# Nanoscale



## Novel Magnetic Relaxation Nanosensors: An Unparalleled "Spin" on Influenza Diagnosis

Tyler Shelby,<sup>‡</sup> Tuhina Banerjee,<sup>‡</sup> Jyothi Kallu, Shoukath Sulthana, Irene Zegar, Lisa A. Clough<sup>±</sup> and Santimukul Santra\*

www.rsc.org/

Received 00th January 20xx, Accepted 00th January 20xx

DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

# **Supporting Information**

#### **Experimental Section:**

**Computational Analyses and Modeling.** Prior to conducting the binding and competition assays, the ligands and peptides used for functionalization of the MRnS were analyzed via computational modeling. Programs used for this method of analysis included Avogrado, Open Babel, and Autodock 4. Shown below are verified dockings between H1NA/HA1 and 2,6-sialic acid, ARLPR, EB Peptide and Ste (Figures S2-S6). K<sub>d</sub> values for 2,6-sialic acid, ARLPR and Ste were 12.92 mM, 27.78  $\mu$ M, 4.62 mM, respectively. The interaction between EB Peptide and H1N1/HA1 is shown in Figure S5.

As well, binding between H5N1/HA1 and 2,3-sialic acid, EB Peptide, ARLPR and Ste was analyzed computationally. One of the differences between active residues in H5N1/HA1 vs H1N1/HA1 is the replacement of Glu190 with Leu190. The K<sub>d</sub> values for 2,3-sialic acid, ARLPR and Ste binding were reported as 2.82 mM, 52.05  $\mu$ M and 12.7 mM, respectively.

In addition, it was noted that the Ste  $K_d$  values observed through Autdodock 4 were in the millimolar range, in contrast to both literature reports, and our experimental data, which both showed a  $K_d$  value in the micromolar range. This discrepancy may be due to the rigidity of the docking files used for this computational experiment.

### Synthesis of IONPs and functional MRnS:



Scheme S1: Preparation of iron oxide nanoparticles and subsequent conjugation with targeting ligands via EDC/NHS or CDI chemistry.

## Characterization of IONPs and MRnS:

IONPs and conjugated MRnS were characterized using size and charge data collected via zetasizer.



Figure S1: Characterization of iron oxide nanoparticles and conjugated MRnS using A) zeta-sizer and B)

STEM image.

#### Journal Name

## Structure of sialic acids and EB peptides:



EB Peptide (RRKKAAVALLPAVLLALLAP)



Ste (ARLPRTMV-NH2)

Figure S2: 3D modelling of targeting ligands using Avogadro.

## Autodock 4 studies between hemagglutinin variants and sialic acids:



Figure S3: Computational analysis of sialic acid cell receptors (2,6 and 2,3) with hemagglutinin (H1 and H5).



## Autodock 4 studies between hemagglutinin variants and EB peptides:

Figure S4: Computational analysis of ARLPR with hemagglutinin (H1 and H5).



Figure S5: Computational analysis of EB Peptide with hemagglutinin (H1 and H5).

# Nanoscale



Figure S6: Computational analysis of Ste with hemagglutinin (H1 and H5).

Binding and competition assays using Ste-MRnS

Ste-MRnS Assays with H5N1 A) B) 1.0 1.0 0.8 0.8 AMRcomp 0.6 ₩2 0.4 0.4 3.48 µM 0.2 0.2 0.0 0.0 0.0 2.0x10<sup>-8</sup> 0.0 5.0x10<sup>-6</sup> 1.0x10<sup>-5</sup> [H5N1/HA1] (M) ["Free" Ste] (M)

Figure S7: Binding and competition assays with Ste (7.5x10-3 M) and H5N1/HA1 (0-10x<sup>-6</sup> M).

## Sample of Raw T2 Data:



**Figure S8:** Example of raw T2 data from binding assay between H1N1/HA1 and 2,6-SA–MRnS. A) T2 value with no target protein present. B-C) Increased T2 value in the presence of H1N1/HA1 [3E<sup>-8</sup> M] and [1E<sup>-7</sup> M], respectively.