# **Supplementary Information**

## **A colorimetric chemosensor for sensitive and selective detection of**

## **copper (II) ions based on catalytic oxidation of 1-naphthylamine**

Rui Cai,<sup>ab</sup> Chaudhary Ammar Shoukat,<sup>ab</sup> Chenqi Zhang,<sup>ab</sup> Xinshuang Gao,<sup>ab</sup> Hanbo Li,<sup>ab</sup> Jiaqi Chen,\*<sup>c</sup> Yinglu Ji,\*<sup>a</sup> and Xiaochun Wu<sup>ab</sup>

*<sup>a</sup>CAS Key Laboratory of Standardization and Measurement for Nanotechnology, National Center for Nanoscience and Technology, Beijing 100190, China. Email: jiyl@nanoctr.cn <sup>b</sup>University of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China. <sup>c</sup>School of Mechanical Engineering, Chengdu University, Chengdu 610000, China. Email: chenjiaqi@cdu.edu.cn*

#### **Supplementary Experiment Information**

**Chemical reagents.** 1-Naphthylamine hydrochloride (α-NA·HCl), nickel chloride hexahydrate (NiCl2·6H2O), cadmium nitrate tetrahydrate (Cd(NO3)2·4H2O), cerium nitrate hexahydrate  $(Ce(NO_3)_3.6H_2O)$ , and hydrogen peroxide  $(H_2O_2, 30 \text{ wt } 96)$  were ordered from Aladdin (Shanghai, China). Copper (II) chloride dihydrate (CuCl<sub>2</sub>·2H<sub>2</sub>O) was obtained from Sinopharm Chemical Reagent Co., Ltd (Beijing, China). Manganese (II) chloride tetrahydrate (MnCl<sub>2</sub>·4H<sub>2</sub>O), sodium citrate (Cit), cysteine (Cys), 2-mercaptoethylamine (MEA), 3-mercaptopropionic acid (MPA), and ascorbic acid (AA) was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Shanghai, China). Ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid (EDTA) solution (0.5 M, pH 8.0), iron (III) chloride (FeCl3), iron (II) chloride (FeCl<sub>2</sub>), sodium fluoride (NaF), cobalt nitrate hexahydrate (Co(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>·6H<sub>2</sub>O), chromium(III) nitrate nonahydrate  $(Cr(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>·9H<sub>2</sub>O)$ , lead chloride (PbCl<sub>2</sub>), mercury nitrate monohydrate  $(Hg(NO<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>·H<sub>2</sub>O)$ , and zinc chloride  $(ZnCl<sub>2</sub>)$  were purchased from Macklin (Shanghai, China). Acetate buffers (HAc/NaAc buffer, 0.2 M) with pH values of 2.7, 3.4, 4.5, 5.6, and 6.5 were from Leagene (Beijing, China). Milli-Q water (18 MΩ·cm<sup>-1</sup>) was used for the preparation of all solutions.

**Characterization.** The catalytic reactions were carried out in cuvette and monitored using Varian Cary 60 ultraviolet-visible-near infrared (UV-Vis-NIR) spectrophotometer (Agilent Technologies, USA). Raman spectra were recorded from a Renishaw InVia Raman microscope.

### **Supplementary Figure Information**



**Figure S1.** Effect of reaction temperature on the formation of the PNA. Evolutions of UV-vis absorption spectra during  $\alpha$ -NA oxidation by H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in the presence of 5  $\mu$ M Cu<sup>2+</sup> at reaction temperature of (A) 30 °C, (B) 40 °C, (C) 50 °C, (D) 60 °C, and (E) 70 °C, respectively. (F) Initial reaction rates at different temperatures. [ $\alpha$ -NA] = 10 mM, [H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>] = 10 mM, and [Cu<sup>2+</sup>] = 5 µM.



**Figure S2.** SERS characterization of PNA formation. (A) TEM image of nanorods. Extinction spectra of (B) NR suspensions before and after incubation with three solutions and corresponding SERS spectra (C) excited using a 785 nm laser.



**Figure S3.** Fe<sup>2+</sup>- or Fe<sup>3+</sup> -catalyzed formation of PNA. A, B) Evolution of UV-vis absorption spectra during  $\alpha$ -NA oxidation by  $H_2O_2$  in the presence of 10  $\mu$ M Fe<sup>2+</sup> or 10  $\mu$ M Fe<sup>3+</sup> in 0.1 M

HAc/NaAc (pH4.5) buffer at the reaction temperature of 50 °C. [α-NA] =10 mM, [H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>] = 10 mM. C)  $A_{500}$  and  $A_{900}$  vs reaction time.

#### **Fe-Fenton reactions**

 $Fe^{2+} + H_2O_2 \rightarrow Fe^{3+} + OH^- + OH$  (eq.1)  $Fe^{3+} + H_2O_2 \rightarrow Fe^{2+} + OOH + H^+$  (eq.2) (eq.2)

In our case, owing to the high concentration of  $H_2O_2$ , the conversion of  $Fe^{3+}$  to  $Fe^{2+}$  is not rate-limiting step (eq.2). Therefore, there is no obvious difference between the formation rate of the PNA catalyzed by  $Fe^{2+}$  and  $Fe^{3+}$ . .



**Figure S4.** Comparison of Fe<sup>3+</sup> and Cu<sup>2+</sup> in catalyzing the oxidative polymerization of  $\alpha$ -NA. (A) 50 °C 20 min. (B) 60 °C 20 min. [α-NA] = 10 mM, [H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>] = 10 mM.



**Figure S5.** Different  $H_2O_2$  concentration dependence of  $Fe^{3+}$  and  $Cu^{2+}$  in catalyzing the oxidative polymerization of  $\alpha$ -NA. A) Reaction temperature of 60 °C for 20 min. B) Reaction temperature of 70 °C for 20 min. Reaction conditions: [α-NA] = 10 mM, [Fe<sup>3+</sup>] = 4 μM. [Cu<sup>2+</sup>] = 4 μM.

At 0.1 mM  $H_2O_2$ , Abs<sub>500 nm</sub> from Fe<sup>3+</sup>-catalyzed system is ca 15-fold of that from Cu<sup>2+</sup>-catalyzed system. Therefore, 0.1 mM  $H_2O_2$  can be used to detect  $Fe^{3+}$ . At 1 mM  $H_2O_2$ ,  $Fe^{3+}$ -catalyzed system reached saturation with H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> concentration, corresponding to a molar ratio of  $[\text{H}_2\text{O}_2]/[\text{Fe}^{3+}]$  of 250. In contrast, a linear concentration dependence between 0.1 mM to 10 mM was observed for  $Cu^{2+}$ -catalyzed system, which may be used for  $H_2O_2$  detection.



**Figure S6.** A<sub>500</sub> of reaction solutions obtained at the default reaction condition in the presence of different metallic ions at 1 μM.



**Figure S7.** Effect of commonly employed masking agents of  $Fe^{3+}$  (1  $\mu$ M) and Cu<sup>2+</sup> (1  $\mu$ M) on inhibiting their catalytic activities for the oxidative polymerization of  $\alpha$ -NA at default reaction conditions. (A, B) In the absence or presence of 10  $\mu$ M blocking agent. (C, D) Effects of citrate concentration.



**Figure S8.** Effect of NaF concentration on catalytic activity. Absorbance spectra for 2  $\mu$ M Fe<sup>3+</sup> (A) or 5  $\mu$ M Cu<sup>2+</sup> (B) obtained at the default reaction conditions. (C) A<sub>500</sub> vs NaF concentration in Cu 2+ -catalyzed reaction.



**Figure S9.** UV-vis absorption spectra of α-NA oxidation at the default reaction condition catalyzed by  $Cu^{2+}$  or  $Fe^{3+}$  in the absence or presence of 10 mM NaF, respectively. Control groups were reaction solutions without adding  $Cu^{2+}$  or  $Fe^{3+}$ . .



Figure S10. Signal stability at room temperature after cooling (A) and after cooling and chelating with EDTA (B), respectively. A $_{500}$  vs time (C). Default detection conditions in the presence of 5  $μ$ M Cu<sup>2+</sup>. .



**Figure S11.** Effect of (A) pH, (B) reaction temperature, (C) H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> concentration, and (D) α-NA

concentration on the UV-vis absorption spectra of  $\alpha$ -NA oxidation by H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in the presence of Cu<sup>2+</sup>. . (E) Corresponding photographs of reaction solutions after the reaction at pH 2.7, pH 3.4, pH 4.5, pH 5.6, and pH 6.5, respectively. Unless specified, the default reaction condition was used.



**Figure S12.** Comparison of calibration plots of  $A_{500}$ ,  $A_{700}$ , and  $A_{900}$  vs  $Cu^{2+}$  concentration.



**Figure S13.** Absorption spectra of α-NA after reaction at the default detection condition in the presence of different metallic cations.  $\text{[Cu}^{2+}\text{]} = 5 \mu\text{M}$ ,  $\text{[M}^{2+}\text{or M}^{3+}\text{]} = 50 \mu\text{M}$ . Control group was reaction solutions without adding metallic cations.



**Figure** S14 Detection of copper (II) ions in the presence of tap water. (A) Absorbance spectra of reaction solutions at different concentrations of copper  $(II)$  ions after reacting at 70 $^{\circ}$ C 20 min and then stopped by ice cold water. (B) A500, A700, and A<sup>900</sup> vs concentration of added copper (II) ions. (C) Photographs of three parallel experiment samples containing 100  $\mu$ l tap water after reaction at the default reaction condition.

#### **Supplementary Table Information**

#### **Table S1 Comparison of colorimetric assays and non-colorimetric methods for**

**Cu 2+ detection**



References

- 1 A. Sadollahkhani, A. Hatamie, O. Nur, M. Willander, B. Zargar and I. Kazeminezhad, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2014, **6**, 17694-17701.
- 2 N. V. Ghule, R. S. Bhosale, A. L. Puyad, S. V. Bhosale and S. V. Bhosale, *Sens. Actuators, B*, 2016, **227**, 17-23.
- 3 G. Nsengiyuma, R. Hu, J. Li, H. Li and D. Tian, *Sens. Actuators, B*, 2016, **236**, 675-681.
- 4 X. Wei, H. Xu, W. Li and Z. Chen, *Sens. Actuators, B*, 2017, **241**, 498-503.
- 5 Z. Zhang, W. Zhao, C. Hu, D. Guo and Y. Liu, *J. Sci.: Adv. Mater. Devices*, 2022, **7**, 100420.
- 6 H. Zhou, T. Chai, L. Peng, W. Zhang, T. Tian, H. Zhang and F. Yang, *Dyes Pigm.*, 2023, **210**, 111028.

7 L. Yang, N. Huang, L. Huang, M. Liu, H. Li, Y. Zhang, S. Yao, *Anal. Methods*, 2017, **9**, 618-624.

8 Z. Zhou, S.Chen, Y. Huang, B. Gu, J. Li, C. Wu, P. Yin, Y. Zhang, H. Li, *Biosensors and Bioelectronics*, 2022, 198, 113858

9 Z. Zhou, H.Tang, S. Chen, Y. Huang, X. Zhu, H. Li, Y. Zhang, S. Yao, *Food Chemistry*, 2021, **343**, 128513.