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[^0]Table S1 Crystallographic data, structure refinement parameters of CYBO: $0.15 \mathrm{Eu}^{3+}$

| Formula | $\mathrm{Ca}_{3} \mathrm{Y}_{1.85} \mathrm{Eu}_{0.15} \mathrm{~B}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{12}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Crystal system | orthorhombic |
| Space group | $\mathrm{Pn} \mathrm{ma}(62)$ |
| $\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}, \mathrm{c}(\AA)$ | $7.1644(4), 15.4729(9), 8.5573(5)$ |
| $\alpha, \beta, \gamma\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | $90,90,90$ |
| Volume $\left(\AA^{3}\right)$ | $948.61(9)$ |
| $\mathrm{Z}, \rho_{\text {calc. }}\left(\mathrm{g} \mathrm{cm} \mathrm{cm}^{-3}\right)$ | $4,3.7966$ |
| Sample | Multi-crystal powder |
| Radiation type | $\mathrm{Cu} \mathrm{K} \alpha$ |
| $2 \theta$ range $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | $5.0080-129.9750$ |
| Step size | 0.017 |
| No. of refined parameters | 124 |
| $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{B}}(\%)$ | 7.48 |
| $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{P}}(\%)$ | 2.53 |
| $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{WP}}(\%)$ | 3.66 |
| S | 2.18 |

Table S2 Atomic coordinate, thermal vibration parameter, Wyckoff position, and occupancy for CYBO:
$0.15 \mathrm{Eu}^{3+}$

| Atom | $\mathrm{x} / \mathrm{a}$ | $\mathrm{y} / \mathrm{b}$ | $\mathrm{z} / \mathrm{c}$ | Uiso | Site. | Occ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ca1 | $0.3237(4)$ | 0.25 | $0.5326(3)$ | 0.0014 | 4 c | 0.252 |
| Y1 | $0.3237(4)$ | 0.25 | $0.5326(3)$ | 0.0014 | 4 c | 0.692 |
| Eu1 | $0.3237(4)$ | 0.25 | $0.5326(3)$ | 0.0014 | 4 c | 0.056 |
| Y2 | $0.1939(5)$ | $0.1277(2)$ | $0.1554(4)$ | 0.0038 | 8 d | 0.139 |
| Eu2 | $0.1939(5)$ | $0.1277(2)$ | $0.1554(4)$ | 0.0038 | 8 d | 0.011 |
| Ca2 | $0.1939(5)$ | $0.1277(2)$ | $0.1554(4)$ | 0.0038 | 8 d | 0.850 |
| Y3 | $0.4792(4)$ | $0.5838(2)$ | $0.1757(3)$ | 0.0045 | 8 d | 0.440 |
| Eu3 | $0.4792(4)$ | $0.5838(2)$ | $0.1757(3)$ | 0.0045 | 8 d | 0.036 |
| Ca3 | $0.4792(4)$ | $0.5838(2)$ | $0.1757(3)$ | 0.0045 | 8 d | 0.524 |
| B1 | 0.4900 | 0.25 | 0.2500 | 0.0063 | 4 c | 1 |
| B2 | 0.2770 | 0.75 | 0.3560 | 0.0063 | 4 c | 1 |
| B3 | 0.3280 | 0.4560 | 0.4510 | 0.0063 | $8 d$ | 1 |
| O1 | $0.5452(1)$ | 0.25 | $0.0704(1)$ | 0.0063 | $8 d$ | 1 |
| O2 | $0.3495(2)$ | 0.25 | $0.2483(2)$ | 0.0063 | 4 c | 1 |
| O3 | $0.6737(2)$ | 0.25 | $0.5012(2)$ | 0.0063 | 4 c | 1 |
| O4 | $0.7659(2)$ | $0.6803(5)$ | $0.2265(1)$ | 0.0063 | $8 d$ | 1 |
| O5 | $0.6052(1)$ | $0.5907(7)$ | $0.4543(1)$ | 0.0063 | $8 d$ | 1 |
|  | $0.2825(1)$ | $0.4776(6)$ | $0.9907(1)$ | 0.0063 | $8 d$ | 1 |
|  | $0.3661(1)$ | $0.4671(7)$ | $0.2943(1)$ | 0.0063 | $8 d$ | 1 |

Table S3 Bond distance and bond angle for CYBO: $0.15 \mathrm{Eu}^{3+}$

| Bond |  | Symmetry Operation | Length ( $\AA$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Y1\|Ca1|Eu1 | O4 | $1-\mathrm{x}, 1-\mathrm{y}, 1-\mathrm{z}$ | 2.4134(3) |
|  | O4 | $1-\mathrm{x},-0.5+\mathrm{y}, 1-\mathrm{z}$ | 2.4134(3) |
|  | O2 | $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{z}$ | 2.4398 (3) |
|  | O1 | -0.5+x, $0.5-\mathrm{y}, 0.5-\mathrm{z}$ | 2.4674(3) |
|  | O1 | -0.5+x, y, 0.5-z | 2.4674(3) |
|  | O5 | $1-\mathrm{x}, 1-\mathrm{y}, 1-\mathrm{z}$ | $2.5195(1)$ |
|  | O5 | $1-\mathrm{x},-0.5+\mathrm{y}, 1-\mathrm{z}$ | 2.5195(1) |
|  | O3 | $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{z}$ | 2.5219(3) |
|  | Average |  | 2.4365 |
| $\mathrm{Ca} 2\|\mathrm{Y} 2\| \mathrm{Eu} 2$ | O6 | $\mathrm{x}, 0.5-\mathrm{y},-1+\mathrm{z}$ | $2.2460(3)$ |
|  | O7 | $\mathrm{x}, 0.5-\mathrm{y}, \mathrm{z}$ | $2.2553(4)$ |
|  | O3 | -0.5+x, $0.5-\mathrm{y}, 0.5-\mathrm{z}$ | $2.3230(3)$ |
|  | O2 | $x, y, z$ | 2.3354(3) |
|  | O1 | -0.5+x, $0.5-\mathrm{y}, 0.5-\mathrm{z}$ | $2.6811(4)$ |
|  | O1 | $\mathrm{x}, 0.5-\mathrm{y}, \mathrm{z}$ | $2.7219(4)$ |
|  | 07 | -0.5+x, $0.5-\mathrm{y}, 0.5-\mathrm{z}$ | $2.8025(4)$ |
|  | O5 | $0.5-\mathrm{x},-0.5+\mathrm{y},-0.5+\mathrm{z}$ | 2.8071(4) |
|  | Average |  | 2.5215 |
| $\mathrm{Ca} 3\|\mathrm{Y} 3\| \mathrm{Eu} 3$ | 07 | $x, y, z$ | 2.2242 (3) |
|  | O4 | $-0.5+x, y, 0.5-z$ | 2.2943 (3) |
|  | O6 | $1-\mathrm{x}, 1-\mathrm{y}, 1-\mathrm{z}$ | $2.4176(3)$ |
|  | O1 | $1-x, 1-y,-z$ | $2.5450(3)$ |
|  | O5 | $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{z}$ | 2.5514(3) |
|  | O4 | $x, y, z$ | 2.5762(3) |
|  | O6 | $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y},-1+\mathrm{z}$ | $2.6816(3)$ |
|  | Average |  | 2.4701 |
| B1 | O1 | $\mathrm{x}, 0.5-\mathrm{y}, \mathrm{z}$ | 1.3056(9) |
|  | O1 | $x, y, z$ | $1.3056(9)$ |
|  | O2 | $x, y, z$ | $1.4584(1)$ |
|  | Average |  | 1.3565 |
| B2 | O3 | $1-\mathrm{x}, 0.5+\mathrm{y}, 1-\mathrm{z}$ | 1.2721(2) |
|  | O4 | $-0.5+x, y, 0.5-z$ | $1.2921(8)$ |
|  | O4 | -0.5+x, 1.5-y, 0.5-z | $1.2921(8)$ |
|  | Average |  | 1.2854 |
| B3 | O5 | $1-\mathrm{x}, 1-\mathrm{y}, 1-\mathrm{z}$ | $1.1866(1)$ |
|  | O6 | $0.5-\mathrm{x}, 1-\mathrm{y},-0.5+\mathrm{z}$ | 1.3408(9) |
|  | 07 | $x, y, z$ | 1.3790(1) |
|  | Average |  | 1.3021 |

Table $\mathbf{S 4}$ Bond distance and bond angle for $\mathrm{Ca}_{3} \mathrm{Eu}_{2} \mathrm{~B}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{12}$

| Bond |  | Symmetry Operation | Length ( $\AA$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eu1\|Ca1 | O2 | $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{z}$ | 2.3304(8) |
|  | O4 | $1-\mathrm{x},-0.5+\mathrm{y}, 1-\mathrm{z}$ | 2.4167(7) |
|  | O4 | $1-x, 1-y, 1-z$ | 2.4167(7) |
|  | O3 | $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{z}$ | 2.4279(1) |
|  | O5 | $1-\mathrm{x},-0.5+\mathrm{y}, 1-\mathrm{z}$ | $2.4430(7)$ |
|  | O5 | $1-\mathrm{x}, 1-\mathrm{y}, 1-\mathrm{z}$ | 2.4430(7) |
|  | O1 | $-0.5+x, y, 0.5-\mathrm{z}$ | 2.4521(7) |
|  | O1 | -0.5+x, 0.5-y, 0.5-z | 2.4521(7) |
|  | Average |  | 2.4215 |
| Ca2\|Eu2 | O6 | $\mathrm{x}, 0.5-\mathrm{y},-1+\mathrm{z}$ | 2.3054(7) |
|  | 07 | $\mathrm{x}, 0.5-\mathrm{y}, \mathrm{z}$ | $2.3572(7)$ |
|  | O3 | $-0.5+x, 0.5-y, 0.5-z$ | 2.371(5) |
|  | O2 | $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{z}$ | $2.4855(6)$ |
|  | O7 | $-0.5+x, 0.5-y, 0.5-z$ | 2.5408(8) |
|  | O1 | $-0.5+x, 0.5-y, 0.5-z$ | $2.6927(7)$ |
|  | O1 | x, $0.5-\mathrm{y}$, z | 2.7869(8) |
|  | O5 | $0.5-\mathrm{x},-0.5+\mathrm{y},-0.5+\mathrm{z}$ | 2.8507(7) |
|  | Average |  | 2.5504 |
| $\mathrm{Ca3} 3 \mathrm{Eu} 3$ | 07 | $x, y, z$ | 2.3594(7) |
|  | O4 | $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{z}$ | 2.3981(7) |
|  | O6 | $1-x, 1-y, 1-z$ | 2.4030(7) |
|  | O4 | -0.5+x, y, 0.5-z | 2.4102(7) |
|  | O5 | $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{z}$ | $2.5217(7)$ |
|  | O1 | $1-x, 1-y,-z$ | 2.5774(6) |
|  | O6 | $x, y,-1+z$ | 2.6092(7) |
|  | Average |  | 2.4685 |
| B1 | O2 | $x, y, z$ | $1.3609(9)$ |
|  | O1 | x, 0.5-y, z | $1.3685(6)$ |
|  | O1 | $x, y, z$ | 1.3685(6) |
| Average |  |  |  |
| B2 | O3 | 1-x, 0.5+y, 1-z | 1.3451(8) |
|  | O4 | $-0.5+x, 1.5-y, 0.5-z$ | 1.3560(6) |
|  | O4 | $-0.5+\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, 0.5-\mathrm{z}$ | 1.3560(6) |
| Average |  |  |  |
| B3 | O6 | 0.5-x, 1-y, -0.5+z | 1.3183(6) |
|  | O5 | $1-x, 1-y, 1-z$ | 1.3222(7) |
|  | O7 | $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{z}$ | $1.3395(7)$ |
|  | Average |  |  |

- Details for the calculation of quantum yield experiment

Absorption rate and quantum yield are calculated as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
& A=\frac{\left(L_{b}-L_{c}\right)}{L_{b}}  \tag{1}\\
& \emptyset_{f}=\frac{\left[E_{c}-(1-A) \cdot E_{b}\right]}{L_{b} \cdot A} \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

Where A is the absorbance of the sample calculated by integrating the emission spectrum intensity; $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{b}}$ is the scattering intensity of the surface of the integrating sphere obtained when the sample is not placed in the optical path; $L_{c}$ is the scattering intensity of the surface of the integrating sphere when the detected sample is present; $\Phi_{\mathrm{f}}$ is the quantum yield of the calculated sample; $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{b}}$ is the luminescence intensity detected at the time of the sample not placed in the optical path; $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{c}}$ is the emission intensity when the detected sample is present; $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{a}}$ is the scattering of the integrating sphere itself.

Here, since the excitation light and the phosphor are not in the same optical path, $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{b}}$ is equivalent to the scattering of the surface of the integrating sphere when no sample is placed. In this sense, $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{b}}$ represents the scattering of the integrating sphere itself, i.e. $L_{a}=L_{b}$.

Quantum yield, which is commonly considered as the internal quantum efficiency, according to its physical definition:

QY $=$ (Photons • Emitted) / (Photons • Absorbed)
It means that the single "molecule" in the compound emits a photon after being excited by the light source, it is not "total emission photon/total absorption photon" in number, although in many cases the two are approximately equal. Combining the analysis of the emission spectrum intensity before, we have realized that the quantum yield is not equal to the emission spectrum intensity, that is, high quantum yield does not mean that the luminescence intensity is high, even though they are similar in some cases and have a consistent pattern. The definition of quantum yield refers to a single compound or molecule. Therefore, if the number of defects is large, the integrity of a single compound molecule is "destroyed", and the quantum yield measured at this
time has not yet reached a maximum value, even if the luminescence intensity is the best among a given series of compounds. This also shows that the quantum yield is positively correlated with the crystallinity to a certain extent, which explains why the quantum yield can not only evaluate the sensitivity and interference degree of the fluorescent material to be measured, but also evaluate the purity of the material.
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