Electronic supplementary information (ESI) for

Cu₃P Nanowire Enabling High-Efficiency, Reliable, and Energy-Efficient Low-Voltage Electroporation-Inactivation of Pathogens in Water **†**

*Zheng-Yang Huo^{ab}, Jian-Feng Zhou^b, Yutong Wu^c, Yin-Hu Wu^a, Hai Liu^a, Nian Liu^c, Hong-Ying Hu^{*ad}, and Xing Xie^{*b}*

^aEnvironmental Simulation and Pollution Control State Key Joint Laboratory, State Environmental Protection Key Laboratory of Microorganism Application and Risk Control (SMARC), School of Environment, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, PR China. E-mail: hyhu@tsinghua.edu.cn; Tel: +86-10-6279-4005.

^bSchool of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia 30332, United States. E-mail: xing.xie@ce.gatech.edu; Tel: +1-404-894-9723.

^cSchool of Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia 30332, United States.

^dShenzhen Environmental Science and New Energy Technology Engineering Laboratory, Tsinghua-Berkeley Shenzhen Institute, Shenzhen 518055, PR China.

* Corresponding author:

Hong-Ying Hu: E-mail: hyhu@tsinghua.edu.cn; Tel: +86-10-6279-4005

Xing Xie: E-mail: xing.xie@ce.gatech.edu; Tel: +1-404-894-9723

Table of Contents

- 1. Experimental section
- 2. Figures
 - 2.1. Fig. S1. SEM images of Cu(OH)₂NW-Cu electrode.
 - 2.2. Fig. S2. SEM images of Cu₃PNW-Cu electrode.
 - 2.3. Fig. S3. SEM image and the corresponding EDX elemental analysis.
 - 2.4. Fig. S4. The elemental analysis using ICP-OES.
 - 2.5. Fig. S5. STEM images of a Cu₃PNW.
 - 2.6. Fig. S6. STEM images and the corresponding EDX elemental mapping analysis.
 - 2.7. Fig. S7. Electric currents during EDC operation.
 - 2.8. Fig. S8. Electric currents with alternating current.
 - 2.9. Fig. S9. The bacterial inactivation efficiency for different operation cycles.
 - 2.10. Fig. S10. SEM images of the Cu(OH)₂NW-Cu electrode after 4-h EDC operation.
 - 2.11. Fig. S11. Electrochemical characterization.
 - 2.12. Fig. S12. SEM image of the Cu₃PNW-Cu electrode after 12 h EDC operation.

3. Tables

- 3.1. Table S1: General information of the lake water.
- 3.2. Table S2: Energy consumption of the EDC operation.

1. Experimental section

1.1. Electrode fabrication and device construction.

The Cu mesh (Alfa Aesar, 100 mesh, 0.11 mm as wire diameter) was washed with 1 M HCl (Sigma) and subsequently with deionized water for 3 times to remove surface impurities. The washed Cu mesh was then anodized in an alkali solution (1.5 M NaOH, Sigma) for 20 min under 1.5 mA cm^{-2} to fabricated the Cu(OH)₂ nanowire-assisted copper mesh (Cu(OH)₂NW-Cu) electrode using a potentiostat (BioLogic, VMP3). To prepare Cu₃P nanowires (Cu₃PNWs), excess sodium hypophosphite (Sigma) was placed at the center of the tube furnace. After flushed with Ar for 15 min, the center of the furnace was elevated to 300 °C and the Cu(OH)₂NW-Cu electrode was placed at the downstream with temperature about 100 °C. After 2 h, the furnace was cooled down naturally to room temperature under Ar atmosphere and the Cu₃PNW-assisted copper mesh (Cu₃PNW-Cu) electrode was obtained. Two of the Cu₃PNW-Cu or Cu(OH)₂NW-Cu electrodes were then fitted into a plexiglass coaxial electrode holder to prepare an electroporation disinfection cell (EDC). The distance between the two electrodes was fixed at 100 µm.

1.2. Material characterization.

The morphology of the electrodes was characterized by a scanning electron microscope (SEM, Zeiss, LEO 1530) and a scanning transmission electron microscope (STEM, Tecnai, G2 F30), respectively. The corresponding element distribution was analyzed by energy dispersive X-ray (EDX) spectroscopy on the SEM (Zeiss, LEO 1530) and the STEM (Tecnai, G2 F30). The atomic ratio of Cu and P was analyzed by inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectrometry (ICP-OES, PerkinElmer, Optima 8000). A piece of 1 cm² prepared Cu₃PNW-Cu electrode underwent

ultrasonic treatment in 5 mL water for 5 min. Removed the electrode and added 5 mL of HNO_3 (2 M; Sigma) into the solution to dissolve the detached Cu_3PNWs , and the Cu and P concentration was measured using the ICP-OES (PerkinElmer, Optima 8000). The crystalline structure of the samples was analyzed by X-ray diffraction (XRD, PANalytical, Alpha 1 MPD). The chemical compositions were analyzed by an X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) with an Axis Ultra instrument (Kratos Analytical, K-alpha) under ultrahigh vacuum (<10⁻⁸ Torr) and by using a monochromatic Al K α X-ray source.

1.3. Bacterial inactivation performance analysis.

Bacterial inactivation by EDC operation was demonstrated using four model bacteria Escherichia coli (E. coli, ATCC 15597), Enterobacter hormaechei (E. hormaechei, ATCC 700323), Enterococcus durans (E. durans, ATCC 6056), and Bacillus subtilis (B. subtilis, ATCC 6051). Bacteria samples were cultured in a tryptic soy broth (TSB, Sigma) to log phase (12 h) and harvested by centrifugation at 1500 g and suspended in deionized water. After washed with deionized water for 3 times, bacteria cells were suspended in deionized water to achieve the desired concentration of ~10⁷ colony forming units per milliliter (CFU mL⁻¹). The *E. coli* were also dispersed into the lake water (after 0.2 µm membrane filtration) to ~10⁷ CFU mL⁻¹. Each water sample flowed through the EDC device at a designated flow rate. Varying voltages (1 to 5 V) applied by Keithley 2400 sourcemeter were applied across the two electrodes. Given that the crosssection area of the electrode (φ 0.375 inch) was 0.713 cm², flow rates were kept in the range of 1.2-19.2 mL min⁻¹, corresponding to flux of 1.0 to 16.0 m³ h⁻¹ m⁻². After treated for 4 min, the bacteria samples were collected. The bacteria concentrations in the influent (C_{in}) and effluent (C_{eff}) samples were measured using a standard spread plating technique.[1] Each sample was serially diluted and each dilution was plated in triplicate. All the results for each sample were averaged and the standard deviation was calculated. Bacterial inactivation efficiency was calculated [$E = -\log (C_{eff}/C_{in})$] to evaluate the inactivation performance.

1.4. Long-term bacterial inactivation test.

The long-term inactivation performance of the EDC was tested by treating the prepared bacterial samples (*E. coli*, log phase, ~10⁷ CFU mL⁻¹) for a continuous 12-h period and monitoring the bacterial inactivation efficiency over time. The applied voltage was fixed at 1 V and the flux was fixed at 2.0 m³ h⁻¹ m⁻². The long-term inactivation performance of the EDC was also evaluated by treating bacterial samples (*E. coli*, log phase, ~10⁷ CFU mL⁻¹) for different cycles. During each cycle, the Cu₃PNW-Cu electrode treated the bacterial sample for 30 min. After a 30-min operation, the bacterial inactivation efficiency was analyzed. The electrode was taken out carefully dried in a desiccator (VWR) for 2 h. After the drying process, the electrode was then put into the EDC for the next cycle's operation. The applied voltage was fixed at 1 V and the flux was fixed at 2 m³ h⁻¹ m⁻².

1.5. Bacterial inactivation mechanism analysis.

The bacterial inactivation mechanism was analyzed by using a waveform generator (Rigol, DG5352) generating electric pulses (fixed peak voltage of 1 V) with different frequencies ranging from 1 to 3.5×10^8 Hz to the electrodes during the operation. The bacteria inactivation efficiency was analyzed at different frequencies. The bacteria morphology was analyzed by SEM (Zeiss, LEO 1530). All bacterial samples for SEM were harvested by centrifugation at 1500 g for 15 min at 15 °C and supernatants were removed. Then bacteria were fixed overnight in the fixative

containing 0.1 M phosphate-buffered solution (pH 7.3; Sigma), 2% glutaraldehyde (Sigma), and 4% paraformaldehyde (Sigma) at 4 °C. Samples were then dehydrated with increasing concentrations of an ethanol solution (50, 70, 90, and 100%; Sigma) and dried in 100% *tert*-Butyl alcohol (Sigma). Samples were dispersed on a metal grid in preparation for SEM characterization. The bacteria membrane integrity was analyzed by PI dye staining experiment. Bacterial samples (*E. coli*, log phase, ~10⁷ CFU mL⁻¹) before and after EDC operation were collected and 10 μ L of 1 mg mL⁻¹ propidium iodide (PI; Sigma) dye solution was added into 10 mL of each bacteria sample for a final concentration of 1 μ g mL⁻¹. Samples were examined using fluorescent microscopy.

1.6. Electrode release mechanisms analysis.

The electrode release process was investigated for a continuous 12-h period EDC operation (1 V and 2.0 m³ h⁻¹ m⁻²). The released Cu concentration in the EDC effluent was measured as follows: (1) a 1-mL aliquot of effluent was collected and dosed in 1-mL HNO₃ (2 M; Sigma) ensuring the final HNO₃ concentration to 1 M and analyzed by the Copper Test Kit (HACH, porphyrin method) to determine the total Cu concentration (C_T); (2) another 1-mL aliquot was centrifuged (HITACHI RX2 series) at 14500 rpm, corresponding to 17600 g, for 15 min under 15 °C, and the Cu concentration in the supernatant was measured by the Copper Test Kit to determine the dissolved Cu²⁺ concentration (C_{dis}); (3) the suspended Cu particles caused by detaching (C_{det}) was then calculated [$C_{det} = C_T - C_{dis}$]. The electrodes after operation were taken out from the EDC carefully and dried in a desiccator (VWR) overnight. After drying, the Cu₃PNW-Cu electrodes were characterized using SEM (Zeiss, LEO 1530), XRD (PANalytical, Alpha 1 MPD) and XPS (Kratos Analytical, K-alpha) to determine the morphology, the structure, and composition changes, respectively.

2. Figures



Fig. S1. Scanning electron microscope (SEM) images of Cu(OH)₂ nanowire-assisted copper

mesh (Cu(OH)₂NW-Cu) electrode.



Fig. S2. SEM images of Cu₃P nanowire-assisted copper mesh (Cu₃PNW-Cu) electrode.



Fig. S3. SEM image and the corresponding energy dispersive X-ray (EDX) elemental analysis

of Cu and P for a Cu₃PNW.



Fig. S4. The elemental analysis using inductively coupled plasma optical emission spectrometry (ICP-OES) for Cu₃PNWs.



Fig. S5. The scanning transmission electron microscope (STEM) images for a Cu₃PNW. The

scale bar is $0.5 \ \mu m$.



Fig. S6. The STEM images and the corresponding EDX elemental mapping images of P and

Cu for a Cu₃PNW. The scale bar is 0.5 μ m.



Fig. S7. Electric currents during EDC operation. Applied voltages were ranging from 1 to 5 V and the flux was fixed at 2 m³ h⁻¹ m⁻².



Fig. S8. Electric currents (peak currents) with alternating current (AC) with frequencies varying from 1 to 3.5×10^8 Hz. The peak voltage was fixed at 1 V and the flux was fixed at 2 m³ h⁻¹ m⁻². As the frequency increased, current decreased. This indicated fewer electrochemical reactions occurred.



Fig. S9. The bacterial inactivation efficiency of the Cu₃PNW-Cu electrode for different operation cycles. During each cycle, the Cu₃PNW-Cu electrode treated bacterial samples (*E. coli*, log phase, $\sim 10^7$ CFU mL⁻¹) for 30 min. The applied voltage was fixed at 1 V and the flux was fixed at 2 m³ h⁻¹ m⁻².



Fig. S10. SEM image of the Cu(OH)₂NW-Cu electrode after 4-h EDC operation.



Fig. S11. Electrochemical characterization. Cyclic voltammograms (CV) test for the $Cu(OH)_2NW$ -Cu and Cu₃PNW-Cu electrodes were performed using a BioLogic VMP3 potentiostat. A double junction Ag|AgCl|KCl (3.5M) reference electrode (RE) was used in the measurement. CV test was carried out in the potential range -0.7 V to 0.5 V vs. RE under a sweep rate of 10 mV s⁻¹.



Fig. S12. SEM image of the Cu₃PNW-Cu electrode serving as negative electrode after 12 h

EDC operation. The scale bar is 1 µm.

3. Tables

Name	Location	рН	Total dissolved solids (mg L ⁻¹)	Conductivity (uS cm ⁻¹)
Allatoona	34°08'27.6"N	67	83	170
Lake	84°40'37.6"W	0.7		

Table S1. General information of the lake water.

Table S2. Energy consumption of the EDC operation.

Flow rate ^a	Applied voltage	Current	Energy Consumption ^b
(mL h ⁻¹)	(V)	(µA)	(J L ⁻¹)
142	1	45	1.2

^a Flow rate = Flux \times area

Flux = 2000 L·h⁻¹·m⁻²; r = 0.475 cm; Area = $\pi \times r^2 = 0.708$ cm²

^b Energy Consumption = (Applied Voltage × Current) / Flow rate.

Reference:

Allen, M.J., S.C. Edberg, and D.J. Reasoner, *Heterotrophic plate count bacteria—what is their significance in drinking water?* International journal of food microbiology, 2004. 92(3): p. 265-274.