Supplementary Data for

Making H₂ from light and biomass-derived alcohols: the outstanding activity of newly designed hierarchical MWCNTs/Pd@TiO₂ hybrid catalysts

A. Beltram, M. Melchionna, T. Montini, L. Nasi, M. Prato, and P. Fornasiero

- Figure S1: HRTEM of the titania shell in CNTs/Pd@TiO₂-calc (left); FFT of a selected area showing the reflections of TiO₂ anatase phase (right).
- Figure S2: Typical HAADF images of 10-CNT/Pd@TiO₂ (A) and 20-CNT/Pd@TiO₂ (B).
- Figure S3: HRTEM of a CNT/Pd@TiO₂ where Pd nanoparticles can be observed; inset, zoom of a Pd NP showing the crystallographic facet and the size of approximately 3-5 nm range.
- Figure S4: H₂ chemisorption measurements for Pd@TiO₂ (A), 10-CNT/Pd@TiO₂ (B), 20-CNT/Pd@TiO₂ (C); insets: extrapolation of the linear part in the 10-20 mmHg range to evaluate contribution of H adsorbed on the surface.
- Figure S5: Results from photocatalytic hydrogen production from methanol/water solutions under UV irradiation for the fresh and calcined catalysts. Activities are normalised by the grams of catalyst.
- Figure S6: Results from photocatalytic hydrogen production from ethanol (left) and glycerol (right) water solutions under UV irradiation. Activities are normalised by the grams of catalyst.
- Table S1:Comparison with the performance of some recent catalytic systems containing
carbon supports and integrated metal phases.
- Figure S7 Gaseous by-products formation during photocatalytic H₂ production from ethanol/water solutions under UV irradiation with 10-CNT/Pd@TiO₂ (left) and 20-CNT/Pd@TiO₂ (right).
- Table S2:Results from semi-quantitative analysis (1-butanol was used as internal standard) of
liquid solutions collected after photocatalytic H2 production from ethanol/water
solutions under UV irradiation.

- Figure S8: Photocatalytic water splitting under UV irradiation. Methanol (10% v/v) was added after 19 h. Activities (H_2 on the left and CO_2 on the right) are normalised by the grams of catalyst.
- Figure S9: Photocatalytic water splitting under UV irradiation. Acetaldehyde (4% v/v) was added after 3 h. Activities (H₂ on the left and byproducts on the right) are normalised by the grams of catalyst.
- Figure S10: Results from photocatalytic by-products production from glycerol/water solutions under UV irradiation expressed in terms of production rate.
- Table S3:Results from semi-quantitative analysis (1-hexanol was used as internal standard) of
liquid solutions collected after photocatalytic H2 production from glycerol / water
solutions under UV irradiation.
- Figure S11: Results from photocatalytic hydrogen production from ethanol (left) and glycerol (right) water solutions under simulated solar irradiation. Activities are normalised by the grams of catalyst.
- Table S4:Results from semi-quantitative analysis (1-butanol was used as internal standard) of
liquid solutions collected after photocatalytic H2 production from ethanol/water
solutions under simulated solar irradiation.
- Table S5:Results from semi-quantitative analysis (1-hexanol was used as internal standard) of
liquid solutions collected after photocatalytic H2 production from glycerol / water
solutions under simulated solar irradiation.



Figure S1: HRTEM of the titania shell in CNTs/Pd@TiO₂-calc (left); FFT of a selected area showing the reflections of TiO₂ anatase phase (right).



Figure S2: Typical HAADF images of 10-CNT/Pd@TiO₂ (A) and 20-CNT/Pd@TiO₂ (B).



Figure S3: HRTEM of a CNTs/Pd@TiO₂ where Pd nanoparticles can be observed; inset, zoom of a Pd NP showing the crystallographic facet and the size of approximately 3-5 nm range.



Figure S4: H₂ chemisorption measurements for Pd@TiO₂ (A), 10-CNTs/Pd@TiO₂ (B), 20-CNTs/Pd@TiO₂ (C); insets: extrapolation of the linear part in the 10-20 mmHg range to evaluate contribution of H adsorbed on the surface.



Figure S5: Results from photocatalytic hydrogen production from methanol/water solutions under UV irradiation for the fresh and calcined catalysts. Activities are normalised by the grams of catalyst.



Figure S6: Results from photocatalytic hydrogen production from ethanol (left) and glycerol (right) water solutions under UV irradiation. Activities are normalised by the grams of catalyst.

| Table S1: | Comparison | with | the | performance | of | some | recent | catalytic | systems | containing |
|-----------|--------------|---------|-------|---------------|-----|-------|--------|-----------|---------|------------|
| | carbon suppo | orts an | d int | egrated metal | pha | ises. | | | | |

| Entry | Carbon Support | Metal phase | Maximum Rate of H ₂ evolution (mmol·g ⁻¹ ·h ⁻¹) | Hole scavenger | Quantum efficiency | Power of irradiating lamp | Refere nce |
|-------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-----------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. | Ox-MWCNT | Pt/TiO ₂ | 40 | Methanol | Not reported | 200W (240- 500 nm range) | 1 |
| 2. | Ox- MWCNTs | Pt/TiO ₂ | 10 | Methanol | Not reported | 125W (λ>365) | 2 |
| 3. | GO | TiO ₂ | 0.4 | Methanol | Not reported | 300W (λ>320nm) | 3 |
| 4. | GO | Cu/TiO₂ | 19 | Methanol | Not reported | 300W (λ>365) | 4 |
| 5. | g-C ₃ N ₄ | Pt | 0.15 | Triethanolamine | Not reported | 300W (λ>420) | 5 |
| 6. | Ox-CNTs | TiO ₂ | 2 | Glycerol | Not reported | Not specified | 6 |
| 7. | Ox- MWCNTs | Pt/TiO ₂ | 8 | Triethanolamine | Not reported | 250W (λ>320) | 7 |
| 8. | GO | TiO ₂ | 0.7 | Methanol | QE = 3.1% | 350W (λ>320) | 8 |
| 9. | GO | Pt/CdS | 55 | Lactic Acid | QE = 22% | 350W (λ>420) | 9 |
| 10. | C ₆₀ - SWCNTs | TiO ₂ | 3.2 | Triethanolamine | Not reported | 300W (λ>320) | 10 |
| 11. | GO | Pt/Sr_2Ta_2 $O_{7-x}N_x$ | 3 | Methanol | QE = 6.5% | 300W (λ>420) | 11 |
| 12. | MWCNTs | Pt/Ta_2O_5 | 32 | Methanol | Not reported | 450W (λ>365) | 12 |

| 13. | RGO | TiO ₂ | 1 | Ethanol | Not reported | 300W (λ>320) | 13 |
|-----|-------------------|---------------------|------|----------|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| 14. | RGO | V-TiO ₂ | 0.12 | Methanol | Not reported | 300W λ not specified | 14 |
| 15. | RGO | Pt/TiO ₂ | 14 | Methanol | Not reported | 300W λ not specified | 15 |
| 16. | f-MWCNTs (20%) | Pd/TiO ₂ | 21 | Methanol | Not reported | 125W (λ>365) | This work |
| 17. | f-MWCNTs (20%) | Pd/TiO ₂ | 6 | Glycerol | Not reported | 125W (λ>365) | This work |
| 18. | f-MWCNTs (20%) | Pd/TiO ₂ | 26 | Ethanol | QE = 21% | 125W (λ>365) | This work |



Figure S7 Gaseous by-products formation during photocatalytic H₂ production from ethanol/water solutions under UV irradiation with 10-CNT/Pd@TiO₂ (left) and 20-CNT/Pd@TiO₂ (right).

Table S2:Results from semi-quantitative analysis (1-butanol was used as internal standard) of
liquid solutions collected after photocatalytic H2 production from ethanol/water
solutions under UV irradiation.

| | 10-CNTs/Pd@TiO ₂ -calc | 20-CNTs/Pd@TiO ₂ -calc | Pd@TiO ₂ |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Acetaldehyde | 2.235 | 2.895 | 1.102 |
| 1,1-diethoxyethane | 5.424 | 6.812 | 2.533 |
| 2,4,5-trimethyl-1,3- dioxolane | 0.012 | 0.092 | 0 |
| Acetic acid | 0.026 | 0.145 | 0.003 |
| 3-hydroxy-2-butanone | 0.026 | 0.045 | 0.006 |
| 2,3-butandiol | 1.613 | 4.297 | 1.326 |



Figure S8: Photocatalytic water splitting under UV irradiation. Methanol (10% v/v) was added after 19 h. Activities (H_2 on the left and CO_2 on the right) are normalised by the grams of catalyst.



Figure S9: Photocatalytic water splitting under UV irradiation. Acetaldehyde (4% v/v) was added after 3 h. Activities (H_2 on the left and byproducts on the right) are normalised by the grams of catalyst.



Figure S10: Results from photocatalytic by-products production from glycerol/water solutions under UV irradiation expressed in terms of production rate.

Table S3:Results from semi-quantitative analysis (1-hexanol was used as internal standard) of
liquid solutions collected after photocatalytic H2 production from glycerol / water
solutions under UV irradiation.

| | 10-CNTs/Pd@TiO ₂ - calc | 20-CNTs/Pd@TiO ₂ - calc | Pd@TiO ₂ |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Hydroxy-acetaldehyde | 2.34 | 3.03 | 1.65 |
| Formic acid | 0.37 | 0.26 | 0.22 |
| Acetic acid | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.04 |
| 1-hydroxy-2-propanone | 1.60 | 1.12 | 0.75 |
| 2,3-dihydroxypropanal | 0.22 | 0.20 | 0.26 |
| 1,3-dihydroxy-2-propanone | 1.62 | 2.05 | 1.13 |



Figure S11: Results from photocatalytic hydrogen production from ethanol (left) and glycerol (right) water solutions under simulated solar irradiation. Activities are normalised by the grams of catalyst.

Table S4:Results from semi-quantitative analysis (1-butanol was used as internal standard) of
liquid solutions collected after photocatalytic H2 production from ethanol/water
solutions under simulated solar irradiation.

| | 10-CNTs/Pd@TiO ₂ -calc | 20-CNTs/Pd@TiO ₂ -calc | Pd@TiO ₂ |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Acetaldehyde | 0.22 | 0.18 | 0.68 |
| 1,1-diethoxyethane | 0.39 | 0.23 | 0.20 |

Table S5:Results from semi-quantitative analysis (1-hexanol was used as internal standard) of
liquid solutions collected after photocatalytic H2 production from glycerol / water
solutions under simulated solar irradiation.

| | 10-CNTs/Pd@TiO ₂ - calc | 20-CNTs/Pd@TiO ₂ - calc | Pd@TiO ₂ |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Hydroxy-acetaldehyde | 1.04 | 1.14 | 1.40 |
| 1-hydroxy-2-propanone | 0.10 | 0.15 | 0.14 |
| 2,3-dihydroxypropanal | 0.16 | 0.21 | 0.18 |
| 1,3-dihydroxy-2-propanone | 1.18 | 1.30 | 1.53 |

- ³ H. Kim, S. Kim, J.-K. Kang, W. Choi, J. Catal 2014, 309, 49.
- ⁴ X.-J. Lv, S.-X. Zhou, C. Zhang, H.-X. Chang, Y. Chen and W.-F. Fu, J. Mater. Chem., 2012, 22, 18542.

- ⁷ K. Dai, T. Peng, D. Ke, B. Wei, *Nanotechnology* 2009, **20**, 125603.
- ⁸ Q. Xiang, J. Yu, M. Jaroniec, *Nanoscale* 2011, **3**, 3670.

¹⁰ B. Chai, T. Peng, X. Zhang, J. Mao, K. Li, X. Zhang, *Dalton Trans.* 2013, **42**, 3402.

¹ A. Moya, A. Cherevan, S. Marchesan, P. Gebhardt, M. Prato, D. Eder, J. J. Vilatela *Appl Catal B: Environmental* 2015, **179**, 574.

² M. Cargnello, M. Grzelczak, B. Rodriguez-Gonzalez, Z. Syrgiannis, K. Bakhmutsky, V. La Parola, L. M. Liz-Marzan, R. J. Gorte, M. Prato, P. Fornasiero *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2012, **134**, 11760.

⁵ K. Li, Z. Zeng, L. Yan, S.n Luo, X. Luo, M. Huo, Y. Guo, *App. Catal. B: Environmental* 2015, **165**, 428.

⁶ M. MamathaKumari, D. Praveen Kumar, P. Haridoss, V. DurgaKumari, M.V. Shankar, *Int. J. Hydrogen Energ.* 2015, **40**, 1665.

⁹ Q. Li, B. Guo, J. Yu, J. Ran, B. Zhang, H. Yan, J. Ru Gong, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2011, **133**, 10878.

¹¹ A. Mukherji, B. Seger, G. Qing Lu, L. Wang ACS Nano, 2011, **5**, 3483.

¹² A. S. Cherevan, P. Gebhardt, C. J. Shearer, M. Matsukawa, K. Domen, D. Eder, *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2014, **7**, 791

¹³ G. Nagaraju, K. Manjunath, S. Sarkar, E. Gunter, S. R. Teixeira, J. Dupont, *Int. J. Hydrogen Energ.* 2015, 40, 12209.
¹⁴ A. K. Agegnehu, C.-J. Pan, M.-C. Tsai, J. Rick, W.-N. Su, J.-Fu Lee, B.-J. Hwang *Int. J. Hydrogen Energ.* 2016, 41, 6752.
¹⁵ D. Chen, L. Zou, S. Li, F. Zheng *Scientific Reports* 2016, 6, Article number: 20335