

### **Text S1**

23 The phosphate removal efficiency  $(^{0}_{0})$  and adsorption capacity  $(Q_e)$  of the modified biochar were calculated using Eq. (1) and Eq. (2).

$$
Removal \,efficiency = \left(\frac{C_0 - C_e}{C_0}\right) \times 100\%
$$
\n
$$
Q_e = \frac{C_0 - C_e}{m}V\tag{1}
$$
\n
$$
(2)
$$

27 where  $C_0$  and  $C_e$  (mg/L) represent the initial and final phosphate concentrations, 28 respectively; V (L) stands for the volume of the solution; m  $(g)$  denotes the mass of the biochar.

### **Effect of dosage and pH on phosphorus adsorption**

 Adsorption experiments were conducted to compare the phosphorus adsorption at various dosages to determine the optimum dosage. The dosages were set as 0.1, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 4, 6, and 8 g/L, and the above dosages of FCBC and BC were mixed with 34 250 mL of  $KH_2PO_4$  solution (50 mg/L, pH = 8), respectively. To investigate how pH impacts the adsorption of phosphorus by FCBC, 0.5 g of FCBC was mixed with 250 mL of KH2PO<sup>4</sup> solution (50 mg/L). The solution's pH was set to 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12, respectively. The content of remaining phosphorus and pH in the solution were measured by oscillating at 20℃ for 12 h.

### **Adsorption isotherm and kinetics experiments**

 The adsorption isotherms were investigated by combining 0.5 g of FCBC with 41 250 mL of  $KH_2PO_4$  solution at different concentrations (5 - 500 mg/L). The experimental data was simulated using two models: the Langmuir model (Eq. 3) and 43 the Freundlich model (Eq. 4).

44  
\n
$$
Q_e = \frac{K_L Q_m C_e}{1 + K_L C_e}
$$
\n(3)  
\n
$$
Q_e = K_F C_e^{\frac{1}{n}}
$$
\n(4)

46 where  $Q_e$  (mg/g) stands for the quantity of phosphate adsorbed at the equilibrium 47 concentration of the phosphate solution (C<sub>e</sub>, mg/L);  $K_L$  (L/mg) and  $K_F$  (mg<sup>1-1/n</sup>·g<sup>-1</sup>·L<sup>1/n</sup>) 48 represent the Langmuir and Freundlich constants, respectively;  $Q_m$  (mg/g) denotes the 49 maximum adsorption capacity; 1/n is an empirical constant for the Freundlich model.

50 The adsorption kinetics at different contact times from 0 to 24 h were 51 investigated by combining 0.5 g of FCBC and 250 mL of  $KH_2PO_4$  solution (50 mg/L, 52 pH = 8). The adsorption mechanism of FCBC on phosphate was determined using the 53 pseudo-first-order (Eq. 5), pseudo-second-order (Eq. 6), and intra-particle diffusion 54 models (Eq. 7).<sup>1</sup>

$$
Q_t = Q_e \left( 1 - \exp\left(-k_1 t\right) \right) \tag{5}
$$

56 
$$
Q_t = \frac{k_2 Q_e^2 t}{1 + k_2 Q_e t}
$$
 (6)

57 
$$
Q_t = k_t t^{0.5} + C
$$
 (7)

58 where  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  represent the rate constants for the pseudo-first-order and pseudo-59 second-order models, respectively;  $k_i$  and C are the intra-particle diffusion rate 60 constant and intercept, respectively;  $Q_t$  (mg/g) denotes the quantity of phosphate 61 adsorbed at time t, and  $Q_e$  (mg/g) is the quantity of phosphate adsorbed at equilibrium.

### 62 **Effect of coexisting anions**

63 To investigate the impact of common coexisting anions on phosphorus

64 elimination by biochar, varying quantities of  $Na_2CO_3$ ,  $NaNO_3$ ,  $Na_2SO_4$ ,  $NaHCO_3$ , 65 NaF, and NaCl were introduced into a 250 mL  $KH_2PO_4$  solution (50 mg/L). This resulted in coexisting anion concentrations of 100, 500, and 1000 mg/L in the 67 prepared solution. Then, 0.5 g of FCBC was weighed and mixed with a  $KH_2PO_4$ solution containing coexisting anions.

## **Adsorption of phosphorus from natural waters**

 To further examine the adsorption effect of FCBC and BC on phosphorus in natural water bodies, samples of farmland tailwater, ditch water, and pond water were collected from agricultural surface sources in the test field area of Keyuan Road, Wuhan City, Hubei Province, China, on October 11, 2023. The reactor was loaded with 0.5 g of FCBC and BC, and then 250 mL of farmland tailwater, ditch water, and pond water were added respectively.



76 **Table S1** Surface area and pore structure of BC and FCBC

Models	Parameter 1	Parameter 2	$R^2$
Pseudo-first-order	$k_1 = 0.0049$	$Q_e = 18.1213$ mg/L	$R^2=0.9844$
Pseudo-second-order	$k_2 = 0.0002$	$Q_e = 22.2797$ mg/L	$R^2=0.9939$
	$k_{i1} = 0.8783$	$C_1 = -1.0271$	$R^2=0.9961$
Intraparticle diffusion	$k_0 = 0.6253$	$C_2 = 2.4845$	$R^2=0.9921$
	$k_{i3} = 0.0701$	$C_3 = 16.4141$	$R^2=0.9911$

79 **Table S2** Parameters for adsorption kinetics of P on FCBC



ausolotiits tol f							
Adsorpant	Isotherm	Kinetics	$Q_{max}(mg/g)$	References			
MgO-modified biochar	$\overline{F}$	S	18.98	$\sqrt{2}$			
Palm waste biochar	L	S	26.90	$\mathfrak{Z}$			
Lime sludge modified	$R-P$	S	15	4			
biochar							
Hydrocotyle vulgaris							
derived novel biochar	L	S	20.32	5			
beads							
Fe/Mg-Biochar	$L-F$	S	6.95	6			
Nanocomposites							
Lanthanum-ammonia-							
modified hydrothermal	L	S	43.1	$\boldsymbol{7}$			
biochar							
$ZrO2$ nanoparticles							
embedded in biochar							
modified with layered	L	S	20.36	8			
double oxides							
nanosheets							
<b>FCBC</b>	L	${\bf S}$	53.31	This study			

83 **Table S4** Comparison of the maximum adsorption capacity of different biochar 84 adsorbents for P

85 F, L, R-P, and S represent Freundlich, Langmuir, Redlich-Peterson, and Pseudo-86 second-order, respectively.









**Fig. S2** Element mapping of BC(a) and FCBC(b)











Fig. S5 The abundance ratio of phosphates in solutions of varying pH <sup>9</sup>







**Fig. S6** Determination of the point of zero charge of FCBC

# **References**

 1 K.W. Jung, T.U. Jeong, H.J. Kang and K.H. Ahn, Characteristics of biochar derived from marine macroalgae and fabrication of granular biochar by entrapment in calcium-alginate beads for phosphate removal from aqueous solution, *Bioresour. Technol.*, 2016, **211**, 108-116, [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2016.03.066.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2016.03.066)

- 2 L. Wu, C. Wei, S. Zhang, Y. Wang, Y. Kuzyakov and X. Ding, MgO-modified biochar increases phosphate retention and rice yields in saline-alkaline soil, *J. Cleaner Prod.*, 2019, **235**, 901-909, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.07.043>.
- 3 Y.H. Fseha, B. Sizirici and I. Yildiz, The potential of date palm waste biochar for single and simultaneous removal of ammonium and phosphate from aqueous solutions, *J. Environ. Chem. Eng.*, 2021, **9**, [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2021.106598.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2021.106598)
- 4 S. Yang, S. Katuwal, W. Zheng, B. Sharma and R. Cooke, Capture and recover dissolved phosphorous from aqueous solutions by a designer biochar: Mechanism and performance insights, *Chemosphere*, 2021, **274**, 129717, [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2021.129717.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemosphere.2021.129717)
- 5 X. Fu, P. Wang, J. Wu, P. Zheng, T. Wang, X. Li and M. Ren, Hydrocotyle vulgaris derived novel biochar beads for phosphorus removal: static and dynamic adsorption assessment, *J. Environ. Chem. Eng.*, 2022, **10**, [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2022.108177.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2022.108177)
- 6 X. Tao, T. Huang and B. Lv, Synthesis of Fe/Mg-Biochar Nanocomposites for Phosphate Removal, *Materials (Basel)*, 2020, **13**, [https://doi.org/10.3390/ma13040816.](https://doi.org/10.3390/ma13040816)
- 7 Z. Shang, Y. Wang, S. Wang, F. Jin and Z. Hu, Enhanced phosphorus removal of constructed wetland modified with novel Lanthanum-ammonia-modified hydrothermal biochar: Performance and mechanism, *Chem. Eng. J.*, 2022, **449**, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2022.137818>.
- 142 8 X. Song, X. Chen, W. Chen and T. Ao,  $ZrO<sub>2</sub>$  nanoparticles embedded in biochar modified with layered double oxides nanosheets for phosphorus removal by capacitive deionization, *Sep. Purif. Technol.*, 2024, **328**, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seppur.2023.125117>.
- 9 Q. Yin, H. Ren, R. Wang and Z. Zhao, Evaluation of nitrate and phosphate adsorption on Al-modified biochar: Influence of Al content, *Sci. Total Environ.,* 2018, **631-632**, 895-903, [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.03.091.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.03.091)
-