Supporting information

Pyrene-based simple but highly selective fluorescence sensor for Cu^{2+} ion via *static* excimer mechanism

Soma Sarkar, Swapnadip Roy, Anindita Sikdar, R. N. Saha, Sujit S. Panja^{*}

Table of content

1.	ESI - MS Spectrum of L	Fig. S1
2.	¹ H NMR (CDCl ₃) spectrum of L	Fig.S2
3.	FTIR spectrum of L	Fig.S3
4.	Binding constant	Fig.S4
5.	Changes in quantum yield with water variation	Fig.S5
6.	Effect of different counter anions of Cu ²⁺	Fig.S6
7.	Job's plot	Fig.S7
8.	Reversible binding with KI	Fig.S8
9.	Calibration curve	Fig.S9
10.	Determination of Cu ²⁺ in drinking water samples	Table S1



Fig. S1 ESI-MS spectrum of L



Fig. S2 ¹H NMR (CDCl₃) spectrum of L



Fig. S3 FTIR spectrum of L



Fig. S4 Determination of the binding constant of L for Cu^{2+} (4.583 X 10³ M^{-1/2}).



Fig. S5 Changes in quantum yield of L (5 μ M) in CH₃CN upon varying the concentration of H₂O.



Fig. S6 Fluorescence spectra of L (5 μ M) with different salts of Cu²⁺ (SO₄²⁻, Cl⁻, NO₃⁻, OAc⁻ taken as counter ions) (100 μ M) in Tris-HCl (10 mM, pH =7) buffer containing CH₃CN/H₂O (v/v = 1:1). (λ_{ex} =350 nm, λ_{em} =452 nm, Slit: 2.5 nm).



Fig. S7 Job's plot of $L+Cu^{2+}$ complex in Tris-HCl (10 mM, pH =7) buffer containing CH₃CN/H₂O (v/v = 1:1) solution gives rise to a 2:1 stoichiometry.



Fig. S8 Fluorescence spectra of reversible binding of L(5 μ M) with Cu²⁺ (100 μ M) by adding KI (0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 55 and 60 μ M) in Tris-HCl (10 mM, pH =7) buffer containing CH₃CN-H₂O (v/v = 1:1) solution. (λ_{ex} =350 nm, λ_{em} =452 nm, Slit: 2.5 nm).



Fig. S9 Calibration Curve of Fluorescence intensity vs. concentration of Cu^{2+} ion in TrisHCl (20 mM, pH = 7) buffer(λ_{ex} =350 nm, λ_{em} =460 nm, Slit: 2.5 nm).

Table S1: Determination of Cu^{2+} in drinking water samples collected from different places With 1µM externally added Cu^{2+}

Source of tap water sample*	$\begin{array}{cc} Cu & found \\ without \\ externally \\ added & Cu^{2+} \\ (\mu M) \end{array}$	Cu found by externally added 1 μ M Cu ²⁺ (μ M)	% of Deviation
Site – A	0.128	1.13	0.17
Site – B	0.105	1.106	0.09
Site – C	0.26	1.272	0.12
Site – D	0.163	1.164	0.08
Site – E	0.228	1.231	0.16
Site – F	0.241	1.243	0.12

With 2 μM externally added $\text{Cu}^{^{2+}}$

Source of tap water sample [*]	$\begin{array}{c} Cu & found \\ without \\ externally \\ added & Cu^{2+} \\ (\mu M) \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ccc} Cu & found & by \\ externally added 2 \\ \mu M \ Cu^{2+} \ (\mu M) \end{array}$	% of Deviation
Site – A	0.128	2.136	0.4
Site – B	0.105	2.109	0.2
Site – C	0.26	2.276	0.7
Site – D	0.163	2.157	0.3
Site – E	0.228	2.238	0.5
Site – F	0.241	2.251	0.4

With 4 μM externally added $\text{Cu}^{^{2+}}$

Source of tap water sample [*]	$\begin{array}{ll} Cu & found \\ without \\ externally \\ added & Cu^{2+} \\ (\mu M) \end{array}$	Cu found by externally added 4 μ M Cu ²⁺ (μ M)	% of Deviation
Site – A	0.128	4.134	0.15
Site – B	0.105	4.19	0.12
Site – C	0.26	4.27	0.23
Site – D	0.163	4.159	0.1
Site – E	0.228	4.237	0.2
Site – F	0.241	4.247	0.14