## **Electronic Supplementary Information**

## Single step eco-efficient mild chemical process for the total valorisation of rice husk: a focus on inorganics as cement additives

Eleonora Conterosito, Geo Paul, Valentina Toson, Valentina Gianotti, Marco Milanesio, Daniela Gastaldi, Enrico Boccaleri

Phases	CEM I 42.5 R		
C₃S	66.9		
C <sub>2</sub> S	7.2		
C <sub>3</sub> A	13.7		
C₄AF	3.6		
Gypsum	3.6		
Other	5		



Table S1. Phase composition of CEM I 42.5 R





Figure S2. Powder X-ray diffraction of calcined rice husk and phase matching with cristobalite.

Oxide	Wt%	
SiO <sub>2</sub>	85,64	
K <sub>2</sub> O	4,14	
CaO	4,05	
SO <sub>3</sub>	1,40	
P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub>	1,02	
Fe <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	0,96	
Cl	0,84	
Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>3</sub>	0,74	
MnO	0,59	
MgO	0,37	
Na <sub>2</sub> O	0,08	
TiO <sub>2</sub>	0,06	
TOTAL ( $SiO_2 + Al_2O_3 + Fe_2O_3$ )	90.65	





Figure S3. FT-IR ATR spectra of the precipitates: P1 (black), P2 (yellow), P3 (blue), P4(red).



Figure S4. FT-IR ATR spectra of the precipitates: P10 (blue), P11(black) P12 (red).



Figure S5. FT-IR ATR spectra of the husk residues: HR1(green), HR2 (black), HR3 (red), HR4 (blue).



Figure S6. FT-IR ATR spectra of the husk residues: HR5(yellow), HR6 (blue), HR7 (red), HR8 (black).



Figure S7. FT-IR ATR spectra of the husk residues: HR9(black), HR10 (yellow), HR11 (red), HR12 (blue).



Figure S8. XRPD pattern of P11b.



Figure S9. Size distribution by intensity from DLS analysis on the water dispersion prepared using a concentration of precipitate of 1g/L. Red curve measured right after the sonication - Green curve measured after 24 hours.



Figure S10. Size distribution by intensity from DLS analysis on the water dispersion prepared using a concentration of precipitate of 0.5g/L. Red curve measured right after the sonication - Green curve measured after 24 hours

Element	Element	Atomic	
Symbol	Name	Conc. (%)	
С	Carbon	4.2	
0	Oxygen	59.9	
Na	Sodium	0.2	
Si	Silicon	13.9	
К	Potassium	2.7	
Са	Calcium	19.0	

Table S3. Chemical composition of P11b sample as determined by Electron Dispersive X-Ray (EDX) Analysisexpressed as atomic % (average error estimated ± 0.3%).

	Compression strength at different ageing					
	16 h	1 d	2 d	3 d	7 d	
Mixture	(N/mm²)	(N/mm²)	(N/mm²)	(N/mm²)	(N/mm²)	
CEM		17.28 ±	30.33 ±	36.88 ±		
	8.93 ± 0.10	0.01	0.36	0.28	44.76	
CEM-P <sub>ap</sub>			30.15 ±	36.42 ±		
	9.63 ± 0.07	17.8 ± 0.1	0.42	0.97	40.47	
CEM- P <sub>350</sub>	10.61 ±	19.49 ±	32.36 ±	39.64 ±		
	0.29	0.04	0.56	0.14	44.28	
CEM- P <sub>650</sub>		17.18 ±	31.41 ±	36.39 ±		
	9.49 ± 0.11	0.14	1.32	0.10	44.16	

Table S4. Compressive strength of cement mortars samples at different ageing times.



Figure S11. XRPD pattern of the mixtures of additive and cement after hydration.



Figure S12 XRPD patterns of the cement paste samples at different hydration times.