Supplementary information

Conductive MXene ultrafiltration membrane for enhanced antifouling ability and water quality under electrochemical assistance Lulu Qian, Chengyu Yuan, Xu Wang, Haiguang Zhang, Lei Du, Gaoliang Wei, Shuo

Chen*

Key Laboratory of Industrial Ecology and Environmental Engineering (Ministry of Education, China), School of Environmental Science and Technology, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, 116024, China

Corresponding author. Tel: +86-411-84706263. E-mail: shuochen@dlut.edu.cn



Figure S1. Illustration for membrane fabrications.



Figure S2. The photo image of the membrane module.



Figure S3. Diagrams of (a) the home-made membrane module and (b) electrically-assisted membrane filtration setup.



respectively.





Figure S6. Tyndall phenomenon of multi-layered $Ti_3C_2T_X$ MXene dispersion.



Figure S7. Distribution of elements on the surface of MXene materials.



Figure S8. Permeation and HA rejection of unmodified ceramic substrate during operation of 120 min.

The additional experiments were conducted using two types of commercial membranes (Figure R3) for the filtration of humic acid (HA) solution under identical operating conditions as MXene membrane. The results are shown in Figure S9. After 120 minutes of operation, the flux of 100 nm PVDF membrane decreased to 80.9% of its pure water flux, and the rejection rate for HA was only 8.0%. The flux of 100 nm CA-CN membrane decreased to 15.9% of pure water flux, and the rejection rate for HA was 26.9%. In contrast, although the flux of MXene membrane was reduced to 26.7%

of pure water flux, its rejection rate for HA was as high as 86.5%. To further demonstrate the superior antifouling performance of prepared MXene membrane, the hydrophilicity of the above three membranes were characterized by optical contact angle meter. The water contact angles of PVDF, CA-CN and MXene membranes were 55°, 77° and 23°, respectively (Figure S10). These results indicate that MXene membrane has much higher hydrophilicity than the commercial membranes, which contributes to its good antifouling performance.



Figure S9. The variation of (a) flux and (b) rejection rate with time when PVDF membrane, CA-CN membrane and prepared MXene membrane filtered HA solution, respectively.



Figure S10. The water contact angles of (a) PVDF, (b) CA-CN and (c) MXene membrane.



Figure S11. Pure water flux of membrane with MXene loading of 2.33 mg cm⁻² at different pressures.



Figure S12. EDS mapping images of the cross-section of MXene membrane.



Figure S13. CV scans of a MXene membrane as a working electrode in 5 mM Na₂SO₄ solution (20 cycles). A titanium mesh was served as a counter electrode. Scanning range was between 0 V and -1.2 V vs. SCE, and the scaning rate was 10 mV s⁻¹.



Figure S14. Permeances of MXene membrane under different voltages.



Figure S15. SEM images of MXene membranes after NOM filtration for 120 min (a) in the absence of a potential and (b) at the cell voltage of 2.0 V.

Table S1. Performance comparison of MXene membrane under electrochemical assistance

Membrane		Conductivity (S·m ⁻¹)	Feed solution (mg L ⁻¹)	Applied voltage (V)	Rejection (%)	References		
CNTs/Al ₂ O ₃		1615	10, HA	1.5 V, membrane as cathode	~88%	1		
Nanocarbon-based membrane		1900		1.0 V, membrane as cathode	~71%			
			10, HA	1.0 V, membrane as anode	~62%	2		
CNTs/ceramic			10 114	3.0 V, membrane as cathode	~65%	2		
		765	10, HA	3.0 V, membrane as anode	~75%	3		
MXene		2×10 ⁵	10, HA	2.0 V, membrane as cathode	~95%	This work		
Table S2. Parameters of surface water								
	Item	TOC (mg L ⁻	UV_{254} (cm ⁻¹)	pH	Turbidity (NTU)			
	Data	36.55	0.155	7.28	2.35			



Figure S16. The normalized TOC removal rate of MXene membranes static adsorption experiment.



Figure S17. XRD patterns of MXene membrane before/after 300 min treatment with external voltage at 2.0 V.

Index	TOC (mg L ⁻¹)	Colony forming unit (CFU L ⁻¹)	Conductivity (µS cm ⁻¹)	Turbidity (NTU)	UV ₂₅₄					
Raw water	36.55	104	1655	2.35	0.155					
MXene membrane filtration	14.36	None	1035	0.07	0.104					
MXene membrane filtration under electrochemical assistance (2.0 V, membrane as cathode)	10.53	None	782	0.01	0.079					

Table S3. Effluent quality index after membrane filtration

References

- 1 X. F. Fan, H. M. Zhao, Y. M. Liu, X. Quan, H. T. Yu and S. Chen, *Environ Sci Technol*, 2015, **49**, 2293-2300.
- 2 X. F. Fan, H. M. Zhao, X. Quan, Y. M. Liu and S. Chen, *Water Res*, 2016, **88**, 285-292.
- 3 S. Wei, L. Du, S. Chen, H. T. Yu and X. Quan, Front Env Sci Eng, 2021, 15, 11.