

## Supplementary Information

# Macroalgae-based biochar: preparation and characterization of physicochemical properties for potential applications

Anjon Kumar Mondal<sup>a</sup>, Cora Hinkley<sup>a</sup>, Lakshmi Krishnan<sup>a</sup>, Nandhini Ravi<sup>a</sup>, Farjana Akter<sup>a</sup>, Peter Ralph<sup>a</sup>, Unnikrishnan Kuzhiumparambil<sup>a \*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Climate Change Cluster, University of Technology Sydney, Ultimo, NSW 2007, Australia

### S1 Calculation of biochar, bio-oil and gas obtained from five macroalgal biomasses.

The biochar, bio-oil and gas yield were calculated using the following equations: <sup>1</sup>

$$\text{Yield of biochar } (Y_{\text{biochar}}) = M_c/M_f \times 100 \quad (1)$$

Where, Y = Yield of biochar (%), M<sub>c</sub> = Mass of biochar (g), M<sub>f</sub> = Mass of biomass (g).

$$\text{Yield of bio-oil } (Y_{\text{bio-oil}}) = M_{\text{bio-oil}}/M_f \times 100 \quad (2)$$

Where, Y = Yield of bio-oil (%), M<sub>bio-oil</sub> = Mass of bio-oil (g), M<sub>f</sub> = Mass of biomass (g).

The weight difference was used to calculate the yield percentage of gas by subtracting the mass of biomass with the mass of biochar and bio-oil. Subsequently, the yield of gases was estimated using the mass of gases obtained.

$$M_g = M_f - (M_c + M_{\text{bio-oil}}) \quad (3)$$

$$M_g = \text{Mass of gas (g)}$$

$$Y_g = M_g/M_f \times 100 \quad (4)$$

Where, Y<sub>g</sub> = Yield of gas (biogas + syngas) (%).

**Table S2**

Name	<i>Ulva</i> <i>Sp.</i>	<i>Asparagopsis</i>	<i>Oedogonium</i> <i>Sp.</i>	<i>Kappaphycus</i> <i>alvarezii</i>	<i>Eucheuma</i> <i>denticulatum</i>
Biochar (%)	30.46	40.00	28.20	41.59	46.96
Bio-oil (%)	6.37	7.04	9.06	8.95	6.87
Gas (%)	63.17	52.96	62.74	49.46	46.17

**Table S3 Comparison of biochar properties obtained from 5 macroalgal biomasses and biochar from other feedstocks.**

Parameters	Yield (%)	Ash (%)	Volatile matter (%)	pH	FC	C	N	Reference
Wheat straw	-	20.8		10.4		46.70	0.59	<sup>2</sup>
Wood	23.3	1.30	6.40	9.10	93.6	92.3	-	<sup>3</sup>
Straw	25.2	24.5	7.40	11.3	92.6	90.3	-	<sup>3</sup>
Green waste	24.4	13.40	8.80	11.3	91.2	88.4		<sup>3</sup>
Conocarpus wastes	-	8.56	27.22	12.2	-	82.90	0.71	<sup>4</sup>
Peanut shell	21.9	8.9	32.7	10.6	-	83.8	-	<sup>5</sup>
Safflower seed	-	9.20	11.6	9.89	-	73.72	3.84	<sup>6</sup>
Forest residues	-	-	24	8.70	-	75.9	0.45	<sup>7</sup>
Pig manure	-	51.20	22.6		-	33.8	3.18	<sup>8</sup>
Chicken Manure	55.9	56.4	26.5	11.7	-	24.7	-	<sup>9</sup>
Dairy manure		39.5	27.7	9.9	-	56.7	-	<sup>10</sup>
Cow manure		-	-	9.2	-	33.6	1.51	<sup>11</sup>
Oil mallee		15.6	4.10	-	-	80.1	0.30	<sup>12</sup>
Wood Ponderosa pine	-	2.1	25.2	-	-	81.9	0.08	<sup>13</sup>
Coffee husk	31.6	19.6	17.6	9.9	-	66.0	-	<sup>9</sup>
Mulberry wood	26.2	9.8	-	10.6	-	77.0	-	<sup>14</sup>
Corn stover	17.0	32.8	-	7.2	-	57.3	-	<sup>15</sup>
<i>Ulva Sp.</i>	30.46	31.1	22.87	10.53	42.41	55.77	3.78	Current work
<i>Asparagopsis</i>	40.0	30.86	34.21	9.74	32.5	51.89	4.97	Current work
<i>Oedogonium Sp.</i>	28.2	12.6	14.57	10.95	68.86	70.23	7.91	Current work
<i>Kappaphycus alvarezii</i>	41.59	41.73	31.34	10.42	24.94	52.23	0.99	Current work
<i>Eucheuma denticulatum</i>	46.96	52.12	43.92	9.86	2.63	40.12	1.50	Current work

**Table S4 Adsorption efficiency and adsorption capacity of five macroalgal biochar samples.**

Adsorption	<i>Ulva</i> <i>Sp.</i>	<i>Asparagopsis</i>	<i>Oedogonium</i> <i>Sp.</i>	<i>Kappaphycus</i> <i>alvarezii</i>	<i>Eucheuma</i> <i>denticulatum</i>
Adsorption efficiency (%)	100.00	98.10	96.78	98.09	95.47
Adsorption capacity (mg/g)	0.5	0.24	0.10	0.05	0.008

## References

1. W. Z. W. Muhammad, M. R. Isa, S. H. Habib, C. C. Seah, R. Hafriz and A. H. Shamsuddin, *Energy Conversion and Management: X*, 2023, **20**, 100481.
2. A. Zhang, L. Cui, G. Pan, L. Li, Q. Hussain, X. Zhang, J. Zheng and D. Crowley, *Agriculture, ecosystems & environment*, 2010, **139**, 469-475.
3. F. Ronsse, S. Van Hecke, D. Dickinson and W. Prins, *Gcb Bioenergy*, 2013, **5**, 104-115.
4. M. I. Al-Wabel, A. Al-Omran, A. H. El-Naggar, M. Nadeem and A. R. A. Usman, *Bioresource technology*, 2013, **131**, 374-379.
5. M. Ahmad, S. S. Lee, X. Dou, D. Mohan, J.-K. Sung, J. E. Yang and Y. S. Ok, *Bioresource technology*, 2012, **118**, 536-544.
6. D. Angın, *Bioresource technology*, 2013, **128**, 593-597.
7. N. Anderson, J. G. Jones, D. Page-Dumroese, D. McCollum, S. Baker, D. Loeffler and W. Chung, *Energies*, 2013, **6**, 164-183.
8. S. M. Troy, T. Nolan, J. J. Leahy, P. G. Lawlor, M. G. Healy and W. Kwapinski, *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 2013, **49**, 1-9.
9. R. R. Domingues, P. F. Trugilho, C. A. Silva, I. C. N. A. d. Melo, L. C. A. Melo, Z. M. Magriotis and M. A. Sanchez-Moneder, *PloS one*, 2017, **12**, e0176884.
10. K. B. Cantrell, P. G. Hunt, M. Uchimiya, J. M. Novak and K. S. Ro, *Bioresource technology*, 2012, **107**, 419-428.
11. K. C. Uzoma, M. Inoue, H. Andry, H. Fujimaki, A. Zahoor and E. Nishihara, *Soil use and management*, 2011, **27**, 205-212.
12. P. Shivaram, Y.-K. Leong, H. Yang and D. K. Zhang, *Fuel*, 2013, **104**, 326-332.
13. K. Marco, S. N. Peter, G. J. Mark and K. Markus, *Environmental Science & Technology*, 2010, **44**, 1247-1253.
14. E. F. Zama, Y.-G. Zhu, B. J. Reid and G.-X. Sun, *Journal of cleaner production*, 2017, **148**, 127-136.
15. C. A. Mullen, A. A. Boateng, N. M. Goldberg, I. M. Lima, D. A. Laird and K. B. Hicks, *Biomass and bioenergy*, 2010, **34**, 67-74.