

Supporting Information for

A novel dinuclear Schiff base copper(II) complex modified electrode for ascorbic acid catalytic oxidation and determination

Zhijun Zhang^a, Xi Li^{a, b*}, Chenggang Wang^c, Chaocan Zhang^{d*}, Peng Liu^{a, b}, Tingting Fang^a, Yan Xiong^a, Wenjing Xu^a
Yan Xiong^a, Wenjing Xu^a

^aDepartment of Chemistry, School of Science, Wuhan University of Technology, Wuhan 430070, PR China

^bInstitute of High Pressure and Temperature Physics, School of Science, Wuhan University of Technology, Wuhan 430070, PR China

^cCollege of Chemistry, Central China Normal University, Wuhan 430079, PR China

^dSchool of Materials Science and Engineering, Wuhan University of Technology, Wuhan 430070, PR China

Table S1 Comparison of the analytical data's obtained by some modified electrodes proposed for the determination of ascorbic acid

Working electrode	Modified material	pH	$E_{pa}(V)$	Method	Linear range(μM)	Detection Limit(μM)	Ref.
CPE ^a	SiO ₂ /SnO ₂ /Phosphate/Meldola's blue	7.0	0.04 vs. SCE	amperometric	0.4 - 2000	0.4	[1]
GCE ^b	ruthenium oxide hexacyanoferrate	6.9	0.1 vs. Ag/Cl(sat)	FIA ^l	100 - 1000	2.2	[2]
GCE	Poly(direct blue 71)	7.0	0.1 vs. Ag/AgCl(sat)	amperometric	1-100	1	[3]
RGCDE ^c	cadmium pentacyanonitrosylferrate film	7.0	0.5 vs. Ag/AgCl(3M)	voltammetry	5 - 50	2.25	[4]
GCE	poly(luminol)/ ZnO-NPs hybrid film	7.0	0.1 vs. Ag/AgCl(sat)	amperometric	1 - 360	1	[5]
CPE	2,2'-(1,8-octanediylbisnitriloethylidene)-bis-hydroquinone	7.0	0.169 vs. Ag/AgCl	DPV ^m	5 - 30 40 - 1500	0.6	[6]
PtE ^d	Cu(II)-zeolite	4.5	0.11 vs. Ag/AgCl	CV ⁿ	3 - 6000	0.276	[7]
AuE ^e	Laccase/CdTe/cysteine	4.5	0.36 vs. SCE	amperometric	10 - 1400	1.4	[8]
GCE	Fe(CN) ₆ ³⁻ /PAH/PSS-CaCO ₃ /CS ⁱ	7.0	0.27 vs. Ag/AgCl(sat)	amperometric	1 - 2143	0.7	[9]
CFME ^f	nickel oxide /ruthenium hexacyanoferrate	2.0	0.23 vs. Ag/AgCl(sat)	amperometric	10 - 1600	1	[10]
AuE	Polyaniline-poly(acrylic acid)	6.98	0.1 vs. SCE	amperometric	1 - 9300	1	[11]
GCE	MWNT-silica-NW-AuNPs	7.0	0.23 vs. Ag/AgCl(sat)	CV	1000 - 5000	-	[12]
GCE	Pd nanowire	14.0	0.18 vs. Ag/AgCl(sat)	amperometric	25 - 900	0.2	[13]
PGE ^g	mesopore-rich active carbon	7.0	-0.02 vs. SCE	amperometric	0.5 - 2000	0.3	[14]
GCE	NiHCF-PEDOT hybrid Film ^j	7.0	0.2 vs. Ag/AgCl(sat)	amperometric	5 - 150 155 - 300	1	[15]
GCE	[1-butyl-3-methylimidazolium] ₆ P ₂ Mo ₁₈ O ₆₂	7.0	0.07 vs. Ag/AgCl	amperometric	0.1 - 22000	<0.1	[16]
AuE	propargyl- functionalized ferrocene	7.1	0.3 vs. Ag/AgCl(sat)	EIS ^o	5pM - 1nM	2.6pM	[17]
ITOE ^h	Naphthol green B and layered double hydroxides nanoplatelets	7.5	0.7 vs. Ag/AgCl(sat)	CV	1.2 - 55.2	0.51	[18]
PtE	ascorbate oxidase in PEDOT/MWCNTs ^k	6.5	0.4 vs. SCE	amperometric	50 - 20000	15	[19]
AuE	MWCNT/PANI immobilized with ascorbate oxidase	5.8	0.6 vs. Ag/AgCl	amperometric	2 - 206	0.9	[20]
GCE	[Cu ₂ (Sal-Gly) ₂ (H ₂ O) ₂]	6.8	0.16 vs. SCE	amperometric	2 - 500	0.39	Present work

a CPE carbon paste electrode

b GCE glassy carbon electrode

c RDE rotating glassy carbon disk electrode

d PtE platinum electrode

e AuE gold electrode

f CFME carbon fiber microelectrode

g PGE pyrolytic graphite electrode

h ITOE indium tin oxide electrode

i PAH = poly(allylamine) hydrochloride PSS = poly(sodium 4-styrenesulfonate) CS = chitosan

j NiHCF-PEDOT = nickel hexacyanoferrate and poly(3,4-ethylenedioxythiophene) hybrid fil

k PEDOT = poly(3,4-ethylenedioxythiophene)

l FIA = flow injection analysis

m DPV = Differential pulse voltammetry

n CV = Cyclic voltammetry

o EIS = Electrochemical impedance spectroscopy

References:

- [1] R. F. de Castilho, E. B. R. de Souza, R. V. da S. Alfaya and A. A. da S. Alfaya, *Electroanal.*, 2008, **20**, 157.
- [2] T. R. L. C. Paixão, M. Bertotti, *J. Pharm. Biomed. Anal.*, 2008, **46**, 528.
- [3] S. A. Kumar, P. H. Lo and S. M. Chen. *Biosens. Bioelectron.*, 2008, **24**, 518.
- [4] H. Razmi and M. Harasi, *Int. J. Electrochem. Sci.*, 2008, **3**, 82.
- [5] S. A. Kumar, H. W. Cheng and S. M. Chen, *React. Funct. Polym.*, 2009, **69**, 364.
- [6] M. A. Mohammad, H. Fahime, Z. Hamid Reza, N. Hossein and N. Maryam, *J. Appl. Electrochem.*, 2009, **39**, 1117.
- [7] T. Rohani and M. A. Taher, *Talanta*, 2009, **78**, 743.
- [8] Z. Wang, Q. Xu, J. H. Wang, Q. Yang, J. H. Yu and Yuan-Di Zhao, *Microchim. Acta*, 2009, **165**, 387.
- [9] F. Li, C. F. Tang, S. F. Liu and G. R. Ma, *Electrochim. Acta*, 2010, **55**, 838.
- [10] E. A. Hutton, R. Pauliukaitė, S. B. Hocevar, B. Ogorevc and M. R. Smyth, *Anal. Chim. Acta*, 2010, **678**, 176.
- [11] Y. H. Tang, K. X. Pan, X. J. Wang, C. B. Liu and S. L. Luo, *Microchim. Acta*, 2010, **168**, 231.
- [12] D. Ragupathy, A. I. Gopalan and K. P. Lee, *Sens. Actuators B*, 2010, **143**, 696.
- [13] D. Wen, S. J. Guo, S. J. Dong and E. K. Wang. *Biosens. Bioelectron.*, 2010, **26**, 1056.
- [14] G. Z. Hu, Y. Guo, Q. M. Xue, S. J. Shao, *Electrochim. Acta*, 2010, **55**, 2799.
- [15] T. H. Tsai, T. W. Chen and S. M. Chen, *Electroanal.*, 2010, **22**, 1655.
- [16] M. Ammam and E. B. Easton, *Electrochim. Acta*, 2011, **56**, 2847.
- [17] S. Y. Qiu, S. Gao, Q. D. Liu, Z. Y. Lin, B. Qiu and G. N. Chen, *Biosens. Bioelectron.*, 2011, **26**, 4326.
- [18] X. G. Kong, W. Y. Shi, J. W. Zhao, M. Wei and X. Duan, *Talanta*, 2011, **85**, 493.
- [19] M. Liu, Y. P. Wen, J. K. Xu, H. H. He, D. Li, R. R. Yue and G. D. Liu, *Anal. Sci.*, 2011, **27**, 477.
- [20] N. Chauhan, J. Narang and C. S. Pundir, *Analyst*, 2011, **136**, 1938.