Electrochemiluminescence detection of chlorpromazine hydrochloride at bare and graphene oxide modified glassy carbon electrodes

Fengyu Liu,** Jiantao Shao,* Yinqi Zhao

^aState Key Laboratory of Fine Chemicals, School of Chemistry, Dalian University of Technology, No. 2, Linggonglu, Ganjingzi District, 116024, Dalian, China. E-mail: <u>liufengyu@dlut.edu.cn</u>

Supporting information



Fig. S1 ECL of 2.0×10^4 mol·L⁻¹ Ru(bpy)₃²⁺ and 1.0×10^{-5} mol·L⁻¹ CPZ under different pH in 0.1 mol·L⁻¹ phosphate buffer at GC electrode, Scan rate: 100 mV·s⁻¹.



Fig. S2 Dependence of different scan rates on ECL increase with 2.0×10^{-4} mol·L⁻¹ Ru(bpy)₃²⁺ and 1.0×10^{-5} mol·L⁻¹ CPZ in 0.1 mol·L⁻¹ phosphate buffer (pH = 7) at GC electrode, Δ ECL = ECL_{after addition of analyst}-ECL_{before addition of analyst}.



Fig. S3 Cyclic voltammograms of CPZ on GC electrode. A: $1.0 \times 10^{-4} \text{ mol} \cdot \text{L}^{-1} \text{ CPZ}$; B(a): $2.0 \times 10^{-4} \text{ mol} \cdot \text{L}^{-1} \text{ Ru}(\text{bpy})_3^{2+}$; B(b): CPZ-Ru(bpy)_3^{2+} (concentration of CPZ: $1.0 \times 10^{-4} \text{ mol} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$; Ru(bpy)_3^{2+}: $2.0 \times 10^{-4} \text{ mol} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$.); scan rate: $100 \text{ mV} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$; scan potential: 0.2 - 1.6 V.



Fig. S4 Dependence of logarithmic ECL increase versus logarithmic concentration of CPZ in 0.1 mol·L⁻¹ phosphate buffer (pH = 7) at GC electrode.



Fig. S5 Dependence of the ECL increase versus the logarithmic concentration of CPZ with $2.0 \times 10^{-4} \text{ mol} \cdot \text{L}^{-1} \text{ Ru(bpy)}_{3^{2+}}$ in 0.1 mol $\cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ phosphate buffer (pH = 7) at GO modified GC electrode.



Fig. S6 Dependence of the ECL increase versus the logarithmic concentration of CPZ with $2.0 \times 10^{-4} \text{ mol} \cdot \text{L}^{-1} \text{ Ru}(\text{phen})_3^{2+}$ in 0.1 mol $\cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ phosphate buffer (pH = 7) at GO modified GC electrode.