## Supporting information for:

## Enhanced Capture of Particulate Matter by Molecularly Charged Electrospun Nanofibers

Pillalamarri Srikrishnarka,<sup>†,‡</sup> Vishal Kumar,<sup>†,‡</sup> Tripti Ahuja,<sup>†</sup> Vidhya Subramanian, <sup>†</sup>Arun Karthick Selvam, <sup>†</sup> Paulami Bose, <sup>†</sup> Shantha Kumar Jenifer, <sup>†,□</sup> Ananthu Mahendranath, <sup>†,□</sup> Mohd Azhardin Ganayee, <sup>†</sup> Ramamurthy Nagarajan<sup>\*,‡</sup> and Thalappil Pradeep<sup>\*,†</sup>

*†DST Unit of Nanoscience, Department of Chemistry, Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Chennai, India 6000036.* 

*Department of Chemical Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Chennai, India 6000036.* 

Department of Metallurgy and Materials Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Chennai, India 6000036.

\*E-mail: Thalappil Pradeep <u>pradeep@iitm.ac.in</u>

Ramamurthy Nagarajan nag@iitm.ac.in

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION CONTENT

Total number of pages: 15

Total number of figures: 13

Total number of tables: 1

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Figure No.	Description	Page No.
Figure S1	Illustration of the aerosol filtration efficiency tester set-up	S3
Figure S2	Photograph of the soot filtration set-up	S4
Figure S3	(a) Size distribution of dust particles collected on different	S5
	days. (b) Zeta potential of the dust collected on different days	
Figure S4	(a and b) Charge distribution of dust collected from 2 different	S5
	locations measured using a Faraday cup. (c and d) Scanning	
	electron micrographs of dust collected from 2 locations. Scale	

	bar corresponds to 100 μm			
Figure S5	X-ray diffraction patterns of dust collected from 4 different			
	locations matched with the standard ICSD database			
Table S1	Chemical composition of dust collected from 4 different			
	locations matched using the ICSD database			
Figure S6	gure S6 (a and c) Fiber diameter distribution comparing the bare an			
	chemically treated PAN and PS. (b and d) fibers FTIR spectra			
	comparing bare, chemically treated PAN and bare, chemically			
	treated PS, respectively			
Figure S7	Charge distribution of untreated and treated fibers of (a) PAN	S8		
	and (b) PS			
Figure S8	Water contact angle measurements	S9		
Figure S9	(a) Pressure drop across various filter mats with different electrospinning time. (b) Pressure drop across untreated and	S10		
	treated filter mat before and after exposure to soot for 24 h.			
	(c) Comparing the mass of fibers collected on the non-woven mat with electrospinning time			
Figure S10	(a) Scanning electron micrograph of chemically treated PS fiber	S11		
	with NaCl crystals on them. (b) Spot energy dispersive			
	spectrum (EDS) for the highlighted region with various			
	components presented in the atomic and weight %. Scale bare			
	corresponds to 10 $\mu$ m. Comparing the filtration efficiencies of			
	the untreated and treated fibers. Expanded view of the filtration			
	efficiency is shown in the inset			
Figure S11	(a) Charge distribution of electrospun PAN fibers. Marked	S13		
	region is zone presented in the inset. (b) Scanning electron			
	micrograph of ChCl-PAN fibres. Scale bar corresponds to 5			
	$\mu$ m. The pores are highlighted by arrows. (c) Filtration			
	efficiency of ChCl-PAN fibres			
Figure S12	(a) Charge distribution of PS fibres before and after chemical treatment with sulfuric acid. The time of addition of material is marked (b) Soot filtration efficiency of SPS fibres	S14		
Figure \$12	Antibacterial property of the fiber	<u>\$15</u>		
Video S1	Cantura of soot on the fiber met	V S1		
video SI	Capture of soot on the fiber mat	v-51		



Figure S1. Illustration of the aerosol filtration efficiency tester set-up.



**Figure S2.** Photograph of soot filtration set-up. (a) The complete set-up with clamps and caps, (b) without the clamps and caps. (c) Side view of one the bottle were the fibers meet the soot particles.

![](_page_4_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S3.** (a) Size distribution of dust particles collected on different days. (b) Zeta potential of the dust collected on different days.

![](_page_5_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S4.** (a and b) Charge distribution of dust collected from 2 different locations measured using a Faraday cup. (c and d) Scanning electron micrographs of dust collected from 2 different locations. Scale bar corresponds to  $10 \mu m$ .

![](_page_6_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S5.** (a, b, c and d) X-ray diffraction patterns of dust collected from 4 different locations matched with the ICSD database.

Table S1.	Chemical	composition	of	dust	collected	from	4	different	locations	and	matched
using ICSE	) database.										

Location	Sample	Inorganic crystal structure	Chemical composition
	name	database (ICSD)	
1	Kyanite	83456	Al <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> Si
	Quartz low	201353	SiO <sub>2</sub>
	Anorthite	63547	$Al_2Ca_{0.71}Na_{0.25}O_8Si_2$
2	Quartz low	201353	SiO <sub>2</sub>
	Albite low	77423	Al <sub>1</sub> Na <sub>1</sub> O <sub>8</sub> Si <sub>3</sub>
3	Bytownite	30932	Al <sub>1.94</sub> Ca <sub>0.85</sub> Na <sub>0.14</sub> O <sub>8</sub> Si <sub>2.06</sub>
	Quartz low	201353	SiO <sub>2</sub>
	Lauzurite 4A	85087	$Al_6Ca_1Na_7O_{30}S_{2.12}Si_6$
	Andesine	100867	$Al_{1.29}Ca_{0.36}Na_{0.62}O_8Si_{2.7}$
4	Quartz low	201353	SiO <sub>2</sub>
	Albite low	77423	Al <sub>1</sub> Na <sub>1</sub> O <sub>8</sub> Si <sub>3</sub>
	Albite high	9829	$Al_1Na_1O_8Si_3$

![](_page_7_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S6.** (a and c) Fiber diameter distribution comparing the bare and chemically treated PAN and PS. (b and d) fibers FTIR spectra comparing bare, chemically treated PAN and bare, chemically treated PS, respectively.

![](_page_8_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S7.** Charge distribution of untreated and treated (a) PAN and (b) PS fiber mats.(Inset) (a) Molecular model of ChCl treated PAN where, grey represents carbon, blue represents nitrogen and red represents oxygen. Marked region is enlarged and shown in inset. Marked region of the charge distribution is enlarged and shown in another inset. (b) Molecular model of sulfonated PS where, red represents oxygen and yellow represents sulfur. Time of addition of materials to the Faraday cup is indicated.

![](_page_9_Picture_0.jpeg)

**Figure S8.** Water contact angle measurements performed on (a) PAN, (b) PS, (c) ChClPAN and (d) SPS.

![](_page_10_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S9.** (a) Pressure drop across various filter mats with different electrospinning time, Here, 4NW30 indicate 4 NW mats with 30 min of electrospinning time. (b) Pressure drop across untreated and treated filter mat before and after exposure to soot for 24 h. Here, untreated, treated represent the untreated and treated filter mat before exposure to soot, respectively. Untreated after and treated after represent untreated and treated filter mat after exposure to soot, respectively. (c) Comparing the mass of fibers collected on the non-woven mat with electrospinning time.

![](_page_11_Figure_0.jpeg)

Figure S10. (a) Scanning electron micrograph of chemically treated PS fiber with NaCl crystals on them. (b) Spot energy dispersive spectrum (EDS) for the highlighted region with various components presented in the atomic and weight %. Scale bare corresponds to 10  $\mu$ m. Comparing the filtration efficiencies of the untreated and treated fibers. Expanded view of the filtration efficiency is shown in the inset.

![](_page_12_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S11.** (a) Charge distribution of electrospun PAN fibers. Marked region is zone presented in the inset. (b) Scanning electron micrograph of ChCl-PAN fibres. Scale bar corresponds to 5  $\mu$ m. The pores are highlighted by arrows. (c) Filtration efficiency of ChCl-PAN fibres.

![](_page_13_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S12.** (a) Charge distribution of PS fibres before and after chemical treatment with sulfuric acid. The time of addition of material is marked. (b) Soot filtration efficiency of SPS fibres.

![](_page_14_Figure_0.jpeg)

**Figure S13.** Antibacterial property testing of the filter mats using (a) *E. coli*, (b) *B. subtilis* and (c) *E. faecalis*. Here CPAN represent ChClPAN.