Supplementary Materials

 $xyz -1 2$

Hydroquinone radical

 $\overline{4}$ $\overline{3}$ 5

 $\overline{6}$

kampferol radical

 6^o $3'$ $5'$ Quercetin radical

 $5'$

Myricetin radical

 $2⁵$

 6°

3MQ radical $xyz -3$ 2

 6^o

 $5'$

3'MQ radical

 $5'$

 $2'$

 6^o

```
4'MQ radical
xyz -3 2
```


 $2'$

 $6[°]$

 $5'$

Figure S1. The optimized structure of the test compounds (fully deprotonated radical). The xyz coordinate of the atoms of each molecule (from the second to the fourth column), the spin population in percentage (numbers in red, the fifth column) and the bond lengths given in the depicted molecule (Å). Note that the number here is not the same as that of manuscript, the number in blue (the sixth line) represents the number of carbon used in manuscript and depicted in Figure 1.

Figure S2. Simulated ESR spectrum of the kaempferol radical using our calculated spin densities. The simulated ESR spectrum is similar as the experimental ESR spectrum of the kaempferol radical Pirker et al. [1]. reported. The simulation was made using eprsimulator (http://www.eprsimulator.org/ isotropic.html) with the splitting constants of 4.3, 1.3, 1.0, 4.1, and 5.8, respectively.

MS of Standard hydroquinone between RT 9.155 and 9.238 minutes

Figure S3. HPLC/MS analysis of a solution of kaempferol incubated for 5 min at high pH, similar to the incubation of kaempferol in the ESR experiment as described in the material and method section of our manuscript. Panel A is the HPLC chromatogram of the Kaempferol solution after the 5 min incubation. In panel B is the HPLC chromatogram of a freshly prepared 2.5 mM hydroquinone solution in a 0.1% formic acid (85%) acetonitril (15%) mixture. The exact mass of the peak at 9.2 min in the kaempferol chromatogram had the same exact mass as the peak of the hydroquinone standard, confirming the formation of hydroquinone out of kaempferol during the incubation. The small difference in retention time incubation between the hydroquinone peak in the chromatogram of the kaempferol incubation and the chromatogram of the hydroquinone reference is probably due to the difference in the composition of solvent of the kaempferol incubation and that of the hydroquinone standard. The formation of hydroquinone in the kaempferol incubation, substantiates the explanation that the ESR signal with kaempferol was derived from the hydroquinone radical.

The conditions of the HPLC analysis are:

The column used for the separation was an Apollo C18 (150 \times 4.6 mm, 5 µm) from Grace. The mobile phase was 0.1% formic acid (solvent A) and acetonitrile (solvent B). The linear gradient elution conditions were: start with 95% solvent A ; from 95% to 85% of solvent A in 2 min; from 85% to 78% of solvent A in 7 min; from 78% to 50% of solvent A in 1 min; from 50% to 10% of solvent A in 2 min and this condition was held for 6 min; and from 10% to 95% of solvent A in 1 min which was maintained for 1 min. The oven temperature was set at 25 °C and the injection volume was $5 \mu L$. The flow rate was 0.4 mL/min.

The detection was performed with an Agilent DAD detector (set a 300 nm) on an Agilent 6550 iFunnel Accurate-Mass QuadrupoleTime-of-Flight Mass Spectrometer (Q-TOF MS) through an electrospray interface with Jet Stream technology after separation on a 1290 Infinity UHPLC system (Agilent, Santa Clara, CA, USA). All samples and standards were analysed in negative mode with gas temperature 150 °C, gas flow 20 L/min, nebulizer 25 psig, sheath gas temperature 350 °C, sheath gas flow 12 L/min, Vcap 3000 V and nozzle voltage 1000 V.

Figure S4. The simulated ESR spectrum of tested compounds (expect kaemferol) made using eprsimulator (http://www.eprsimulator.org/isotropic.html) with the experimental splitting constants.

heta-HOMO(SOMO)

alpha-HOMO(SOMO)

 $5.149670\ \mathrm{eV} \quad \ \ \bigg| \quad \ \ \,$

alpha-LUMO

alpha-HOMO(SOMO)

 $\operatorname{alpha-LUMO}$

alpha-LUMO

Orthogonal normalization (SOMO)

 $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{1}_{\text{LHSUSY eV}}$

4.025586 eV

 $beta-LUMO$

Kaempferol

beta-HOMO(SOMO)

 $\begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{3.733407 eV} \end{array}$

beta-LUMO

quercetin

beta-HOMO(SOMO)

TOO! -0.946919 eV

beta-LUMO

myricetin

 $\mbox{Orthogonal normalization}\;\;(\mbox{SOMO})$

alpha-HOMO(SOMO)

 -5.204589 eV

 -0.128776 eV

 $5.350190\,\,\mathrm{eV}$

 $\operatorname{alpha-LUMO}$

beta-LUMO

Orthogonal normalization (SOMO)

 4° MQ

Hydroquinone

Figure S5. The HOMO (SOMO) and LUMO gap of the tested compounds (in the radical form). The gap between alpha-HOMO (SOMO) and alpha-LUMO of kaempferol radical, quercetin radical and myricetin radical are 5.15, 5.10, 5.04 eV, respectively, which indicates that the kaempferol radical is more stable than the quercetin radical and the myricetin radical. The higher alpha energy gap of 4′MQ radical compared with 3′MQ radical indicates the importance of hydroxyl group in Q at the 4′ position. The default isosurface is 0.05 that's why the alpha-LUMO of catechol radical and hydroquinone radical can't be shown. The SOMO maps of tested compounds after orthogonal normalization are shown on the right.

Reference

1. Pirker, K.F.; Stolze, K.; Pirker, K.F.; Stolze, K.; Reichenauer, T.G.; Pirker, K.F.; Stolze, K.; Reichenauer, T.G.; Nohl, H.; Pirker, K.F. Are the biological properties of kaempferol determined by its oxidation products? *Free Radic. Res.* **2006**, 40, 513–521.