Supporting Information.

Promoting H₂O₂ direct synthesis through Fe incorporation into AuPd Catalysts.

Rong-Jian Li^{a †}, Richard J. Lewis^{a†*}, Ángeles López-Martín^a David J. Morgan^{a,b}, Thomas E. Davies^a, David Kordus^c, A. Iulian Dugulan^d, Beatriz Roldan Cuenya^c, and Graham J. Hutchings^{a*}

^aMax Planck-Cardiff Centre on the Fundamentals of Heterogeneous Catalysis FUNCAT, Cardiff Catalysis Institute, School of Chemistry, Cardiff University, Translational Research Hub, Maindy Road, Cardiff, CF24 4HQ, United Kingdom.

^bHarwellXPS, Research Complex at Harwell (RCaH), Didcot, OX11 OFA, United Kingdom.

^cDepartment of Interface Science, Fritz Haber Institute of the Max Planck Society, 14195 Berlin, Germany

^dLaboratory of Fundamentals Aspects of Materials and Energy, Department of Radiation Science & Technology, Delft University of Technology, Mekelweg 15, 2628 CD, Delft, The Netherlands

[†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

*LewisR27@Cardiff.ac.uk, Hutch@Cardiff.ac.uk



Figure S.1. X-ray diffractograms of AuPdFe/TiO₂ catalysts. (A) TiO₂, (B) 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd/TiO₂, (C), 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.01%Fe/TiO₂, (D) 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.02%Fe/TiO₂, (E) 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.05%Fe/TiO₂, (F) 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.1%Fe/TiO₂, (G) 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.5%Fe/TiO₂ and (H) 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.1%Fe/TiO₂. Note: Catalysts exposed to a reductive heat treatment (5%H₂/Ar, 400 °C, 4h, 10 °Cmin⁻¹). Support (P25), used as received.

Catalyst		Actual metal loading / wt.	%
-	Au	Pd	Fe
1%Au/TiO ₂	1.01	-	-
1%Pd/TiO ₂	-	0.91	-
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd/TiO ₂	0.48	0.46	-
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.01%Fe/TiO ₂	0.45	0.47	0.01
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.02%Fe/TiO ₂	0.48	0.49	0.02
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.05%Fe/TiO ₂	0.52	0.52	0.05
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.1%Fe/TiO ₂	0.48	0.47	0.11
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.5%Fe/TiO ₂	0.49	0.49	0.47
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-1%Fe/TiO ₂	0.55	0.53	0.99
0.5%Au-0.02%Fe/TiO ₂	0.46	-	0.03
0.5%Pd-0.02%Fe/TiO ₂	-	0.47	0.02
1%Au-0.02%Fe/TiO ₂	1.04	-	0.03
1%Pd-0.02%Fe/TiO ₂	-	0.97	0.03

Table S.1. Actual metal loading of AuPdFe/TiO₂ catalysts, as determined by ICP analysis of microwave-assisted aqua regia digested catalysts.

Table S.2. Catalytic performance towards the direct synthesis of H₂O₂, as a function of Fe loading.

Catalyst	Productivity / mol _{H2O2} kg _{cat} -	H ₂ O ₂ Conc. /	H₂ Conv.	H ₂ O ₂ Sel. /	Initial rate of reaction /	Degradation / mol _{H2O2} kg _{cat} - ¹ h ⁻¹
	¹ h ⁻¹	wt.%	1%	%	mmol _{H2O2}	-
					mmol _{metal} -1min ⁻¹	
1%Au/TiO ₂	4	0.008	3.0	14	1.76 x10 ²	28
1%Pd/TiO ₂	50	0.100	13	41	9.99 x10 ²	224
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd/TiO ₂	70	0.139	19	39	2.46 x10 ³	208
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.01%Fe/TiO ₂	78	0.155	26	32	1.30 x10 ³	331
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.02%Fe/TiO ₂	121	0.242	40	31	3.00 x10 ³	451
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.05%Fe/TiO ₂	110	0.213	36	32	1.89 x10 ³	365
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.1%Fe/TiO ₂	105	0.210	33	32	2.26 x10 ³	353
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.5%Fe/TiO ₂	94	0.186	25	39	1.33 x10 ³	307
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-1%Fe/TiO ₂	65	0.129	16	42	4.65 x10 ²	287
0.5%Au-0.02%Fe/TiO ₂	3	0.006	2	16	3.18x10 ²	52
0.5%Pd-0.02%Fe/TiO ₂	35	0.070	9	40	1.03x10 ³	151
1%Au-0.02%Fe/TiO ₂	3	0.006	2	13	1.74 x10 ²	24
1%Pd-0.02%Fe/TiO ₂	41	0.082	11	38	7.24 x10 ²	233

H₂O₂ direct synthesis reaction conditions: Catalyst (0.01 g), H₂O (2.9 g), MeOH (5.6 g), 5% H₂/CO₂ (420 psi), 25% O₂/CO₂ (160 psi), 0.5 h, 2 °C 1200 rpm. **H₂O₂ degradation reaction conditions:** Catalyst (0.01 g), H₂O₂ (50 wt.% 0.68 g) H₂O (2.22 g), MeOH (5.6 g), 5% H₂/CO₂ (420 psi), 0.5 h, 2 °C 1200 rpm. **Note:** Initial reaction rate measured over a reaction time of 0.083 h, calculated based on actual metal loading.



Figure S.2. CO-DRFITS spectra for AuPdFe/TiO₂ catalysts, with analysis of a 1%Fe/TiO₂ formulation included for reference. **Note:** No bands which may be associated with the redox process of FeOx, (typically at 3700 cm⁻¹) were observed and the x-axis range has been restricted to allow for improved clarity of the Pd-CO region.¹



Figure S.3.A Representative bright field transmission electron micrographs and corresponding particle size histograms of **(A)** 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd/TiO₂ **(B)** 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.01%Fe/TiO₂ and **(C)** 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.02Fe%/TiO₂ catalysts. **Note:** All catalysts exposed to a reductive heat treatment (5%H₂/Ar, 400 °C, 4h, 10 °Cmin⁻¹)



Figure 3. B. Representative bright field transmission electron micrographs and corresponding particle size histograms of **(D)** 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd0.05%Fe/TiO₂, **(E)** 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.1%Fe/TiO₂, **(F)** 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.5%Fe/TiO₂ and **(G)** 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-1%Fe/TiO₂ catalysts. **Note:** All catalysts exposed to a reductive heat treatment (5%H₂/Ar, 400 °C, 4h, 10 °Cmin⁻¹).

Catalyst	Productivity /	Solvent	Temp /	Time /	H_2O_2	H ₂	H_2O_2	Rate of	Reference
	mol _{H2O2} kg _{cat} -1h ⁻¹		°C	h	Conc. /	Conv. /	Sel. / %	reaction /	
					wt.%	%		mol _{H2O2} mol _{metal} - ¹ h ⁻¹	
1% Au1Pd1Pt0.01/TiO2	112	H ₂ O/MeOH	2	0.5	0.22	43	37	1.70 x10 ³	2
1%AuPd _(0.975) Pt _(0.025) /TiO ₂	106	H ₂ O/MeOH	2	0.5	0.22	-	-	1.62 x10 ³	3
1%AuPd _(0.975) Ni _(0.025) /TiO ₂	107	H ₂ O/MeOH	2	0.5	0.22	32	41	1.56 x10 ³	3
1%AuPd _(0.975) Sn _(0.025) /TiO ₂	78	H ₂ O/MeOH	2	0.5	0.16	-	-	1.18 x10 ³	3
1%AuPd _(0.975) Cu _(0.025) /TiO ₂	94	H ₂ O/MeOH	2	0.5	0.19	31	40	1.38 x10 ³	3
1%AuPd _(0.975) Co _(0.025) /TiO ₂	71	H ₂ O/MeOH	2	0.5	0.14	-	-	1.04 x10 ³	3
1%AuPd _(0.975) In _(0.025) /TiO ₂	77	H ₂ O/MeOH	2	0.5	0.15	-	-	1.16 x10 ³	3
1%AuPd _(0.975) Ga _(0.025) /TiO ₂	70	H ₂ O/MeOH	2	0.5	0.14	-	-	1.03 x10 ³	3
1%AuPd _(0.975) Zn _(0.025) /TiO ₂	100	H ₂ O/MeOH	2	0.5	0.20	24	50	1.47 x10 ³	3
0.2%Au-4.60%Pd-	184	H ₂ O/MeOH	2	0.5	0.37	-	-	4.06 x10 ²	4
1%AuPd _(0.975) Cu _(0.025) /ZSM- 5	115	H ₂ O/MeOH	2	0.5	0.23	19	72	1.69 x10 ³	5
1%AuPd _(0.975) Ni _(0.025) /ZSM- 5	81	H ₂ O/MeOH	2	0.5	0.16	-	-	1.19 x10 ³	5
1%AuPd _(0.975) Zn _(0.025) /ZSM- 5	77	H ₂ O/MeOH	2	0.5	0.16	-	-	1.13 x10 ³	5
2.4%Au-2.4%Pd- 0.2%Pt/TS-1	167	H ₂ O/MeOH	2	0.5	0.33	-	-	4.67 x10 ²	6
0.275%Au-0.275%Pd- 0.11%Pt/TS-1	135	H ₂ O/MeOH	2	0.5	0.27	-	-	2.97 x10 ³	7
2.4%Au-2.4%Pd- 0.2%Pt/CeO ₂	170	H ₂ O/MeOH	2	0.5	0.34	-	-	4.75 x10 ²	8
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd- 0.02%Fe/TiO ₂	122	H ₂ O/MeOH	2	0.5	0.24	40	31	1.61 x10 ³	This work

Table S.3. A comparison of catalytic performance of trimetallic catalysts towards the direct synthesis of H₂O₂.

Table S.4. Comparison of catalytic selectivity towards H₂O₂ at iso-conversion.

Catalyst	Reaction time / min	H ₂ Conv. / %	H ₂ O ₂ Sel. / %	H ₂ O ₂ Conc. / wt.%
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd/TiO ₂	10	8	50	0.08
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.02%Fe/TiO ₂	5	9	41	0.07
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-1%Fe/TiO ₂	10	8	37	0.06

 $\begin{array}{l} \textbf{H_2O_2 direct synthesis reaction conditions:} \ Catalyst (0.01 g), \ H_2O (2.9 g), \ MeOH (5.6 g), \ 5\% \\ \textbf{H_2/CO_2} (420 \ psi), \ 25\% \ O_2/CO_2 (160 \ psi), \ 0.5 \ h, \ 2^\circ \ C, \ 1200 \ rpm. \end{array}$



Figure S.4. HAADF-STEM analysis of the as-prepared **(A)** 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd/TiO₂ **(B)** 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.02%Fe/TiO₂ and **(C)** 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-1%Fe/TiO₂ catalysts. **Note:** Catalysts exposed to a reductive heat treatment prior to use (5%H₂/Ar, 400 °C, 4h, 10 °Cmin⁻¹).



Figure S.5. HAADF-STEM and corresponding EDX analysis of the as-prepared 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd/TiO₂ catalyst. **Note:** Catalysts exposed to a reductive heat treatment prior to use (5%H₂/Ar, 400 °C, 4h, 10 °Cmin⁻¹).



Figure S.6. HAADF-STEM and corresponding EDX analysis of the as-prepared 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.02%Fe/TiO₂ catalyst. **Note:** Catalysts exposed to a reductive heat treatment prior to use (5%H₂/Ar, 400 °C, 4h, 10 °Cmin⁻¹).



Figure S.7. HAADF-STEM and corresponding EDX analysis of the as-prepared 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-1%Fe/TiO₂ catalyst. **Note:** Catalysts exposed to a reductive heat treatment prior to use (5%H₂/Ar, 400 °C, 4h, 10 °Cmin⁻¹).



Figure S.8. A comparison of catalytic performance towards the direct synthesis of H_2O_2 , as a function of reaction time. H_2O_2 direct synthesis reaction conditions: Catalyst (0.01 g), H_2O (2.9 g), MeOH (5.6 g), 5% H_2/CO_2 (420 psi), 25% O_2/CO_2 (160 psi), 0.5 h, 2 °C 1200 rpm.

Catalyst	Reaction time /	Au / ppm (%)	Pd / ppm (%)	Fe / ppm (%)
	min			
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd/TiO ₂	5	0.0 (0.0)	1.9 (0.03)	-
	10	0.0 (0.0)	2.7 (0.05)	-
	30	0.0 (0.0)	3.3 (0.06)	-
	60	0.0 (0.0)	5.5 (0.10)	-
	120	0.0 (0.0)	6.0 (0.11)	-
	180	0.0 (0.0)	6.3 (0.12)	-
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-	5	0.0 (0.0)	1.7 (0.03)	0.0 (0.0)
0.02%Fe/TiO ₂				
	10	0.0 (0.0)	2.5 (0.05)	0.0 (0.0)
	30	0.0 (0.0)	3.0 (0.06)	0.0 (0.0)
	60	0.0 (0.0)	6.0 (0.11)	0.0 (0.0)
	120	0.0 (0.0)	6.7 (0.12)	0.0 (0.0)
	180	0.0 (0.0)	8.5 (0.16)	0.0 (0.0)
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-1%Fe/TiO ₂	5	0.0 (0.0)	3.1 (0.06)	0.0 (0.0)
	10	0.0 (0.0)	4.3 (0.08)	0.0 (0.0)
	30	0.0 (0.0)	6.3 (0.12)	0.0 (0.0)
	60	0.0 (0.0)	9.3 (0.17)	0.0 (0.0)
	120	0.0 (0.0)	13.2 (0.24)	0.0 (0.0)
	180	0.0 (0.0)	15.2 (0.28)	0.0 (0.0)

Table S.5. Catalyst stability as a function of reaction time, as determined by ICP analysis of post- H_2O_2 direct synthesis reaction solutions.

H₂O₂ direct synthesis reaction conditions: Catalyst (0.01 g), H₂O (2.9 g), MeOH (5.6 g), 5% H₂/CO₂ (420 psi), 25% O₂/CO₂ (160 psi), 2° C, 1200 rpm.



Figure S.9. Comparison of catalytic activity over sequential H_2O_2 synthesis reactions. *Key:* 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd/TiO₂ (green squares), 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.02%Fe/TiO₂ (red circles), and 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-1.0%Fe/TiO₂ (blue triangles). H_2O_2 direct synthesis reaction conditions: catalyst (0.01 g), H_2O (2.9 g), MeOH (5.6 g), 5% H_2/CO_2 (420 psi), 25% O_2/CO_2 (160 psi), 0.5 h, 2 °C, 1200 rpm.

Table S.6	. Catalyst stability a	fter a 0.5 h H ₂ O ₂	direct synthesis	reaction, as	determined by	y ICP
analysis o	f post-H ₂ O ₂ direct s	ynthesis reaction	solutions.			

Catalyst	Au / ppm (%)	Pd / ppm (%)	Fe / ppm (%)
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd/TiO ₂	0.0 (0.0)	3.3 (0.06)	-
0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-	0.0 (0.0)	3.0 (0.06)	0.0 (0.0)
0.02%Fe/11O2 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-	0.0 (0.0)	6.3 (0.12)	0.0 (0.0)
1%Fe/TiO ₂			

 H_2O_2 direct synthesis reaction conditions: catalyst (0.01 g), H_2O (2.9 g), MeOH (5.6 g), 5% H_2/CO_2 (420 psi), 25% O_2/CO_2 (160 psi), 0.5 h, 2 °C, 1200 rpm.



Figure S.10. Representative bright field transmission electron micrographs and corresponding particle size histograms of **(A)** 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd/TiO₂ **(B)** 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.02%Fe/TiO₂ and **(C)** 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-1%Fe/TiO₂ catalysts after use in the direct synthesis of H₂O₂. H₂O₂ direct synthesis reaction conditions: Catalyst (0.01 g), H₂O (2.9 g), MeOH (5.6 g), 5% H₂/CO₂ (420 psi), 25% O₂/CO₂ (160 psi), 0.5 h, 2 °C 1200 rpm. Note: Catalysts exposed to a reductive heat treatment prior to use (5%H₂/Ar, 400 °C, 4h, 10 °Cmin⁻¹). Spent samples were dried (30 °C, 16 h, under vacuum).



Figure S.11. HAADF-STEM and corresponding EDX analysis of the 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd/TiO₂ catalyst after use in the direct synthesis of H₂O₂. **H₂O₂ direct synthesis reaction conditions:** Catalyst (0.01 g), H₂O (2.9 g), MeOH (5.6 g), 5% H₂/CO₂ (420 psi), 25% O₂/CO₂ (160 psi), 2° C, 1200 rpm. **Note:** Catalysts exposed to a reductive heat treatment prior to use (5%H₂/Ar, 400 °C, 4h, 10 °Cmin⁻¹). Spent samples were dried (30 °C, 16 h, under vacuum).



Figure S.12. HAADF-STEM and corresponding EDX analysis of the 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.02%Fe/TiO₂ catalyst after use in the direct synthesis of H₂O₂. **H₂O₂ direct synthesis reaction conditions:** Catalyst (0.01 g), H₂O (2.9 g), MeOH (5.6 g), 5% H₂/CO₂ (420 psi), 25% O₂/CO₂ (160 psi), 2° C, 1200 rpm. **Note:** Catalysts exposed to a reductive heat treatment prior to use (5%H₂/Ar, 400 °C, 4h, 10 °Cmin⁻¹). Spent samples were dried (30 °C, 16 h, under vacuum).



Figure S.13. HAADF-STEM and corresponding EDX analysis of the 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-1%Fe/TiO₂ catalyst after use in the direct synthesis of H₂O₂. **H₂O₂ direct synthesis reaction conditions:** Catalyst (0.01 g), H₂O (2.9 g), MeOH (5.6 g), 5% H₂/CO₂ (420 psi), 25% O₂/CO₂ (160 psi), 2° C, 1200 rpm. **Note:** Catalysts exposed to a reductive heat treatment prior to use (5%H₂/Ar, 400 °C, 4h, 10 °Cmin⁻¹). Spent samples were dried (30 °C, 16 h, under vacuum).



Figure S.14. XPS analysis of the loss of Cl after reaction on (A) 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd/TiO₂, (B) 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-0.02%Fe/TiO₂ and (C) 0.5%Au-0.5%Pd-1.0%Fe/TiO₂. H₂O₂ direct synthesis reaction conditions: catalyst (0.01 g), H₂O (2.9 g), MeOH (5.6 g), 5% H₂/CO₂ (420 psi), 25% O₂/CO₂ (160 psi), 2 °C, 1200 rpm.

Catalyst	Au _{0.5} Pd _{0.5} Fe _{0.02} /TiO ₂		
Metal Loading / g	Au	5.00	
	Pd	5.00	
	Fe	0.20	
Support / g	TiO ₂	989.80	
Catalyst: Solvent Ratio (wt/wt)		0.0018	
Solvent Usage / t		0.56	
H ₂ O ₂ Selectivity / %		31.00	
H ₂ O ₂ Productivity / mol _{H2O2} Kg _{Cat} -1 h ⁻¹		122.00	
H₂ Usage / Kg		189.75	
	Unit	USD / Unit	Cost / USD
H ₂	Kg	2	379.51
Methanol	t	336.99	188.71
TiO ₂ (P25)	Kg	1.5	7.42
Au (metal)	g	96.9	24.23
Pd (metal)	g	37.2	9.30
Fe (metal)	t	104.62	0.0000010462
Catalyst	Kg		40.95
Total Cost/USD			609.17

Table S.7.A. Technoeconomic analysis of the direct synthesis of H_2O_2 over the $Au_{0.5}Pd_{0.5}Fe_{0.02}/TiO_2$ catalyst reported in this work.

Catalyst	Au _{0.65} Pd _{0.35} Pt _{0.01} /TiO ₂		
Metal Loading / g	Au	5.00	
	Pd	5.00	
	Pt	0.10	
Support / g	TiO ₂	989.80	
Catalyst: Solvent Ratio (wt/wt)		0.0018	
Solvent Usage / t		0.56	
H ₂ O ₂ Selectivity / %		37.00	
H ₂ O ₂ Productivity / mol _{H2O2} Kg _{Cat} -1 h ⁻¹		112.00	
H ₂ Usage / Kg		158.98	
	Unit	USD / Unit	Cost / USD
H ₂	Kg	2	317.97
Methanol	t	336.99	188.71
TiO ₂ (P25)	Kg	1.5	7.42
Au (metal)	g	96.9	31.49
Pd (metal)	g	37.2	6.51
Pt (metal)	g	36.3	0.18
Catalyst	Kg		45.61
Total Cost/USD			552.29

Table S.7.B. Technoeconomic analysis of the direct synthesis of H_2O_2 over the $Au_{0.65}Pd_{0.35}Pt_{0.01}/TiO_2$ catalyst.

Catalyst	Au _{0.25} Pd _{0.25} /TiO ₂		
Metal Loading / g	Au	2.50	
	Pd	2.50	
Support / g	TiO ₂	995.00	
Catalyst: Solvent Ratio (wt/wt)		0.0018	
Solvent Usage / t		0.56	
H ₂ O ₂ Selectivity / %		59.00	
H ₂ O ₂ Productivity / mol _{H2O2} Kg _{Cat} -1 h ⁻¹		90.00	
H ₂ Usage / Kg		99.70	
	Unit	USD / Unit	Cost / USD
H ₂	Kg	2	199.40
Methanol	t	336.99	188.71
TiO ₂ (P25)	Kg	1.5	7.46
Au (metal)	g	96.9	12.11
Pd (metal)	g	37.2	4.65
Catalyst	Kg		24.23
Total Cost/ USD			412.34

Table S.7.C. Technoeconomic analysis of the direct synthesis of H_2O_2 over the $Au_{0.25}Pd_{0.25}/TiO_2$ catalyst.

Catalyst	Au _{0.5} Pd _{0.5} /TiO ₂			
Metal Loading / g	Au	5.00		
	Pd	5.00		
Support / g	TiO ₂	990.00		
Catalyst: Solvent Ratio (wt/wt)		0.0032		
Solvent Usage / t		0.32		
H ₂ SO ₄ Usage / t		9.81x10⁻³		
NaBr Usage / t		2.06x10 ⁻⁶		
H ₂ O ₂ Selectivity / %		88.00		
H ₂ O ₂ Productivity / mol _{H2O2} Kg _{Cat} -1 h ⁻¹		51		
H ₂ Usage / Kg		66.84		
	Unit	USD / Unit	Cost / USD	
H ₂	Kg	2	133.69	
H_2SO_4	t	85	0.83	
NaBr	t	1734	3.57x10 ⁻³	
Methanol	t	336.99	106.66	
TiO ₂ (P25)	Kg	1.5	7.43	
Au (metal)	g	96.9	24.23	
Pd (metal)	g	37.2	9.30	
Catalyst	Kg		40.95	
Total Cost/ USD			282.14	

Table S.7.D. Technoeconomic analysis of the direct synthesis of H_2O_2 over the $Au_{0.5}Pd_{0.5}/TiO_2$ catalyst.

Catalyst	Pd _{0.72} /TiO ₂		
Metal Loading / g	Pd	7.20	
Support / g	TiO ₂	992.80	
Catalyst: Solvent Ratio (wt/wt)		0.0004	
Solvent Usage / t		2.24	
H ₂ O ₂ Selectivity / %		80.50	
H ₂ O ₂ Productivity / mol _{H2O2} Kg _{Cat} -1 h ⁻¹		186	
H ₂ Usage / Kg		73.07	
	Unit	USD / Unit	Cost / USD
H ₂	Kg	2	146.15
Methanol	t	336.99	754.86
TiO ₂ (P25)	Kg	1.5	7.45
Pd (metal)	g	37.2	13.38
Catalyst	Kg		20.84
Total Cost/ USD			921.84

 $\label{eq:table_state} \textbf{Table S.7.E.} Technoeconomic analysis of the direct synthesis of H_2O_2 over the $Pd_{0.72}/TiO_2$ catalyst. }$

Catalyst		Pd₀	. ₁ /TiO ₂
Metal Loading / g	Pd	1.00	
Support / g	TiO ₂	999.00	
Catalyst: Solvent Ratio (wt/wt)		0.0004	
Solvent Usage / t		2.24	
H ₂ O ₂ Selectivity / %		99.00	
H ₂ O ₂ Productivity / mol _{H2O2} Kg _{Cat} -1 h-1		115	
H ₂ Usage / Kg		59.42	
	Unit	USD / Unit	Cost / USD
H ₂	Kg	2	118.84
Methanol	t	336.99	754.86
TiO ₂ (P25)	Kg	1.5	7.49
Pd (metal)	g	37.2	1.86
Catalyst	Kg		9.35
Total Cost/ USD			883.05

 $\label{eq:table_state} \textbf{Table S.7.F.} Technoeconomic analysis of the direct synthesis of H_2O_2 over the $Pd_{0.1}/TiO_2$ catalyst. }$

Catalyst		Pd ₂	₁₆ /TiO ₂
Metal Loading / g	Pd	21.60	
Support / g	TiO ₂	978.40	
Catalyst: Solvent Ratio (wt/wt)		0.0005	
Solvent Usage / t		2.00	
H ₂ SO ₄ Usage / t		3.92x10 ⁻³	
H ₂ O ₂ Selectivity / %		41.00	
H ₂ O ₂ Productivity / mol _{H2O2} Kg _{Cat} -1 h ⁻¹		24	
H ₂ Usage / Kg		147.06	
	Unit	USD / Unit	Cost / USD
H ₂	Kg	2	294.12
H ₂ SO ₄	t	85	0.33
Methanol	t	336.99	673.98
TiO ₂ (P25)	Kg	1.5	7.34
Pd (metal)	g	37.2	40.18
Catalyst	Kg		47.51
Total Cost/ USD			1015.95

Table S.7.G. Technoeconomic analysis of the direct synthesis of H_2O_2 over the $Pd_{2.16}/TiO_2$ catalyst.

Catalyst		Pd₁/	N-TiO ₂
Metal Loading / g	Pd	10.00	
Support / g	TiO ₂	990.00	
Catalyst: Solvent Ratio (wt/wt)		0.0011	
Solvent Usage / t		1200.00	
H₂SO₄ Usage / t		4.11x10 ⁻³	
H ₂ O ₂ Selectivity / %		58.0	
H ₂ O ₂ Productivity / mol _{H2O2} Kg _{Cat} -1 h ⁻¹		41	
H ₂ Usage / Kg		101.42	
	Unit	USD / Unit	Cost / USD
H ₂	Kg	2	202.84
H ₂ SO ₄	t	85	0.35
Ethanol	L	0.34	408.00
TiO ₂ (P25)	Kg	1.5	7.43
Pd (metal)	g	37.2	18.60
Catalyst	Kg		26.03
Total Cost/ USD			637.21

 $\label{eq:constraint} \textbf{Table S.7.H.} Technoeconomic analysis of the direct synthesis of H_2O_2 over the Pd_1/N-TiO_2$ catalyst.$

Catalyst	Pd₁/TiO₂		
Metal Loading / g	Pd	10.00	
Support / g	TiO ₂	990.00	
Catalyst: Solvent Ratio (wt/wt)		0.0011	
Solvent Usage / t		1200.00	
H₂SO₄ Usage / t		4.11x10 ⁻³	
H ₂ O ₂ Selectivity / %		61.0	
H ₂ O ₂ Productivity / mol _{H2O2} Kg _{Cat} -1 h ⁻¹		30	
H ₂ Usage / Kg		96.43	
	Unit	USD / Unit	Cost / USD
H ₂	Kg	2	192.86
H ₂ SO ₄	t	85	0.35
Ethanol	L	0.34	408.00
TiO ₂ (P25)	Kg	1.5	7.43
Pd (metal)	g	37.2	18.60
Catalyst	Кg		26.03
Total Cost/ USD			627.24

Table S.7.I. Technoeconomic analysis of the direct synthesis of H_2O_2 over the Pd_1/TiO_2 catalyst.

Table S.7.J. Costings associated with key reagents utilised in the direct synthesis of H_2O_2 , used to conduct the economic analysis reported in Figure 8 and Tables S.7.A-I.

	Unit	USD / Unit	Reference
H ₂	Kg	2.00	9
H_2SO_4	t	85.00	10
NaBr	t	1734.00	11
Ethanol	L	0.34	12
Methanol	t	336.99	13
TiO ₂ (P25)	Kg	1.50	14
Au (metal)	g	96.90	15
Pd (metal)	g	37.20	16
Pt (metal)	g	36.30	17
Fe (metal)	t	104.62	18

References.

- B. Zheng, G. Liu, L. Geng, J. Cui, S. Wu, P. Wu, M. Jia, W. Yan and W. Zhang, *Catal. Sci. Technol.*, 2016, 6, 1546-1554.
- 2. X. Gong, R. J. Lewis, S. Zhou, D. J. Morgan, T. E. Davies, X. Liu, C. J. Kiely, B. Zong and G. J. Hutchings, *Catal. Sci. Technol.*, 2020, **10**, 4635.
- A. Barnes, R. J. Lewis, D. J. Morgan, T. E. Davies and G. J. Hutchings, *Catal. Sci. Technol.*, 2022, **12**, 1986-1995.
- 4. J. K. Edwards, J. Pritchard, P. J. Miedziak, M. Piccinini, A. F. Carley, Q. He, C. J. Kiely and G. J. Hutchings, *Catal. Sci. Technol.*, 2014, **4**, 3244-3250.
- 5. A. Barnes, R. J. Lewis, D. J. Morgan, T. E. Davies and G. J. Hutchings, *Catalysts*, 2022, **12**, 1396.
- R. J. Lewis, K. Ueura, Y. Fukuta, S. J. Freakley, L. Kang, R. Wang, Q. He, J. K. Edwards, D. J. Morgan, Y. Yamamoto and G. J. Hutchings, *ChemCatChem*, 2019, **11**, 1673.
- R. J. Lewis, K. Ueura, Y. Fukuta, T. E. Davies, D. J. Morgan, C. B. Paris, J. Singleton, J. K. Edwards, S. J. Freakley, Y. Yamamoto and G. J. Hutchings, *Green Chem.*, 2022, 24, 9496-9507.
- J. K. Edwards, J. Pritchard, L. Lu, M. Piccinini, G. Shaw, A. F. Carley, D. J. Morgan,
 C. J. Kiely and G. J. Hutchings, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.*, 2014, **53**, 2381-2384.
- 9. M. Kayfeci, A. Keçebaş, and M Bayat, M. In *Solar Hydrogen Production*, Academic Press: 2019, 45-83.

10. Sulphuric Acid Prices, Monitor, News, Analysis & Demand via www.chemanalyst.com/Pricing-data/sulphuric-acid-70, (accessed 20.11.2024).

11. Sodium Bromide Price Trend and Forecast via www.procurementresource.com/resource-center/sodium-bromide-price-trends (accessed 20.11.2024).

12. Trading Economics, Ethanol via www.tradingeconomics.com/commodity/ethanol (accessed 20.11.2024).

13. Trading Economics, Mehanol via www.tradingeconomics.com/commodity/methanol (accessed 20.11.2024).

14. Degussa, P25 costing via www.daliantnn.en.made-inchina.com/product/WmkYHiDChpVo/China-Degussa-P25-Low-Price-Per-Kg-TiO2-Titanium-Dioxide-Rutile-Grade.html (accessed 20.11.2024). 15. Gold Prices - 100 Year Historical Chart via www.macrotrends.net/1333/historical-gold-prices-100-year-chart (accessed 20.11.2024).

16. Palladium Prices - Interactive Historical Chart via www.macrotrends.net/2542/palladiumprices-historical-chart-data (accessed 20.11.2024).

17. Platinum Prices - Interactive Historical Chart via www.macrotrends.net/2540/platinum-prices-historical-chart-data (accessed 20.11.2024).

18. Iron ore via www.tradingeconomics.com/commodity/iron-ore (accessed 20.11.2024).