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## SI-1 Several analogous MOFs and SBU presented in this work



Fig. S1 Several analogous MOFs and SBU derived from $\mathrm{M}_{3} \mathrm{O}$ node(a); (h) and (i) represent hexagonal microporous window and pentagonal microporous window of MIL-100(Al), respectively.

## SI-2 PXRD and Porosity characterizations



Fig. S2 PXRD patterns of analogous MIL-100s (Al, $\mathrm{Fe}, \mathrm{Cr}$ ) following exposure in 0.1 M HCl solution.


Fig. S3 PXRD patterns of three MOFs before and after uranium adsorption.
Table S1 The surface area, pore volume and pore size of MIL-100.

| Sample | $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{BET}}\left(\mathrm{m}^{2} \cdot \mathrm{~g}^{-1}\right)$ | Pole volume $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{3} \cdot \mathrm{~g}^{-1}\right)$ | Pore size $(\mathrm{nm})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MIL-100(Cr) | 1671.6 | 0.7848 | 1.88 |
| MIL-100(Fe) | 1980.5 | 0.9021 | 1.82 |
| MIL-100(Al) | 1825.8 | 0.8785 | 1.92 |

SI-3 The topology dependent U(VI) sorption


Fig. S4 Comparison of PXRD (Left) of MIL-100(Al) and MIL-96(Al) and uranyl ions adsorption (Right).

SI-4 The species distribution of U(VI)


Fig. S5 Aqueous speciation of $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{VI})$ in an open system equilibrated with $p\left(\mathrm{CO}_{2}\right)=10^{-3.5}$ as a function of pH from reference 1.
$\mathrm{A},[\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{VI})]_{\text {total }}=1.00 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{~mol} \cdot \mathrm{~L}^{-1}$;
$\mathrm{B},[\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{VI})]_{\text {total }}=5.00 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{~mol} \cdot \mathrm{~L}^{-1}$;
C, $[\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{VI})]_{\text {total }}=1.00 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{~mol} \cdot \mathrm{~L}^{-1}$;
$\mathrm{D},[\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{VI})]_{\text {total }}=5.00 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{~mol} \cdot \mathrm{~L}^{-1}$ in water solution.
(The species less than $1 \%$ were not denoted in the figures for clarity)

## SI-5 The sorption data fitting by kinetics models

The pseudo-second-order kinetic model and the pseudo-second-order kinetic model were used to fit the dependence of the $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{VI})$ adsorption amount on time. The linear form of the equation is:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\ln \left(Q_{e}-Q_{t}\right)=\ln q Q_{e}-K_{1} t \\
\frac{t}{Q_{t}}=\frac{t}{Q_{e}}+\frac{1}{k_{2} Q_{e}^{2}}
\end{gathered}
$$

where t is the adsorption time $(\mathrm{min}), \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{e}}$ and $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}}$ are the amounts adsorbed at equilibrium and at time t , respectively $\left(\mathrm{mg} \cdot \mathrm{g}^{-1}\right)$, and $k_{2}$ is the rate constant for pseudo-second-order adsorption ( $\mathrm{g} \cdot(\mathrm{g} \cdot \mathrm{min})^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{k}_{2}=$ slope2/intercept when $\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{qt}$ is plotted against t . Fig. S5 shows the plots of the pseudo-second-order kinetics of $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{VI})$ adsorption in MIL$100(\mathrm{Al})$ for different initial $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{VI})$ concentrations. The calculated kinetic constants $\left(k_{2}\right)$ as well as the correlation coefficients $\left(R^{2}\right)$ are listed in Table S2. The value of $\mathrm{k}_{2}$ decreases with increase of the initial ion concentrations, which can be attributed to the weaker competition of the adsorption surface sites at lower concentrations.


Fig. S6 The pseudo-second-order (left) and pseudo-first-order (right) kinetic linearized plots for U(VI) sorption in MIL-100s

Table S2 Kinetics parameters for U(VI) sorption in MIL-100s (Cr, Fe, Al)

| Sample | pseudo-first-order kinetic model |  | pseudo-second-order kinetic model |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $q_{\mathrm{e}}\left(\mathrm{mg} \cdot \mathrm{g}^{-1}\right)$ | $K_{1}\left(\mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right)$ | $R^{2}$ | $q_{\mathrm{e}}\left(\mathrm{mg} \cdot \mathrm{g}^{-1}\right)$ | $k_{2}\left(\mathrm{~g} \mathrm{mg}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~min}^{-1}\right)$ | $R^{2}$ |
| MIL-100(Cr) | 15 | 0.0108 | 0.98 | 30 | 0.03393 | 0.999 |
| MIL-100(Fe) | 110 | 0.0414 | 0.98 | 120 | 0.00809 | 0.99 |
| MIL-100(Al) | 130 | 0.00377 | 0.96 | 170 | 0.00681 | 0.99 |

## SI-6 The sorption data fitting by isotherm models

The Langmuir model assumes that the removal of metal ions occurs on an energetically homogenous surface by monolayer sorption and there are no interactions between the adsorbates on adjacent sites and the linear form of the equation is:

$$
\frac{C_{e}}{Q_{e}}=\frac{C_{e}}{Q_{L}}+\frac{1}{Q_{L} K_{L}}
$$

where $Q_{e}$ is the amount of adsorbate adsorbed per gram of adsorbent ( $\mathrm{mg} \cdot \mathrm{g}^{-1}$ ), $C_{e}$ denotes the equilibrium concentration of the adsorbate in solution ( $\mathrm{mg} \cdot \mathrm{L}^{-1}$ ), $Q_{L}$ is a theoretical limit of adsorption capacity when the monolayer surface is fully covered with the adsorbate to assist in the comparison of adsorption performance ( $\mathrm{mg} \cdot \mathrm{g}^{-1}$ ), and $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{L}}$ is the separation constant of the Langmuir adsorption isotherm.

The Freundlich equation is an empirical equation based on sorption on a heterogeneous surface. The isotherm assumes that adsorbent surface sites have a spectrum of different binding energies. The linear equation can be expressed by:

$$
\ln Q_{e}=\ln k_{F}+\frac{1}{n} \ln \mathrm{C}_{e}
$$

where $k_{F}$ and $n$ are the Freundlich constants related to the sorption capacity and the sorption intensity, respectively. A linear relationship was obtained by plotting $\ln q_{e}$ against $\ln c_{e}$, and the values of $k_{F}$ and $n$ were calculated from the slope and intercept of the straight line.


Fig. S7 Langmuir isotherm (left) and Freundlich isotherm (right) for U(VI) sorption on MIL-100(Cr), MIL100(Fe) and MIL-100(Al)

Table S3 Comparison of parameters of Langmuir and Freundlich isotherms in MIL-100s

|  | Langmuir |  | Freundlich |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $q_{\mathrm{m}}\left(\mathrm{mg} \cdot \mathrm{g}^{-1}\right)$ | $K_{\mathrm{L}}\left(\mathrm{L} \cdot \mathrm{mg}^{-1}\right)$ | $R^{2}$ | $\mathrm{kF}\left(\mathrm{mg} \cdot \mathrm{g}^{-1}\right)$ | $n$ | $R^{2}$ |
| MIL-100(Cr) | 33.6 | 0.118 | 0.99 | 14.6 | 6.51 | 0.99 |
| MIL-100(Fe) | 116.3 | 0.141 | 0.99 | 33.6 | 3.91 | 0.98 |
| MIL-100(Al) | 212.8 | 0.207 | 0.99 | 86 | 4.926 | 0.93 |

Table S4 Number of U(VI) ions adsorbed per node in MIL-100s (Al, Fe, Cr).

| MOFs | MIL-100(Al) |  | MIL-100(Fe) | MIL-100(Cr) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Items | Capacities <br> $\left(\mathrm{mg} \cdot \mathrm{g}^{-1}\right)$ | Capacities <br> per Node | Capacities <br> $\left(\mathrm{mg} \cdot \mathrm{g}^{-1}\right)$ | Capacities <br> per Node | Capacities <br> $\left(\mathrm{mg} \cdot \mathrm{g}^{-1}\right)$ | Capacities <br> per Node |
| Maximum capacities <br> per node | 212.8 | 0.50 | 116.3 | 0.32 | 33.6 | 0.09 |
| Actual capacities per <br> node | 206.4 | 0.49 | 115.1 | 0.31 | 32.3 | 0.087 |

## SI-7 Surface structure and $\mathrm{pH}_{\mathrm{pzc}}$ value of hydrated MIL-100s(M)

As mentioned in the introduction, MIL-100s present abundant of coordinated unsaturated sites (CUS). Moreover, water molecules present in the solution or atmosphere may cause the hydroxylation of a metal oxide surface. It has been confirmed by solid-state nuclear magnetic aluminum spectroscopy ( ${ }^{27} \mathrm{Al} \mathrm{NMR}$ ) that there is no unsaturated coordination site on the surface of the MIL-100 (Al) sample, as shown in Fig. 4b. Amphiphilic surface hydroxyls can be protonated/deprotonated by the surrounding environment:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \equiv \mathrm{SOH}+\mathrm{H}^{+} \leftrightarrow \equiv \mathrm{SOH}_{2}^{+} \\
& \equiv \mathrm{SOH} \leftrightarrow \equiv \mathrm{SO}^{-}+\mathrm{H}^{+}
\end{aligned}
$$

The reactions involving electrolyte (salt) ions can also take place. As a result, the connections of surface complexes or ion pairs are formed. Surface complexes are formed according to the equations:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \equiv \mathrm{SOH}+\mathrm{A}^{-}+\mathrm{H}^{+} \leftrightarrow \equiv \mathrm{SOH}_{2}^{+} \mathrm{A}^{-} \\
& \equiv \mathrm{SOH}+\mathrm{M}^{+} \leftrightarrow \equiv \mathrm{SO}^{-} \mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}^{+}
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover, ion pair connections are formed when presence of excess of $\mathrm{OH}^{-}$with the following way:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \equiv \mathrm{SOH}_{2}^{+}+\mathrm{A}^{-} \leftrightarrow \equiv \mathrm{SOH}_{2} \mathrm{~A} \\
& \equiv \mathrm{SO}^{-}+\mathrm{M}^{+} \leftrightarrow \equiv \mathrm{SO}^{-} \mathrm{M}^{+}
\end{aligned}
$$

The interactions of positively charged ions with the solid hydroxyl groups (leading to the surface complexes creation) causes formation of negatively charged surface groups according to the reaction:

$$
\equiv \mathrm{SOH}+\mathrm{M}^{+} \leftrightarrow \equiv \mathrm{SO}^{-} \mathrm{M}^{+}+\mathrm{H}^{+}
$$

where: $\mathrm{S}=\mathrm{Al}$, Fe or Cr atoms, $\mathrm{M}^{+}=$other metal ions.

However, for MIL-100(Cr), negatively charged surface groups may formed. Studies have shown that the Cr center metal cluster will dissociate protons from the water ligand $\left(\mathrm{Cr}_{-}-\mathrm{OH}_{2}\right)$ leaving a negatively charged hydroxyl group ( $\mathrm{Cr}-\mathrm{OH}^{-}$). Therefore, the insoluble Framework will be the counteranion of the proton or other cations.

$$
\equiv \mathrm{CrOH}_{2} \leftrightarrow \equiv \mathrm{CrOH}_{2}^{-}+\mathrm{H}^{+}
$$

From the Zeta potential, it can be seen that the complexing ability of different metal hydrate surfaces with protons $\left(\mathrm{H}^{+}\right)$is not exactly the same, and generally satisfies the following laws:

$$
\mathrm{Al}-\mathrm{OH}_{2}>\mathrm{Fe}-\mathrm{OH}_{2}>\mathrm{Cr}-\mathrm{OH}_{2}
$$

Therefore, the surface of the MIL-100(Al) shows less negative charge due to the combination of more protons on the surface of Al-metal cluster, followed by the Fe-metal cluster surface. The surface of the Cr-metal cluster is negatively charged due to deprotonation.


Fig. S8 Correlatons of Zeta potential of analogous MOFs MIL-100s (Al, $\mathrm{Fe}, \mathrm{Cr}$ ) and adsorption for U(VI) at $\mathrm{pH}=5.0$

## SI-8 Temperature dependence and adsorption energy

To get further insight into the adsorption mechanism, three basic thermodynamic parameters, standard free energy change $\left(\Delta \mathrm{G}^{0}, \mathrm{~kJ} \cdot \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}\right)$, standard enthalpy change $\left(\Delta \mathrm{H}^{0}, \mathrm{~kJ} \cdot \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}\right)$ and standard entropy change $\left(\Delta \mathrm{S}^{0}, \mathrm{~J} \cdot \mathrm{~mol}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~K}^{-}\right.$ ${ }^{1}$ ) for the adsorption of $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{VI})$ on MIL-100(Al) (Fig. S8 and Table S5) were determined based on the following equations

$$
\begin{gathered}
K_{d}=\frac{C_{s}}{C_{e}} \\
\Delta G^{o}=\Delta H^{o}-T \Delta S^{o} \\
\ln K_{d}=\frac{\Delta S^{o}}{R}-\frac{\Delta H^{o}}{R T}
\end{gathered}
$$

where $K_{d}$ is the distribution coefficient, $C_{s}$ the amount of $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{VI})$ adsorbed per mass of MIL-100(M) ( $\mathrm{mg} \cdot \mathrm{g}^{-1}$ ), $C_{e}$ the $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{VI})$ concentration in solution at equilibrium ( $\mathrm{mg} \cdot \mathrm{L}^{-1}$ ), R is the gas constant, and T is the absolute temperature of aqueous solution.


Fig. S9 Effect of adsorption temperature for MIL-100(Al).

Table S5 thermodynamic parameters of U(VI) adsorption by MIL-100(Al).

| Condition | $\begin{gathered} \Delta \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{o}} \\ \left(\mathrm{KJ} \cdot \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \Delta \mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{o}} \\ \left(\mathrm{KJ} \cdot \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\Delta \mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{o}}\left(\mathrm{KJ} \cdot \mathrm{mol}^{-1}\right)$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{U}_{0}=100 \mathrm{ppm} ; \\ \mathrm{pH}=5 . \end{gathered}$ |  |  | 298 K | 308 K | 318 K | 323 K | 328 K |
|  | 18.86 | 0.76 | -206.53 | -214.10 | -221.66 | -225.40 | -229.20 |

## SI-9 Reusability of MIL-100(Al)

Considering that little U(VI) sorption occurred in all the MOF sorbents at lower pH as denoted in Fig. 3a, regeneration of the MOF was performed by eluting the sorbed $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{VI})$ using an acid solution, and the results were given in Fig. S9 and Table S6. It was found that a complete U(VI) leaching (> 99\%) for MIL-100(Al) can be easily achieved using a $0.3 \mathrm{~mol} \cdot \mathrm{~L}^{-1} \mathrm{HNO}_{3}$ solution, suggesting an apparent reversibility of the U(VI) sorption into the MIL-100(Al).


Fig. S10 Reusability of MIL-100(Al).

Table S6 Desorption and reusability of MIL-100s

|  | Desorption(\%) |  | Reusability(mg•g ${ }^{-1}$ ) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left[\mathrm{HNO}_{3}\right] / \mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{L}$ | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.02 | Fresh | Reclaimed |
| MIL-100(Cr) | $>99$ | $>99$ | $>99$ | 32 | - |
| MIL-100(Fe) | $>99$ | $>99$ | 91 | 115 | - |
| MIL-100(Al) | $>99$ | 86 | 69 | 168 | 158 |
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