## **Supporting Information**

# Post-metalation of porous aromatic frameworks for highly efficient carbon capture from CO<sub>2</sub>+N<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub>+N<sub>2</sub> mixtures

Heping Ma<sup>a</sup>, Hao Ren<sup>a</sup>, Xiaoqin Zou<sup>a</sup>, Shuang Meng<sup>a</sup>, Fuxing Sun<sup>a</sup>, and Guangshan Zhu<sup>a,b\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> State Key Laboratory of Inorganic Synthesis & Preparative Chemistry, Jilin University, Changchun, 130012, China. Tel/Fax: (+86)431-8516-8331 E-mail: zhugs@jlu.edu.cn

<sup>b</sup> Queensland Micro- and Nanotechnology Centre, Griffith University, Queensland, 4111, Australia.



Fig. S1 XRD patterns of PAF-26-COOH, PAF-26-COOLi, PAF-26-COONa, PAF-26-COOK and

PAF-26-COOMg samples.



Fig. S2 SEM images of PAF-26-COOH (a) and PAF-26-COOMg (b).



Fig. S3 TG curves of PAF-26-COOH and PAF-26-COOM samples.

**Table S1**. Elemental analysis of PAF-26-COOH.

	C (wt %)	H (wt %)	N (wt %)	S (wt %)
Theoretical value	86.5	3.68	0	0
Experiment value	87.2	3.54	0.02	0.028



Fig. S4 Pore size distribution of PAF-26-COOH (a), PAF-26-COOLi (b), PAF-26-COONa (c),

PAF-26-COOK (d), and PAF-26-COOMg (e) samples.



Fig. S5 CO<sub>2</sub> adsorption isotherms for PAF-26-COOH and PAF-26-COOM at 298 K.



Fig. S6 CH<sub>4</sub> adsorption isotherms for PAF-26-COOH and PAF-26-COOM at 298 K.



Fig. S7  $N_2$  adsorption isotherms for PAF-26-COOH and PAF-26-COOM at 273 K (a), and at 298 K (b).



**Fig. S8** Cyclic  $CO_2$  adsorption–desorption of freshly prepared PAF-26-COOMg (black), after 2 months (red) and 4 months (bule) exposure in air. Before measurement, the sample was degassed at 80 °C for 5 h.



Fig S9. CO<sub>2</sub> adsorption isotherms of PAF-26-COOMg and CO<sub>2</sub> adsorption of PAF-26-COOMg

obtained after 3 days exposure in wet air at 273 K.



Fig S10. XPS spectra of PAF-26-COOH.



Fig. S11 Enlarged views of XPS spectra of Pd 3d, Cu 2p, Br 3d, P 2p, N 1s, and I 3d in the PAF-26-COOH sample.

#### Qst Calculations

The  $Q_{st}$  of CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub> was calculated as a function of the gas uptake based on the adsorption isotherms at 273 K and 298 K (the isotherms and fitting parameters are shown in Fig. S9-S13). The data was modelled with a virial-type expression composed of parameters  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  according to *equation* 1. The isosteric heats of adsorption were calculated by fitting the parameters according to *equation* 2. In these two equations, p is the pressure, N the amount adsorbed, T the temperature, and R the universal gas constant, m and n determine the number of terms required to adequately describe the isotherm,  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  are virial coefficients.

$$\ln p = \ln N + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=0}^{m} a_{i} N^{i} + \sum_{i=0}^{n} b_{i} N^{i}$$
(1)
$$Q_{st} = -R \sum_{i=0}^{m} a_{i} N^{i}$$
(2)

The basicity of metalized PAF-26 is estimated by the moles of ion contained in the material multiplied by the hydrolysis constants of the metal ion; thus, the pKb for PAF-26-COOLi: 2.46\*13.8=33.948, PAF-26-COONa: 2.6\*14.6=37.96, PAF-26-COOK: 2.4\*15=36, PAF-26-COOMg: 1.3\*11.6=15.08, respectively.<sup>[a]</sup> [a] C. F. Baes, R. E. Mesmer, The Hydrolysis of Cations. A Wiley-Interscience publication, 1976.

#### **Selectivity Calculations**

The ideal adsorption solution theory (IAST) was used to predict the binary mixture adsorption of  $CO_2/N_2$  and  $CH_4/N_2$  from the experimental pure-gas isotherms. It has been reported that IAST can accurately predict gas mixture adsorption in many nanoporous materials, including porous-organic frameworks. The single-component isotherms were fitted using a dual-site Langmuir-Freundlich equation:

$$q = q_{m1} \cdot \frac{b_1 \cdot p^{1/n_1}}{1 + b_1 \cdot p^{1/n_1}} + q_{m2} \cdot \frac{b_2 \cdot p^{1/n_2}}{1 + b_2 \cdot p^{1/n_2}}$$

Here, *p* is the pressure of the bulk gas at equilibrium with the adsorbed phase (kPa), *q* is the adsorbed amount per mass of adsorbent (mmol  $g^{-1}$ ),  $q_{m1}$  and  $q_{m2}$  are the saturation capacities of sites 1 and 2 (mmol  $g^{-1}$ ),  $b_1$  and  $b_2$  are the affinity coefficients of sites 1 and 2 (kPa<sup>-1</sup>), and  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  represent the deviations from an ideal homogeneous surface.

The IAST adsorption selectivity, S, for binary mixtures of  $CO_2(1)/N_2(2)$  or  $CH_4(1)/N_2(2)$ , is defined as

$$S = \frac{q_1 / q_2}{p_1 / p_2}$$

where  $q_i$  and  $p_i$  (i=1, 2) are the mole fractions of component 1 and 2 in the adsorbed and bulk phases, respectively. **Table S2.** Comparison of  $Q_{st}$  for  $CO_2$  and  $CH_4$ , and selectivities for  $CO_2$  and  $CH_4$  over  $N_2$  at 298 K using PAF-26 materials in this work with other porous materials from open literatures.

Adsorbent	$Q_{st}$ for $CO_2$	Selectivity	$Q_{st}$ for $CH_4$	Selectivity	Reference
	(kJ mol <sup>-1</sup> )	for CO <sub>2</sub>	(kJ mol <sup>-1</sup> )	for CH <sub>4</sub>	
		over N <sub>2</sub>		over N <sub>2</sub>	
13 X zeolite				2.3-4.0	S1
Silicalite-1				1.8-3.0	S1
H-ZSM-5				3.0-3.6	S1
Activated carbon				4.0-5.5	S1
BILP-1-BILP-7	26.7-28.8	62-113	13-18.4	-	S2
СМР-1-(ОН)2	28.5	-	-	-	S3
CMP-1-(CH <sub>3</sub> )2	28.6	-	-	-	S3
СМР-1-СООН	35	-	-	-	S3
CMP-1-NH <sub>2</sub>	27.8	-	-	-	S3
PPN-6-SO <sub>3</sub> H	30.5	150	-	-	S4
PPN-6-SO <sub>3</sub> Li	36	414	-	-	S4
UMCM-1	12		10	2 <sup>a</sup>	\$5,\$6
ZIF-68		18.7	15.7	3.5 <sup>b</sup>	\$5,\$6
ZIF-69		20	16.2	3 <sup>b</sup>	\$5,\$6
IRMOF-1	17		9.98	2 <sup>c</sup>	S5,S6

MIL-47(V)	25	10	14.7	5 <sup>°</sup>	\$5,\$6
HKUST-1	35	32	18.4	3 <sup>c</sup>	\$5,\$6
IR-MOF-11- 14	17-25	3-11	10-20	2-4 <sup>c</sup>	\$5,\$6
Cu(Me-4py-trz-ia)	30		18.5	4.4 <sup>d</sup>	S7
Basolite A100			19.8	4 <sup>d</sup>	S7
PAF-26-COOH	28.1	20	14.3	4.2 <sup>e</sup>	This work
PAF-26-COOLi	31.8	24	16.5	4.4 <sup>e</sup>	This work
PAF-26-COONa	30.0	53	26.0	5.0 <sup>e</sup>	This work
PAF-26-COOK	32.6	50	24.0	5.8 <sup>e</sup>	This work
PAF-26-COOMg	35.0	73	21.5	6.0 <sup>e</sup>	This work

Adsorption selectivities of CH<sub>4</sub> over  $N_2^{a}$  at 4 Mpa, <sup>b</sup> at 3 MPa, <sup>c</sup> at 2 MPa, <sup>d</sup> at 1 MPa,

<sup>e</sup> at 0.1 MPa and at the temperature of 298 K.

### **References:**

- S1. P. Li and F. H. Tezel, J. Chem. Eng. Data, 2009, 54, 8.
- S2. M. G. Rabbani and H. M. El-Kaderi, Chem. Mater., 2012, 24, 1511.
- S3. R. Dawson, D. J. Adams, A. I. Cooper, Chem. Sci., 2011, 2, 1173.
- S4. W. Lu, D. Yuan, J. Sculley, D. Zhao, R. Krishna, H. C. Zhou, J. Am. Chem. Soc.,

2011, **133**, 18126.

- S5. K. Sumida, D. L. Rogow, J. A. Mason, T. M. McDonald, E. D. Bloch, Z. R. Herm,
- T. H. Bae, J. R. Long, Chem. Rev., 2012, 112, 724.
- S6. J. Liu, P. K. Thallapally, B. P. McGrail, D. R. Brown, J. Liu, Chem. Soc. Rev., 2012, 41, 2308.

S7. J. Möllmer, M. Lange, A. Möller, C. Patzschke, K. Stein, D. Lässig, J. Lincke, R.

Gläser, H. Krautscheid, R. Staudt, J. Mater. Chem., 2012, 22, 10274.