

## **Supplementary Materials**

### **New optimization framework for improvement sustainability of wastewater treatment plants**

**Hang LI,<sup>1,2</sup> Fei PANG,<sup>2</sup> Di XU,<sup>3,\*</sup> Lichun DONG<sup>1,\*</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>School of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Chongqing University, Chongqing 400044, P. R. China

<sup>2</sup>Chongqing Three Gorges Water YuBei Drainage Co., Ltd., Chongqing 401120, P. R. China

<sup>3</sup>College of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, Chongqing University of Science and Technology, Chongqing 400044, P. R. China

**Corresponding Authors:** Lichun Dong ([lcdong72@cqu.edu.cn](mailto:lcdong72@cqu.edu.cn)); Di Xu ([xdcq86@163.com](mailto:xdcq86@163.com))

**S1. Collected original data in the case study**

**S2. Normalized data in the interval CRITIC in the case study**

## S1. Collected original data in the case study

The original data in Tables S1-S3 were collected from Internal Research Report, Chongqing Three Gorges Water YuBei Drainage Co., Ltd.

Table S1. Original data of O<sub>1</sub> (discharged pollution reduction) with respect to taking each alternative retrofit technology

Category	$\Delta BOD_5$	$\Delta TN$	$\Delta TP$
Unit	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L
T1	-	(0.8-1.5)	-
T2	-	-	(0.2-0.4)
T3	-	(1.5-4.5)	(0.1-0.1)
T4	(0.5-1.0)	(3.0-6.0)	(0.1-0.1)
T5	(1.0-2.0)	(1.5-3.0)	(0.1-0.2)
T6	(1.0-1.0)	(3.0-3.0)	(0.1-0.2)
T7	-	-	-
T8	-	-	-
T9	-	-	-
T10	-	-	-

Note: “-” means no effect

Table S2. Original data of O<sub>2</sub> (operational cost reduction) with respect to taking each alternative retrofit technology

Category	$OR_{Tj-energy}$	$OR_{Tj-material}$	$OR_{Tj-staff}$	$OR_{Tj-other}$ (cost regarding sewage sludge)
Unit	CNY/m <sup>3</sup>	CNY/m <sup>3</sup>	CNY/m <sup>3</sup>	CNY/m <sup>3</sup>
T1	(0.0292-0.0584)	-	-	-
T2	-	(0.0066-0.0082)	-	-
T3	(0.0155-0.0164)	-	-	(0.0120-0.0301)
T4	-	+(0.0699-0.0699)	-	+(0.006-0.012)
T5	+(0.0350-0.0526)	-	-	(0.0301-0.0301)
T6	+(0.0088-0.0175)	-	-	(0.012-0.012)
T7	(0.0443-0.0591)	-	+(0.0164-0.0164)	(0.1505-0.1505)
T8	-	-	+(0.0164-0.0164)	(0.3010-0.4013)
T9	+(0.2066-0.2066)	-	+(0.0164-0.0164)	(0.4274-0.4274)
T10	(0.0443-0.0443)	-	+(0.0088-0.0088)	

Note: “-” means no effect; “+” means increasement instead of reduction is found, highlighted with red color

Table S3. Original data of O<sub>3</sub> (GHG emissions reduction) with respect to taking each alternative retrofit technology

Category	$CR_{Tj-electricity}$	$CR_{Tj-chemicals}$
Unit	kg CO <sub>2</sub> -eq/m <sup>3</sup>	kg CO <sub>2</sub> -eq/m <sup>3</sup>
T1	(0.034-0.069)	-
T2	-	(0.018-0.018)
T3	(0.018-0.019)	-
T4	-	+(0.009-0.009)
T5	+(0.041-0.062)	-
T6	+(0.010-0.021)	-
T7	(0.052-0.070)	-
T8	-	-
T9	+(0.049-0.049)	-
T10	(0.052-0.052)	-

Note: “-” means no effect; “+” means increasement instead of reduction is found, highlighted with red color; the GHG emissions regarding the sewage sludge treatment is not considered in Table S3.

## S2. Normalized data in the interval CRITIC in the case study

Table S4. Normalized data in the interval CRITIC in the case study

$\left[ \bar{z}_{ij}^L, \bar{z}_{ij}^U \right]$	O <sub>1</sub>	O <sub>2</sub>	O <sub>3</sub>
T <sub>1</sub>	[0.083, 0.167]	[0.238, 0.301]	[0.732, 0.993]
T <sub>2</sub>	[0.333, 0.667]	[0.190, 0.193]	[0.609, 0.609]
T <sub>3</sub>	[0.250, 0.667]	[0.234, 0.275]	[0.609, 0.617]
T <sub>4</sub>	[0.500, 1.000]	[0.000, 0.013]	[0.402, 0.402]
T <sub>5</sub>	[0.500, 1.000]	[0.127, 0.165]	[0.000, 0.157]
T <sub>6</sub>	[0.667, 0.833]	[0.164, 0.182]	[0.314, 0.392]
T <sub>7</sub>	[0.000, 0.000]	[0.558, 0.589]	[0.868, 1.000]
T <sub>8</sub>	[0.000, 0.000]	[0.785, 1.000]	[0.471, 0.471]
T <sub>9</sub>	[0.000, 0.000]	[0.613, 0.613]	[0.101, 0.101]
T <sub>10</sub>	[0.000, 0.000]	[0.252, 0.252]	[0.868, 0.868]