Electronic Supplementary Material (ESI) for Catalysis Science & Technology. This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2016

1 2	Electronic Supplementary Information:
3	Esterification of Fatty Acids from Waste Cooking Oil to Biodiesel Over a
4	Sulfonated Resin/PVA Composite
5	
6	Honglei Zhang ^{<i>a,b</i>} , Jiarui Gao ^{<i>a</i>} , Zengdian Zhao ^{<i>c</i>} , George Z. Chen ^{<i>a, b, d</i>} , Tao Wu ^{<i>a</i>} and Feng He* ^{<i>e</i>}
7	
8	^a Key Laboratory of Clean Energy Conversion Technologies, The University of Nottingham Ningbo
9	China, Ningbo, 315100, P.R. China
10	^b Department of Chemical and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, The University of
11	Nottingham, Nottingham, NG7 2RD, UK
12	° School of Chemical Engineering, Shandong University of Technology, Zibo, 255049, P. R. China
13	^d International Academy of Marine Economy and Technology, The University of Nottingham Ningbo
14	China, Ningbo, 315100, P.R. China
15	^e College of Environment, Zhejiang University of Technology, Hangzhou, Zhejiang 310014, P. R.
16	China
17	
18	
19	
20	*Corresponding author:
21	Feng He (fengyhe0001@163.com) 086-571-88871509 (ph) 086-571-88871509 (fax)
22 23	
24 25	

1 Experimental Section

2 1. Materials

PVA with a polymerization degree of 1750±50 was obtained from Tianjin Kermel Chemical Reagents 3 Ltd., China. Sulfonated cation exchange resin (s-CER), NKC-9 in acidic form (average size of 0.83 mm, 4 5 see Table S1 for more details), was purchased from the Nankai Group. The average particle size of the grounded s-CER analyzed by laser scattering particle analyzer (BT-9300H, Dandong Baite Instrument 6 CO., Ltd. Dandong, China) was 24.96 µm. FFAs obtained from WCO with an acid value of 152.3 mg 7 KOH g⁻¹ was kindly supplied by Hubei Haolin Bioenergy Company and filtered to remove impurities. 8 No water was detected by a Karl Fischer water tester with a sensitivity of 500 ppm (KF-1A, Shanghai 9 Precision and Scientific Instrument Co. Ltd., China). The average molecular weight of the FFAs was 371 10 g mol-1 calculated by saponification value. The sources of WCO were broad and the extracted FFAs 11 contained trace sulfur (140 ppm). The main compositions of the FFAs analyzed by a GC-MS (6890N 12 13 GC/5973 MS, Agilent) were dodecanoic acid, tetradecanoic acid, hexadecanoic acid and octadecadienoic acid. The detailed information of the FFAs is provided in Table S2. The other chemicals were all 14 analytical reagent (AR) grade and used without further purification. 15

16

17 2. Physical characterization

The composite samples were freeze-dried at 213 K in vacuum and then fractured to expose the cross-18 sectional area in liquid nitrogen. The composite samples for measurement of scanning electron 19 microscope (SEM) were coated by gold via sputtering at 20 mA for 180 s. The cross-section morphology 20 of the composite was inspected under a Zeiss Ultra plus field-emission scanning electron microscope 21 (FESEM) (Zeiss Co.) equipped with an energy dispersive X-ray (EDX) detector operating at an 22 accelerating voltage of 10 kV. The composites annealed at different temperatures were characterized by 23 24 a TENSOR-37 Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR) (Bruker Co.) operated by attenuated total reflectance (ATR) in the wave number range of 4000-500 cm⁻¹. The thermal stability of the composites 25 was investigated using a STA449 F3 Jupiter (Netzsch Co.). Thermo gravimetric analysis (TGA) was 26

carried out under a nitrogen atmosphere at a heating rate of 10 K min⁻¹ from 323 to 773 K. Ion exchange 1 capacity (IEC) indicates the number of milli equivalents of ions (H⁺) in dry composite of unit quality.[1] 2 The IEC of the composites was obtained using the KOH titration method. The reported values were the 3 4 mean of at least five measurements and the average experimental error was $\pm 5\%$. Swelling degree (SD) represents the swelling status of the composite in the solvent and was measured according to Caetano's 5 method.[2] SD was calculated by dividing the initial sample mass by the mass difference between swollen 6 sample and initial sample. The porosity of the composite flake was obtained by dividing the mass 7 difference between dry and water-saturated composite by area and thickness according to Ding's 8 method.[3] Sulfur content in the FFAs and biodiesel were tested by a micro-coulometry analyzer (WK-9 2D, Jianfen Electrochemical Instrument CO., LTD. China) and water content was detected by a Karl 10 Fischer water tester. The elemental composition of the samples was studied by elemental analysis with a 11 12 Perkin-Elmer 2400 Series II CHNS/O analyzer (PerkinElmer Co.). Analyses of FFAs and FAME were performed on a GC (7890B, Agilent) equipped with a HP-5 column. The temperatures of the injector and 13 FID detector were both at 523 K. The oven temperature was ramped from 333 K to 513 K at a rate of 10 14 15 K min⁻¹ and held at 513 K for 10 min.

16

17 3. Esterification catalyzed by s-CER/PVA

18 For the esterification reaction, the composite flakes were cut into small pieces (about 0.5 cm \times 0.5 cm) to achieve better contact with the reactants and to remove the influence of diffusion on esterification. The 19 FFAs were first introduced into the reactor and heated to the desired temperature. Then the desired amount 20 of the methanol and the composite flakes were added into the reactor and the reaction began at pre-21 determined conditions. The samples were taken out from the reactor every hour and treated by 22 23 decompression distillation to remove unreacted methanol and water produced to determine acid value and FFAs conversion. After completion, the reaction mixture was poured into a separating funnel and allowed 24 to settle for 1 h to separate the excess methanol and the biodiesel. The biodiesel was further purified by 25 decompression distillation to remove excess methanol and other impurities. The compositions of the 26

biodiesel were analyzed by GC (7890B, Agilent) and listed in Table S4. In reusability experiments, the
 composites were reused in the next run without further treatment.

3

4 The optimal reaction conditions were comprehensively studied and the results are listed in Fig. S1. As an 5 example, the FFAs conversion increased from 63. 2% to 86.3 % with the increase of methanol/FFAs mass 6 ratio from 0.5: 1 to 2.5: 1 (Fig. S1(a)). However, the FFAs conversion decreased to 74.3 % when the mass 7 ratio further increased to 4: 1, which is mainly because the excess methanol would adsorb on the catalytic 8 membrane surface and decrease the catalytic activity or even deactivate the composite. Therefore, the 9 optimal methanol/FFAs mass ratio is 2.5: 1 in the reaction system.





Fig. S1. Esterification of FFAs catalyzed by s-CER/PVA (mass ratio =3: 2) under different reaction
conditions. The results were used to optimize reaction conditions. (a) Effect of methanol: FFAs mass
ratio; (b) Effect of catalyst loading; (c) Effect of mechanical stirring rate; (d) Effect of catalyst thickness;
(e) Effect of catalyst dimension; (f) Effect of catalyst porosity (the different porosities of catalysts were
obtained using different ethanol/water ratio during phase inversion); (g) Effect of reaction time (the
equilibrium time for esterification was 8 h); and (h) the equilibrium conversion under the optimal reaction
conditions according to results from (a)-(g).



6 Fig. S2. FTIR spectra of PVA, s-CER and s-CER/PVA composites (mass ratio 3: 2) annealed at 323,







2 Fig. S3. Effect of reaction temperature on esterification (Reaction conditions: FFAs 20 g, methanol 50







Fig. S4. Linear relationships between ln([FFAs]/[FFAs]₀) and reaction time t for esterification
reactions catalyzed by ground s-CER, PVA, s-CER/PVA and H₂SO₄ (Reaction conditions: FFAs 20 g,
methanol 50 g, catalyst loading 4 g except H₂SO₄ (1 g, same numbe of H⁺ as 4 g s-CER), reaction
temperature 338 K and stirring rate 480 rpm). The obtained pseudo-first-order reaction rate constants
were used to calculate the TOF number.



2 Fig. S5. Relationship between mass portion of PVA in catalysts and its corresponding TOF.



2 Fig. S6. Comparison of esterification catalyzed by "s-CER with PVA", s-CER/PVA composite and s3 CER alone (Reaction conditions: FFAs 20 g, methanol 50 g, catalyst loading 4 g, and mechanical
4 stirring rate 480 rpm). "s-CER with PVA" represents a simple physical mixing of s-CER and PVA.



3 Fig. S7. Effect of water addition on esterification catalyzed by s-CER/PVA (a) and ground s-CER (b).

 $^{4 \}quad (Reaction \ conditions: \ FFAs \ 20 \ g, \ methanol \ 50 \ g, \ s-CER/PVA \ composite \ loading \ 4 \ g \ (or \ ground \ s-CER$

⁵ with same amount of catalytic sites), and mechanical stirring rate 480 rpm)





3 Fig. S8 Comparison of time-dependant FFAs conversion calculated based on KOH titration and GC

4 analyses.

- U

Property	NKC-9
Structure	Macroreticular structure
Matrix	Styrene, divinyl-benzene
Functional groups	Sulfonated
Form	H^+
Total exchange capacity (mmol g ⁻¹ , dry)	≥4.7
Surface area (m ² g ⁻¹)	77
Particles size range (mm)	0.4~1.25
Maximum operating temperature (K)	413
Average pore diameter (nm)	56
Moisture content (%)	≤5
Density True (g ml ⁻¹)	1.20~1.30
Density Apparent (g ml ⁻¹)	0.70~0.80

1 Table S1 Characteristics of the sulfonated cation exchange resin

2

3 Table S2 GC results of the FFAs

Peak	Retention Time (min)	Constituents	Eatty Aaid	Mole fraction (%)		
			Fatty Actu	Before reaction	After reaction ^b	
А	13.814	Dodecanoic acid	C12: 0 ^a	17.2	0.6	
В	15.441	Myristic acid	C14: 0	4.3	0.1	
С	17.289	Palmitic acid	C16: 0	22.7	0.7	
D	19.256	Octadecadienoic acid	C18: 2	55.8	1.8	

4 ^a: the first number stands for the number of the carbon in the compound; the second number stands for the number

5 of C=C double bond in the compound; ^bUnder optimal reaction conditions.

7 Table S3 Effect of ethanol percentages in ethanol/water bath on the porosity of s-CER/PVA (s-CER:

⁸ PVA mass ratio 3: 2, annealing temperature 373 K)

Ethanol percentages	100 %	80 %	60 %	40 %
Porosity	54.3 %	49.5 %	46.3 %	43.7 %

9

10

11 Table S4 GC results of the products (Esterification results obtained under optimal reaction conditions;

12 Both the FFAs conversion and the FAME yield were 96.8 % calculated from the GC results)

⁶

Peak	Retention Time (min)	Constituents	Fatty Acid	Mole fraction (%)
А	16.132	Methyl Laurate	C12: 0*	16.6
В	17.841	Methyl myristate	C14: 0	4.2
С	19.531	Methyl hexadecanoate	C16: 0	22.0
D	21.091	Methyl linoleate	C18: 2	54.0

1 *: the first number stands for the number of the carbon in the compound; the second number stands for the number 2 of C=C double bond in the compound.

- 3
- 4

5 **Table S5** IEC and SD values of ground s-CER, PVA, and s-CER/PVA composite catalysts before and 6 after 6 times' reaction

s-CER: PVA mass ratio	IEC ^a	IEC ^b	IEC °	SD ^a	SD ^b	SD °
s-CER	5	4.5	5	0.69	0.24	0.69
1:1	1.9	1.85	1.9	1.46	0.6	1.45
5:4	1.96	1.9	1.95	1.59	0.64	1.59
3:2	2.01	1.94	2.01	1.67	0.56	1.66
2:1	2.75	2.46	2.74	1.73	0.67	1.72
PVA	_	_	_	2.06	0.06	2.05

7 All the catalysts were annealed at 373 K.

8 ^a Newly prepared catalytic catalysts;

9 ^b Catalysts after 6 runs (the catalysts were air dried in a fume hood for 12 h before analysis);

10 ° Catalysts after 6 runs (the catalysts were first washed with ethyl ether to remove organic components and then

11 washed with ethanol and then dried in a vacuum oven at 373 K for 24 h to remove residual water completely before 12 analysis).

- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17

18

19

20 Table S6 Esterification of single component FFAs and oleic acid in separate batches catalyzed by s-

21 CER/PVA composite (mass ratio 3:2) under typica reaction conditions (FFAs 20 g, methanol 50 g,

22 reaction temperature 338 K, catalyst loading 4 g and mechanical stirring rate 480 rpm)

Entry	Alcohol	FFAs	Products	Yield (%)
1	Methanol	Dodecanoic acid	Methyl Laurate	97.9
2	Methanol	Myristic acid	Methyl myristate	95.8
3	Methanol	Palmitic acid	Methyl hexadecanoate	95.1
4	Methanol	Stearic acid	Methyl stearate	93.4
5	Methanol	Oleic acid	Methyl oleate	93.9
Table S7	7 Sulfur content of c	catalysts with CER/PV	A mass ratio of 3: 2 by elementa	l analysis
Annealling temperatures (K)) Before reaction	on (wt. %) After 6 times'	reaction (wt. %)
	323	7.8	7	7.82
	373	8.32	2 8	3.30
	423	8.3	5 8	3.31

8 Table S8 Sulfur content in the reaction solution after each reaction

Reaction cycles	1	2	3	4	5	6
S content before reaction (ppm)	143	143	143	143	143	143
S content after reaction (ppm)	142	143	142	142	143	141

1 Note and references

- 2 [1] Zhang H, Ding J, Qiu Y, Zhao Z. Bioresour Technol 2012;112:28-33.
- 3 [2] Caetano C S, Guerreiro L, Fonseca I M, Ramos A M, Vital J, Castanheiro J E. Appl Catal, A
- 4 2009;359:41-6.
- 5 [3] Ding J, He B, Li J. Journal of Biobased Materials and Bioenergy 2011;5:1-7.