Hydrodeoxygenation of Lignin-Derived Phenols into Alkanes over Carbon Nanotubes Supported Ru Catalysts in Biphasic Systems

Anhui Province Key Laboratory of Biomass Clean Energy, Department of Chemistry, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, China. Fax: (+86)-551-63606689

> **Corresponding author: Yao Fu** E-mail: fuyao@ustc.edu.cn

Catalysts	Metal Dispersion/ %	Metallic Surface Area/ m ² /g metal
5%Ru/CNT	27.2102	99.5614
5%Ru/C	77.6735	284.2050
5%Ru/ZrO ₂	34.6094	126.6350
5%Ru/CeO ₂	0.3265	1.1948

Table S1. Chemisorption of supported-Ru catalysts

Table S2. N_2 adsorption and desorption of supported-Ru catalysts

Catalysts	Surface Area/ m ² /g ^a	Pore Volume/ m ³ /g ^b	Pore Size/ Å ^c
5%Ru/CNT	201.6027	0.725084	138.560
5%Ru/C	1245.1460	1.222686	42.568
5%Ru/ZrO ₂	98.8010	0.270289	91.374
5%Ru/CeO ₂	5.2126	0.026519	179.750

a. BET Surface Area; b. BJH Desorption cumulative volume of pores between 17.000 Å and 3000.000

Å diameter; c. BJH Desorption average pore diameter (4V/A)

	Ru ⁰ Area	Ru(IV) Area	Ru(IV) (Hydrate)	$\mathbf{D}_{11}0/(\mathbf{D}_{11}(\mathbf{I}_{1})+\mathbf{D}_{11}(\mathbf{I}_{2}))$
Catalysts	$(462.2 \pm 0.2$	$(464.2 \pm 0.3$	Area	Ku ⁽ /(Ku(IV)+Ku(IV)
	eV)	eV)	(466.5 ±0.5 eV)	Hydrate)
Ru/CNT	1937	1057	863	1.01
Ru/C	2343	1168	875	1.15
Ru/ZrO ₂	3842	1229	927	1.78
Ru/CeO ₂	3097	1169	851	1.53
Ru/CNT(used)	1564	523	395	1.70

 Table S3. XPS Ru 3p analysis for supported-Ru catalysts and used Ru/CNT



Figure S1. Chemisorption of Ru/CNT







Figure S3. Chemisorption of Ru/ZrO₂



Figure S4. Chemisorption of Ru/CeO_2



Figure S5. BJH pore size distributions for Ru/CNT



Figure S6. BJH pore size distributions for Ru/C



Figure S7. BJH pore size distributions for Ru/ZrO_2



Figure S8. BJH pore size distributions for Ru/CeO₂



Figure S9. XPS Ru 3p spectra for Ru/CNT



Figure S10. XPS Ru 3p spectra for Ru/C



Figure S11. XPS Ru 3p spectra for Ru/ZrO₂



Figure S12. XPS Ru 3p spectra for Ru/CeO₂



Figure S13. XPS Ru 3p spectra for the used Ru/CNT



Figure S14. SEM and TEM micrographs of 5%Ru/CNT, 5%Ru/C, 5%Ru/ZrO₂ and 5%Ru/CeO₂



Figure S15. Ru particle size distribution for Ru/CNT











Figure S18. Ru particle size distribution for Ru/CeO_2

3. Discussion

Catalyst characterization

Table. S1 summarizes the metal dispersion and metallic surface area achieved from the chemisorption of Ru/CNT, Ru/C, Ru/ZrO₂ and Ru/CeO₂.

The CO adsorption curves for Ru/CNT, Ru/C, Ru/ZrO₂ and Ru/CeO₂ are shown in Figure. S1-S4. It can be confirmed from these figures that Ru/C showed a better adsorbing capacity than the others. The asorbing capacity of Ru/CNT was similar to that of Ru/ZrO₂, while Ru/CeO₂ showed the least adsorption performance.

Table S2 shows the BET surface area (S_{BET}), pore volume (V_p) and pore size (D_p) of Ru/CNT, Ru/C, Ru/ZrO₂ and Ru/CeO₂.

The BJH pore size distributions for Ru/CNT, Ru/C, Ru/ZrO₂ and Ru/CeO₂ are shown in Figure. S4-S7. All these four supported-Ru catalysts shows characteristic of mesoporous materials. However, the N₂ adsorption and desorption curves of Ru/C (not shown here) indicates the presence of partial micropores which are not dominating in Ru/C. Ru/C shows the maximum surface area which is $1245m^2/g$, in the cases of Ru/CNT, Ru/ZrO₂ and Ru/CeO₂, $202 m^2/g$, 99 m²/g and 5 m²/g are achieved, respectively.

The XPS Ru 3p analysis for supported-Ru catalysts and used Ru/CNT in Table S3 and Figures. S9-S13 indicates the presence of Ru⁰, Ru (IV) and Ru (IV)(hydrate) simultaneously, and the ratio of Ru⁰/ (Ru (IV)+ Ru (IV)(hydrate)) are calculated through the peak area in Table S3. The ratio showed a higher content of Ru⁰ than Ru (IV) and Ru (IV)(hydrate) existed in all the supported-Ru catalysts. The XPS analysis of the used catalysts showed that Ru (IV) and Ru (IV)(hydrate) particles were further reduced into Ru⁰ particles under the reductive reaction condition.

Figure. S14 shows the scanning electron microscopy (SEM) microphotographs and transmission electron microscopy (TEM) microphotographs of Ru/CNT, Ru/C, Ru/ZrO₂ and Ru/CeO₂. The SEM and TEM microphotographs indicates that the Ru particles were dispersed on all the supports homogeneously. And the Ru particle size distribution for all the supported-Ru catalysts (Figure. S15-S18) were calculated from the TEM microphotographs (Figure. S14).

The HDO of phenols extracted from bio-oil.

The crude bio-oil was obtained by flash pyrolysis of rice husk at 550-600°C according to the previous work ^[1]. Phenols were separated from the crude bio-oil by a modified glycerol-assisted distillation technology ^[1]: a mixture of 10 g glycerin and 100 g bio-oil was distilled. The first distillate under 120°C was about 60 g. The second distillate (about 10 g), mainly consisted of phenols was obtained under 0.1 atm at 120°C. The mixture of the second distillate was washed by NaHCO₃ and the organic layer was extracted by hexane. The hexane was removed by a rotary evaporation. And the mixture of phenols for the hydrodeoxygenation reaction was collected as a light yellow liquid.

The reaction conditions for the HDO of the bio-oil was as follow: bio-oil 200 mg, 5 wt% Ru/CNT 50 mg, $n-C_{12}H_{26}/H_2O= 6/6$ ml, 5.0 MPa H₂, 270°C, 20 h. The products after the reaction were extracted by ethyl acetate and analyzed by GC and GC-MS (Figure. 4). All the phenols

were converted into alkanes in the biphasic systems.



Figure. S19 GC-MS analysis of the mixture of phenols from bio-oil



Figure. S20 GC-MS analysis of the mixture of the alkanes products after the hydrodeoxygenation of bio-oil

Table S4. The weight of alkane products from the HDO of bio-oil. (Extracted phenols 200mg)

Entry	Alkane	Retention Time/ min	Weight/ mg
1	\bigcirc	2.68	13.47

2	\bigcirc	3.50	9.28
3		3.66	1.43
4		4.53	0.88
5	-71-	4.70	0.72
6		5.74	0.78
7	\bigcirc	5.84	15.56
8	\sum	7.30	0.66
9	\bigcirc	8.25	0.62
10	\bigcirc	8.55	5.74
Total	-	-	49.14

[1] J. Guo; R. Ruan, Y. Zhang, Ind. Eng. Chem. Res. 2012, 51, 6599.