Supporting information for

A chronopotentiometric flow injection system for aptasensing of *E. coli O157*

Jiahong Lei, Jiawang Ding* and Wei Qin*

Key Laboratory of Coastal Environmental Processes and Ecological Remediation, Yantai Institute of Coastal Zone Research (YIC), Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS); Shandong Provincial Key Laboratory of Coastal Environmental Processes, YICCAS, Yantai, Shandong 264003, P. R. China *Corresponding author: Telephone: +86 535 2109156, Fax: +86535 2109000, E-mail: jwding@yic.ac.cn; wqin@yic.ac.cn

Materials and Methods. 2-Nitrophenyl octyl ether (o-NPOE), high molecular weight poly(vinyl chloride) (PVC), dinonylnaphthalene sulfonic (DNNS, 50 wt% solutions in tetradodecylammonium tetrakis(4-chlorophenyl)borate heptane). (ETH 500). protamine sulfate salt from herring, and tris(hydroxymethyl)aminomethane (Tris) were purchased from sigma. Bacterial strains for Salmonella typhimurium, and Listeria monocytogenes were kindly provided by Yantai Import and Export Inspection and Quarantine Bureau. The strain of E. coli O157 ATCC35150 and the chromogenic medium (SMAC, HBPM017) were brought from Qingdao Hope Biotechnology Co. Ltd (Qingdao, China). The number of the colony-forming unit per mL (CFU mL⁻¹) for each culture was determined by the surface plate counting method. The morphology of E. coli O157 was characterized by scanning electron microscopy (SEM, JSM5600 LV, operating at 5.0 KV).¹



Fig. S1. Photograph of the detection chamber.



E. coli O157 ATCC 35150

Fig. S2. Typical characteristics of *E. coli O157* ATCC35150 in the chromogenic medium.



E. coli O157 ATCC 35150

Fig. S3. SEM imagine of *E. coli O157* ATCC35150.



Fig. S4. Potentiometric responses of the electrode to 1.0 μM aptamer Eco 3 Rev in the absence of *E. coli O157*.

Calculations of the detection limit

As shown in Figure S5, the s.d. value for the blank measurement was 0.503 mV (n=3). (The potential peak heights were 13.6 mV, 13.2 mV and 12.6 mV, respectively). The detection limit is given by the equation DL= 3sb1/S, where the sb1 is the standard deviation of the blank measurements and the sensitivity of the calibration graph. In the presence of 10 CFU mL⁻¹ target bacteria, the difference in the potential peak height was 1.65 ± 1.3 mV (as shown in figure 4B). Thus, S can be obtained as (1.65 mV / 10 CFU mL⁻¹). The detection limit of *E. Coli O157* was calculated as below:

 $DL = 3 \times 0.503 \text{ mV} / (1.65 \text{ mV} / 10 \text{ CFU mL}^{-1})$

Since the concentration of the bacteria was defined as the number of colony-forming units per mL, the detection limit was calculated to be ca 10 CFU mL⁻¹ (3σ).



Fig. S5. Potential responses to *E. coli O157* ATCC35150, *Listeria monocytogenes*, and *Salmonella typhimurium*. The concentration of *E. coli O157* and that of other bacteria were 10^7 CFU mL⁻¹ and 10^8 CFU mL⁻¹, respectively.

Detection method	Detection limit (CFU/mL)	Detection range (CFU/mL)	Reference
ELISA with electrochemical detection	10 ³	10^{3} - 10^{8}	2
ELISA with impedometric detection	6 × 10 ³	6×10^3 - 6×10^7	3
Chemiluminescence immunoassay	1.2×10^{3}	$4.3 \times 10^{3} - 4.3 \times 10^{5}$	4
immunomagnetic separation with realtime RT-PCR	10	10-107	5
Inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry	500	5×10^2 - 5×10^5	6
Magnetoelastic immunosensors	10 ²	$10^2 - 10^6$	7
Surface plasmon-enhanced fluorescence spectroscopy	10	10-106	8
Potentiometric aptasensing	10	10-104	this work

Table S1. Comparison of the detection limits for measuring E. coli O157 usingdifferent methods.

References

- 1. J. W. Ding, J. X. Lei, X. Ma, J. Gong and W. Qin, Anal. Chem., 2014, 86, 9412-9416.
- M. R. Akanda, V. Tamilavan, S. Park, K. Jo, M. H. Hyun and H. Yang, *Anal. Chem.*, 2013, 85, 1631-1636
- 3. C. M. Ruan, L. J. Yang and Y. B. Li, Anal. Chem., 2002, 74, 4814-4820.
- 4. Y. Zhang, C. Tan, R. H. Fei, X. X. Liu, Y. Zhou, J. Chen, H. C. Chen, R. Zhou and Y. G. Hu, *Anal. Chem.*, 2014, **86**, 1115-1122.
- 5. H. J. Lee, B. C. Kim, K.W. Kim, Y. K. Kim, J. Kim and M. K. Oh, *Biosens. Bioelectron.*, 2009, **24**, 3550-3555.
- 6. F. Li, Q. Zhao, C. Wang, X. F. Lu, X. F. Li and X. C. Le, Anal. Chem., 2010, 82, 3399-3403.
- 7. C. Ruan, K. F. Zeng, O. K. Varghese and C. A. Grimes, Anal. Chem., 2003, 75, 6494-6498.
- 8. C. J. Huang, J. Dostalek, A. Sessitsch and W. Knoll, Anal. Chem., 2011, 83, 674-677.