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ABSTRACT Continuous production of hydrogen peroxide (H$_2$O$_2$) through the two-electron oxygen reduction reaction (2e-ORR) in distributed electrochemical cells offers important advantages for point-of-use water treatment and pulp bleaching over the complex industrial anthraquinone process. A low-cost, heterogeneous 2e-ORR electrocatalyst with high activity and selectivity is key to meeting the future needs for distributed production of H$_2$O$_2$ with large capacity. Herein, we demonstrate high activity and selectivity of a new heterogeneous organic molecular electrocatalyst, 2,2’-dipyridylamine, with an H$_2$O$_2$ yield of ca. 80%, and an onset potential of ca. 0.60 V vs. RHE in acidic aqueous electrolyte. We show that this acid-compatible, inexpensive, small organic molecule can catalyze 2e-ORR as efficiently as the state-of-the-art catalysts based on mercury-precious metal alloys. We propose different mechanisms of dioxygen electroreduction based on density functional theory calculations, which correlate activity with calculated standard reduction potential of reaction intermediates.
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Organic Molecular Catalyst for Electrochemical H₂O₂ Generation
Introduction

Hydrogen peroxide (H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2}) is an important chemical with versatile applications in water treatment, environmental remediation, paper/pulp industry, production of bleach, and medical disinfection\textsuperscript{1,2}. Industrial production of H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2} relies on the anthraquinone process, which has many drawbacks, such as complexity, high initial capital cost, and added transportation and distribution cost\textsuperscript{1,2}. By comparison, the electrochemical production of H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2} in fuel cell and electrolyzer setups has attracted much attention thanks to its safety, energy efficiency and capacity to be conducted in distributed systems\textsuperscript{1,3-8}. Such systems require an efficient and highly selective heterogeneous catalyst for two-electron oxygen reduction reaction (2e-ORR) to generate H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2}. Catalysts explored for electrochemical production of H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2} include carbons\textsuperscript{4,6,9-11}, heteroatom-doped carbon materials\textsuperscript{12-14}, carbon-coated precious metals\textsuperscript{15}, atomically dispersed platinum\textsuperscript{16}, and metal nanoparticles based on precious metal-mercury alloys\textsuperscript{17,18}. Because of a better H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2} stability in acids and maturity of the proton exchange membrane (PEM) devices, 2e-ORR catalysts capable of operating in acidic environments are generally preferred. Low-cost carbon and heteroatom-doped carbon materials have shown good activity for 2e-ORR in alkaline solutions but significantly lower activity and selectivity in acidic electrolytes\textsuperscript{9,10,13}. Mercury-precious metal alloys have demonstrated high selectivity and activity in acidic electrolytes\textsuperscript{17,18}, but their cost and potential risk of mercury release make them less appealing for practical applications.

Besides the materials mentioned above, some organic molecules have also shown catalytic activity for the 2e-ORR. They include quinones\textsuperscript{19-22}, viologens\textsuperscript{23-28}, pyrazine derivatives\textsuperscript{29-32}, and porphyrin-type macrocycles\textsuperscript{33-39}. While these organic molecular catalysts are based on well-defined chemical motifs that allow for structure-activity correlations and activity fine-tuning, they are not fully viable for H\textsubscript{2}O\textsubscript{2} production. For instance, viologens and porphyrins are
homogeneous catalysts that require a solution phase, less attractive than heterogeneous systems. Quinones and viologens have good 2-e ORR activity in alkaline electrolytes but perform poorly in acidic electrolytes. For pyrazine derivatives, high overpotential is needed to catalyze 2e-ORR in acidic environments. Furthermore, only a few organic structural motifs have been explored for their catalytic activity, leaving the vast organic chemical space unexplored. Well-defined organic molecular electrocatalysts with low cost, high activity and selectivity for 2e-ORR in acidic electrolyte are needed to enable energy-efficient and cost-effective electrochemical production of H₂O₂.

Herein, we demonstrate 2,2’-dipyridylamine (dpa) adsorbed on glassy carbon support (Scheme 1), as an efficient heterogeneous and inexpensive organic molecular electrocatalyst for the 2-e ORR to generate hydrogen peroxide in acidic aqueous electrolytes.

Scheme 1. Heterogeneous organic molecular catalyst based on 2,2’-dipyridylamine adsorbed on glassy carbon substrate for two-electron reduction of dioxygen.
Results and Discussion

We evaluated the 2e-ORR activity of dpa adsorbed on glassy carbon electrode (GCE) in a standard three-electrode electrochemical cell, using graphite rod as a the counter electrode and a hydrogen reference electrode (HydroFlex®, Gaskatel GmbH). Figure 1 shows a rotating ring-disk electrode (RRDE) polarization curve of dpa on glassy carbon disk electrode (dpa/GCE) in O₂-saturated 0.5 M H₂SO₄ solution at 25 °C, using a 20-mV potential steps from 0.8 V to 0 V and 20-second hold time per step. The onset potential of the 2e-ORR was ca. 0.60 V vs. RHE, close to the thermodynamic equilibrium potential of 0.70 V. The current density increased to ca. 1.5 mA/cm² at 0 V, exceeding the theoretical limiting current density for 100% 2e-ORR by 6%. Data in Figure 1b reveal a ca. 80% H₂O₂ yield at the dpa/GCE catalyst and current efficiency (CE) of ca. 67% in the potential range of 0 to 0.4 V vs. RHE, based on the ring current. Here, we define the H₂O₂ yield as the molar fraction of H₂O₂ in the product of H₂O₂/H₂O mixture, and the current efficiency as a ratio of electrons consumed in the 2e-ORR to the total number of electrons transferred.

In order to make sure that that peroxide generation was happening only at the molecular catalyst, we took special care to minimize the presence of trace metal impurities during the experiments. The trace amounts of potentially ORR-active transition metals in as-received dpa and GCE were between less than one ppm to tens of ppm (Tables S1-S2). This level of metal concentration is many orders of magnitude lower than in metal complex-based ORR catalysts (at a mM level), making ORR activity originating from the traces of the transition metals in dpa and GCE unlikely. Comparative electrochemical experiments were also conducted with sulfuric acids of ACS Plus and Optima® grades, with trace metal contents of less than 0.1 ppm and 1 ppt, respectively. The
ORR polarization curves were identical in both cases (Figure S1), confirming no contribution of the trace amounts of the metals to the 2e-ORR.

Figure 1. Electrochemical generation of H₂O₂ through two-electron reduction of O₂ at 2,2'-dipyridylamine. (a) RRDE polarization curve of GCE-supported dpa and GCE alone (baseline) in O₂-saturated 0.5 M H₂SO₄; 25 °C, rotation rate 900 rpm, 20 mV potential step, potential hold time 20 s. (b) H₂O₂ yield and current efficiency (CE) determined by RRDE experiment. (c) Kinetic current density for H₂O₂ generation at dpa/GCE and precious metal-based and mercury-based catalysts.

Figure 1c shows a comparison of the 2e-ORR kinetic currents measured with the GCE-supported dpa catalyst and currents measured with precious-metal and mercury-alloy catalysts reported in literature.¹⁷,¹⁸ The 2e-ORR activity increases in the order of Pt < Au <
dpa/GCE < Cu-Hg < Ag-Hg < Pt-Hg < Pd-Hg. To account for lower atmospheric pressure at Los Alamos (0.76 atm), the kinetic current at dpa/GCE has been adjusted to one atmosphere pressure, assuming a first-order dependency of 2e-ORR rate on the oxygen pressure (Figure S2).41

We propose three mechanisms for 2e-ORR at dpa/GCE, which are shown in Scheme 2. Mechanism I, catalyzed by dpa molecule, consists of three steps: (1) formation of a dpaHOO intermediate through an oxygen-proton-coupled electron transfer (OPCET) step at dpa; (2) formation of dpaH_{2}O_{2} intermediate through a proton-coupled electron transfer (PCET) step; and (3) the dissociation of dpaH_{2}O_{2} to release H_{2}O_{2}. Mechanism II, catalyzed by singly-protonated dpa (dpaH^{+}) also involves three steps: (1) formation of di-pronated dpa (dpaH_{2}^{2+}) through the protonation of dpaH^{+}; (2) formation of dpaH_{2}^{+}OO intermediate through an oxygen-coupled electron transfer (OCET) step; and (3) formation of H_{2}O_{2} and restoration of dpaH^{+} through a PCET step. Mechanism III, catalyzed by molecular dpa, consists of the following four steps: (1) di-protonation of dpa to dpaH_{2}^{2+}; (2) formation of dpaH_{2}^{+}OO intermediate through an OCET step; (3) formation of dpaH_{2}O_{2} through an electron transfer (ET) step; and (4) dissociation of dpaH_{2}O_{2} into dpa and H_{2}O_{2}.

Scheme 2. Proposed 2-e ORR mechanisms at dpa.

We studied the thermodynamics of these three mechanisms using density functional theory (DFT). To simplify the problem, we modeled homogeneous reactions in solution without taking
into account the catalyst-substrate interactions. Three conformers of dpa, namely dpa-A, dpa-B, dpa-C, and intermediates were included in the DFT study. We primarily focused on the intermediates with pyridyl- and amino-N as likely active sites. The calculated Gibbs free energies of reaction intermediates at standard conditions (298.15 K, 1 atm, 1 M solution) are summarized in Table S3, and the free energies of reference states are summarized in Table S4. The calculated standard reduction potentials ($E^\circ$) for the reduction steps are referenced to the absolute potential of standard hydrogen electrode ($E_{SHE} = 4.42$ V). The reduction step with the lowest $E^\circ$ along the reaction pathway is referred to in the forthcoming discussion as the thermodynamic potential-determining step.

Figure 2 shows the proposed Mechanism I of H$_2$O$_2$ formation at dpa-C, which is the most active among the three possible conformers. The calculated standard reduction potential for dpa-C is 0.48 V vs. SHE for the OPCET step and 0.95 V for the PCET step. For dpa-A, the calculated $E^\circ$ for the OPCET step is 0.27 V and 1.12 V for the PCET step. Finally, calculations for dpa-B reveals the $E^\circ$ values of 0.45 V and 0.95 V for OPCET and PCET steps, respectively (Figures S3-S4). Of the dpa conformers, dpa-C has been found to be the most active. It should be noted that HOO· is expected to bind to the pyridyl-N and the amine-group hydrogen in dpa-C and dpa-B, and to the pyridyl-N and 2-C hydrogen in dpa-A.
The ORR mechanism on metal surfaces has been the subject of extensive theoretical studies via the computational hydrogen electrode (CHE) approach. Mechanism I at dpa resembles the 2e-ORR mechanism on metal surfaces, proposed in the literature, in which a surface HOO* intermediate is formed (the symbol * denotes a surface species). The HOO* binding energy, $\Delta G_{\text{HOO}^*}$, was suggested as a thermodynamic descriptor for 2e-ORR activity. The $\Delta G_{\text{HOO}^*}$ value for an ideal 2e-ORR catalyst with zero thermodynamic limiting potential is 3.52 eV at the thermodynamic equilibrium potential for 2e-ORR ($U = 0.70$ V vs. CHE). A $\Delta G_{\text{HOO}^*}$ value lower or higher than 3.52 eV represents an over-binding or under-binding of the HOO* intermediate, respectively, leading to a theoretical thermodynamic overpotential that follows the Sabatier principle (solid black line in Figure 3b). We translated the binding energy of dpa-HOO intermediates from our calculation to $\Delta G_{\text{HOO}^*}$ in the CHE scheme (Supporting Information). Figure 3a shows a comparison of the free energy of the HOO* intermediate bound to the conformers of dpa and metallic catalysts at the equilibrium potential for 2e-ORR ($U = 0.70$ V vs. CHE). Of the three dpa conformers, dpa-C shows a HOO* binding energy closest to the ideal catalyst. Figure 3b shows the correlation of the 2-e ORR overpotential at a current density of 1.0 mA/cm$^2$ and $\Delta G_{\text{HOO}^*}$ for dpa-C and metallic H$_2$O$_2$ catalysts.
Figure 3. (a) Free-energy diagram showing calculated HOO$^*$ binding energy for dpa conformers (dpa-A, dpa-B, and dpa-C) and metallic catalysts. (b) Correlation between overpotential ($U$) required to reach 1 mA/cm$^2$ current density in H$_2$O$_2$ generation and $\Delta G_{\text{HOO}^*}$ for dpa-C conformer and metallic catalysts. Data for metallic catalysts are from literature,$^{17,18}$ reported with permission. The solid line in (b) represents a theoretical Sabatier volcano plot for the 2e-ORR overpotential vs. $\Delta G_{\text{HOO}^*}$.$^{43}$

Figure 4 depicts 2-e ORR catalysis according to Mechanisms II and III at dpa-A and dpaH$^+$-A, respectively. The calculated standard reduction potential was 0.71 V for the OCET step at dpa-H$_2$\(^{2+}\)-A, 1.37 V for the PCET step at dpaH$_2$\(^+\)OO-A, and 0.77 V for the ET step at dpaH$_2$\(^+\)OO-A. Of these three steps, the OCET step has the lowest $E^\circ$ values, likely becoming the potential-determining step. It should be noticed that the predicted nano-pK$_a$ is a conformation-specific value, which describes the protonation equilibrium between a single protonated conformation and a single deprotonated conformation.$^{44}$ It is conceptually different from the micro- or macro-pK$_a$, as well as experimentally determined pK$_a$.$^{44}$ Figures S5 and S6 show the catalytic cycles according to Mechanisms II and III at dpa-B and dpa-C. For dpa-B, the standard reduction potentials are 0.62 V for the OCET step at dpa-H$_2$\(^{2+}\)-B, 0.62 V for the ET step at dpa-H$_2$\(^+\)OO-B, and 1.01 V for the PCET step at dpa-H$_2$\(^+\)OO-B. For dpa-C, the $E^\circ$ values are 0.61 V for the OCET step at dpaH$_2$\(^{2+}\)-C, 0.61 V for the ET step at dpa-H$_2$\(^+\)OO-C, and 1.05 V for the PCET step at dpa-H$_2$\(^+\)OO-C. The results suggest that dpa-A has higher activity for 2e-ORR proceeding
according to Mechanisms II and III than dpa-B and dpa-C. Also, the thermodynamic potential-determining steps in Mechanisms II and III have $E^\circ$ higher than those in Mechanism I, implying that Mechanisms II and III are favored over Mechanism I. As suggested by the results of DFT calculations, various dpa conformers and their conjugated acids have different catalytic activities. It is thus plausible that the apparent activity of the dpa on GDE depends on the conformational ensembles of dpa at equilibrium under given electrochemical conditions.

**Figure 4.** DFT-predicted catalytic cycle for 2e-ORR at dpa-A and its conjugated acids. Cycle consists of an oxygen-coupled electron transfer step and a proton-coupled electron transfer step (Mechanism II) or a single-electron transfer step (Mechanism III).

**Figure S7** shows a durability test of the dpa/GCE catalyst during H$_2$O$_2$ generation at a constant potential of 0 V vs. RHE in 0.5 M H$_2$SO$_4$. A decrease in the reduction current was observed during the first five hours and continued until reaching a steady current after approximately 10 hours. A steady-state polarization recorded after 20 hours of the durability testing shows a decrease in 2e-ORR activity. The H$_2$O$_2$ yield increased from ca. 80% to ca. 98% after the durability test (**Figure S8**). The detailed mechanism of the change in catalytic activity and selectivity over time at 0 V vs. RHE is still unclear and will be addressed in our future research. It is possible that the
equilibrium conformational ensembles of dpa change during the durability test, leading to the observed change in activity.

Conclusions

Summarizing, we demonstrate in this work, a new type of 2e-ORR electrocatalyst, which is based on a small organic molecule, dpa. As acid compatible, heterogeneous catalyst composed of abundant C, N, H elements, dpa is capable of catalyzing the electrochemical generation of hydrogen peroxide from dioxygen at low overpotentials (high rates) with high selectivity in aqueous acidic electrolyte. These properties make dpa appealing for the application of hydrogen peroxide production in electrochemical devices for clean energy conversion and water treatment. The DFT study reveals possible 2e-ORR mechanisms at dpa, in which the pyridyl- and amino-N play as the anchoring sites for reaction intermediates. The results of DFT calculations also suggest strong dependence of the dpa activity on the molecule conformation, which determines its thermodynamic limiting potentials. This research opens up the possibility for molecular design of organic compounds for electrochemical production of \( \text{H}_2\text{O}_2 \) and helps understand the electrochemical properties of C-N based materials.

Experimental

Materials. 2,2'-dipyridylamine (dpa, 98%, Sigma-Aldrich), chloroform (99%, Sigma-Aldrich), isopropanol (IPA, > 99.5%, Certified ACS Plus Grade, Fisher Chemical), sulfuric acid (\((\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4, 97.2 \text{ wt\%}, \text{Certified ACS Plus Grade lot# 153943, and 95 wt\%, Optima}^\circledR \text{ lot# 3217051, Fisher}\)
Chemical), hydrogen gas (H₂, 99.999%, Airgas Inc.), nitrogen gas (N₂, 99.999%, Airgas Inc.), and oxygen gas (O₂, 99.999%, Airgas Inc.) were used as received.

**Electrode preparation.** ORR activity of dpa adsorbed on glassy carbon electrode (GCE) was studied using an E6R1 ChangeDisk® rotating ring disk electrode (RRDE, Pine Research Instrumentation). The working electrode was a 5.0 mm in diameter interchangeable glassy carbon disk (Pine Research Instrumentation). Before each experiment, the glassy carbon disk insert was first sanded with a fresh of 600-grit CarbiMet® paper and then polished with 0.3 μm and 0.05 μm alumina suspensions on nylon and MicroCloth (Buehler) polishing clothes, respectively, before being sonicated in the isopropanol bath three times. The thus-prepared glassy carbon disk was inserted into the RRDE tip and immersed into 1.0 M solution of dpa in chloroform to allow dpa to adsorb for three hours. At the end of adsorption, the electrode was removed from the dpa solution, immediately dried in air and rinsed with 0.5 M H₂SO₄ solution to remove the excess dpa.

**Electrochemical measurements.** The electrochemical measurements were performed in an electrochemical cell filled with 0.5 M H₂SO₄ supporting electrolyte, using a CHI 760D potentiostat (CH Instruments). A graphite rod served for the counter electrode. A hydrogen reference electrode (HydroFlex®, Gaskatel GmbH) was used and calibrated versus a reversible hydrogen electrode (RHE). The working electrode was cycled between -0.5 and 0.3 V vs. RHE at a scan rate of 20 mV/s, first at 80 °C and then at 25 °C in N₂-saturated 0.5 M H₂SO₄. The ORR performance was measured by staircase voltammetry from 0.8 to 0 V vs. RHE at steps of 20 mV, 20 s per step, at a rotation rate of 900 rpm in O₂-saturated 0.5 M H₂SO₄. Ring current was measured at a ring potential of 1.3 V vs. RHE. The collection efficiency of the Pt ring, N, was determined to be 23% using the reversible redox [Fe(CN)₆]⁴⁻/³⁻ couple (0.36 V vs. SHE). The yield of H₂O₂, Y_H₂O₂, and the current efficiency, CE, were calculated using the following equations:
\[ Y_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2} = 200\% (I_r/N)/(I_d+I_r/N) \]  
\( \text{(Eq. 1)} \)

\[ CE = 2Y_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2}/(400\% - 2Y_{\text{H}_2\text{O}_2}) \]  
\( \text{(Eq. 2)} \)

where \( I_r \) is the ring current and \( I_d \) is the disk current.

The kinetic current density \( j_k \) was calculated using the equation:

\[ 1/j = 1/j_d + 1/j_k \]  
\( \text{(Eq. 3)} \)

where \( j \) is the total current density and \( j_d \) is the measured mass transport-limited current density.

The kinetic current density presented in Figure 1c was divided by a factor of 0.76 for a fair comparison with the reference data measured at 1 atm, assuming a first-order dependency of 2e-ORR rate on the concentration of oxygen concentration (see above).\(^{41}\)

The theoretical limiting current density at Los Alamos elevation was calculated using the equation:

\[ j_d = (0.620)nFD^{2/3}v^{-1/6}C_O\omega^{1/2} \]  
\( \text{(Eq. 4)} \)

where \( n \) is the number of electrons transferred in half-reaction (2 for 2e-ORR, 4 for 4e-ORR), \( F \) is the Faraday constant (96485 C/mol), \( D \) is the diffusion coefficient of oxygen (1.9 \( \times \) 10\(^{-5} \) cm\(^2\)/s), \( v \) is the kinematic viscosity of water (0.890 \( \times \) 10\(^{-2} \) cm\(^2\)/s),\(^{45}\) \( C_O \) is the concentration of O\(_2\) in 0.5 M H\(_2\)SO\(_4\) (1.026 \( \times \) 10\(^{-6} \) mol/cm\(^3\) at 1 atm,\(^{46}\) 0.76 atm at the Los Alamos altitude), \( \omega \) is the angular rotation rate of the electrode (900 rpm; 94.248 rad/s). The theoretical \( j_d \) is ca.1.42 mA/cm\(^2\) for 100% 2e-ORR.

**Theoretical Calculations**

**Computational details.** DFT calculations were carried out using Gaussian 09 package at B3LYP/6-31++G(d,p) level of theory, with a geometric optimization of the structures followed by
a single-point energy and frequency calculation. The electrostatic solute-solvent interactions were treated with the Polarizable Continuum Model (PCM), using the integral equation formalism variant (IEFPCM) and water as the solvent. An extension of the dpa catalyst name was used to differentiate the conformational structures, e.g., dpa-A, dpa-B, and dpa-C. The calculated Gibbs free energy values at standard conditions (298.15 K, 1.0 atm, 1 M concentration) are summarized in Table S2.

The standard reduction potential $E^\circ$ was calculated according to the equation:

$$E^\circ = -\Delta G/nF - E_{SHE}$$  \hspace{1cm} (Eq. 5)

where $\Delta G$ is the free molar energy of reaction, $n$ is the number of electrons in the half-reaction, $F$ is the Faraday constant, $E_{SHE}$ is the absolute potential of the aqueous standard hydrogen electrode (SHE). The value of $E_{SHE}$ is 4.42 V, based on the experimental values of the proton solvation energy, $\Delta G^\circ_{S}(H^+)$, of -1091 kJ/mol, and the proton formation energy, $\Delta_f G^0(H^+)$, of 1517 kJ/mol.

For a single-electron reduction reaction: Ox + e$^-$ → Red, Ox: oxidized species, Red: reduced species, the free molar energy of reaction, $\Delta G$, is calculated according to the equation:

$$\Delta G = G(\text{Red}) - (G(\text{Ox}) + G(\text{e}^-))$$  \hspace{1cm} (Eq. 6)

where $G(\text{e}^-)$ is the free energy of the free electron gas, with the values of -0.001383 Hartree (-3.632 kJ/mol) by convention.

The free energy of the solvated proton, $G(H^+)$, was calculated to be -0.426352 Hartree according to the equation:

$$G(H^+) = G(H_2)/2 + 4.42 \text{ eV} - G(\text{e}^-)$$  \hspace{1cm} (Eq. 7)
where $G(H_2)$ is the Gibbs free energy of hydrogen gas from DFT calculation.

At 298.15 K 1 atm, liquid water is in equilibrium with 0.03128 atm H$_2$O vapor, therefore the free energy of water is calculated according to the equation:

$$G(\text{H}_2\text{O liquid, 1 atm}) = G(\text{H}_2\text{O gas, 0.03128 atm})$$  \hspace{1cm} (Eq. 8)

where $G(\text{H}_2\text{O gas, 0.03128 atm})$ is the Gibbs free energy of H$_2$O gas at 0.03128 atm from DFT calculation.

The free energy of O$_2$, $G(\text{O}_2)$, was calculated according to the equation:

$$G(\text{O}_2) = 2 \times G(\text{H}_2\text{O, liquid, 1.0 atm}) - 2 \times G(\text{H}_2) + 4e \times 1.23 \text{ V}$$  \hspace{1cm} (Eq. 9)

where 1.23 V is the standard electrode potential for the reaction: $2\text{O}_2 + 4\text{H}^+ + 4e^- \rightarrow 2\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$

The free energy of H$_2$O$_2$, $G(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2)$, was calculated according to the equation:

$$G(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2) = G(\text{O}_2) + 2 \times [G(\text{H}^+) + G(e^-) - 4.42 \text{ eV}] - 2e \times 0.70 \text{ V}$$  \hspace{1cm} (Eq. 10)

$$G(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2) = G(\text{O}_2) + G(\text{H}_2) - 2e \times 0.70V$$  \hspace{1cm} (Eq. 11)

where 0.70 V is the standard reduction potential $E^\circ$ for reaction:

$$\text{O}_2 + 2\text{H}^+ + 2e^- \rightarrow \text{H}_2\text{O}_2$$

The nano-$pK_a$ values of the conjugated acids in specific conformations were calculated using the equation:

$$pK_a = \Delta G_{AH^+/A}/(2.303RT)$$  \hspace{1cm} (Eq. 12)
where $\Delta G_{\text{AH}^+/\text{A}}$ is the acid dissociation energy of the conjugated acid in specific conformations, $R$ is the ideal gas constant, $T$ is the temperature (298.15 K).
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**Figure S1.** Multiple 2e-ORR polarization plots at dpa/GCE in O₂-saturated 0.5 M H₂SO₄ at 25 °C, RDE rotation rate 900 rpm, 20 mV potential step, potential hold time 20 s. Plot #1 was recorded using Certified ACS Plus H₂SO₄, Fisher Chemical (lot# 153943, each type of metal impurity less than 0.1 ppm). Plots #2-4 were recorded using Optima® H₂SO₄, Fisher Chemical (lot# 3217051, most metal impurities less than 0.01 to 1 ppt). The Certificates of Analysis for the H₂SO₄ provided by the manufacturer are attached as additional files.

**Figure S2.** Kinetic current density for H₂O₂ generation at dpa/GCE, without (black) and with the correction (red) for the lower atmospheric pressure at Los Alamos, New Mexico.
**Figure S3.** Catalytic cycle for 2e-ORR at dpa-A according to Mechanism I.

**Figure S4.** Catalytic cycle at dpa-B according to Mechanism I.
**Figure S5.** Catalytic cycle at dpa-B according to Mechanisms II and III.

**Figure S6.** Catalytic cycle at dpa-C according to Mechanisms II and III.
Figure S7. Durability of the dpa/GCE catalyst for H₂O₂ generation in O₂-saturated 0.5 M H₂SO₄ at 25 °C. RDE rotation rate 900 rpm. (a) Current density vs. time curve at 0 V vs. RHE. (b) 2e-ORR polarization plots measured before and after 20 h of a durability test (20 mV steps, 20 s/step).

Figure S8. H₂O₂ yield at dpa/GCE after 20 h durability test.
Table S1. ICP-MS analysis of as-received 2,2'-dipyridylamine.

| Element | Concentration (ppm) | Element | Concentration (ppm) |
|---------|---------------------|---------|---------------------|
| Li      | 0.663               | Cd      | 0.000               |
| Be      | 0.000               | In      | 0.000               |
| B       | 0.000               | Sn      | 0.000               |
| Na      | 92.333              | Sb      | 0.000               |
| Mg      | 26.195              | Te      | 0.000               |
| Al      | 0.000               | I       | 0.000               |
| Si      | 0.000               | Cs      | 0.015               |
| P       | 53.701              | Ba      | 0.568               |
| S       | 0.000               | La      | 0.038               |
| K       | 65.031              | Ce      | 0.000               |
| Ca      | 0.000               | Pr      | 0.007               |
| Sc      | 0.000               | Nd      | 0.000               |
| Ti      | 0.000               | Sm      | 0.000               |
| V       | 0.000               | Eu      | 0.000               |
| Cr      | 0.012               | Gd      | 0.000               |
| Mn      | 1.810               | Tb      | 0.000               |
| Fe      | 0.000               | Dy      | 0.000               |
| Co      | 0.091               | Ho      | 0.003               |
| Ni      | 0.890               | Er      | 0.000               |
| Cu      | 23.311              | Tm      | 0.000               |
| Zn      | 14.019              | Yb      | 0.000               |
| Ga      | 0.000               | Lu      | 0.000               |
| Ge      | 0.000               | Hf      | 0.000               |
| As      | 0.000               | Ta      | 0.000               |
| Se      | 0.000               | W       | 0.000               |
| Br      | 0.000               | Re      | 0.000               |
| Kr      | 0.000               | Os      | 0.000               |
| Rb      | 0.121               | Ir      | 0.000               |
| Sr      | 0.613               | Pt      | 0.000               |
| Y       | 0.000               | Au      | 0.000               |
| Zr      | 0.000               | Hg      | 0.000               |
| Nb      | 0.013               | Tl      | 0.000               |
| Mo      | 0.000               | Pb      | 2.510               |
| Ru      | 0.000               | Bi      | 3.647               |
| Rh      | 0.006               | Th      | 0.021               |
| Pd      | 0.000               | U       | 0.158               |
| Ag      | 0.000               |         |                     |
Table S2. ICP-AAS analysis of glassy carbon SIGRADUR® provided by Hochtemperatur-Werkstoffe GmbH

| Element | Concentrations (ppm) |
|---------|----------------------|
| Al      | 0.27                 |
| Ba      | 0.081                |
| Be      | 0.044                |
| Bi      | 0.050                |
| Ca      | 9.71                 |
| Cd      | 0.044                |
| Co      | 0.089                |
| Cr      | 0.091                |
| Cu      | 0.030                |
| Fe      | 0.92                 |
| K       | 0.34                 |
| Mg      | 0.052                |
| Mn      | 0.041                |
| Mo      | 0.044                |
| Na      | 0.78                 |
| Ni      | 0.12                 |
| Sn      | 0.44                 |
| Si      | 13.86                |
| Sr      | 0.061                |
| Ti      | 0.096                |
| V       | 0.044                |
| W       | 0.089                |
| Zn      | 0.044                |
| Zr      | 0.062                |
Table S3. Gibbs free energy of dpa and reaction intermediates from DFT calculation under standard conditions (298.15 K, 1 atm, 1 M concentration in water)

| Structure | B3LYP/6-31++G(d,p)/IEFPCM-water free energy (Hartree) |
|-----------|------------------------------------------------------|
| dpa-A     | -550.647003                                          |
| dpa-B     | -550.650825                                          |
| dpa-C     | -550.653268                                          |
| dpaH⁺-A   | -551.094832                                          |
| dpaH⁺-B   | -551.081396                                          |
| dpaH⁺-C   | -551.083816                                          |
| dpaH⁺-C’  | -551.081622                                          |
| dpaHOO-A  | -701.572811                                          |
| dpaHOO-B  | -701.583410                                          |
| dpaHOO-C  | -701.586923                                          |
| dpaHOO-C’ | -701.581574                                          |
| dpaH₂O₂-A | -702.203987                                          |
| dpaH₂O₂-B | -702.208784                                          |
| dpaH₂O₂-B’| -702.198524                                          |
| dpaH₂O₂-C | -702.211920                                          |
| dpaH₂O₂-C’| -702.196765                                          |
| dpaH₂⁺OO-A| -702.011930                                          |
| dpaH₂⁺OO-B| -702.011760                                          |
| dpaH₂⁺OO-C| -702.010675                                          |
| dpaH₂⁺-A  | -551.496073                                          |
| dpaH₂⁺-B  | -551.498974                                          |
| dpaH₂⁺-C  | -551.498483                                          |

Table S4. Parameterized Gibbs free energies of reference states at 298.15K, 1 atm pressure.

| Reference states                        | Gibbs free energy (Hartree) |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| H₂ gas, 1 atm                           | -1.180339                   |
| solvated H⁺ (1 M, aqueous)              | -0.426352                   |
| free e⁻ gas                             | -0.001383                   |
| H₂O gas, 0.03128 atm                    | -76.433777                  |
| H₂O (liquid)                            | -76.433777                  |
| O₂ gas, 1 atm                           | -150.326067                 |
| H₂O₂ (1 M, aqueous)                     | -151.557856                 |
Calculations of the free energy change and standard potential for specific reactions

\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpa-A} + H^+ + O_2 + e^- \rightarrow \text{dpaHOO-A}) = -4.68 \text{ eV}; \ E^0_1 = 0.26 \text{ V} \]
\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaHOO-A} + H^+ + e^- \rightarrow \text{dpaH}_2\text{O}_2\text{-A}) = -5.54 \text{ eV}; \ E^0_2 = 1.12 \text{ V} \]
\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaH}_2\text{O}_2\text{-A} \rightarrow \text{dpa-A} + H_2\text{O}_2) = -0.024 \text{ eV} \]

\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpa-B} + H^+ + O_2 + e^- \rightarrow \text{dpaHOO-B}) = -4.86 \text{ eV}; \ E^0_1 = 0.44 \text{ V} \]
\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaHOO-B} + H^+ + e^- \rightarrow \text{dpaH}_2\text{O}_2\text{-B}) = -5.38 \text{ eV}; \ E^0_2 = 0.96 \text{ V} \]
\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaH}_2\text{O}_2\text{-B} \rightarrow \text{dpa-B} + H_2\text{O}_2) = 0.003 \text{ eV} \]

\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}}(\text{dpa-C} + H^+ + O_2 + e^- \rightarrow \text{dpaHOO-C}) = -4.89 \text{ eV}; \ E^0 = 0.47 \text{ V} \]
\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaHOO-C} + H^+ + e^- \rightarrow \text{dpaH}_2\text{O}_2\text{-C}) = -5.37 \text{ eV}; \ E^0 = 0.95 \text{ V} \]
\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaH}_2\text{O}_2\text{-C} \rightarrow \text{dpa-C} + H_2\text{O}_2) = 0.022 \text{ eV} \]

\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaH}_2^{2+}\text{-A} + O_2 + e^- \rightarrow \text{dpaH}_2^+\text{OO-A}) = -5.13 \text{ eV}; \ E^0_3 = 0.71 \text{ V} \]
\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaH}_2^+\text{OO-A} + e^- \rightarrow \text{dpaH}_2\text{O}_2\text{-A}) = -5.19 \text{ eV}; \ E^0_4 = 0.77 \text{ V} \]
\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaH}_2^+\text{OO-A} + H^+ + e^- \rightarrow \text{dpaH}^+\text{-A} + H_2\text{O}_2) = -5.80 \text{ eV}; \ E^0_5 = 1.38 \text{ V} \]

\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaH}_2^{2+}\text{-B} + O_2 + e^- \rightarrow \text{dpaH}_2^+\text{OO-B}) = -5.04 \text{ eV}; \ E^0 = 0.62 \text{ V} \]
\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaH}_2^+\text{OO-B} + e^- \rightarrow \text{dpaH}_2\text{O}_2\text{-B'}) = -5.04 \text{ eV}; \ E^0 = 0.62 \text{ V} \]
\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaH}_2^+\text{OO-B} + H^+ + e^- \rightarrow \text{dpaH}^+\text{-B} + H_2\text{O}_2) = -5.44 \text{ eV}; \ E^0 = 1.02 \text{ V} \]
\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaH}_2\text{O}_2\text{-B'} \rightarrow \text{dpaH}_2\text{O}_2\text{-B}) = -0.28 \text{ eV} \]
\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaH}_2\text{O}_2\text{-B} \rightarrow \text{dpa-B} + H_2\text{O}_2) = 0.003 \text{ eV} \]

\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaH}_2^{2+}\text{-C} + O_2 + e^- \rightarrow \text{dpaH}_2^+\text{OO-C}) = -5.03 \text{ eV}; \ E^0 = 0.61 \text{ V} \]
\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaH}_2^+\text{OO-C} + e^- \rightarrow \text{dpaH}_2\text{O}_2\text{-C'}) = -5.03 \text{ eV}; \ E^0 = 0.61 \text{ V} \]
\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaH}_2^+\text{OO-C} + H^+ + e^- \rightarrow \text{dpaH}^+\text{-C'} + H_2\text{O}_2) = -5.47 \text{ eV}; \ E^0 = 1.05 \text{ V} \]
\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaH}_2\text{O}_2\text{-C'} \rightarrow \text{dpaH}_2\text{O}_2\text{-C}) = -0.41 \text{ eV} \]
\[ \Delta G_{\text{rxn}} (\text{dpaH}_2\text{O}_2\text{-C} \rightarrow \text{dpa-C} + H_2\text{O}_2) = 0.022 \text{ eV} \]
Free energy calculation using computational hydrogen electrode approach

We used computational hydrogen electrode (CHE) approach to calculate the free energy level of intermediates in CHE scheme, denoted as $G_{\text{CHE}}$. The following reference states were used in the calculations:

$$G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{O}_2) = 4 \times 1.23 \text{ eV} = 4.92 \text{ eV}$$
$$G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{H}_2\text{O}) = 0 \text{ eV}$$
$$G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{H}_2) = 0 \text{ eV}$$
$$G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2) = G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{O}_2) + G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{H}_2) - 2 \times 0.7 \text{ eV} = 3.52 \text{ eV}$$
$$G_{\text{CHE}}(*) = 0 \text{ eV}$$

When electrode potential $U$ equals 0 V, the free energy of $\text{H}_2$ and $(\text{H}^+ + \text{e}^-)$ pair is at equilibrium.

$$G_{\text{CHE}, U=0} (\text{H}^+ + \text{e}^-) = 0.5 \times G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{H}_2) = 0 \text{ eV}$$

At potential $U$, the free energy the $(\text{H}^+ + \text{e}^-)$ pair can be calculated using the equation:

$$G_{\text{CHE}, U} (\text{H}^+ + \text{e}^-) = 0.5 \times G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{H}_2) - eU$$

The free energy level of $(*) + \text{O}_2 + 2(\text{H}^+ + \text{e}^-)$, $(*) + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2)$, and $(\text{HOO}^* + (\text{H}^+ + \text{e}^-))$ in CHE scheme at potential $U$ are calculated using the following equations:

$$G_{\text{CHE}, U} (* + \text{O}_2 + 2(\text{H}^+ + \text{e}^-))$$
$$= G_{\text{CHE}}(*) + G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{O}_2) + 2 \times G_{\text{CHE}, U} (\text{H}^+ + \text{e}^-)$$
$$= G_{\text{CHE}}(*) + G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{O}_2) + 2 \times [0.5 \times G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{H}_2) - eU]$$
$$= 0 \text{ eV} + 4.92 \text{ eV} + 2 \times [0.5 \times 0 \text{ eV} - eU]$$
$$= 4.92 \text{ eV} - 2eU$$

$$G_{\text{CHE}, U} (* + \text{H}_2\text{O}_2)$$
$$= G_{\text{CHE}}(*) + G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{H}_2\text{O}_2)$$
$$= 3.52 \text{ eV}$$

$$G_{\text{CHE}, U} (\text{HOO}^* + (\text{H}^+ + \text{e}^-))$$
$$= G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{HOO}^*) + G_{\text{CHE}, U} (\text{H}^+ + \text{e}^-)$$
$$= G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{HOO}^*) + [0.5 \times G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{H}_2) - eU]$$
$$= G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{HOO}^*) - eU$$
\[ \Delta G(H^+ + e^- + O_2 + \bullet \rightarrow \text{HOO}^*) \]

\[ = G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{HOO}^*) - G_{\text{CHE}}(O_2) - G_{\text{CHE}}(\bullet) - G_{\text{CHE}, U}(H^+ + e^-) \]

\[ = G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{HOO}^*) - G_{\text{CHE}}(O_2) - G_{\text{CHE}}(\bullet) - [0.5 \times G_{\text{CHE}}(H_2) - eU] \]

\[ = G(\text{HOO}^*) - G(O_2) - G(\bullet) - [0.5 \times G(H_2) - eU] \]

\[ G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{HOO}^*) \]

\[ = G(\text{HOO}^*) - G(O_2) - G(\bullet) - [0.5 \times G(H_2) - eU] + G_{\text{CHE}}(O_2) + G_{\text{CHE}}(\bullet) + [0.5 \times G_{\text{CHE}}(H_2) - eU] \]

\[ = G(\text{HOO}^*) - G(O_2) - G(\bullet) - [0.5 \times G(H_2) - eU] + 4.92 \text{ eV} + 0 \text{ eV} + [0.5 \times 0 \text{ eV} - eU] \]

\[ = G(\text{HOO}^*) - G(O_2) - G(\bullet) - 0.5 \times G(H_2) + 4.92 \text{ eV} \]

The free energy of \text{HOO}^* in CHE scheme, \( \Delta G_{\text{HOO}^*} \), or \( G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{dpaHOO}) \) can be calculated as:

\[ G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{dpaHOO-A}) = G(\text{dpaHOO-A}) - G(O_2) - G(\text{dpa-A}) - 0.5 \times G(H_2) + 4.92 \text{ eV} = 4.66 \text{ eV} \]

\[ G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{dpaHOO-B}) = G(\text{dpaHOO-B}) - G(O_2) - G(\text{dpa-B}) - 0.5 \times G(H_2) + 4.92 \text{ eV} = 4.48 \text{ eV} \]

\[ G_{\text{CHE}}(\text{dpaHOO-C}) = G(\text{dpaHOO-C}) - G(O_2) - G(\text{dpa-C}) - 0.5 \times G(H_2) + 4.92 \text{ eV} = 4.45 \text{ eV} \]

At \( U = 0.70 \text{ V} \)

\[ G_{\text{CHE}, U=0.7}(\text{dpaHOO-A} + (H^+ + e^-)) = 4.66 \text{ eV} - 0.70 \text{ eV} = 3.96 \text{ eV} \]

\[ G_{\text{CHE}, U=0.7}(\text{dpaHOO-B} + (H^+ + e^-)) = 4.48 \text{ eV} - 0.70 \text{ eV} = 3.78 \text{ eV} \]

\[ G_{\text{CHE}, U=0.7}(\text{dpaHOO-C} + (H^+ + e^-)) = 4.45 \text{ eV} - 0.70 \text{ eV} = 3.75 \text{ eV} \]
