Deciphering the Role of Hydrothermal Pretreatment on Biomass Waste for Derived Hard Carbon with Superior Electrochemical Performance in Sodium-ion Battery

Wenxiu Li,^{ab†} Jian Cui,^{b†} Wendong Ye,^b Panpan Su,^{*b} Xuefen Song,^b Tai Yang,^{*a} Yongguang Zhang ^{*b} and Zhongwei Chen ^{*b}

^a School of Materials Science and Engineering, Hebei University of Technology, Tianjin, 300130, China.

^b Power Battery and Systems Research Center, State Key Laboratory of Catalysis, Dalian Institute of Chemical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Dalian, 116023, China

[†] Wenxiu Li and Jian Cui contributed equally to this work.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: panpansu@dicp.ac.cn (P. Su), yangtai@hebut.edu.cn (T. Yang), ygzhang@dicp.ac.cn (Y. Zhang), zwchen@dicp.ac.cn (Z. Chen).



Fig. S1 TG curve of raw material.



Fig. S2 (a) XRD patterns and (b) the relative crystallinity of HY-P, HY-A, HY-W.



Fig. S3 Infrared spectra of HY-P, HY-A, HY-W.



Fig. S4 TEM images of (a) HC-P, (b) HC-A, (c) HC-W.



Fig. S5 Closed pore size distribution of HC-P, HC-A and HC-W.



Fig. S6 XRD patterns of HC-P, HC-A and HC-W.



Fig. S7 (a) CV curves at different scan rates from 0.1 to 2.0 mV s⁻¹ and (b) b-values of HC-P. (c) Capacitive contribution at different scan rates of HC-P.



Fig. S8 (a) CV curves at different scan rates from 0.1 to 2.0 mV s⁻¹ and (b) b-values of HC-A. (c) Capacitive contribution at different scan rates of HC-A.



Fig. S9 The in-situ XRD curve of HC-P at 0.15 C.



Fig. S10 The in-situ XRD curve of HC-A at 0.15 C.



Fig. S11 (a) Ex-situ SAXS and (b) closed pore size distribution of HC-P at 1.0 V, 0.1 V and 0.01 V.



Fig. S12 (a) Ex-situ SAXS and (b) closed pore size distribution of HC-A at 1.0 V, 0.1 V and 0.01 V.

| Samples | R _{SAXS} (Å) | d ₀₀₂ (nm) | L _a (nm) | L _c (nm) | FWHM (°) | A _D /A _G |
|---------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|
| НС-Р | 3.8 | 0.4 | 3.3 | 0.8 | 7.6 | 1.37 |
| HC-A | 3.6 | 0.4 | 3.2 | 0.7 | 7.4 | 1.31 |
| HC-W | 3.8 | 0.4 | 3.3 | 0.8 | 7.9 | 1.42 |

 Table S1. Structure parameters of samples.

 Table S2. Microcrystalline parameters of samples.

| Band | Samples | Raman shift (cm ⁻¹) | Corresponding structure |
|-------|---------|---------------------------------|---|
| | HC-P | 1581.7 | |
| G | HC-A | 1590.0 | Vibration of the graphite |
| | HC-W | 1586.9 | crystal |
| | HC-P | 1351.9 | |
| D(D1) | HC-A | 1351.8 | Disordered graphite lattice |
| | HC-W | 1350.8 | |
| | HC-P | 1613.7 | |
| D2 | HC-A | 1604.3 | Layer-stacking arrangement |
| | HC-W | 1616.1 | of carbon atoms in graphene |
| | HC-P | 1486.3 | |
| D3 | HC-A | 1480.6 | Amorphous carbon |
| | HC-W | 1490.0 | |
| | HC-P | 1236.9 | |
| D4 | HC-A | 1250.1 | Disordered structure of sp ² - |
| | HC-W | 1232.5 | sp ³ |

| Precursors | Reversible capacity | Initial coulombic efficiency | Rate capacity | Capacity retention | Reference s |
|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---|---|----------------|
| Sunflower seed shells | 287 mAh g ⁻¹ at 25 mA g ⁻¹ | 76% | 135 mAh g ⁻¹ at 372 mA g ⁻¹ | 85% after 500 cycles at 372 mA g ⁻¹ | 1 |
| Aegle marmelos shell | 224 mAh g ⁻¹ at 10 mA g ⁻¹ | 76% | 78 mAh g ⁻¹ at 1 A g ⁻¹ | 66% after 2500 cycles at 1000 mA g ⁻¹ | 2 |
| Peanut shell | 204 mAh g ⁻¹ at 30 mA g ⁻¹ | 54% | 99 mAh g ⁻¹ at 300 mA g ⁻¹ | 81% after 100 cycles at 300 mA g ⁻¹ | 3 |
| Corncob | 272 mAh g^{-1} at 30 mA g^{-1} | 67% | 35 mAh g^{-1} at 2 A g^{-1} | 79% after 100 cycles at 30 mA g ⁻¹ | 4 |
| Spartina alterniflora loisel | 142 mAh g ⁻¹ at 50 mA g ⁻¹ | 42% | 150 mAh g ⁻¹ at 500 mA g ⁻¹ | 42% after 1000 cycles at 200 mA g ⁻¹ | 5 |
| Green peas pod | 293 mAh g ⁻¹ at 30 mA g ⁻¹ | 74% | 142 mAh g ⁻¹ at 300 mA g ⁻¹ | 74% after 100 cycles at 30 mA g ⁻¹ | 6 |

Table S3. Comparison of the electrochemical performance with typical biomass-derived HC reported previously.

| Sugarcane bagasse | 300 mAh g ⁻¹ at 25 mA g ⁻¹ | 57% | 115 mAh $g^{-1} \text{ at } 1 \text{ A}$ g^{-1} | 67% after 300 cycles at 100 mA g^{-1} | 7 |
|-----------------------|---|-----|---|---|----|
| Macadamia nutshell | 118 mAh g ⁻¹ at 100 mA g ⁻¹ | 54% | 200 mAh g ⁻¹ at 200 mA g ⁻¹ | 65% after 100 cycles at 20 mA g^{-1} | 8 |
| Rice husks | 251 mAh g ⁻¹ at 25 mA g ⁻¹ | 67% | 111 mAh g ⁻¹ at 500 mA g ⁻¹ | 85% after 500 cycles at 100 mA g ⁻¹ | 9 |
| Vine shoots | 270 mAh g^{-1} at 30 mA g^{-1} | 71% | 110 mAh g ⁻¹ at 100 mA g ⁻¹ | 97% after 315 cycles at 100 mA g^{-1} | 10 |
| Natural balsa | 248 mAh g ⁻¹ at 100 mA g ⁻¹ | 32% | 100 mAh $g^{-1} \text{ at } 2 \text{ A}$ g^{-1} | 95% after 500 cycles at 2 A g^{-1} | 11 |
| Pomegranate peel | 359 mAh $g^{-1} \text{ at } 30$ $mA g^{-1}$ | 52% | 84 mAh g^{-1} at 600 mA g^{-1} | 68% after 200 cycles at 150 mA g ⁻¹ | 12 |
| Platanus flosses | 260 mAh g ⁻¹ at 100 mA g ⁻¹ | 80% | 107 mAh $g^{-1} \text{ at } 2 \text{ A}$ g^{-1} | 80% after 1000 cycles at 500 mA g^{-1} | 13 |
| Waste hemp hurd | 262 mAh g^{-1} at 30 | 73% | 79 mAh g^{-1} at 1 A | 96% after 300 cycles | 14 |

| | $mA g^{-1}$ | | g^{-1} | at 2 A g^{-1} | |
|-----------------|--|-----|--|--------------------------------------|-----------|
| Coffee | 225 mAh | | 119 mAh g ⁻¹ at | 92% after 250 cycles | |
| ground | ground g^{-1} at 50 mA g^{-1} | 62% | 2500 mA | at 50 mA g^{-1} | 15 |
| Almond shell | 317 mAh g^{-1} at 37 mA g^{-1} | 86% | 267 mAh g ⁻¹ at 3720 mA | 91% after 600 cycles at 372 mA | This work |
| | 6 | | g^{-1} | g^{-1} | |

 Table S4. Closed pore sizes of samples.

| abie 54: Closed pol | ne 54. Closed pore sizes of samples. | | | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Samples | 1.0 V (Å) | 0.1 V (Å) | 0.01 V(Å) | | | |
| НС-Р | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.6 | | | |
| HC-A | 4.2 | 4.2 | 3.6 | | | |
| HC-W | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.6 | | | |

References:

- N. Nieto, J. Porte, D. Saurel, L. Djuandhi, N. Sharma, A. Lopez-Urionabarrenechea, V. Palomares and T. Rojo, *ChemSusChem*, 2023, 16, e202301053.
- 2 A. Patel, R. Mishra, R. K. Tiwari, A. Tiwari, D. Meghnani, S. K. Singh and R. K. Singh, *J. Energy Storage*, 2023, 72, 108424.
- B. T. Yan, C. Han, Y. M. Dai, M. Y. Li, Z. Y. Wu and X. P. Gao, *Fuel*, 2024, 371, 132141.
- 4 N. J. Song, N. N. Guo, C. L. Ma, Y. Zhao, W. X. Li and B. Q. Li, *Molecules*, 2023, 28, 3595.
- 5 H. Y. Wei, H. K. Cheng, N. Yao, G. Li, Z. Q. Du, R. X. Luo and Z. Zheng, *Chemosphere*, 2023, **343**, 140220.
- 6 M. Venkatesh, P. L. Mani Kanta, T. Thomas, R. Vijay, T. N. Rao and B. Das, *Biomass Bioenergy*, 2025, **194**, 107646.
- 7 B. Verma, H. Raj, H. Rajput and A. Sil, *Ionics*, 2023, **29**, 5205-5216.
- 8 U. Kumar, J. Wu, N. Sharma and V. Sahajwalla, *Energy Fuels*, 2021, 35, 1820-1830.
- 9 W. Nie, X. L. Liu, Q. M. Xiao, L. X. Li, G. X. Chen, D. Li, M. Zeng and S. W. Zhong, *ChemElectroChem*, 2020, 7, 631-641.
- 10 D. Alvira, D. Antorán, M. Vidal, V. Sebastian and J. J. Manyà, *Batteries Supercaps*, 2023, **6**, e202300233.
- W. F. Jing, M. Wang, Y. Li, H. R. Li, H. N. Zhang, S. L. Hu, H. Q. Wang and Y. B. He, *Electrochim. Acta*, 2021, **391**, 139000.
- 12 Q. J. Wu, K. W. Shu, L. Zhao and J. M. Zhang, *Molecules*, 2024, 29, 4639.
- 13 Z. D. Hou, D. Lei, M. W. Jiang, Y. Y. Gao, X. Zhang, Y. Zhang and J. G. Wang, ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces, 2023, 15, 1367-1375.
- D. Antorán, D. Alvira, M. E. Peker, H. Malón, S. Irusta, V. Sebastián and J. J. Manyà, *Energy Fuels*, 2023, 37, 9650-9661.

15 P. H. Chiang, S. F. Liu, Y. H. Hung, H. Tseng, C. H. Guo and H. Y. Chen, *Energy Fuels*, 2020, **34**, 7666-7675.