaction is energetically favorable. We calculate the value of ΔE according to $E(\text{H}^* + \text{OH}^*) - E(\text{H}_2\text{O}^*)$. The lowest possible pathways for H₂O dissociation on the pristine and Ru₈ cluster decorated NiSe₂ surfaces are presented in Fig. 7. From this figure, it is evident that the value of ΔE on NiSe₂ (210) is 0.76 eV. This significant positive value of ΔE indicates that the H₂O dissociation into H and OH is an endothermic process. On the other hand, on the Ru₈–NiSe₂ system, the dissociation of a H₂O






Fig. 6 Theoretical calculations for the HER. (a) Free energy plots for H adsorption and (b) OH adsorption on some of the high symmetry sites of pristine and $\text{Ru}_8\text{-NiSe}_2$ (210) surfaces.




Fig. 7 Representation of reaction pathways. (a) Pristine and (b) $\text{Ru}_8\text{-NiSe}_2$ (210) materials. Green, grey, golden yellow, red, and blue coloured balls represent Se, Ni, Ru, O, and H atoms, respectively.





molecule into H and OH fragments yields a reaction energy of -1.06 eV, which is significantly negative. This indicates that H_2O dissociation is exothermic and thus energetically feasible on the cluster-decorated NiSe_2 surface. As we have established that H_2O is adsorbed more strongly on the $\text{Ru}_8\text{-NiSe}_2$ system and its dissociation into H and OH is energetically favorable on this system, we expect that the OH fragment will also be adsorbed more strongly on the Ru cluster-decorated surface compared to on pristine NiSe_2 , where $\text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{H} + \text{OH}$ is endothermic. To verify this assumption, we will now proceed to calculate the adsorption-free energy of OH, ΔG_{OH}^* , on both the pristine and $\text{Ru}_8\text{-NiSe}_2$ materials. To calculate ΔG_{OH}^* , we use the following equation:

$$\Delta G_{\text{OH}}^* = E_{\text{ads}}(\text{OH}) + 0.35 \text{ eV.} \quad (6)$$

Here, $E_{\text{ads}}(\text{OH})$ denotes the adsorption energy of OH on either pure or $\text{Ru}_8\text{-NiSe}_2$ (210). More details are given in the ESI.† The values of ΔG_{OH}^* at various possible positions on both the systems are provided in Table S6 (ESI)† and the corresponding plot is presented in Fig. 6b. From this figure, it is clear that the value of ΔG_{OH}^* is highly positive, nearly 1.0 eV, close to zero and even slightly negative at some of the positions on the $\text{Ru}_8\text{-NiSe}_2$ surface. For example, at the $\text{Ru}_3\text{-top}$ site, $\Delta G_{\text{OH}}^* = -0.28$ eV.

Koper *et al.*⁷³ showed that transition metal decorated stepped surfaces of Pt have the best HER performance in alkaline media when $\Delta G_{\text{OH}}^* = -0.26$ eV. While there is no knowledge of what would be an optimal ΔG_{OH}^* on pristine or decorated NiSe_2 surfaces, one can take -0.26 eV as a guide. Since ΔG_{OH}^* on the Ru cluster-decorated surface is very close to the optimum value (see Fig. 6b), we expect $\text{Ru}_8\text{-NiSe}_2$ (210) to perform much better for the HER in alkaline media compared to pristine NiSe_2 (210). From the above discussion, we find that in terms of H adsorption, ΔG_{H}^* is approximately zero for both pristine and Ru cluster-decorated NiSe_2 ; however $\text{Ru}_8\text{-NiSe}_2$ (210) has more active sites compared to the pristine material. Moreover, the adsorption of an H_2O molecule is comparatively stronger on $\text{Ru}_8\text{-NiSe}_2$ (210) than on pristine NiSe_2 (210). The most crucial step of H_2O dissociation into H and OH is an exothermic process on $\text{Ru}_8\text{-NiSe}_2$, whereas it is endothermic on the pristine catalyst surface. Additionally, ΔG_{OH}^* is closer to the optimum value of -0.26 eV on $\text{Ru}_8\text{-NiSe}_2$ (210) while it is large and positive on the pristine material. These findings collectively suggest that Ru cluster-decorated NiSe_2 (210) is a significantly superior catalyst for alkaline HER compared to pristine NiSe_2 (210).

The OER in an alkaline medium involves the transfer of four electrons, accompanied by the formation of the O–O bond and the breaking of the O–H bond. The complete oxygen evolution reaction in an alkaline medium can be represented as $4\text{OH}^- \leftrightarrow 2\text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{O}_2 + 4\text{e}^-$ and the intermediate reaction steps are as follows:



In summary, the OER follows the following path: $\text{OH}^- \rightarrow \text{OH}^* \rightarrow \text{O}^* \rightarrow \text{OOH}^* \rightarrow \text{O}_2$. The free energy change at each of






Fig. 8 Theoretical calculations for the OER. (a) Free energy plot and (b) intermediate structures involved in the OER at the minimum over-potential sites of pure and $\text{Ru}_8\text{-NiSe}_2$ (210) systems.

these reaction steps is calculated using the following equations. A more detailed discussion of these steps is provided in the ESI.†

$$\Delta G_1 = G(\text{OH}^*) - G(^*) - G(\text{OH}^- - e^-) \quad (11)$$

$$\Delta G_2 = G(\text{O}^*) + G(\text{H}_2\text{O}) - G(\text{OH}^*) - G(\text{OH}^- - e^-) \quad (12)$$

$$\Delta G_3 = G(\text{OOH}^*) - G(\text{O}^*) - G(\text{OH}^- - e^-) \quad (13)$$

$$\Delta G_4 = G(^*) + G(\text{O}_2) + G(\text{H}_2\text{O}) - G(\text{OOH}^*) - G(\text{OH}^- - e^-) \quad (14)$$

Once we have the values of ΔG_1 , ΔG_2 , ΔG_3 , and ΔG_4 , we can calculate the overpotential, η , using the following equation: $\eta = \max[\Delta G_1, \Delta G_2, \Delta G_3, \Delta G_4]/e - 1.23$ V. We studied the adsorption of all the intermediates, that is, OH, O, and OOH, at all the possible non-equivalent positions on the pristine as well as the $\text{Ru}_8\text{-NiSe}_2$ systems. The calculated values of these free energy changes, along with η , at various positions on the pristine and $\text{Ru}_8\text{-NiSe}_2$ systems, are compiled in Table S7 (ESI).† From this table we observe that the value of ΔG_3 is maximum at all the possible positions, indicating that the $\text{O}^* \rightarrow \text{OOH}^*$ step is the rate-determining as well as the potential-determining step.

The free energy plots for the OER on pristine and $\text{Ru}_8\text{-NiSe}_2$ surfaces, at the positions where the overpotential is minimum, are presented in Fig. 8. In this figure, we also demonstrate the structural evolution of the various intermediates on the pristine and Ru cluster-decorated surfaces. It is noteworthy that on both

the clean and $\text{Ru}_8\text{-NiSe}_2$ (210) surfaces, the OER active sites are the Se-top positions. From Table S7 (ESI)† and Fig. 8, it is clear that the minimum OER overpotential is 0.88 V at one of the Se-top sites on the pristine NiSe_2 surface, while this value decreases to 0.79 V after Ru cluster decoration. Due to this reduction in the overpotential value caused by Ru cluster decoration, we expect that $\text{Ru}_8\text{-NiSe}_2$ may serve as a marginally better catalyst for the OER than pure NiSe_2 .

Conclusions

In summary, we have demonstrated an energy-efficient and scalable electrosynthesis approach for the synthesis of ruthenium nanocluster decorated nickel diselenide catalysts for high-performance and stable alkaline water splitting application. We optimized the catalyst synthesis, and 50-Ru- NiSe_2 was found to exhibit a very low HER overpotential of 13 mV at a current density of 10 mA cm^{-2} and an OER overpotential of 260 mV at a current density of 30 mA cm^{-2} . A full cell has been designed using 50-Ru- NiSe_2 as both the anode and cathode, which showed a cell potential of 1.45 V to deliver a current density of 10 mA cm^{-2} , and we performed a long-term 400 h stability test which showed negligible degradation in current density. The enhancement in the catalytic activity of NiSe_2 towards the HER and OER, after Ru cluster decoration, was also investigated *via* density functional theory calculations, and the



results of these calculations fully explain the experimental findings. The present work thus provides a new approach to design metal nanocluster-decoration over transition metal selenide-based electrocatalysts, resulting in high electrocatalytic activity, improved electrochemically active sites, and enhanced stability for the alkaline water splitting process.

Author contributions

V. Y. and M. M. S. conceived the idea and designed the experiments. V. Y. performed all the experiments including synthesis of the catalysts, characterization of the materials, and electrochemical studies. V. Y. and M. M. S. analysed the experimental data. P. S. designed the computational part of the work based on discussions with others. P. S. and M. S. performed the theoretical studies, analysed the computational data, and wrote the portions of the manuscript related to the computational studies. V. Y. wrote the manuscript with inputs from others. M. M. S. and P. S. reviewed and edited the manuscript. M. M. S. supervised all aspects of the experimental work.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

Acknowledgements

M. M. S. acknowledges the Department of Science & Technology, Govt. of India (DST/TMD/HFC/2k18/136), Science and Engineering Research Board, Department of Science and Technology, India, (CRG/2021/006246), and IISER Thiruvananthapuram, for the financial support. V. Y. is grateful to the Govt. of India, for a PhD scholarship through the Prime Minister's Research Fellowship.

References

- 1 J. Zhao, J. J. Zhang, Z. Y. Li and X. H. Bu, *Small*, 2020, **16**, 2003916.
- 2 M. Đurović, J. Hnát and K. Bouzek, *J. Power Sources*, 2021, **493**, 229708.
- 3 I. Lucentini, X. Garcia, X. Vendrell and J. Llorca, *Ind. Eng. Chem. Res.*, 2021, **60**, 18560–18611.
- 4 X. Chu, C. I. Sathish, J.-H. Yang, X. Guan, X. Zhang, L. Qiao, K. Domen, S. Wang, A. Vinu and J. Yi, *Small*, 2023, 2302875.
- 5 C. N. R. Rao and S. Dey, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2017, **114**, 13385–13393.
- 6 P. V. Sarma, T. V. Vineesh, R. Kumar, V. Sreepal, R. Prasannachandran, A. K. Singh and M. M. Shaijumon, *ACS Catal.*, 2020, **10**, 6753–6762.
- 7 Z.-N. Zhang, X.-H. Wang, X.-L. Tian, Y. Chen and S.-N. Li, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2023, **11**, 21628–21635.
- 8 Q. Xue, X.-Y. Bai, Y. Zhao, Y.-N. Li, T.-J. Wang, H.-Y. Sun, F.-M. Li, P. Chen, P. Jin, S.-B. Yin and Y. Chen, *J. Energy Chem.*, 2022, **65**, 94–102.
- 9 N. P. Dileep, P. V. Sarma, R. Prasannachandran, V. Surendran and M. M. Shaijumon, *ACS Appl. Nano Mater.*, 2021, **4**, 7206–7212.
- 10 N. P. Dileep, T. V. Vineesh, P. V. Sarma, M. V. Chalil, C. S. Prasad and M. M. Shaijumon, *ACS Appl. Energy Mater.*, 2020, **3**, 1461–1467.
- 11 P. V. Sarma, T. V. Vineesh, R. Kumar, V. Sreepal, R. Prasannachandran, A. K. Singh and M. M. Shaijumon, *ACS Catal.*, 2020, **10**, 6753–6762.
- 12 R. Prasannachandran, T. V. Vineesh, M. B. Lithin, R. Nandakishore and M. M. Shaijumon, *Chem. Commun.*, 2020, **56**, 8623–8626.
- 13 Y. Bai, Y. Wu, X. Zhou, Y. Ye, K. Nie, J. Wang, M. Xie, Z. Zhang, Z. Liu, T. Cheng and C. Gao, *Nat. Commun.*, 2022, **13**, 6094.
- 14 T. V. Vineesh, U. V. Anagha, N. P. Dileep, H. Cheraparambil, J. Nambeesan and M. M. Shaijumon, *ChemElectroChem*, 2020, **7**, 3319–3323.
- 15 L. Li, B. Wang, G. Zhang, G. Yang, T. Yang, S. Yang and S. Yang, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2020, **10**, 2001600.
- 16 A. Shan, X. Teng, Y. Zhang, P. Zhang, Y. Xu, C. Liu, H. Li, H. Ye and R. Wang, *Nano Energy*, 2022, **94**, 106913.
- 17 J. Li, J. Hu, M. Zhang, W. Gou, S. Zhang, Z. Chen, Y. Qu and Y. Ma, *Nat. Commun.*, 2021, **12**, 3502.
- 18 N. K. Dang, J. N. Tiwari, S. Sultan, A. Meena and K. S. Kim, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 2021, **404**, 126513.
- 19 P. Thangavel, G. Kim and K. S. Kim, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2021, **9**, 14043–14051.
- 20 B. Kim, T. Kim, K. Lee and J. Li, *ChemElectroChem*, 2020, **7**, 3578–3589.
- 21 B. M. Leonard, in *Encyclopedia of Inorganic and Bioinorganic Chemistry*, 2021, pp. 1–27.
- 22 S. Kumaravel, K. Karthick, S. S. Sankar, A. Karmakar, R. Madhu, K. Bera and S. Kundu, *Sustain. Energy Fuels*, 2021, **5**, 6215–6268.
- 23 F. Song, L. Bai, A. Moysiadou, S. Lee, C. Hu, L. Liardet and X. Hu, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2018, **140**, 7748–7759.
- 24 Y. Liu, Y. Guo, Y. Liu, Z. Wei, K. Wang and Z. Shi, *Energy Fuels*, 2023, **37**, 2608–2630.
- 25 P. V. Sarma, A. Kayal, C. H. Sharma, M. Thalukulam, J. Mitra and M. M. Shaijumon, *ACS Nano*, 2019, **13**, 10448–10455.
- 26 R. Prasannachandran, T. V. Vineesh, A. Anil, B. M. Krishna and M. M. Shaijumon, *ACS Nano*, 2018, **12**, 11511–11519.
- 27 Y. Zhao, B. Jin, Y. Zheng, H. Jin, Y. Jiao and S.-Z. Qiao, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2018, **8**, 1801926.
- 28 Z. Zou, X. Wang, J. Huang, Z. Wu and F. Gao, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2019, **7**, 2233–2241.
- 29 D. Damien, A. Anil, D. Chatterjee and M. M. Shaijumon, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2017, **5**, 13364–13372.
- 30 B. Sun, G. Dong, J. Ye, D. Chai, X. Yang, S. Fu, M. Zhao, W. Zhang and J. Li, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 2023, **459**, 141610.
- 31 M. Singh, T. T. Nguyen, J. Balamurugan, N. H. Kim and J. H. Lee, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 2022, **430**, 132888.
- 32 M. Ahmad, B. Xi, Y. Gu, H. Zhang and S. Xiong, *Inorg. Chem. Front.*, 2022, **9**, 448–457.
- 33 Q. Zhao, D. Zhong, L. Liu, D. Li, G. Hao and J. Li, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2017, **5**, 14639–14645.



- 34 K. Chang, D. T. Tran, J. Wang, N. H. Kim and J. H. Lee, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2022, **10**, 3102–3111.
- 35 B. Xu, H. Yang, L. Yuan, Y. Sun, Z. Chen and C. Li, *J. Power Sources*, 2017, **366**, 193–199.
- 36 Q. Hu, K. Gao, X. Wang, H. Zheng, J. Cao, L. Mi, Q. Huo, H. Yang, J. Liu and C. He, *Nat. Commun.*, 2022, **13**, 3958.
- 37 M. P. de Lara-Castells, C. Puzzarini, V. Bonačić-Koutecký, M. A. López-Quintela and S. Vajda, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2023, **25**, 15081–15084.
- 38 J. Cai, R. Javed, D. Ye, H. Zhao and J. Zhang, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2020, **8**, 22467–22487.
- 39 L. Chen, B. Lu, J. Zhang, R. Wu and Y. Guo, *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, 2022, **623**, 897–904.
- 40 H. Hu, F. M. D. Kazim, Q. Zhang, K. Qu, Z. Yang and W. Cai, *ChemCatChem*, 2019, **11**, 4327–4333.
- 41 J. Zhu, R. Lu, W. Shi, L. Gong, D. Chen, P. Wang, L. Chen, J. Wu, S. Mu and Y. Zhao, *Energy Environ. Mater.*, 2023, **6**, e12318.
- 42 X. Gu, M. Yu, S. Chen, X. Mu, Z. Xu, W. Shao, J. Zhu, C. Chen, S. Liu and S. Mu, *Nano Energy*, 2022, **102**, 107656.
- 43 Y. Zheng, Y. Jiao, Y. Zhu, L. H. Li, Y. Han, Y. Chen, M. Jaroniec and S.-Z. Qiao, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2016, **138**, 16174–16181.
- 44 J. Yu, Q. He, G. Yang, W. Zhou, Z. Shao and M. Ni, *ACS Catal.*, 2019, **9**, 9973–10011.
- 45 Q. Hu, K. Gao, X. Wang, H. Zheng, J. Cao, L. Mi, Q. Huo, H. Yang, J. Liu and C. He, *Nat. Commun.*, 2022, **13**, 3958.
- 46 R. Qin, P. Wang, Z. Li, J. Zhu, F. Cao, H. Xu, Q. Ma, J. Zhang, J. Yu and S. Mu, *Small*, 2022, **18**, 2105305.
- 47 Z. Pu, Y. Luo, A. M. Asiri and X. Sun, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2016, **8**, 4718–4723.
- 48 G. Kresse and J. Hafner, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1993, **47**, 558–561.
- 49 G. Kresse and J. Hafner, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1994, **49**, 14251–14269.
- 50 G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, *Comput. Mater. Sci.*, 1996, **6**, 15–50.
- 51 G. Kresse and J. Furthmüller, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1996, **54**, 11169–11186.
- 52 J. P. Perdew, K. Burke and M. Ernzerhof, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 1996, **77**, 3865–3868.
- 53 P. E. Blöchl, *Phys. Rev. B: Condens. Matter Mater. Phys.*, 1994, **50**, 17953–17979.
- 54 S. Grimme, J. Antony, S. Ehrlich and H. Krieg, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 2010, **132**, 154104.
- 55 X. Hu, X. Tian, Y.-W. Lin and Z. Wang, *RSC Adv.*, 2019, **9**, 31563–31571.
- 56 C. Gu, S. Hu, X. Zheng, M.-R. Gao, Y.-R. Zheng, L. Shi, Q. Gao, X. Zheng, W. Chu, H.-B. Yao, J. Zhu and S.-H. Yu, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2018, **57**, 4020–4024.
- 57 S. K. Ramesh, V. Ganesan and J. Kim, *ACS Appl. Energy Mater.*, 2021, **4**, 12998–13005.
- 58 H. Huang, Y. Zhao, Y. Bai, F. Li, Y. Zhang and Y. Chen, *Adv. Sci.*, 2020, **7**, 2000012.
- 59 B. Xu, H. Yang, L. Yuan, Y. Sun, Z. Chen and C. Li, *J. Power Sources*, 2017, **366**, 193–199.
- 60 Z. Zou, X. Wang, J. Huang, Z. Wu and F. Gao, *J. Mater. Chem. A*, 2019, **7**, 2233–2241.
- 61 H. Wang, X. Li, Q. Ruan and J. Tang, *Nanoscale*, 2020, **12**, 12329–12335.
- 62 K. Fan, H. Chen, Y. Ji, H. Huang, P. M. Claesson, Q. Daniel, B. Philippe, H. Rensmo, F. Li, Y. Luo and L. Sun, *Nat. Commun.*, 2016, **7**, 11981.
- 63 B. Xu, H. Yang, L. Yuan, Y. Sun, Z. Chen and C. Li, *J. Power Sources*, 2017, **366**, 193–199.
- 64 I. S. Kwon, T. T. Debela, I. H. Kwak, Y. C. Park, J. Seo, J. Y. Shim, S. J. Yoo, J. G. Kim, J. Park and H. S. Kang, *Small*, 2020, **16**, 2000081.
- 65 J. Zhu, L. Hu, P. Zhao, L. Y. S. Lee and K. Y. Wong, *Chem. Rev.*, 2020, **120**, 851–918.
- 66 X. Luo, X. Tan, P. Ji, L. Chen, J. Yu and S. Mu, *EnergyChem*, 2023, **5**, 100091.
- 67 S. Anantharaj and S. Noda, *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, 2020, **45**, 15763–15784.
- 68 I. Demiroglu, K. Yao, H. A. Hussein and R. L. Johnston, *J. Phys. Chem. C*, 2017, **121**, 10773–10780.
- 69 A. S. Chaves, M. J. Piotrowski and J. L. F. Da Silva, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 2017, **19**, 15484–15502.
- 70 Y. Wu, L. Wang, T. Bo, Z. Chai, J. K. Gibson and W. Shi, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2023, **33**, 2214375.
- 71 J. K. Noerskov, T. Bligaard, A. Logadottir, J. R. Kitchin, J. G. Chen, S. Pandalov and U. Stimming, *ChemInform*, 2005, **152**, J23–J26.
- 72 B. Hinnemann, P. G. Moses, J. Bonde, K. P. Jørgensen, J. H. Nielsen, S. Hørch, I. Chorkendorff and J. K. Nørskov, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2005, **127**, 5308–5309.
- 73 I. T. McCrum and M. T. M. Koper, *Nat. Energy*, 2020, **5**, 891–899.

