List of figures

| Figure | Figure caption | Page |
|------------|---|------|
| | | No. |
| Figure1.1 | Classifications of nano-carbon allotropes based on | 7 |
| | dimensions scale | |
| Figure1.2 | Pictorial representations of carbon dots and fullerene | 8 |
| Figure1.3 | Pictorial representations of the MWCNT structures | 9 |
| Figure1.4 | Pictorial representation of graphene sheet | 10 |
| Figure1.5 | Different forms of 3D nano-structured carbon derived | 12 |
| | from biomass | |
| Figure1.6 | Pictorial representation of heteroatom atom doped 2D | 13 |
| | graphene sheet | |
| Figure1.7 | Graphical illustration of the preparation of CuOx/AC | 17 |
| | composite | |
| Figure1.8 | Structure of porphyrin (a) and their derivatives, TPP (b) | 20 |
| | OEP (c) metal bonded porphyrin (d) | |
| Figure1.9 | Nanohybrid formations between porphyrin and a carbon | 21 |
| | nanohorn via covalent and non-covalent bonding | |
| Figure1.10 | Schematics representation of the possible interaction of | 23 |
| | conducting PPy with porphyrin | |
| Figure1.11 | Schematics representation of the porphyrin@polypyrrole | 23 |
| | hybrid | |
| Figure1.12 | Presentation of bonding between SnTPP and PPy and | 24 |
| | synthesis of PPy-SnTPP | |
| Figure1.13 | Monomer units of different CPs | 26 |
| Figure1.14 | Applications of CPs | 29 |
| Figure1.15 | Pictorial representation of In-situ interfacial and | 29 |
| | interfacial process of CPs synthesis | |
| Figure1.16 | Pictorial representations of applications of carbon-based | 30 |
| | nanomaterials | |
| Figure1.17 | Schematic diagram of charge storage mechanism in an | 32 |
| | EDLC (at top) and pseudocapacitor (down) | |
| Figure1.18 | Categorically representation of types of supercapacitor | 33 |
| Figure1.19 | Ragone plot for various energy devices | 33 |
| Figure2.1 | Real photograph of tubular furnace | 38 |
| Figure2.2 | TGA instruments and its Block diagram of Thermo- | 39 |
| | balance. | |

| Figure 2.3 | Photograph of SEM instruments and schematic layout of | 40 |
|-------------|---|-----------|
| | different components of the SEM. | |
| Figure 2.4 | Photograph of TEM instruments. | 41 |
| Figure 2.5 | Schematic diagram of AFM | 42 |
| Figure 2.6 | FTIR instruments and schematic illustration about its | 43 |
| | different components. | |
| Figure 2.7 | Schematic illustration of the Raman components | 45 |
| Figure 2.8 | Schematic working layout and photograph of NMR. | 46 |
| Figure 2.9 | Schematic working layout of the Uv-Vis | 47 |
| | spectrophotometer and their photograph. | |
| Figure 2.10 | Layout of the physical process in XPS. | 48 |
| Figure 2.11 | Photograph of XRD instrument | 49 |
| Figure 2.12 | Instruments photograph and experimental setup. | 49 |
| Figure 2.13 | Representation of the CV curve. | 50 |
| Figure 2.14 | Representation of the Nyquist plot. | 51 |
| Figure 3.1 | Schematic presentation of PIn structure | 59 |
| Figure 3.2 | XRD pattern of (a) bare g-C ₃ N ₄ , (b) 1:0.5, (c) 1:2, (d) 1:5 | 61 |
| | g-C ₃ N ₄ -PIn nanohybrids and (e) pure PIn | |
| Figure 3.3 | Combined UV-Vis spectra of (a) bare $g-C_3N_4$, (b) 1:0.5, | 62 |
| | (c) 1:2 g-C ₃ N ₄ -PIn nanohybrids and (d) pure PIn in | |
| | ethanol | |
| Figure 3.4 | ATR spectra of (a) bare $g-C_3N_4$, (b) 1:0.5, (c) 1:2, (d) 1:5 | 64 |
| | g-C ₃ N ₄ -PIn nanohybrids and (e) pure PIn | |
| Figure 3.5 | Raman spectra of (a) bare g-C ₃ N ₄ , (b) pure PIn and (c) | 65 |
| | 1:2 g-C ₃ N ₄ -PIn nanohybrid | |
| Figure 3.6 | XPS spectra of (A) bare $g-C_3N_4$, (B) 1:2, $g-C_3N_4$ -PIn | 67 |
| | nanohybrids full survey, (C) and (D) deconvolute peak of | |
| | N1s and (E) C1s peaks for g-C ₃ N ₄ and 1:2g-C ₃ N ₄ -PIn | |
| | nanohybrids, respectively | |
| Figure 3.7 | SEM image of (a) bare $g-C_3N_4$, (b) 1:0.5, (c) 1:2, (d) 1:5 | 69 |
| | $g-C_3N_4$ -PIn nanohybrids, (e) pure PIn and EDX of (a') g- | |
| | C3N4 and (b') 1:2 g-C ₃ N ₄ -PIn nanohybrids | |
| Figure 3.8 | TEM image of (a) bare $g-C_3N_4$, (b) 1:0.5, (c) 1:2, (d) | 70 |
| | 1:5 g-C ₃ N ₄ -PIn nanohybrids, (e) pure PIn and (f) SAED | |
| | pattern of $g-C_3N_4$, (g) 1:2 $g-C_3N_4$ -PIn nanohybrids, (h) | |
| | pure PIn | |
| Figure 3.9 | TGA curves of (a) bare $g-C_3N_4$, (b) pure PIn and (c) 1:2 | 71 |
| | g-C ₃ N ₄ -PIn nanohybrid | |
| Figure 3.10 | (A) Combined CV graph of glassy carbon (a), bare g- | 74 |
| | C_3N_4 (b), 1:0.5 (c), 1:2 (d), 1:5 (e) g- C_3N_4 -PIn | |

| | nanohybrids and pure PIn (f) electrodes at 50 | |
|-------------|---|-----------|
| | $mVs^{-1}scan$ rate in 1.0 M H ₂ SO ₄ : (B) CV curves of 1:2 | |
| | g-C ₃ N ₄ -PIn nanohybrid electrode in1.0 M H ₂ SO ₄ at | |
| | various scan rates: (C) combined GCD graph of bare g- | |
| | C_2N_4 (a) 1:0.5 (b) 1:2 (c) 1:5 (d) σ - C_2N_4 -PIn | |
| | nanohybrids and pure PIn (e) electrodes in 1.0 M H ₂ SO ₄ | |
| | at 2 Ag ⁻¹ current density: (D) GCD curves of 1.2 g- | |
| | C_2N_4 -PIn nanohybrid electrode in 1.0 M H ₂ SO ₄ at | |
| | various current density. | |
| Figure 3.11 | Nyquist plots of (a) bare g-C ₃ N ₄ , (b) 1:0.5, (c) 1:2, (d) | 76 |
| _ | 1:5 g-C ₃ N ₄ -PIn nanohybrids and (e) pure PIn electrodes | |
| | at their OCP (inset shows enlarged view of 1:2 g- C_3N_4 - | |
| | PIn nanohybrid electrode) | |
| Figure 3.12 | Cyclic stability test of 1:2 g-C ₃ N ₄ -PIn nanohybrid | 77 |
| | electrode at 5Ag ⁻¹ | |
| Figure 3.13 | SEM image of (I) 1:1, (II) 1:2 and (III) 1:4::Indole : | 79 |
| | APS ratios, and its CV graph as (a) 1:1, (b) 1:2 and (c) | |
| | 1:4 respectively. | |
| Figure 4.1 | Schematic representation for the synthesis of ECCs | 86 |
| Figure4.2 | XRD analysis of the as-prepared ACs prepared at | 87 |
| | different temperatures (a) ECC 600, (b) ECC 700 and | |
| | (c) ECC 800 | |
| Figure 4.3I | FT-IR analysis of the as-prepared ACs prepared at | 88 |
| | different temperatures (a) ECC 600, (b) ECC 700 and | |
| | (c) ECC 800 | |
| Figure | Raman spectra of ECC 800 | 88 |
| 4.3II | | |
| Figure 4.4 | SEM image of (a) ECC 600, (b) ECC 700, (c) ECC 800 | 89 |
| Figure 4.5 | BET surface area and other parameters for ECC 600, | 91 |
| | ECC 700, and ECC 800 | |
| Figure 4.6 | TGA of (I) (a) ECC 600, (b) ECC 700, (c) ECC 800,. | 93 |
| | Inset shows TGA of (a) dried Eichhorniacrassipes. | |
| Figure 4.7 | CV of (I) ECC 600 (II) ECC 700, (III) ECC 800 at | 95 |
| | different scan rates in 1.0 M H_2SO_4 and (d) comparative | |
| | CV of (a) ECC 600, (b) ECC 700, and (c) ECC 800 at 150 | |
| | mV/s scan rate and (VI) current density vs. square root of | |
| | scan rate plot for ECC 800. | |
| Figure 4.8 | GCD profiles of (I) ECC 600, (II) ECC 700 and (III) | 96 |
| | ECC 800 at various current densities and (IV) | |
| | comparative charge-discharge profiles of (a) ECC 600 | |

| | (b) ECC 700, (c) and ECC 800 at current | |
|-----------------------|--|-----------|
| | density=0.78A/g | |
| Figure 4.9 | EIS of (a) ECC 600, (b) ECC 700 and (c) ECC 800 | 97 |
| Figure 4.10 | Stability test of the ECC 800 via multiple CV at 50 | 98 |
| | mV/s scan rate | |
| Figure 5.1 | Schematic representation of ECC surface modification | 106 |
| | with PAni | |
| Figure 5.2 | XRD of (a) Ox- ECC 800, (b) OX-ECC/PAni and (c) | 109 |
| | PAni. | |
| Figure 5.3 | FT-IR analysis of (a) Ox- ECC 800, (b) OX-ECC/PAni | 110 |
| | and (c) PAni. | |
| Figure 5.4 | Raman of (a) Ox-ECC, (b) Ox-ECC/PAni and (c) PAni. | 112 |
| Figure 5.5 | XPS of Ox-ECC for (a) survey spectrum, (c) C1s, (e) | 114 |
| | N1s(g) O1sand Ox-ECC/PAni for (b) survey spectrum, | |
| | (d) C1s, (f)N1s (h) O1s respectively. | |
| Figure 5.6 | SEM image of (a) Ox-ECC (b) PAni, (c) Ox-ECC/PAni, | 115 |
| | TEM image of (d) Ox-ECC, (e) Ox-ECC/PAni and (f) | |
| | SAED of Ox-ECC/PAni. Inset of Fig. 5.6d showing | |
| | SAED of Ox-ECC. | |
| Figure 5.7 | N_2 adsorption-desorption isotherm of (a) Ox- ECC 800, | 117 |
| | (b) PAni and (c).OX-ECC/PAni. | |
| Figure 5.8 | Comparative TGA of (I) (a) Ox-ECC (b) ECC 800, and | 118 |
| | (II) (a) Ox-ECC, (b) Ox-ECC/PAni, and (c) PAni. | |
| Figure 5.9 | CV at different scan rate of (I) PAni, (II) Ox-ECC (III) | 121 |
| | Ox-ECC/PAni and comparative CV of (IV) (a) PAni, | |
| | (b) Ox-ECC and (c) Ox-ECC/PAni. (V) comparative | |
| | CV of (a) Ox-ECC, (b) ECC 800 at scan rate 150 mVs- | |
| | 1in 1.0M H2SO4 electrolyte and (VI) current density | |
| F | vs. square root of scan rate plot of Ox-ECC/PAni. | 100 |
| Figure 5.10 | GCD of (I) PAni, (II) Ox-ECC (III) Ox-ECC/PAni at | 123 |
| | different current density and (IV) comparative GCD of | |
| | (a) PAni, (b) Ox-ECC and (c) Ox -ECC/PAni, (V) | |
| | comparative GCD of (a) Ox-ECC and (b) ECC 800 at | |
| F ¹ | current density 0.78 A/gin 1.0M H ₂ SO ₄ electrolyte. | 105 |
| Figure 5.11 | (I) EIS OF (a) EUC 600, (b) EUC 700, (c) EUC 800, (d) PAri (c) Or EUC and (b) Or EUC 800, (d) | 125 |
| | PANI, (e) UX-EUU and (I) UX-EUU800/PANI. Inset | |
| | shows an emarged view of a similar curve and (II) Plot of θ rotantion us, number of system | |
| Figure 6 1 | UV via absorption apactra of (a) Din (b) Eq. (CED/DL | 127 |
| rigure 0.1 | by brid and inset represent the LW via character | 13/ |
| | nyoria, and inset represent the UV-vis absorption | |

| | spectra of (a) OEP (b) Fe-OEP | |
|-------------|---|-----|
| Figure 6.2 | FTIR spectra of (Ia) PIn and (Ib) Fe-OEP/PIn composite | 138 |
| 0 | and (IIa) OEP (IIb) Fe-OEP. | |
| Figure 6.3 | H-NMR spectra of (a) OEP, (b) FeOEP/PIn composite | 140 |
| | and (c) PIn | |
| Figure 6.4 | XRD spectra of (a) OEP, (b) Fe-OEP/PIn hybrid, and | 141 |
| | (c) Pure PIn | |
| Figure 6.5 | XPS spectra of (I) N1s, (II) C1s and (III) Fe2p of | 143 |
| | corresponding to (a) FeOEP, (b) Fe-OEP/Pin hybrid | |
| | respectively. | |
| Figure 6.6 | SEM of Fe-OEP/PIn at different magnifications (a and | 147 |
| | b), pure PIn (c) and EDX of Fe-OEP/PIn (d) | |
| Figure 6.7 | AFM image of pure PIn (a) and FeOEP/PIn (d), 3D | 148 |
| | image in (b) and (e), and KPFM in (c) and (f) | |
| | respectively. | |
| Figure 6.8 | CV of (a) Fe-OEP/PIn and (b) pure PIn respectively. | 149 |
| Figure 6.9 | Nyquist plot of (a) Fe-OEP/PIn and (b) pure PIn | 151 |
| | respectively. | |
| Figure 6.10 | GCD of Fe-OEP/PIn at different current density as as | 152 |
| | (a) 2.5A/g, (b) 5A/g, (c) 7A/g, (d) 9A/g and (e) 10A/g | |
| | respectively. | |
| Figure 6.11 | GCD cyclic stability test of FeOEP/PIn at current | 153 |
| | density 9A/g. | |
| Figure 6.12 | J-V (b) semilog plot (c) $J^{1/2}$ vs. V characteristics of Fe- | 156 |
| | OEP/PIn. | |
| Scheme 6.1 | Schematic representation of progress of reaction and | 144 |
| | interaction between Fe-OEP/PIn. | |