# **Supporting Information**

## Design and Synthesis of PANI/GO/MoS<sub>2</sub> Nanocomposites via Oxidative Polymerization

# for Efficient Photocatalytic Applications: Organic Pollutant Degradation and Hydrogen

#### Generation

Pritam Hait<sup>a</sup>, Rajeev Mehta<sup>b</sup>, and Soumen Basu<sup>a\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, TIET-Virginia Tech Center of Excellence in Emerging Materials, Thapar Institute of Engineering & Technology, Patiala-147004, India.

<sup>b</sup> Department of Chemical Engineering, TIET-Virginia Tech Center of Excellence in Emerging Materials, Thapar Institute of Engineering & Technology, Patiala-147004, India.

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: soumen.basu@thapar.edu (Dr. Soumen Basu)

#### S1. Chemicals used in the synthesis procedure:

The following chemicals were used for the synthesis of the materials: graphite fine powder (98%, LOBA CHEMIE), aniline (99%, LOBA CHEMIE), hydrochloric acid (36%, LOBA CHEMIE), ammonium persulfate (98%, SDFCL), thiourea (99.5%-100%, LOBA CHEMIE), Ammonium Molybdate (98%, LOBA CHEMIE), potassium permanganate (99%, LOBA CHEMIE), sodium nitrite (97%, LOBA CHEMIE), and hydrogen peroxide (30% solution, RANKEM). Methyl Orange was purchased from CDH Chemical.

### S2. Instrument specifications:

The as-prepared nanocomposites were characterized by various characterization techniques. The ultraviolet-visible absorption spectra of the synthesized materials were measured utilizing a UV-vis spectrophotometer instrument (Shimadzu UV 2600). Photoluminescence spectra were recorded utilizing a spectrofluorometer instrument (Shimadzu RF-6000). The shape of the prepared composite was analyzed using field emission scanning electron microscopy (FESEM, JEOL). The functional groups present in the materials were identified using Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy (Shimadzu IRTracer-100). The X-ray Photoelectron Microscopy (XPS) analysis was performed using a monochromatic aluminium source, specifically Al ka radiation, on an Omicron ESCA instrument with an energy of 1486.7 eV. Brunauere-Emmette-Teller (BET) method and Barrette-Joynere-Halenda (BJH) method were done by Belsorp Mini II instrument. The degraded products and possible Intermediate by-products of the degradation product were analysed by Gas Chromatography Mass Spectrometry (GCMS, Bruker SHS-40). The amount of hydrogen produced by photocatalytic water splitting was measured using GC-TCD (nucon 5765).



Fig. S1: FTIR of PANI, GO, MoS<sub>2</sub>, 1PGMS, 2.5PGMS, and 4PGMS.



Fig. S2: EIS plot of (a) GO, (b) PANI, (c) MS, and (d) 2.5PGMS.



Fig S3: Mott-Schottky plot of (a) PANI (b) MS (c) GO (d) 2.5PGMS.



**Fig. S4**: a, c, and e are adsorption-desorption curves of PANI, GO, and MS respectively, whereas b, d and f are BJH plots of PANI, GO, and MS respectively.



Fig. S5: a, c, and e are adsorption-desorption curves 4PGMS, 2.5 PGMS, and 1PGMS

Respectively, whereas b, d, and f are BJH plots of 4PGMS, 2.5 PGMS, and 1PGMS respectively.



Fig. S6: (a) FESEM image of 2.5PGMS (b,c) EDS spectrum of 2.5PGMS.

Table S1: GC-TCD results for standard sample gases, with the sacrificial agent, acidic

condition, basic condition, only catalyst (neutral condition), and Mineralization of methyl orange solution.

Samples	Gases	Peak area
Standard	H <sub>2</sub>	2.084
With sacrificial agent	H <sub>2</sub>	6.150
Acidic condition	H <sub>2</sub>	4.068

Basic condition	H <sub>2</sub>	3.33
Only catalyst	H <sub>2</sub>	1.66

Concentration =

$(standard\ concentration \times sample\ area)$	<pre>standard injection volume</pre>	gas volume generated
standard area	sample injection volume	sample taken (lit.)

Standard concentration 505 ppm.

# **S3. GC-MS data after degradation of methyl orange**







Fig. S7: Kinetic graph.

 Table S2: Comparison with different photocatalyst materials for photocatalytic degradation.

Photocatalyst	Catalyst amount (mg)	% degradation	Time (min)	References
PANI-TiO <sub>2</sub>	10	89.7	120	1
PANI/TiO <sub>2</sub> /Cotton	_	87.7	180	2
PANI/TiO <sub>2</sub> /SiO <sub>2</sub>	-	87	120	3
PANI/Fe-TiO <sub>2</sub>		28	150	4
Ag-Ag <sub>2</sub> O/TiO <sub>2</sub> @PPY	100	100	175	5
PEDOT/GO/MnO <sub>2</sub>	20	92.7	420	6
RGO/mesoTiO <sub>2</sub> /AuNP	10	_	240	7
PANI@GN/TiO2	50	87	180	8

Ag <sub>2</sub> O/TiO <sub>2</sub> @PPY	50	100	240	9
PANI/TiO2	5	99	360	10
Ag-ZnO/PANI	200	98.6	120	11
PANI/GO/MoS <sub>2</sub> (2.5%)	2	99	120	Present
				work

#### References

- 1 H. M. El-Bery, M. R. Salah, S. M. Ahmed and S. A. Soliman, *RSC Adv.*, 2021, **11**, 13229–13244.
- 2 J. Ma, J. Dai, Y. Duan, J. Zhang, L. Qiang and J. Xue, *Renew. Energy*, 2020, **156**, 1008–1018.
- 3 A. Li, W. Zhu, C. Li, T. Wang and J. Gong, *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 2019, **48**, 1874–1907.
- J. Kröger, A. Jiménez-Solano, G. Savasci, P. Rovó, I. Moudrakovski, K. Küster, H. Schlomberg, H. A. Vignolo-González, V. Duppel, L. Grunenberg, C. B. Dayan, M. Sitti, F. Podjaski, C. Ochsenfeld and B. V. Lotsch, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2021, 11, 2003016.
- 5 R. Kumar, R. El-Shishtawy and M. Barakat, *Catalysts*, 2016, 6, 76.
- L. Zhang, R. Jamal, Q. Zhao, M. Wang and T. Abdiryim, *Nanoscale Res. Lett.*, 2015, 10, 148.
- 7 Y. Yang, Z. Ma, L. Xu, H. Wang and N. Fu, *Appl. Surf. Sci.*, 2016, **369**, 576–583.
- 8 R. Kumar, M. O. Ansari, N. Parveen, M. Oves, M. A. Barakat, A. Alshahri, M. Y. Khan and M. H. Cho, *RSC Adv.*, 2016, **6**, 111308–111317.
- 9 R. Kumar, J. Colloid Interface Sci., 2016, 477, 83–93.
- 10 Y.-J. Lee, H. S. Lee, C.-G. Lee, S.-J. Park, J. Lee, S. Jung and G.-A. Shin, *Appl. Sci.*, 2020, **10**, 6710.
- 11 F. Habtamu, S. Berhanu and T. Mender, J. Chem., 2021, 2021, 1–12.