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Table S1. Statistical parameters of the calibration plots from UV-visible spectroscopy study (Figure 2) of ellagic acid in 0.05 M HCl solution and in pure water, both containing $1 \mathrm{vol} \%$ of methanol.

| Medium | Max wavelength | Slope (std. error) | Intercept (std. error) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.05 M HCl <br> $\left(+1 \mathrm{vol} \% \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}\right)$ | 367 nm | $6.2 \cdot 10^{3}\left(5 \cdot 10^{2}\right)$ | $1.0 \cdot 10^{-2}\left(4 \cdot 10^{-3}\right)$ |
|  | 250 nm | $3.7 \cdot 10^{4}\left(4 \cdot 10^{3}\right)$ | $3 \cdot 10^{-2}\left(3 \cdot 10^{-2}\right)$ |
| water <br> $\left(+1 \mathrm{vol} \% \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}\right)$ | 357 nm | $1.15 \cdot 10^{4}\left(5 \cdot 10^{2}\right)$ | $-6 \cdot 10^{-3}\left(4 \cdot 10^{-3}\right)$ |
|  | 274 nm | $2.9 \cdot 10^{4}\left(1 \cdot 10^{3}\right)$ | $-1 \cdot 10^{-2}\left(1 \cdot 10^{-2}\right)$ |
|  | 253 nm | $3.4 \cdot 10^{4}\left(2 \cdot 10^{3}\right)$ | $-2 \cdot 10^{-2}\left(2 \cdot 10^{-2}\right)$ |



Figure S1. Mass loss of Armco ${ }^{\circledR}$ iron coupons as a function of HCl concentration. Solution temperature: $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Immersion time: 1 hour. Bars represent standard deviations from at least two independent measures.


Figure S2. Voltammogram traces (scan rate $0.5 \mathrm{mV} \mathrm{s}^{-1}$ ) of Armco ${ }^{\circledR}$ iron electrodes in aerated HCl 0.05 M solution (black line) and with addition of $1 \mathrm{vol} \%$ methanol as co-solvent (grey line). The last is the blank reference reported in Figure 3 of the main text. Solution temperature: $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

Table S2. Electrochemical key features obtained from the potentiodynamic polarizations carried out on Armco ${ }^{\circledR}$ pure iron electrodes (Figure 3 and Figure 4). All the solutions invariably present $1 \mathrm{vol} \%$ methanol as co-solvent.

| Solution | Inhibitor | $E_{\text {corr }} \boldsymbol{v s}$. RHE / ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $i_{\text {corr }} /\left(\mu \mathrm{A} \mathrm{cm}{ }^{-2}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.05 M HCl | none | -0.22 | 130 |
|  | 0.01 mM EA | -0.21 | 114 |
|  | $1 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{EA} \mathrm{(ex-situ)}$ | -0.21 | 70 |
|  | FPW ( 0.01 mM EA ) | -0.22 | 157 |
|  | FPW (0.1 mM EA) | -0.21 | 146 |
| 0.05 M NaCl | none | -0.07 | n.a. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
|  | 0.01 mM EA | 0.07 | n.a. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
|  | FPW ( 0.01 mM EA ) | 0.13 | n.a. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
|  | FPW ( 0.1 mM EA ) | 0.10 | n.a. ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |

${ }^{\text {apotential }}$ refereed to reversible hydrogen electrode (RHE): $E_{(\mathrm{VS}}$ RHE) $\left.=E_{(\mathrm{vS}} \mathrm{SCE}\right)+0.244+0.059 \mathrm{pH}$. ${ }^{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{Not}$ available because of inapplicability of the Tafel approximation.


Figure S3. Voltammogram traces (scan rate $0.5 \mathrm{mV} \mathrm{s}^{-1}$ ) of Armco ${ }^{\circledR}$ iron electrodes in aerated 0.05 M HCl (dashed line) and 0.05 M NaCl (solid line) solutions. For sake of clarity, considering the different pH of the solutions, all potentials are referred to reversible hydrogen electrode (RHE) according to the following formula: $E_{(v s \mathrm{RHE})}=E_{(v s \mathrm{SCE})}+0.244+0.059 \mathrm{pH}$, with 0.244 the potential (in volt) of saturated calomel electrode (SCE) with respect to standard hydrogen electrode (SHE). In this scale of potential, the hydrogen evolution reaction occurs at $E=0 \mathrm{~V} v s$ RHE independently by the actual concentration of hydrogen ions.

Table S3. pH values of the solutions used in voltammetric investigation. Obtained by a combined glass electrode coupled to a potentiometer.

| Tested solution | $\mathbf{p H}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| blank <br> $\left(0.05 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaCl}+1 \mathrm{vol} \% \mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}\right)$ | 6.2 |
| blank $+10 \mu \mathrm{M} \mathrm{EA}$ | 5.6 |
| blank +8 mg dm <br> (ca. FPW extract <br> (ca EA) | 4.9 |
| blank +80 mg dm <br> $(\mathrm{ca}$..300 FPW eA) extract | 4.9 |



Figure S4. Effect of temperature on Armco ${ }^{\circledR}$ iron electrodes in aerated 0.05 M NaCl solution with $10 \mu \mathrm{M} \mathrm{EA}$ (solid lines) and without inhibitor (dashed lines). Solution temperature: $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (left), $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (centre), $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (right). Voltammogram traces are recorded at $0.5 \mathrm{mV} \mathrm{s}^{-1}$ potential scan rate.

