Supporting Information

Electrocatalytic cross-coupling of biogenic diacids for the sustainable production of fuels

F. Joschka Holzhäuser,^a Guido Creusen,^b Gilles Moos, Manuel Dahmen,^c Andrea König,^d Jens

Artz,^a Stefan Palkovits^a and Regina Palkovits^a,*

a Institut für Technische und Makromolekulare Chemie, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany. [*palkovits@itmc.rwth-aachen.de]

b Institut für Makromolekulare Chemie, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany.

c Institut für Energie- und Klimaforschung Modellierung von Energiesystemen, Forschungszentrum Jülich, Jülich, Germany

d Aachener Verfahrenstechnik - Process Systems Engineering, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany

- 1. Calculations
- 2. Experimental photographs
- 3. NMR spectra
- 4. Additional charts
- 5. Total faradaic efficiency charts

1. Calculations

Calculation of charge chronoamperometry (Q = charge, I = current, t = time):

$$Q = \int_{x}^{y} I \, dt$$

Calculation of charge potentiometry:

$$Q = It$$

Caclulation of the faradiac efficiency (n_{mol} = amount of total product amount in mol, n = number of electrons transferred, F = Faraday constant):

$$F_{eff} = \frac{n_{mol}nF}{Q} \cdot 100\%$$

For 1 faradaic equivalent the equation becomes $(n_{mol-spl} = simplified factor [dimensionless])$:

$$F_{eff} = n_{mol-spl} \cdot 100\%$$



















Figure 1a: Variation of different ratios of MMSA with IVA. Conditions: 0 °C, MeOH:H₂O 80:20, 1 farad equivalent, 0.1 M NEt₃, 100 mAcm⁻², WE: Pt, CE: Ti. Yield of MDH/ DDH related to MMSA, DH related to IVA (total Volume 5 mL).



Figure 2a: Variation of the electrolyte concentration. Conditions: 0 °C, MeOH:H₂O 80:20, 1 farad equivalent, 100 mAcm⁻², WE: Pt, CE: Ti, 0.33 M MMSA, 1.3 M IVA. Yield of MDH/ DDH related to MMSA, DH related to IVA (total Volume 5 mL).



Figure 3a: Variation of the solvent mixture. Conditions: 0 °C, 1 farad equivalent, 100 mAcm⁻², WE: Pt, CE: Ti, 0.33 M MMSA, 1.3 M IVA, 0.1 M NEt₃ (for 100% Water: 0.1 M MMSA, 0.4 M IVA). Yield of MDH/ DDH related to MMSA, DH related to IVA (total Volume 5 mL).



Figure 4a: Screening of $(Ru_xTi_{1-x})O_2$ on titanium plates in comparison with Pt. Conditions: 0 °C, 1 farad equivalent, 100 mAcm⁻², MeOH as solvent, CE: Ti, 0.33 M MMSA, 1.3 M IVA, 0.1 M NEt₃. Yield of MDH/ DDH related to MMSA, DH related to IVA (total Volume 2 mL).



5. Total faradaic efficiency charts (Complete new Section!)

For Figure 1(left) + Figure 1a: Variation of different ratios of MMSA/HESA with IVA. Conditions: 0 °C, MeOH:H₂O 80:20, after 1 farad equivalent, 0.1 M NEt₃, 100 mAcm⁻², WE: Pt, CE: Ti.



For Figure 1(right) + Figure 2a: Variation of the electrolyte concentration. Conditions: 0 °C, MeOH:H₂O 80:20, after 1 farad equivalent, 100 mAcm⁻², WE: Pt, CE: Ti, 0.33 M MMSA/HESA, 1.3 M IVA.



For Figure 2 + Figure 3a: Variation of the solvent mixture. Conditions: 0 °C, after 1 farad equivalent, 100 mAcm⁻², WE: Pt, CE: Ti, 0.33 M MMSA/HESA, 1.3 M IVA, 0.1 M NEt₃ (for 100% Water: 0.1 M MMSA/HESA, 0.4 M IVA).



For Figure 3 + Figure 4a: Screening of $(Ru_xTi_{1-x})O_2$ on titanium plates in comparison with Pt. Conditions: 0 °C, after 1 farad equivalent, 100 mAcm⁻², MeOH as solvent, CE: Ti, 0.33 M MMSA/HESA, 1.3 M IVA, 0.1 M NEt₃.



For Figure 4: Screening of $(Ru_xTi_{1-x})O_2$ on Ti and Pt plates with different electrolytes. Left: Using 0.1 M NEt₃ as electrolyte and base. Right: Using 0.1 M KOH as electrolyte and base. General conditions: 0 °C, after 1 farad equivalent, 100 mAcm⁻², MeOH as solvent, CE: Ti, 0.33 M MHO, 1.3 M IVA.



For Figure 5: Screening of $(Ru_xTi_{1-x})O_2$ on Ti and Pt plates with different electrolytes. General conditions: 0 °C, after 1 farad equivalent, 100 mAcm⁻², MeOH as solvent, CE: Ti, 1 M MHO.