Supporting information

Spinel copper-iron-oxide magnetic nanoparticles with cooperative Cu(I) and Cu(II) sites for enhancing catalytic transformation of 1,2-propanediol to lactic acid under anaerobic conditions

Yonghai Feng ^{a,*}, Congming Lu ^a, Huijie Wang ^a, Minjia Meng ^b, Yunlei Zhang ^b, Dewei Rao ^{a,*}, Lei

Liu^{*a*} and Hengbo Yin^{*b*}

^a Institute for Advanced Materials, School of Materials Science and Engineering, Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang 212013, China.

^b School of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang 212013, China.

*Corresponding authors: Y. Feng (fengyonghai@ujs.edu.cn), D. Rao (dewei@ujs.edu.cn)

Methods for DFT calculations

Vienna *ab initio* simulation package (VASP)¹ was employed to study the pathway, as well as the mechanism. Primary calculation methods have been described in our previous work.² For the models, we substituted the Fe of surface with Cu, which could represent the increase of Cu. And the reaction steps for this works are designed by experimental data and the reported work.³

For each step, the reaction Gibbs free energy ΔG is defined by Eq. (S1).

$$\Delta G = \Delta E + \Delta Z P E$$
 (S1)

where ΔE is the electronic energy difference, ΔZPE is the change of zero-point energies.

And the electronic energy difference is defined by Eq. (S2).

 $\Delta E = \sum E(products) - \sum E(reactions)$ (S2)

It should be noted that the aqueous solution effect is not considered in this work since the Gibbs free energy cannot be heavily influenced by solution.

Elimination of the diffusion limitations



Figure S1. PDO conversion vs stirring speed. Reaction conditions: PDO concentration = 0.2 M (40 mL), NaOH/PDO (mol/mol) = 2, reaction temperature = 160° C, N₂ = 1.0 MPa, catalyst loading = 0.06 g.

In order to eliminate the external diffusion, the catalytic oxidation of PDO was tested at different stirring speeds (see Figure S1). As shown in Figure S1, when the stirring rates are increased to 800 and 900 rpm, the PDO conversions were over-lapped at different reaction times. The results show that the external diffusion can be completely eliminated at the stirring speed of 800 rpm.

The Weisz–Prater criterion ⁴ was used to estimate the intraparticle diffusion limitations:

$$\phi_i = \frac{(-r_{obs,i})\rho_p R_p^2}{D_{eff,i} C_i}$$
(S3)

where the C_i was the concentration of PDO [mol/m³], D_{eff} was the effective diffusion [m²/s × m³_{liq}/m³_{cat}], R_p indicated the main particle radius [m], r_{obs} was the initial observed rate of PDO consumption [mol/s kg_{cat}], and ρ_p was the apparent density of the catalyst [kg/m³]. The W–P criterion indicated that when $\Phi_i < 1$, there were no diffusional problems for i.⁵ Herein, the PDO conversion at initial 1 h (16.5%) was used to calculate the r_{obs} , which was calculated as ca. 6.1 × 10⁻³ mol/s kg_{cat}. The apparent bulk density of catalyst particles (ρ_p) is 1200 kg/m³. The catalyst particle diameter (R_p) is 4.5×10⁻⁵ m (300 mesh) and the C_{PDO} is 200 mol/m³. The effective diffusivity (D_{eff}) was estimated using a porosity (ε_p) of 0.5 and a tortuosity (τ) of 4 as recommended in Davis and Davis.⁶ The estimated Φ_{PDO} (0.6) was smaller than 1, and thus the internal diffusion can also be neglected.



Figure S2. TEM images of CuFe₂O₄ porous nanoparticles prepared by hydrothermal method.⁵



Figure S3. PDO conversion vs reaction time for different copper based catalysts. Reaction conditions: PDO concentration = 0.2 M (40 mL), NaOH/PDO (mol/mol) = 2, reaction temperature = 160° C, N₂ = 1.0 MPa, catalyst loading = 0.06 g.

H₂ production from catalytic PDO and glycerol transformation under anaerobic and basic aqueous conditions



Figure S4. Profile of H_2 in gas products from catalytic conversion of PDO before (a) and after (b) reaction, and the catalytic conversion of glycerol after reaction (c).



Figure S5. H₂ selectivity vs temperature for catalytic PDO (a) and glycerol (b) transformations. Reaction conditions for PDO transformation: reaction temperature = $120-200^{\circ}$ C, PDO concentration = 1.0 M (30 mL), NaOH/PDO (mol/mol) = 2.0, N₂ pressure = 1.0 MPa, catalyst loading = 0.2 g, reaction time = 8 h. Reaction conditions for glycerol conversion: reaction temperature = $180-220^{\circ}$ C, glycerol concentration = 1.1 M (30 mL), NaOH concentration = 1.2 M, N₂ pressure = 1.4 MPa, catalyst loading = 0.2 g, reaction time = 0.2 g, reaction time = 6 h.

Figure S4 shows that H_2 was produced from the catalytic PDO and glycerol transformation under anaerobic and basic aqueous conditions. On basis of the mole ratios of H_2 /PDO (ca. 2.0) and H_2 /glycerol (ca. 1.0) (Figure S5), the reaction can be written as (S4) for the formation of lactic acid from PDO and (S5) for the formation of lactic acid from glycerol.

$$C_3H_8O_2$$
 (1,2-propanediol) + $H_2O \rightarrow C_3H_6O_3$ (lactic acid) + $2H_2$ (S4)

$$C_3H_8O_3$$
 (glycerol) $\rightarrow C_3H_6O_3$ (lactic acid) + H_2 (S5)



Figure S6 XPS and XAS spectra for CuFe₂O₄ and O-Cu₁Fe₁O_x MNs with dominant copper species

of Cu²⁺.



Figure S7. (a) Hot catalyst filtration test for $Cu_1Fe_1O_x$ MNs; (b) Field-dependent magnetization curves of $CuFeO_x$ MNs at room temperature. The insets photographs of magnetic recovery of $Cu_1Fe_1O_x$ after applying the external magnetic field.



Figure S8. XRD patterns (a), TEM (b) and HRTEM (c) images of spent $Cu_1Fe_1O_x$ MNs, and HAADF-

STEM image (e) and element-mapping of Cu (f), Fe (g), and O (h).

| Table S1. | Consumption | of H_2 over | different | catalysts |
|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|
|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|

| Catalysts | $Cu_{0.5}Fe_1O_x$ | $Cu_1Fe_1O_x$ | $Cu_2Fe_1O_x$ | $CuFe_2O_4$ | Fe_3O_4 | Cu ₂ O | CuO |
|-------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|------|
| Consumption | | | | | | | |
| of H ₂ | 9.78 | 7.80 | 4.16 | 13.69 | 10.13 | 24.12 | 12.5 |
| (mmol g⁻¹) | | | | | | | |

Table S2. Concentration of acid and base site according to CO₂-TPD and NH₃-TPD profiles

| Samples | | Acid sites | (mmol g ⁻¹) | | Base sites (mmol g ⁻¹) | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|---------|------------------------------------|------|-----------------------------|--|--|
| · - | A _{NH3} ^a | Aw ^b | A _M ^c | A_S^d | B _{CO2} ^e | Bwf | B _S ^g | | |
| Fe ₃ O ₄ | 0.80 | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.71 | 0.18 | 0.02 | 0.16 | | |
| $Cu_{0.5}Fe_1O_x$ | 0.76 | 0.03 | 0.33 | 0.40 | 0.16 | 0.03 | 0.13 | | |
| $Cu_1Fe_1O_x$ | 0.23 | 0 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.03 | 0.10 | | |
| $Cu_2Fe_1O_x$ | 0.11 | 0 | 0 | 0.11 | 0.12 | 0.04 | 0.08 | | |

^a A_{NH3} represents the total concentration of acid sites, which is calculated based on the result of NH₃-TPD.

 $^{b\text{-d}}A_W,\,A_M,\,\text{and}\,A_S$ are the concentration of weak, medium, and strong acid site, respectively.

 e B_{CO2} represents the total concentration of base sites, which is calculated on the basis of the results of CO₂-TPD.

 $^{f\text{-}g}\,B_W$ and B_S are the concentration of weak and strong base site, respectively.

| Sample | Metal con | tent (wt%) | Cu/Fe ratio |
|--|-----------|------------|-------------|
| _ | Cu | Fe | - |
| fresh Cu ₁ Fe ₁ O _x | 18.5 | 16.9 | 1.10 |
| spent Cu ₁ Fe ₁ O _x | 17.5 | 16.4 | 1.07 |
| Mother liquid (after filtration) | 1.92 ppm | 1.83 ppm | - |

Table S3 Cu/Fe weight ratios of fresh $Cu_1Fe_1O_x$ and spent $Cu_1Fe_1O_x$ MNs^a

^a As detected by ICP.

Table S4 Catalytic performance of Cu₁Fe₁O_x MNs for PDO, glycerol (GLY), and ethylene glycol (EG) transformation in anaerobic and basic

aqueous solution.

| | | (| Conditior | IS | | | | | | | |
|-----------|----------------------|-------------|-----------|--------------------------|----------|----------------------------|-------------------|------|------------------|---|---------------|
| Substrate | concentration (M) | NaOH (M) | т (°С) | P _{N2} (MPa) | t (h) | catalyst loading (g) | Conversion (%) | LA | glyceric acid | Mole ratio of H ₂ /substrate | TOFª (h⁻¹) |
| PDO | 0.2 | 0.4 | 160 | 1.0 | 8 | 0.06 | 72.6 | 94.5 | 0 | 1.9 | 1410 |
| GLY | 1.08 | 1.2 | 200 | 1.4 | 6 | 0.2 | 72.3 | 98.5 | 0 | 0.95 | 2280 |
| EG | 0.2 | 0.4 | 160 | 1.0 | 8 | 0.06 | 87.4 | 0 | 97.8 | 1.95 | 1690 |

^a Activity expressed as turn-over-frequency (TOF) calculated by the around 20% conversion (at initial reaction time of 1 h).

| Cu ₂₀ Fe ₄₀ O _x | Origin-Structure-1 Origin-Structure-2 | | | | | | | Origin-St | ructure-3 | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|----|----------|-----------|----------|----------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|----------|-----------|
| Terms | O82-H8 | - | C2-H4 | - | H7-081 | O82-H8 | O82-H6 | - | C3-H4 | - | C2=081 | - | C3_H4 | - |
| Bond lengths | 0.9732 | - | 1.09593 | - | 0.97565 | 0.9732 | 0.97101 | - | 1.10638 | - | 1.24686 | - | 1.11134 | - |
| Terms | 082 | H8 | C2 | H4 | 081 | 082 | 082 (142) | H6 (151) | H4 (149) | C3 (145) | C2 (144) | 081 (141) | C3 | H4 |
| Valene state | -1.66759 | 1 | 0.5361 | 0.11 | -1.6121 | -1.66759 | -1.75623 | 1 | 0.100246 | 0.723539 | 1.454105 | -1.66467 | 0.840295 | 0.094468 |
| Cu ₂₁ Fe ₃₉ O _x | | | Cu-Fe-S | Structure | -1 | | | Cu-Fe-Structure-2 | | | | | Cu-Fe-St | ructure-3 |
| Terms | O82-H8 | | C2-H4 | | H7-081 | | O82-H6 | | C3-H4 | | C2=081 | | C3-H5 | |
| Bond lengths | 0.97191 | | 1.10357 | | 0.97312 | | 0.97279 | | 1.09828 | | 1.24027 | | 1.11255 | |
| Terms | 082 | H8 | C2 | H4 | 081 | H7 | 082 (142) | H6 (151) | H4 (149) | C3 (145) | C2 (144) | 081 (141) | C3 | H5 |
| Valene state | -1.59829 | 1 | 0.588013 | 0.1411 | -1.66519 | 1 | -1.6186116 | 1 | 0.1105666 | 0.5634567 | 1.5807554 | -1.7563967 | 1.498611 | 0.047535 |

Table S5. Summary of the bond distance of C-H and O-H near Cu or Fe atoms, as well as their atomic charge based on DFT calculation

| Substrates | Catalysta | Conversion | | Sele | ctivity (% | 6) | A HA | | | | |
|------------|-------------------|------------|------|------|------------|------|------|--|--|--|--|
| | Catalysis | (%) | PA | LA | FA | AA | HA | | | | |
| PDO | $Cu_1Fe_1O_x$ | 16.5 | 7.1 | 87.9 | 1.1 | 2.8 | 1.1 | | | | |
| | CuO | 8.3 | 4.2 | 82.6 | 4.5 | 8.0 | 0.7 | | | | |
| | Cu ₂ O | 11.8 | 1.0 | 72.3 | 10.5 | 15.4 | 0.8 | | | | |
| HA | $Cu_1Fe_1O_x$ | 100 | 0.8 | 82.1 | 1.3 | 15.8 | - | | | | |
| | CuO | 100 | 5.4 | 78.8 | 7.4 | 8.4 | - | | | | |
| | Cu ₂ O | 100 | 2.8 | 76.3 | 6.4 | 14.5 | - | | | | |
| PAD | $Cu_1Fe_1O_x$ | 100 | 10.0 | 78.6 | 3.8 | 7.6 | - | | | | |
| | CuO | 100 | 8.6 | 73.6 | 6.7 | 10.1 | - | | | | |
| | Cu ₂ O | 100 | 7.5 | 71.1 | 7.3 | 14.1 | - | | | | |
| PA | $Cu_1Fe_1O_x$ | 38.7 | - | - | - | 100 | - | | | | |
| | CuO | 40.3 | - | - | - | 100 | - | | | | |
| | Cu ₂ O | 79.5 | - | - | - | 100 | - | | | | |
| LA | $Cu_1Fe_1O_x$ | 63.8 | 100 | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| | CuO | 18.1 | 100 | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| | Cu ₂ O | 31.9 | 100 | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| AA | $Cu_1Fe_1O_x$ | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| FA | $Cu_1Fe_1O_x$ | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | | | | |

Table S6. Catalytic transformation of proposed intermediates in PDO conversion over $Cu_1Fe_1O_x$, CuO, and Cu_2O catalysts^a

^aReaction conditions: substrate concentration, 0.2 M (40 mL); NaOH/substrate (mol/mol) = 2; reaction temperature, 160° C; N₂, 1.0 MPa; catalyst loading, 0.06 g; reaction time, 1 h. PDO = 1,2-propanediol, LA = lactic acid, AA = acetic acid, FA = formic acid, PA = pyruvic acid, HA = hydroxyacetone, PAD = pyruvaldehyde.

References

- 1. G. Kresse and J. Furthmuller, Phys Rev B 1996; 54: 11169-11186.
- 2. D. Rao, H. Yang, X. Shen, X. Yan and G. Qiao, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys., 2019, 21, 10895-10901.
- D. J. Chadderdon, L. Xin, J. Qi, B. Brady, J. A. Miller, K. Sun, M. J. Janik and W. Li, ACS Catal., 2015, 5, 6926-6936.
- 4. P. Weisz, D. Prater, Adv. Catal. ,1954, 6, 143-196.

- 5. C.M. Piqueras, G. Tonetto, S. Bottini, D.E. Damiani, Catal. Today, 2008,133-135, 836-841.
- 6. M. E. Davis and R. J. Davis, Fundamentals of Chemical Reaction Engineering, Dover Publications, Mineola, New York, 1st edn, 2012.
- 7. M. Zhu, D. Meng, C. Wang, G. Diao, ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces, 2013, 5, 6030-6037.