Accelerated Identification of High-Performance Catalysts for Low-

Temperature NH₃-SCR by Machine Learning

Yi Dong, Yu Zhang, Mingchu Ran, Xiao Zhang*, Shaojun Liu, Yang Yang, Wenshuo Hu, Chenghang Zheng, Xiang Gao*

State Key Laboratory of Clean Energy Utilization, State Environmental Protection Center for Coal-Fired Air Pollution Control, Zhejiang University, 38 Zheda Road, Hangzhou, 310027, China

Corresponding author. Tel.: +86 571 87951335 E-mail address: xgao1@zju.edu.cn (X. Gao); zhangx_energy@zju.edu.cn (X. Zhang)



Fig. S1. The activity distribution diagram of catalysts prepared by different methods. CP: co-precipitation, HT: Hydrothermal method, SG: sol-gel, IP: impregnation, W-IP: wet incipient impregnation, CA: citric acid.



Fig. S2. Histogram of the the input data layers of (a) Calcination temperature, (b) Calcination time, (c) NO inlet concentration, (d) NH_3 inlet concentration, (e) O_2 inlet concentration, (f) H_2O inlet concentration, (h) catalyst weight, (i) specific surface area, (j) average pore volume, the blue dashed line is the normal distribution curve.



Fig. S3. The correlation heat map for the individual primary features with themselves in the dataset.



Fig. S4. The comparison of actual and predicted values of the regression model for predicting (a) specific surface area, (b) average pore diameter: blue dot: training set, red dot: testing set.



Fig. S5. The comparison of actual and predicted values of the Pattern D: using the feature vector does not include specific surface area and average pore volume, blue dot: training set, red dot: testing set.



Fig. S6. Partial dependence plot for twelve most important variables (The blue shaded part indicates the confidence interval).



Fig. S7. (a)The comparison of actual and predicted values for the training sets and testing sets: Pattern E (b) The importance score of the top 20 features.



Fig. S8. Partial dependence plot for twelve most important variables (The blue shaded part indicates the confidence interval).

X-ray diffraction (XRD) patterns were measured by a PANalytical X'Pert PRO XRD system, which was equipped with a Cu K α radiation in the 2 θ range from 10° to 80° and a scanning rate of 4° min⁻¹.N₂ adsorption and desorption experiments were carried out at liquid nitrogen temperature (-196 °C) over a range of relative pressures using an ASAP 2460 (Micromeritics Instrument Crop.), after being outgassed at 300 °C for 4 h. The specific area was computed using the Brunauer-Emmett-Teller (BET) method, while pore size distribution and average pore diameter were calculated by Barrett-Joyner-Halenda (BJH) method. SEM–EDS was performed with SU-8010 (Hitachi, Ltd., Tokyo, Japan).

Fig. S9 represented the XRD patterns of the Mn-Ce-M (M=Co, Fe, Cu) catalysts. For Mn-Ce-Co catalyst, it presented sharp peaks at $2\theta = 19^{\circ}$, 36.7° , 44.8° , 59.3° , 65.2° , which belong to (111), (311), (400), (511), (440) planes of Co₃O₄ (PDF#80-1532), while the diffraction peaks of CeO₂, MnO₂ were not detected. For Mn-Ce-Fe catalyst, serval sharp peaks presented at $2\theta = 28.9^{\circ}$, 36.1° , 59.9° belong to (112), (211), (224) planes of Mn₃O₄ (PDF#75-1560), $2\theta = 47.4^{\circ}$, 56.3° belong to (220), (311) planes of CeO₂ (PDF#81-0792), while the diffraction peaks of Fe₂O₃ were not detected. For Mn-Ce-Cu catalyst, serval sharp peaks presented at $2\theta = 28.5^{\circ}$, 33° , 47.4° , 56.3° belong to (111), (220), (222), (311) planes of CeO₂ (PDF#81-0792), $2\theta = 28.9^{\circ}$ belong to (112) plane of Mn₃O₄ (PDF#75-1560), while the diffraction peaks of CuO were not detected.



Fig. S9. XRD patterns of Mn-Ce-M (M=Co, Fe, Cu).



Fig. S10. SEM-EDS analyses of the catalyst samples: (a) Mn-Ce-Co, (b) Mn-Ce-Fe, (c) Mn-Ce-Cu.



Fig. S11. SCR performance over Mn-Ce-M catalysts (M=Co, Cu, Fe), (a)NO conversion, (b) N_2O yield. Reaction conditions: [NO]=[NH₃]=500ppm, [O₂]=5%, [H₂O]=5%, total flow rate = 200

Pattern	Features	Total number
A	inlet concentration of NO (ppm), NH ₃ (ppm), O ₂ (%), H ₂ O (%), GHSV (h ⁻¹), catalyst weight (g), specific surface area (m^2/g), mass ratio of the 22 elements	29
В	type, calcination temperature, calcination time, inlet concentration of NO (ppm), $O_2(\%)$, $H_2O(\%)$, GHSV (h ⁻¹), catalyst weight (g), specific surface area (m ² /g), average pore volume (cm ³ /g), molar ratio of the 22 elements	32
С	type, calcination temperature, calcination time, inlet concentration of NO (ppm), O_2 (%), H_2O (%), GHSV (h ⁻¹), catalyst weight (g), specific surface area (m ² /g), average pore volume (cm ³ /g), molar ratio of the 22 elements	32
<u>D</u>	type, calcination temperature, calcination time, inlet concentration of NO (ppm), O_2 (%), H_2O (%), GHSV (h ⁻¹), catalyst weight (g), molar ratio of the 22 elements	<u>30</u>
Ē	type, calcination temperature, calcination time, inlet concentration of NO (ppm), O ₂ (%), H ₂ O (%), GHSV (h ⁻¹), catalyst weight (g), specific surface area (m ² /g), average pore volume (cm ³ /g),molar ratio of the 19 elements(Mn, Ti, Ce, O, W, Zr, Ni, Co, Fe, Al, Cu, Si, Sn, Mo, Cr, V, Nb, Mg, Ca)	<u>29</u>

Table S2. The detailed molar ratio of the catalysts

	Abbreviated name in Fig. 6(d)	Formulation	Molar ratio	
This work	Co-	Mn-Ce-Co	Mn:Ce:Co=129:18:223	
	Cu-	Mn-Ce-Cu	Mn:Ce:Cu=73:69:37	
	Fe-	Mn-Ce-Fe	Mn:Ce:Fe=216:47:59	
	ref1	MnCeCoOx	Mn:Ce:Co=4:5:1	
Deferrere	ref2	MnCeCuOx	Mn:Ce:Cu=4:5:1	
Kelerence	ref3	MnCeFeOx	Mn:Ce:Fe=4:5:1	
	ref4	MnCeOx	Mn:Ce=4:6	

Table S3. Structural parameters and element content of catalysts

		Structural parameters	
Samples	BET surface area	Total pore volume	Average
	(m^{2}/g)	(cm^{3}/g)	pore diameter (nm)
Mn-Ce-Co	97.68	0.35	14.94

Mn-Ce-Fe	131.02	0.48	14.14
Mn-Ce-Cu	174.11	0.38	7.65