Electronic Supplementary Material (ESI) for RSC Advances. This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2021

## Rice husk biochar modified-CuCo<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> as an efficient

## peroxymonosulfate activator for non-radical degradation of organic pollutants from aqueous environment

Kai Xie<sup>ab</sup>, Ruirui Han<sup>c</sup>, Ping Sun<sup>a</sup>, Hui Wang<sup>a</sup>, Yingsen Fang<sup>\*a</sup>, Zhicai Zhai<sup>a</sup>, Danzhu Ma<sup>b</sup>, Hui Liu <sup>\*a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> College of Biological, Chemical Sciences and Engineering, Jiaxing University,

Zhejiang Jiaxing 314001, PR China

<sup>b</sup> College of Petroleum Engineering, Liaoning Petrochemical University,

Liaoning Fushun 113001, PR China

<sup>c</sup> College of of Advanced Materials and Engineering, Jiaxing Nanhu University,

Zhejiang Jiaxing 314001, PR China



Fig. S1. XRD patterns of CuO,  $\mathrm{Co_2O_3},$  and recycle RHBC-CuCo\_2O\_4.



Fig. S2. N<sub>2</sub> sorption isotherms and pore size distributions of different materials (RHBC, CuCo<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub>, RHBC-CuCo<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub>).



Fig S3. A possible pathway of OG oxidation degradation.



Fig S4. Biodegradation efficiency of RHBC-CuCo<sub>2</sub>O<sub>4</sub> for different pollutant. Condition: [ACT] = 50 mg/L, [STZ] = 20 mg/L, [BPA] = 20 mg/L, [RhB] = 50 mg/L, [catalyst] = 100 mg/L, [PMS] = 307 mg/L, and T = 25 °C.

Table S1. Surface porosity of various materials.

Catalysts	$SSA(m^2/g)$	Pore size (nm)	Pore volume $(cm^{3}/g)$
RHBC	128.6	5.12	0.165
CuCo <sub>2</sub> O <sub>4</sub>	72.6	12.01	0.218
RHBC- CuCo <sub>2</sub> O <sub>4</sub>	142.9	8.81	0.315

Table S2. Degradation of pollutants by different catalysts.

Preparation method	Catalysts	Pollutant	Oxidants	Initial pH	Ros	Ref.
Sol-gel method	CuCo <sub>2</sub> O <sub>4</sub> @kaolin (0.1 g/L)	SIZ (10 mg/L)	PMS (1 mM)	7.0	SO4 <sup>•-</sup> , •OH, O2 <sup>•- 1</sup> O2	[1]
pyrolysis method	RHBC-CuCo2O4 (0.307 g/L)	STZ (20 mg/L)	PMS (1 mM)	3.4	SO4 <sup>•-</sup> , •OH, O2 <sup>•-1</sup> O2	This study
hydro-thermal method	GO-CuCo <sub>2</sub> O <sub>4</sub> (0.05 g/L)	BPA (22.83 mg/L)	PMS (0.2 mM)	7.0	SO₄• <sup>-</sup> , •OH	[2]
pyrolysis method	RHBC-CuCo <sub>2</sub> O <sub>4</sub> (0.1 g/L)	BPA (20 mg/L)	PMS (1 mM)	3.4	SO <sub>4</sub> •-, •OH, O <sub>2</sub> •- <sup>1</sup> O <sub>2</sub>	This study
solvothermal method	AC-CuCo <sub>2</sub> O <sub>4</sub> (0.2 g/L)	3BF (25.63 mg/L)	PMS (0.4 mM)	10.0	SO4 <sup>•-</sup> , •OH, O2 <sup>•-</sup> , <sup>1</sup> O2	[3]
pyrolysis method	RHBC-CuCo <sub>2</sub> O <sub>4</sub> (0.1 g/L)	OG (50 mg/L)	PMS (1 mM)	3.4	SO <sub>4</sub> •-, •OH, O <sub>2</sub> •-, <sup>1</sup> O <sub>2</sub>	This study

## References

- C. Chen, L. Liu, Y.X. Li, W. Li, L.X. Zhou, Y.Q. Lan, Y. Li, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 2020, **384**, 123257.
  X. Q. Xu, Y. B. Feng, Z. H. Chen, S. B. Wang, G. H. Wu, T. L. Huang, J. Ma, G. Wen, Sep. Purif. Technol., 2020, **251** 117351.
- 3. S. Chen, X. Liu, S. Y. Gao, Y.C. Chen, L.J. Rao, Z. W. Wu, Environ. Res., 2020, 183, 109245.