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Figure S1 the surface element mapping diagrams of OPPy/ERGO/CCE (E-H)


Figure S2 Nyquist plots of bare CCE (A), ERGO/CCE (B), OPPy/CCE (C) and 3DOPPy/ERGO/CCE (D). the black dots represented the measured data, and the red dots were the data fitted by ZSimpWin software.

The ZSimpWin software was used to fit the EIS data, the results were showed in Fig.S2 (in this section). For bare CCE (A) and ERGO/CCE (B), the equivalent circuit were $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{RW})$ ). For OPPy/CCE (C) and OPPy/ERGO/CCE (D), the equivalent circuit were $R(C(R(Q(R W))))(C R)$. It can be seen that the fitting effect were good. From fig. S2, the charge transfer resistance ( $R_{\mathrm{ct}}$ ) of the above electrodes was 1013 (bare CCE), 649 (ERGO/CCE), 4388 (OPPy/CCE), and 2067 (OPPy/ERGO/CCE), respectively. The error was $2.1 \%$ (Bare CCE), 2.1\% (ERGO/CCE), 2.8\% (OPPy/CCE), and 2.4\% (OPPy/ERGO/CCE), respectively.


Figure S3 CV graphs of various modified electrodes of CCE (A), OPPy/CCE (B), ERGO/CCE (C) and OPPy/ERGO/CCE (D) in $0.1 \mathrm{~mol} \mathrm{~L}^{-1} \mathrm{KCl}$ containing 5.0 mM $\mathrm{K}_{3} \mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{CN})_{6}$ at various scan rates $\left(20,50,70,100,150\right.$, and $\left.200 \mathrm{mV} \mathrm{s}^{-1}\right)$.


Figure S4 linear relationship between the anodic peak currents to the square root of potential scan rates, (A). CCE, (B). OPPy/CCE, (C). ERGO/CCE, (D). OPPy/ERGO/CCE. According to this diagram, the effective electrode area of different electrodes can be calculated as 0.055 (bare CCE), 0.048 (OPPy/CCE), 0.067 (ERGO/CCE) and 0.085 (OPPy/ERGO/CCE) $\mathrm{cm}^{2}$, respectively.
[1] N. Sabbaghi, M. Noroozifar, Anal. Chim. Acta, 2019, 1056, 16-25.

The effective area of different electrodes was determined by CV. Fig. S3 exhibited the CV graphs of bare CCE (A), OPPy/CCE (B), ERGO/CCE (C) and OPPy/ERGO/CCE (D) in $0.1 \mathrm{~mol} \mathrm{~L}^{-1} \mathrm{KCl}$ containing $5.0 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{~mol} \mathrm{~L}^{-1} \mathrm{~K}_{3} \mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{CN})_{6}$ at various scan rates $\left(20,50,70,100,150\right.$, and $200 \mathrm{mV} \mathrm{s}^{-1}$ ). Based on the RandlesSevcik equation, the peak current on CV can be expressed as equation (1):

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{\mathrm{p}}=2.69 \times 10^{5} n^{3 / 2} A D^{1 / 2} c v^{1 / 2} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $I_{\mathrm{p}}$ was the anode peak current on $\mathrm{CV}(\mathrm{A}), n$ was the electron transfer number ( $n$ $=1$ ), $c$ was the concentration of $\mathrm{K}_{3}\left[\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{CN})_{6}\right]\left(5.0 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{~mol} \mathrm{~cm}^{-3}\right), v$ was the potential scan rate, $D$ was the diffusion coefficient of $\mathrm{K}_{3}\left[\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{CN})_{6}\right]\left(7.6 \times 10^{-6} \mathrm{~cm}^{2} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right)$ [1], and $A$ was the effective area of the electrode ( $\mathrm{cm}^{2}$ ). According to the linear
relationship between $I_{\mathrm{p}}$ and $v^{1 / 2}$, the effective electrode area $A$ can be calculated. Fig. S 4 was the linear relationship between $I_{\mathrm{p}}$ and $v^{1 / 2}$ of CCE (A), OPPy/CCE (B), ERGO/CCE (C) and OPPy/ERGO/CCE (D), respectively. Based on this, the effective electrode areas of these electrodes can be calculated as 0.055 (bare CCE), 0.048 (OPPy/CCE), 0.067 (ERGO/CCE) and 0.085 (OPPy/ERGO/CCE) $\mathrm{cm}^{2}$, respectively.


Figure S5 CV graphs of $0.1 \mathrm{mM}(\mathrm{HQ})$, (CC) and (RS) on 3D-OPPy/ERGO/CCE prepared at various deposition times of 100 s (A), $200 \mathrm{~s}(\mathrm{~B}), 300 \mathrm{~s}(\mathrm{C}), 400 \mathrm{~s}$ (D) and $500 \mathrm{~s}(\mathrm{E})$, and the curves between peak currents versus deposition time (F), the other experimental conditions are the same as those in figure 4.


Figure S6 CV graphs of $0.1 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{HQ}, \mathrm{CC}$ and RS on 3D-OPPy/ERGO/CCE prepared with different overoxidation cycles of 0 (A), 5 (B), 10 (C), 20 (D), 40 (E), $60(\mathrm{~F})$ and 100 cycle ( G ), and the curves between peak currents versus overoxidation cycle $(\mathrm{H})$, the other experimental conditions are the same as in fig. 4.


Figure S7 Effect of accumulation time on the oxidation peak currents of $5.0 \mu \mathrm{MHQ}$, CC and RS, the parameters of DPV were as follows, sweep potential range, - $0.2-$ 0.8 V , potential increment, 4 mV , pulse amplitude, 50 mV , pulse period, 0.05 s , sampling width, 0.0167 s , the supporting electrolyte, 0.10 M phosphate buffer ( pH $6.0)$.


Figure S8 DPV curves of $30.0 \mu \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HQ}+\mathrm{CC}+\mathrm{RS}$ with the addition of some common interfering substances in water.

Table S1 Peak current changes caused by some common interfering substances for $\mathrm{HQ}, \mathrm{CC}$ and RS.

| Substances | Peak current $(\mu \mathrm{A})$ |  |  | Peak current changes r (\%) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HQ | CC | RS | HQ | CC | RS |
| $0.03 \mathrm{mM}(\mathrm{HQ}+\mathrm{CC}+\mathrm{RS})$ | 8.348 | 5.387 | 2.177 | - | - | - |
| $0.3 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{Cu}\left(\mathrm{NO}_{3}\right)_{2}+0.03 \mathrm{mM}(\mathrm{HQ}+\mathrm{CC}+\mathrm{RS})$ | 8.054 | 5.387 | 2.143 | -3.5 | 2.0 | -1.6 |
| $0.3 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{NaNO}_{2}+0.03 \mathrm{mM}(\mathrm{HQ}+\mathrm{CC}+\mathrm{RS})$ | $8.697$ | 5.501 | 2.238 | 4.2 | 2.1 | 2.8 |
| $6.0 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}+0.03 \mathrm{mM}(\mathrm{HQ}+\mathrm{CC}+\mathrm{RS})$ | 8.291 | 5.249 | 2.231 | -0.7 | -0.6 | 2.5 |
| $0.3 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{FeCl}_{3}+0.03 \mathrm{mM}(\mathrm{HQ}+\mathrm{CC}+\mathrm{RS})$ | 8.592 | 5.434 | 2.211 | 2.9 | 2.9 | -1.5 |
| $3.0 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{Zn}\left(\mathrm{NO}_{3}\right)_{2}+0.03 \mathrm{mM}(\mathrm{HQ}+\mathrm{CC}+\mathrm{RS})$ | 8.710 | 5.327 | 2.187 | 4.3 | 0.8 | -0.5 |
| $3.0 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{Ni}\left(\mathrm{NO}_{3}\right)_{2}+0.03 \mathrm{mM}(\mathrm{HQ}+\mathrm{CC}+\mathrm{RS})$ | 8.222 | 5.153 | 2.209 | -1.5 | -2.5 | 1.5 |
| $1.5 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{3}+0.03 \mathrm{mM}(\mathrm{HQ}+\mathrm{CC}+\mathrm{RS})$ | 8.183 | 5.263 | 2.302 | -2.0 | -0.4 | 5.7 |
| $6.0 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{CaCl} 2_{2}+0.03 \mathrm{mM}(\mathrm{HQ}+\mathrm{CC}+\mathrm{RS})$ | 8.271 | 5.284 | 2.069 | -0.9 | -2.0 | -4.9 |
| 3.0 mM MnSO $4+0.03 \mathrm{mM}(\mathrm{HQ}+\mathrm{CC}+\mathrm{RS})$ | 8.426 | 5.248 | 2.112 | 0.9 | -0.7 | -3.0 |
| $6.0 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{Mg}\left(\mathrm{NO}_{3}\right)_{2}+0.03 \mathrm{mM}(\mathrm{HQ}+\mathrm{CC}+\mathrm{RS})$ | 8.702 | 5.303 | 2.228 | 4.2 | 0.4 | 2.3 |
| 0.03 mM Phenol $+0.03 \mathrm{mM}(\mathrm{HQ}+\mathrm{CC}+\mathrm{RS})$ | 7.943 | 5.046 | 2.318 | -4.9 | -4.5 | 4.5 |



Figure S9 DPV curves for 7 times parallel determination of $30.0 \mu \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HQ}, \mathrm{CC}$ and RS mixture using a same modified electrode.

Table S2 The peak currents and its RSD for 7 times parallel determination of 30.0 $\mu \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HQ}, \mathrm{CC}$ and RS mixture using a same modified electrode.

| Number | Peak current ( $\mu \mathrm{A}$ ) |  |  | RSD (\%) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HQ | CC | RS | HQ | CC | RS |
| 1 | 8.442 | 5.211 | 2.240 |  |  |  |
| 2 | 8.340 | 5.315 | 2.226 |  |  |  |
| 3 | 8.121 | 5.199 | 2.248 |  |  |  |
| 4 | 8.003 | 5.162 | 2.210 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 2.0 |
| 5 | 8.461 | 5.249 | 2.177 |  |  |  |
| 6 | 8.430 | 5.293 | 2.221 |  |  |  |
| 7 | 8.216 | 5.165 | 2.120 |  |  |  |



Figure S10 CV graphs of $0.1 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{HQ}, \mathrm{CC}$ and RS on five modified electrodes prepared by the same procedure.

Table S3 Peak currents and RSD of $0.1 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{HQ}, \mathrm{CC}$ and RS on five modified electrodes prepared by the same procedure.

| Number | Anode peak current $(\mu \mathrm{A})$ |  |  |  | RSD (\%) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | HQ | CC | RS |  | HQ | CC | RS |
| 1 | 10.48 | 7.118 | 6.901 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 10.31 | 6.483 | 7.349 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 10.81 | 7.303 | 7.142 |  | 2.3 | 7.5 | 4.8 |
| 4 | 10.20 | 6.276 | 7.248 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 10.32 | 6.217 | 7.861 |  |  |  |  |



Figure S11 DPV curves for 5 times parallel determination (A-E) of water sample and the spiked samples, curve a. water sample, b-f. the spiked samples with addition of $3.00,6.00,9.00,12.0$, and $15.0 \mu \mathrm{M} \mathrm{HQ}+\mathrm{CC}+\mathrm{RS}$ standard solution.

