Supporting Information

An Automated Detection of Influenza Virus based on 3-D Magnetophoretic Separation and Magnetic Label

Shao-Li Hong[†]* ^{a,b,c}, Nangang Zhang[†]a,b,c, Li Qin ^{a,b,c}, Man Tang ^{a,b,c}, Zhao Ai ^{a,b,c}, Aiju,

Chen^{a,b,c}, Shuibing Wang^{a,b,c}, Kan Liu*^{a,b,c,d}

^a School of Electronic and Electrical Engineering, Wuhan Textile University, Wuhan

430200, People's Republic of China

^b Hubei Province Engineering Research Center for Intelligent Micro-nano Medical

Equipment and Key Technologies, Wuhan 30200, People's Republic of China

^c Hubei Engineering and Technology Research Center for Functional Fiber Fabrication

and Testing, Wuhan 430200, People's Republic of China

^d School of Life Science and Technology, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu, Sichuan 610054, People's Republic of China

[†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

*Co-corresponding authors e-mail: <u>liukan2002@gmail.com</u> (K. Liu); <u>slhong@whu.edu.cn</u> (S.L. Hong);

Table of Contents



S.1 Microscopic images of glass capillary

Figure S1. (A-C) Microscopic images of antibody modified glass capillary (bright field, fluorescence field, and merge, respectively). (D-F) Microscopic images of magnetic beads without antibody modification. The scale bar is 100 μm.

S.2 Calculation of separation efficiency

The calculation of separation efficiency was taken Uv-Vis absorption quantitation. The absorbance at 600 nm was proportional to its concentration of magnetic beads, thus the separation effectiveness could be calculated by the equation:

$$\varphi_e = (1 - A_2 / A_1) \times 100\%$$

Where ϕ_e is the separation efficiency, A_2 is the absorbance of solution at 600 nm after 3-D magnetophoretic separation, and A_1 is the absorbance of the original solutions at 600 nm.

S3 Specificity Analysis

To investigate whether there is a statistically significant difference, p analysis was

further calculated, and the results were shown in figure S2 with a significant difference.

*means p < 0.05.



Figure S2. Histograms of the results of the specificity using this method. Error bars = \pm SD, and n = 3.

Table S1. Intra- and Interassay Variability of This Method.

	Mean	SD	CV (n=5)
Intra-assay	-0.83	-0.044	5.3 %
Interassay	-0.91	-0.068	7.5 %

Table.S1 Intra- and Interassay Variability of This Method.