## **Electronic Supplementary Information**

## Hydroxyapatite supported antibacterial Ag<sub>3</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> nanoparticles

Joanna J. Buckley,<sup>*a*</sup> Adam F. Lee,<sup>*b*</sup>\* Luca Olivi<sup>*c*</sup> and Karen Wilson<sup>*b*</sup>

Porosimetry



Figure S1: Pore size distribution for HA-H support.



Figure S2a. Adsorption and desorption isotherms for high and low loading Ag-HA-L sample. Inset shows BET surface areas across series.



Figure S2b. Adsorption and desorption isotherms for high and low loading Ag-HA-H sample. Inset shows BET surface areas across series.



**Powder X-ray Diffraction (XRD)** 

Figure S3a. Wide angle powder XRD scans of Ag-HA-L samples (left) and silver standards (right)



Figure S3b. Wide angle powder XRD scans of Ag-HA-H samples (left) and silver standards (right)

X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy (XPS)



**Figure S4.** Ag 3d of Ag-HA-L



X-ray Absorption Near Edge Spectroscopy (XANES)

**Figure S5:** Normalised Ag-K edge XANES spectra for Ag-HA-L (left) and Ag-HA-H (right) samples showing linear combination fits (dark line) to silver standards





Figure S6a. k<sup>3</sup>-weighted EXAFS of 6.87 wt % Ag-HA-L



**Figure S6b.** k<sup>3</sup>-weighted EXAFS of 5.56 wt % and 3.27 wt% Ag-HA-H

Table S1. Fitted EXAF	parameters f	or high	loading A	Ag-HA sa	imples
		~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	2	2	

Sample	CN1 Ag-Ag	CN2 Ag-Ag	R1 <sub>Ag-Ag</sub>	R2 <sub>Ag-Ag</sub>	$\sigma 1_{Ag-Ag}$	$\sigma 1_{Ag-Ag}$	R-factor		
6.87 wt % Ag-HA-L	9.1	3	2.88	4.07	0.02	0.04	54.7		
5.56 wt % Ag-HA-H	9	2.9	2.88	4.06	0.02	0.02	34.0		

Table S2. Fitted EXAFS parameters for 3.27 wt% Ag-HA-H sample

I ubic			n n o p	urunitere	10 101	5.21	1101	19 111	1 11 50	inpro					
CN1 <sub>Ag-P</sub>	CN2 <sub>Ag-O</sub>	CN3 <sub>Ag-Ag</sub>	CN4 <sub>Ag-O</sub>	CN5 <sub>Ag-Ag</sub>	R1 <sub>Ag-P</sub>	R2 <sub>Ag-O</sub>	R3 <sub>Ag-Ag</sub>	R4 <sub>Ag-O</sub>	R5 <sub>Ag-Ag</sub>	$\sigma 1_{Ag\text{-}P}$	$\sigma 2_{Ag\text{-}O}$	$\sigma 3_{Ag\text{-}Ag}$	$\sigma 4_{Ag\text{-}O}$	$\sigma 5_{Ag\text{-}Ag}$	R-factor
1	2	6	2	4	1.32	1.41	2.13	2.72	3.00	0.02	0.04	0.04	0.033	0.025	80.3

## **Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM)**



0.29 wt% Ag-HA-L



0.31 wt% Ag-HA-H



6.87 wt% Ag-HA-L



5.56 wt% Ag-HA-H

## **Dissolution profiles**



**Figure S7.** Normalised concentration of leached silver from representative low, medium and high loading Ag-HA-L (left) and Ag-HA-H (right) samples

Sample	Rate constant/ ppm min <sup>-1</sup> (± 0.05)
Ag <sub>3</sub> PO <sub>4</sub>	0.028
AgO	0.0080
SSD	0.00040
0.067 wt %	1.33
0.29 wt %	1.24
0.69 wt %	0.97
1.19 wt %	0.67
3.03 wt %	0.38
6.87 wt %	0.063

Table 3. Ag<sup>+</sup> dissolution rates for standards and Ag-HA-L samples in water

Table 4 Ag<sup>+</sup> dissolution rates for standards and Ag-HA-H samples in water

Sample	Rate constant/ ppm min <sup>-1</sup> (± 0.05)
Ag <sub>3</sub> PO <sub>4</sub>	0.028
AgO	0.0080
SSD	0.00040
0.045 wt %	1.37
0.31 wt %	1.26
0.59 wt %	1.17
1.39 wt %	1.02
3.27 wt %	0.59
5.56 wt %	0.093

**Zones of Inhibition** 6.87 wt % 3.03 wt % 1.19 wt % 0.69 wt % 0.29 wt % 6 SW **HA-L** support 0.067 wt % Ag,O AgO Figure S8a. Zones of inhibition of Ag-HA-L for 1 ginosa 8626 NCIMB 3 6.87 wt % 3.03 wt % 1.19 wt % 0.69 wt % 0.29 wt % Sus 0.067 wt % Ag<sub>3</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> sterile water Ag<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub>

Figure S8b. Zones of inhibition of Ag-HA-L for Staphylococcus aureus 10788 NCTC



Figure S8c. Zones of inhibition of Ag-HA-H for F

ginosa 8626 NCIMB



**Figure S8d**. Zones of inhibition of Ag-HA-H for *Staphylococcus aureus 10788 NCTC* **Log reduction kill tests** 



Figure S9. Comparison of normalised bacteria kill tests for *S. aureus* using  $\sim$ 3 wt % and  $\sim$ 0.2 wt % Ag loaded mesoporous Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> versus HA-L or HA-H



**Figure S10.** Comparison of normalised bacteria kill tests for *S. aureus* using  $\sim$ 3 wt % and  $\sim$ 0.15 wt % Ag loaded low are amorphous versus high area mesoporous Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>