Supplementary Information

O_v-rich γ-MnO₂ enhanced electrocatalytic three-electron oxygen reduction to hydroxyl radicals for sterilization in neutral media

Yingnan Qin^a, Tongzhu Han^b, Ligang Chen^{*c}, Kexin Yan^d, Jing Wang^e, Ning Wang ^{*a}, Baorong Hou^a

^a Key Laboratory of Advanced Marine Materials, Key Laboratory of Marine Environmental Corrosion and Bio-fouling, Institute of Oceanology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Qingdao, 266071, China

^b Marine Bioresource and Environment Research Center, Key Laboratory of Marine Eco-Environmental Science and Technology, First Institute of Oceanography, Ministry of Natural Resources, Qingdao, 266061, China

^c State Power Investment Corporation Hydrogen Energy Company, Limited, Beijing 102600, China

^d College of Environmental and Safety Engineering, Qingdao University of Science and Technology, Qingdao 266042, PR China

^e College of Chemical Engineering, Qingdao University of Science and Technology, Qingdao 266042, PR China

Electrochemical measurements.

All the electrochemical tests were conducted on CS2350M electrochemical workstation (Wuhan Corrtest Instrument Co., LTD). Before electrochemical measurements, 5 mg of as-prepared catalysts were dispersed in 1 mL mixture of DI water, ethanol, and 5 wt% Nafion solution (volume ratio is 1: 1: 0.0001) to form a uniform ink. All the electrochemical measurements were conducted in a three-electrode system, with a catalyst-modified RRDE as working electrode, saturated calomel electrode (SCE) as reference electrode, and carbon rod as counter electrode. 10 µL ink was dropped onto the glassy carbon disk electrode of RRDE, and rotary drying under the ambient environment. Cyclic voltammetry was conducted in N2-saturated 3.5 wt% NaCl solution at a potential range of 0-1.2 V vs. RHE, with a scan rate of 500 mV/s for 50 cycles, to get a stable curve. The linear polarization curve (LSV) was measured at 0-1.1 V vs. RHE with a scan rate of 20 mV/s and a rotate speed of 1600 rpm. The RRDE tests were performed in an O₂-saturated solution with a scan rate of 20 mV/s and rotate speed of 1600 rpm, with the ring potential was fixed at 1.2 V vs. RHE. The selectivity of H₂O₂ (H₂O₂%) via 2e⁻ ORR pathway and the number of transfer-electron (n) can be calculated by the following equation based on the disk current (I_D) and ring current (I_R) measured by RRDE.

$$H_2 O_2 \% (\%) = \frac{200 \times I_R / N}{|I_D| + I_R / N}$$
(S1)

$$n = \frac{4 \times |I_D|}{|I_D| + I_R/N} \tag{S2}$$

Here, N refers to the collection coefficient of RRDE, which depends on only the size of RRDE and is 37% in this system.

H₂O₂ yield tests.

The tests of H_2O_2 yield were conducted in a traditional three-electrode system with catalyst-loaded carbon paper (mass loading: 0.2 mg cm⁻²) as working electrode, saturated calomel electrode as reference electrode, and graphite rod as counter electrode. All the tests were performed in 35 mL O₂-satureted 3.5 wt% NaCl solution at 0.1 V (*vs.* RHE) for 2 h in a separate chamber with Nafion 117 as the membrane. The concentration of H_2O_2 was measured using the cerium sulfate titration method based on

the color variation with Ce⁴⁺ concentration as described in Eq. S3. The Ce⁴⁺ concentration-absorbance standard curve was plotted by UV-visible adsorption peak at 318 nm for a range of Ce⁴⁺ solutions, and the final correction curve was y = -0.015 + 5.21x (y is UV-visible absorbance, x is the concentration of Ce⁴⁺). The electrolyte after i-t test was mixed with 0.5 mM Ce(SO₄)₂ solution at a volume ratio of 1: 49, and reacted for another 2 h, and the corresponding H₂O₂ concentration ($c_{H_2O_2}$) was calculated by Eq. S4. Finally, the H₂O₂ yield was calculated by Eq. S5.

$$2Ce^{4+}(yellow) + H_2O_2 \longrightarrow 2Ce^{3+}(colorless) + 2H^+ + O_2 \uparrow$$
(S3)

$$c_{H_2O_2}(mM) = \frac{(c_0 - x)/2}{1/50}$$
 (S4)

Where the c_0 is the original Ce⁴⁺ standard solution with a concentration of 0.5 mM.

$$H_2 O_2 \text{ yield rate } (mmol \ g_{cat}^{-1} \ h^{-1}) = \frac{c_{H_2 O_2} \cdot v}{t \cdot m_{cat}}$$
 (S5)

Where v is the volume of electrolyte (35 mL), t is reaction time (2 h), and m_{cat} is the loading mass of as-prepared catalysts (0.2 µg cm⁻²).

Conditions of on-line SPE LC-MS/MS system.

Salicylic acid in samples was concentrated and detected by the on-line SPE-LC-MS/MS system, which was carried out on a 1290 II ultrahigh-performance liquid chromatography coupled with a 6470 triple quadrupole mass spectrometry system (Agilent, Santa Clara, CA, USA). A schematic of the online SPE-LC-MS/MS is presented in **Fig. S1.** The online SPE system consists of a high-performance (with a 900 μ L sample loop), a quaternary pump (P1), binary pump (P2) and a thermostatic column compartment equipped with a six-port valve. Chromatographic separation was performed on a Zorbax Extend C18 (3.5 μ m, 3.0 mm × 150 mm) from Agilent (Santa Clara, CA, USA). A guard column Zorbax Eclipse XDB-C8 (5 μ m, 2.1 mm × 12.5 mm) from Agilent was employed as a trap column for the online SPE. Details of on-line SPE-LC-MS/MS conditions are listed in **Table S1 and S2**.

DFT calculation.

All density functional theory (DFT) calculations carried out on the $MnO_2(O_v)$ and $Mn_3O_4(O_v)$ catalysts were performed via Vienna ab initio simulation package (VASP) with the projector augmented wave (PAW) method¹. The generalized gradient

approximation (GGA) with the Perdew-Burke-Ernzerhof (PBE) was adopted to describe the exchange-correlation functional². The DFT-D3 method is used to introduce van der Waals (vdW) interaction. Spin polarization was considered in the calculation³. The U parameter of the Mn atom is set to 4 eV⁴. The kinetic energy cutoff was set to 400 eV, and the force and energy convergence criteria were set to 0.03 eV/Å and 10^{-4} eV, respectively.

A slab model of MnO_2 with (300) crystal faces consisting of 16 Mn atoms and 32 O atoms was constructed using an optimized MnO_2 single cell. A slab model of Mn_3O_4 with (101) crystal faces consisting of 28 Mn atoms and 48 O atoms was constructed using an optimized Mn_3O_4 single cell. The vacuum layer of the slab model for MnO_2 and Mn_3O_4 is set to 20 Å. $MnO_2(O_v)$ and $Mn_3O_4(O_v)$ slab models with oxygen vacancies are constructed by removing one oxygen atom from the surface of the MnO_2 and Mn_3O_4 slab models. For geometric optimization, the bottom two atomic layers of all slab models are fixed, and the upper atomic layers remain relaxed.

The adsorption energy of O_2 molecules at active sites on the catalyst surface was calculated by the following equation:

$$\Delta E_{*O_2} = E_{*O_2} - E_* - E_{O_2}$$

Where * refers to O_v - γ -MnO₂ or O_v -Mn₃O₄. E_{*O_2} refer to the total energy after the adsorption of O₂ on the catalyst surface. E_* is the total energy of the catalyst. E_{O_2} refer to the energy of O₂ molecules.

During the calculation of the reaction mechanism, Gibbs free energy (G) was obtained by the following equation:

$$G = E + ZPE - TS$$

Where E, ZPE and TS were total energy, zero-point energy and entropic contributions, respectively. ZPE and TS were processed by the vaspkit code at 298.15 K⁵.

Antibacterial performance tests.

Pseudomonas aeruginosa (*P. aeruginosa*) and staphylococcus aureus (*S. aureus*) were used as the typical strain to invest the antibacterial performance of as-prepared catalysts. First of all, the typical strains were cultured in LB medium, after 12 h preservation at 37°C, the bacteria body was centrifugated at 4000 rpm for 5 min, and redispersed in 0.1 M phosphate buffer saline (PSB) to get a uniform solution with a concentration of 10^7 cfu/mL. The antibacterial test was carried in 35 mL above solution, with catalyst-modified carbon paper (1×2 cm, with a loading mass of 0.2 mg/cm²) as working electrode, SCE as reference electrode, and carbon rod as counter electrode. Electrolytes were collected after 0, 10, 30, 60, 120, and 180 min chronoamperometry test with an applied potential at 0.1 V *vs*. RHE. Coating the above electrolytes onto nutrient agar medium plates, keeping at 37°C for 24 h, counting the colony number of each plate and calculating the disinfection rate with the variation of time.



Figure S1 Schematic of the online SPE-LC-MS/MS.



Figure S2 SEM images of PBA precursor.



Figure S3 SEM images of ammonia-treated PBA.



Figure S4 SEM images of Mn_3O_4 -x with different calcination temperature. (a) Mn_3O_4 -700, (b) Mn_3O_4 -800, (c) Mn_3O_4 -900.



Figure S5 SEM images of MnO₂-700A



Figure S6 SEM images of MnO₂-800A



Figure S7 SEM images of MnO₂-900A



Figure S8 XRD patterns of as-prepared MnO₂-xA catalysts.



Figure S9 XPS patterns of as-prepared MnO₂-xA catalysts. (a) survey-scan spectra,

(**b**) O 1s spectra, (**c**) Mn 2p spectra.



Figure S10 RRDE polarization curves of Mn₃O₄-x.



Figure S11 Electrochemical performance of as-prepared MnO₂-xA catalysts. (**a**) RRDE polarization curves, (**b**) H₂O₂ selectivity, (**c**) number of transfer electron, (**d**) Tafel curves.



Figure R12 The stability of as-prepared catalysts.



Figure 13 (a) UV-visible spectra of CeSO₄ at various concentrations, (b) calibration curve of the absorbance and Ce⁴⁺ concentration at 318 nm.



Figure S14 The equation of the reaction of salicylic acid and hydroxyl radical.



Figure S15 (a) curves of LC-MS/MS for salicylic acid at different masses, (b) calibration curve of the peak area and mass of salicylic acid, (c) variation of salicylic acid concentration with different reaction times.



Figure S16 The configurations of (a) Mn_3O_4 (101), $O_v-Mn_3O_4$ (101), (b) $\gamma-MnO_2$ (300) and $O_v-\gamma-MnO_2$ (300) models.



Figure S17 The O position on adsorbed *OOH in $O_v-\gamma$ -MnO₂ (300).



Figure S18 Geometry adsorption configurations of $3e^{-}$ ORR progress on O_v - γ -MnO₂

(300).



Figure S19 Geometry adsorption configurations of 3e⁻ ORR progress on O_v-Mn₃O₄

(101).



Figure S20 The projected density of state (PDOS) analysis. (**a**) O_v -Mn₃ O_4 (101) and (**b**) O_v - γ -MnO₂ (300). (The two Mn atoms in the blue dotted circles are the active sites of as-prepared catalysts, all the PDOS and d-band center analysis are based on that.)



Figure S21 Digital pictures of colony plates with different reaction times without the addition of IPA. (a) *P. aeruginosa*, (b) *S. aureus*.



Figure S22 Variety of sterilization efficiencies for different reaction times.



Figure S23 Digital pictures of colony plates with different reaction times with the addition of IPA. (a) *P. aeruginosa*, (b) *S. aureus*.

Table S1. LC parameters and MS/MS parameters of the instrumental method forSalicylic acid analysis.

LC parameters							
Instrument	HPLC 120	HPLC 1260 and UPLC 1290 (Agilent Technologies, USA)					
Analytical	Zorbax E	xtend C18, 3.5 µm	n, 3.0 mm	× 150 m	m (Agilent		
column		Technologies, USA)					
Tranning column	Zorbax Ecl	ipse XDB-C8, 5 μ	m, 2.1 mr	m × 12.5	mm (Agilent		
Trapping column	Technologies, USA)						
Inication volume		100	0 μL				
Injection volume	(Needle rins	ed once with 1:1 n	nethanol:	water be:	fore injection)		
Column temperature		30 °C					
Mobile phases UP 1290		Flow rate:	0.3 mL m	in ⁻¹			
	A1: Ultrapure water with 0.5% formic acid						
	B1: Methanol						
Mobile phases	А	A: Ultrapure water with 0.5% formic acid					
HP 1260		B: Me	ethanol				
Gradient	Time / min	A / %	B /	%	note		
UP 1290	0.0	80	2	0	equilibration		
	2.0	80	2	0			
	7.0	50	5	0			
	10.5	0	10)0			
HD 1260	Time /	Flow rate / mL	A / 0/	D / 0/	noto		
HF 1200	min	min ⁻¹	A / 70	D / 70	note		
	0	0.5	95	0	landing		
	2	0.5	95	0	loading		
	10.5	0.5	95	0	equilibration		
MS/MS parameter	rs						

Instrument

6470 triple quadrupole mass spectrometer (Agilent

	Technologies, USA)				
Ion source	Agilent Jet stream (Agilent Technologies, USA)				
Ionization	Electrospray ionization (ESI) in negative mode				
Gas temp	300 °C				
Gas flow	3 L/min				
Nebulizer	5 psi				
Sheath gas temp	350 °C				
Sheath gas flow	7 L/min				
Capillary voltage	3500 V				
Scan type	MS2 SIM				

Table S2. Retention times, molecular formula (precursor ion), monitored mass,fragmentor, collision energy.

Acronym	Retention	Molecular	Monitored	Fragmentor	Collision
analyte	Time /min	formula	mass / m/z	/ V	energy / V
SA	9.85	$[C_7H_6O_3]^-$	137	100	5

Table S3 Binding energy and ΔE of as-prepared catalysts in Mn 3s XPS spectra.

	Binding energy / eV	$\Delta \mathbf{E} / \mathbf{eV}$
Mn3O4-800	88.59 / 83.08	5.51
MnO2-700A	89.05 / 84.23	4.82
MnO ₂ -800A	88.76 / 83.99	4.77
MnO2-900A	88.78 / 83.94	4.84

Table S4 Percentage of O with different configuration of as-prepared catalysts in

O 1s spectra.

	Mn-O	Ov	C-0	C=O
Mn3O4-800	55.4	26.5	9.4	8.7

MnO ₂ -700A	38.8	19.4	12.2	29.6
MnO2-800A	39.1	17.6	22.2	21.1
MnO ₂ -900A	47.9	15.5	26.7	9.9

Table S5 The peak intensity of UV-visible spectrum and the corresponding Ce⁴⁺ concentration, the amount of H₂O₂ and its yield rate after 2 h i-t tests.

	Peak	oc. u. / mM	n H2O2 /	H ₂ O ₂ yield rate	
	intensity		mmol	/ mmol g ⁻¹ h ⁻¹	
Mn3O4-800	2.10	0.406	82.25	205.63	
MnO ₂ -700A	2.12	0.401	78.75	196.88	
MnO ₂ -800A	1.25	0.243	22488	562.19	
MnO ₂ -900A	2.06	0.398	89.25	223.13	

Table S6 The peak area of HPLC curve and the corresponding SA mass and $\cdot OH$ concentration.

Reaction		Mn ₃ O ₄		MnO2-800A		
Time /	Deals area		С∙он / mg	Peak	msa /	С∙он / mg
min	Peak area	msa / ng	L-1	area	ng	L-1
0	1475942	138.42	0	1475896	138.42	0
30	1010819	94.80	0.436	611287	33.97	1.044
60	649961	36.12	1.023	91899	4.66	1.337
90	319297	17.24	1.211	40791	1.83	1.336
120	115031	5.94	1.325	33923	1.45	1.369

Table S7 3e ⁻	ORR	performance	comparison	between	different	catalysts.

OCNT 12 mg L ⁻¹ cm ⁻¹ 97.05 % of STZ degradation efficiency in 180 min	6

Cu/CoSe ₂ /C			98% of CIP	7
			degradation efficiency	
			in 60 min	
TiO ₂ /C		2.69 μg cm ⁻²		8
cathode		min ⁻¹		
FeCoC	1350 ± 38.9		100.0 % removal of	9
	μM/2 h		CIP in 5 min	
1.0-			94.7% removal of	10
MnCu/C			TCH in 60 min	
FeCl ₂ C _x /PC		48.86 µM t	98.12% removal of	11
			AMX in 15 min	
MnO ₂ -	562.2 mmol g_{cat}	2.09 mg L ⁻¹ h ⁻¹	97.8% sterilization	This
800A	1 h ⁻¹		efficiency of	work
			P. aeruginosa in 60	
			min;	
			96.4% sterilization	
			efficiency of	
			S. aureus in 30 min	

References:

- 1. G. Kresse, *Physical Review B* 1996, **54**, 11169-11186.
- 2. K. B. John P. Perdew, Matthias Ernzerhof, Phys. Rev. Lett., 1996, 77, 3865-3868.
- 3. S. Grimme, J. Comput. Chem., 2006, 27, 1787-1799.
- Z. Shi, Y. Wang, J. Li, X. Wang, Y. Wang, Y. Li, W. Xu, Z. Jiang, C. Liu, W. Xing and J. Ge, *Joule*, 2021, 5, 2164-2176.
- V. Wang, N. Xu, J.-C. Liu, G. Tang and W.-T. Geng, *Comput. Phys. Commun.*, 2021, 267, 108033.
- 6. J. Zhang, S. Qiu and F. Deng, J. Hazard. Mater., 2024, 465, 133261.
- L. Xie, P. Wang, W. Zheng, S. Zhan, Y. Xia, Y. Liu, W. Yang and Y. Li, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2023, **120**, e2307989120.
- F. Miao, M. Gao, X. Yu, P. Xiao, M. Wang, Y. Wang, S. Wang and X. Wang, Electrochem. Commun., 2020, 113, 106687.
- F. Xiao, Z. Wang, J. Fan, T. Majima, H. Zhao and G. Zhao, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.*, 2021, 60, 10375-10383.
- 10. D. Shang, S. Wang, J. Li, S. Zhan, W. Hu and Y. Li, Small, 2024, 2311984.
- R. Ren, X. Shang, Z. Song, C. Li, Z. Wang, F. Qi, A. Ikhlaq, J. Kumirska, E. Maria Siedlecka and O. Ismailova, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 2023, 474, 145545.