Supporting Information

Enhanced catalysis of vanadium-substituted Keggin-type polyoxomolybdate supported on M3O4/C (M=Fe or Co) surface enables efficient and recyclable HMF oxidation to DFF

Yun-Dong Cao,^a Wen-Xia Mu,^a Mengdi Gong,^a Lin-Lin Fan,*^a Jie Han,^b Hong Liu,*^a Bin Qi^a and Guang-Gang Gao *^a

^a School of Materials Science and Engineering, University of Jinan, Jinan 250022, China

^b School of Science and Technology, Hong Kong Metropolitan University, Homantin, Kowloon, Hong Kong, China

* Corresponding author E-mail: mse_fanll@ujn.edu.cn; mse_liuh@ujn.edu.cn; mse gaogg@ujn.edu.cn

Contents

- 1. Materials
- 2. Experimental methods
- 3. Characterization methods
- 4. HPLC analytical methods

5. Supporting Figures

Fig. S1. TEM images of (a) MIL-88A(Fe) and (b) ZIF-67.

Fig. S2. TEM images of Fe_3O_4/C obtained by the calcination temperature

of (a) 350 °C, (b) 450 °C, (c) 550 °C and (d) 650 °C.

Fig. S3. TEM images of Co_3O_4/C obtained by the calcination temperature of (a) 700 °C, (b) 800 °C, (c) 900 °C and (d) 1000 °C.

Fig. S4. Optimization of reaction conditions for $PMo_{10}V_2@Fe_3O_4/C$: (a) temperature and (b) reaction time.

Fig. S5. Optimization of reaction conditions for $PMo_{10}V_2@Co_3O_4/C$: (a) temperature and (b) reaction time.

Fig. S6. (a) FTIR spectra of $PMo_{10}V_2@Fe_3O_4/C$ before and after reaction.

(b) FTIR spectra of $PMo_{10}V_2@Co_3O_4/C$ before and after reaction.

Fig. S7. PXRD patterns of $PMo_{10}V_2@Fe_3O_4/C$ and $PMo_{10}V_2@Co_3O_4/C$ before and after reaction.

Fig. S8. Quenching tests with (a) $PMo_{10}V_2@Fe_3O_4/C$ and (b) $PMo_{10}V_2@Co_3O_4/C$ as the catalyst.

Table S1. Fe and Mo concentrations in $PMo_{10}V_2@Fe_3O_4/C$ determined by ICP-OES analysis.

Table S2. Co and Mo concentrations in $PMo_{10}V_2@Co_3O_4/C$ determined by ICP-OES analysis.

Table S3. Comparison of $PMo_{10}V_2@M_3O_4/C$ (M = Fe, Co) and other POMs-based catalysts on selective oxidation of HMF to DFF.

Table S4. The element percentage in different oxidation states of $PMo_{10}V_2@M_3O_4/C$ (M = Fe, Co) after the reaction.

1. Materials

All chemicals and reagents are utilized without any additional purification steps being performed. Sodium metavanadate (NaVO₃), 85% phosphoric acid (85% H₃PO₄), Molybdenum trioxide (MoO₃), concentrated hydrochloric acid (HCl), diethyl ether, ferric nitrate nonahydrate (Fe(NO₃)₃·9H₂O), cobalt(II) nitrate hexahydrate (Co(NO₃)₂·6H₂O), 2-methylimidazole, fumaric acid, *N*,*N*-dimethylformamide (DMF), dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO), ethanol, methanol, 5-Hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF), 2,5-diformylfuran (DFF), *p*-benzoquinone and isopropyl alcohol were purchased from Aladdin Chemical Co., Ltd.

2. Experimental methods

2.1. Synthesis of PMo₁₀V₂

The synthesis of $H_5[PMo_{10}V_2O_{40}]\cdot 32H_2O$ (PMo_{10}V_2) is based on the previously reported literature.¹ The specific synthesis process is as follows: the NaVO₃ (30.0 g), 85% H_3PO_4 (3.4 mL), and MoO₃ (74.0 g) were added to 800 mL of water and refluxed for 8 h. Afterwards, the mixture was acidified using 145 mL of HCl, and the resulting acid was extracted with 200 mL of diethyl ether. Finally, the diethyl ether was removed, and the product was obtained by recrystallization from water.

2.2. Synthesis of MIL-88A(Fe)

The synthesis of MIL-88A(Fe) is based on previously reported literature with slight modifications.² In brief, $Fe(NO_3)_3 \cdot 9H_2O$ (0.808 g, 0.002 mol) and fumaric acid (0.580 g, 0.005 mol) were added to 100 mL of DMF and stirred at room temperature. The solution was then transferred to a 500 mL round-bottom flask and kept at 75 °C

for 4 h. Subsequently, the suspension was cooled to room temperature. The resulting products were collected by centrifugation and successively washed five times with ultra-pure water and ethanol. MIL-88A(Fe) was obtained after further vacuum drying at 60 °C for 24 h.

2.3. Synthesis of ZIF-67

The synthesis of ZIF-67 is based on previously reported literature.³ In brief, $Co(NO_3)_2 \cdot 6H_2O$ (2.328 g, 0.008 mol) was added to 180 mL of methanol, and 2methylimidazole (2.627 g, 0.032 mol) was added to 140 mL of methanol. Then, the two solutions were quickly mixed and stirred for 2 min. After that, the mixture was allowed to stand at room temperature for 24 h. Finally, the products were collected by centrifugation, washed several times with methanol, and dried at 50 °C.

2.4. HMF Adsorption test

Adsorption ability were characterized to determine the adsorption capacity of catalyst. Typically, 50 mg of HMF and 40 mg of catalyst were added to 4 mL DMSO solution in atmosphere with stirring. Then, the catalyst was separated by centrifuge, and the adsorption amount of HMF was detected by HPLC.

3. Characterization methods

The morphologies of the samples were analyzed using TEM (JEM-2100F, 200 kV) and SEM (FEG-250, 30 kV) equipped with an energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy. The structures of the samples were identified using PXRD (Philips X'pert MPD) with Cu Kα radiation (50 kV). The XPS spectra were detected by a ESCALAB-MKII spectrometer (VG Co., UK) with Al Kr X-ray radiation as the X-

ray source for excitation. FTIR spectra were obtained using a NEXUS-870 spectrometer with KBr pellets. The products from catalytic reaction were analyzed by high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC, Shimadzu LC-20A) using a reversed-phase ZOR-BAX Eclipse XDB-C18 column (4.6 \times 250 mm) with UV detection (288 nm) and an SPD-20A UV detector. The elemental contents were determined by ICP-OES (Thermo iCAP 6300).

4. HPLC analytical methods

The mobile phase consists of acetonitrile and 0.1 wt% acetic acid with a volume ratio of 50: 950 at a flow rate of 0.5 mL·min⁻¹. The oven temperature is carefully controlled at 30°C to maintain stability. The reaction mixture is diluted to a final volume of 50 mL using pure water. The concentrations of HMF and DFF in the sample are determined using an external standard calibration curve, which is constructed using pure samples. The molar conversion and yield of the target compounds are then calculated based on these measurements.

$$HMF \text{ conversion} = \frac{\text{mol of converted HMF}}{\text{mol of initial HMF}} \times 100\%$$
(1)
mol of DFF

DFF yield = mol of initial HMF \times 100% (2)

DFF yield $DFF \text{ selectivity} = \overline{HMF \text{ conversion} \times 100\%}$ (3)

5. Supporting figures



Fig. S1. TEM images of (a) MIL-88A(Fe) and (b) ZIF-67.



Fig. S2. TEM images of Fe_3O_4/C obtained by the calcination temperature

of (a) 350 °C, (b) 450 °C, (c) 550 °C and (d) 650 °C.



Fig. S3. TEM images of Co₃O₄/C obtained by the calcination temperature of (a) 700 °C, (b) 800 °C, (c) 900 °C and (d) 1000 °C.



Fig. S4. Optimization of reaction conditions for $PMo_{10}V_2@Fe_3O_4/C$: (a) temperature and (b) reaction time.



Fig. S5. Optimization of reaction conditions for $PMo_{10}V_2@Co_3O_4/C$: (a) temperature and (b) reaction time.



Fig. S6. (a) FTIR spectra of $PMo_{10}V_2@Fe_3O_4/C$ before and after reaction.

(b) FTIR spectra of $PMo_{10}V_2@Co_3O_4/C$ before and after reaction.



Fig. S7. PXRD patterns of $PMo_{10}V_2@Fe_3O_4/C$ and $PMo_{10}V_2@Co_3O_4/C$

before and after reaction.



Fig. S8. Quenching tests with (a) $PMo_{10}V_2@Fe_3O_4/C$ and (b)

 $PMo_{10}V_2@Co_3O_4/C$ as the catalyst.

Table S1. Fe and Mo concentrations in $PMo_{10}V_2@Fe_3O_4/C$ determined by ICP-OES analysis.

	Fe	Мо
Concentration (mg/kg)	263332.5 (measured)	157876.9 (measured)
Concentration (wt%)	26.3%	15.8%

Table S2. Co and Mo concentrations in $PMo_{10}V_2@Co_3O_4/C$ determined by ICP-OES analysis.

	Со	Мо
Concentration (mg/kg)	197431.8 (measured)	177715.4 (measured)
Concentration (wt%)	19.7%	17.8%

DFF Yield Time HMF Recycle Catalyst Oxidant Selectivity Ref. Con. (%) (%) times (h) $H_5PMo_{10}V_2O_{40}$ 1.0 MPa O_2 8 100 69 69 4 -92 98 $H_5PMo_{10}V_2O_{40}/SiO_2$ 1.0 MPa O_2 8 90 10 4 5 H₅PMo₁₀V₂O₄₀/chitosan 0.8 MPa O_2 6 96 94 98 10 H₃PMo₁₂O₄₀@Cr-MIL-101 $20 \; mL/min \; O_2$ 94 97 5 6 20 91 20 mL/min O_2 99 99 100 7 CeCu(OH)₆Mo₆O₁₈ 8 _ Mo₇₂V₃₀@Fe₃O₄/C 0.4 MPa O_2 4 99 99 100 10 8 $Cs_3HPMo_{11}VO_{40}$ 0.1 MPa O_2 14 100 60 60 9 _ $Cs_3HPMo_{10}V_2O_{40}\\$ 0.8 MPa O_2 6 99 92 93 9 _ 99 99 100 5 10 Mo₁₃₂ Atmosphere 6 99 PM010V2@C03O4/C 1.4 MPa O₂ 6 99 100 5 This work 99 99 100 PMo10V2@Fe3O4/C 0.8 MPa O_2 6 10 This work

Table S3. Comparison of $PMo_{10}V_2@M_3O_4/C$ (M = Fe, Co) and other

17

POMs-based catalysts on selective oxidation of HMF to DFF.

Table S4. The element percentage in different oxidation states of $PMo_{10}V_2@M_3O_4/C$ (M = Fe, Co) after the reaction.

catalyst	element per	element percentage (%)	
PMo ₁₀ V ₂ @Fe ₃ O ₄ /C	Fe ²⁺ : 75.8	Fe ³⁺ : 24.2	
	V ⁴⁺ : 20.9	V ⁵⁺ : 79.1	
PMo ₁₀ V ₂ @Co ₃ O ₄ /C	Co ²⁺ : 55.0	Co ²⁺ : 45.0	
	V ⁴⁺ : 14.7	V ⁴⁺ : 85.3	

Reference

- [1] G. A. Tsigdinos, C. J. Hallada, *Inorg. Chem.*, 1968, 7(3), 437-441.
- [2] T. Chalati, P. Horcajada, R. Gref, P. Couvreur, C. Serre, J. Mater. Chem., 2011, 21, 2220-2227.
- [3] Y. B. Li, Z. L. Jin, T. S. Zhao, Chem. Eng. J., 2020, 382, 123051.
- [4] S. Q. Yan, Y. Li, P. L. Li, T. Jia, S. T. Wang, X. H. Wang, *RSC Adv.*, 2018, 8, 3499-3511.
- [5] S.-S. Wang, G.-Y. Yang, Chem. Rev., 2015, 115(11), 4893-4962.
- [6] J. Zhao, J. Anjali, Y. B. Yan, J.-M. Lee, *ChemCatChem*, 2017, 9, 1187-1191.
- [7] J. J. Xu, T. Su, Z. G. Zhu, N. M. Chen, D. M. Hao, M. R. Wang, Y. C. Zhao, W. Z. Ren, H. Y. Lü, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 2020, **396**, 125303.
- [8] M. D. Gong, X.-Y. Wang, M.-Q. Li, W.-X. Mu, Y.-D. Cao, H. Liu, Y.-G. Lv, X.-H. Qi, G.-G. Gao, *Fuel*, 2023, 332, 126050.
- [9] R. L. Liu, J. Z. Chen, L. M. Chen, Y. Y. Guo, J. W. Zhong, *ChemPlusChem*, 2014, **79**(10), 1448-1454.
- [10] M. D. Gong, W.-X. Mu, Y.-D. Cao, Y.-W. Shao, X. Hu, D. Yin,
 H. Liu, C.-H. Zhang, G.-G. Gao, *Fuel. Process. Technol.*, 2023, 242, 107635.