1	Non-mercury catalytic acetylene hydrochlorination over Ru				
2	confined in carbon nanotubes				
3 4 5	Guangbi Li, ^{a,b} Wei Li ^a , Haiyang Zhang ^a , Yanfeng Pu ^a , Mengxia Sun ^a and Jinli Zhang* ^a				
6	(aSchool of Chemical Engineering and Technology, Tianjin University, Tianjin				
7	300072, P. R. China; ^b Department of Environmental Science and Engineering,				
8	Tianjin University of Science and Technology, Tianjin 300457, P. R. China)				
9	*Corresponding Author: Tel: +86-22-27401476; Fax: +86-22-27403389				
10	E-mail: zhangjinli@tju.edu.cn				
11					
12	Supplementary Information				
13	Contents:				
14	Fig. S1 TEM images of the nitric acid-treated supports of (a) CNT, and (b) CNT-M.				
15	Fig. S2TEM images of different nanotubes including (a) raw-CNT, (b) CNT, (c) in-				
16	CNT, and (d) out-CNT				
17	Fig. S3Deconvolution profiles of Ru 3p3/2 XPS spectra for the fresh catalysts of (a)				
18	Ru-out-CNT and (b) Ru-in-CNT.				
19	Fig. S4Catalytic activities of different carbon nanotube supports.				
20	Fig. S5 TEM images and the particle size distributions of the fresh catalysts of Ru-in-				
21	CNT-M (a, c) and Ru-out-CNT-M (b, d).				
22	Fig. S6 Deconvolution profiles of Ru 3p3/2 XPS spectra for the fresh catalysts of (a)				
23	Ru-out-CNT-M and (b) Ru-in-CNT-M.				
24	Table S1 The binding energy (eV) and relative content (Area %) of ruthenium species				

23	In the fresh catalysis of Ku-III-CN I-IVI and Ku-Out-CN I-IVI.							
26	Table S2 Pore structure parameters of the support CNT-M and the supported Ru							
27	catalysts							
28								
29								
30								
31								
32								
33								
34								
35								
36								
37								
38								
39								
40								
41								

25 in the fresh catalysts of Ru-in-CNT-M and Ru-out-CNT-M.



43 Fig. S1 TEM images of the nitric acid-treated supports of (a) CNT, and (b) CNT-M.







- 54 out-CNT



60 Fig. S3Deconvolution profiles of Ru 3p3/2 XPS spectra for the fresh catalysts of (a) Ru-out-CNT-

- 61 M and (b) Ru-in-CNT-M.





Fig. S4Catalyticactivities of different carbon nanotube supports. Reaction conditions: temperature (*T*) =170 °C; C₂H₂ gas hourly space velocity (GHSV)= 90h⁻¹; feed volume ratio $V_{HCl}/V_{C_2H_2}$ =1.1.





Fig. S5TEM images and the particle size distributions of the fresh catalysts of Ru-in-CNT-M (a, c)
and Ru-out-CNT-M (b, d). (Red circle: Ru nanoparticles confined within nanochannels of CNT;
blue square: Ru nanoparticles located on external surface of CNT.)



96 Fig. S6Deconvolution profiles of Ru 3p3/2 spectra: (a) fresh Ru-out-CNT-M, and (b) fresh Ru-in-

97 CNT-M.

98

99 Table S1Pore structure parameters of the support CNT-M and the supported Ru catalysts

catalyst	$S_{BET}(m^2~g^{1})$	Pore diameter (nm)
raw-CNT-M ^a	110	5.01
CNT-M ^b	162	5.34
Ru-out-CNT-M	160	5.32
Ru-in-CNT-M	156	5.28

100 ^a: The raw multiwalled CNT-M purchased from Chengdu Organic Chemicals Co., LTD, China.

^b: The CNT-M treated by refluxing in concentrated nitric acid at 140 °C for 14 h, which are used as the support to
 prepare catalysts.

103

104 Table S2The binding energy (eV) and relative content (Area %) of ruthenium species in the fresh

105 Ru-in-CNT-M and the fresh Ru-out-CNT-M catalysts

	Ru ⁰	Ru/RuO _y	RuCl ₃	RuO ₂	RuO _x
Catalysts	eV(Area %)	eV(Area %)	eV(Area %)	eV(Area %)	eV(Area %)
Ru-in-CNT-M	461.5(14.3)	462.7(24.7)	463.1(22.5)	464.7(35.5)	466.0(3.0)
Ru-out-CNT-M	461.8(13.7)	462.6(3.5)	463.8(70.1)	464.6(10.4)	466.0(2.3)