## **Electronic Supplementary Information**

## Efficient Electrochemical Detection of Cancer Cells on *in-situ* Surface-Functionalized MoS<sub>2</sub>Nanosheets

Yulin Guo<sup>a</sup>, Yijin Shu<sup>a</sup>, Aiqun Li<sup>a</sup>, Baole Li<sup>a</sup>, Jiang Pi<sup>b</sup>, Jiye Cai<sup>a, c</sup>, Huai-hong Cai<sup>a,\*</sup>, and Qingsheng Gao<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Chemistry, College of Chemistry and Materials Science, Jinan University No. 601 Huangpu Avenue West, Guangzhou 510632, China.

E-mail: tqsgao@jnu.edu.cn, thhcai@jnu.edu.cn

<sup>b</sup>Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of Illinois, Chicago 60612, USA.

<sup>°</sup> State Key Laboratory of Quality Research in Chinese Medicines, Macau University of Science and Technology, Macau 999078, China.



**Fig. S1** TGA curve of bare thiourea (TU), showing an obvious weight loss from 175 to 245°C associated with TU decomposition.



Fig. S2 AFM image of TU-MoS<sub>2</sub>.



Fig. S3 (a) SEM and (b) HR-TEM images of bare  $MoS_2$  after removing TU by  $H_2SO_4$  treatment. After the treatment with 0.05 M  $H_2SO_4$  at 150 °C, the bare  $MoS_2$  nanosheets are finally received. The SEM image of  $MoS_2$  (Figure S3a) identifies the nanosheet-like morphology similar with TU-MoS<sub>2</sub>. The HR-TEM (Figure S3b) shows the visible lattice fringe of 0.27 nm indexed as the (100) or (010) of hexagonal  $MoS_2$ , and an interlayer spacing of 0.62 nm corresponding to  $MoS_2(002)$ .



Fig. S4 XPS profiles of N 1s in TU-MoS<sub>2</sub> and thiourea (TU).



Fig. S5 XPS profiles of Mo 3d and S 2p in TU-MoS<sub>2</sub> and bare MoS<sub>2</sub>, showing the coincident peaks of Mo  $3d_{3/2}$ , Mo  $3d_{5/2}$ , S  $2p_{1/2}$ , and S  $2p_{3/2}$  in the both tow samples. The similar chemical environment of Mo and S is reasonably indicated in TU-MoS<sub>2</sub> and MoS<sub>2</sub>.



**Fig. S6** Reproducibility of GE11/TU-MoS<sub>2</sub>/GCEs biosensor for the repeated three tests with different HepG2 concentration.

Method	cytosensor material	Linear range [cells mL <sup>-1</sup> ]	Detection limit [cells mL <sup>-1</sup> ]	Ref.
Electrochemical impedance spectroscopy	TU-MoS <sub>2</sub> nanosheets	50 - 2.0×10 <sup>6</sup>	50	This work
Differential pulse volammetry	G-quadruplex/hemin /aptamer-AuNPs- HRP	$1.0 \times 10^2 - 1.0 \times 10^7$	30	[1]
ICP-MS	CdSe/ZnS QDs	$200-3 \times 10^4$	61	[2]
Electrochemiluminescence	TiO <sub>2</sub> /CdS	$400 - 1.0 \times 10^4$	396	[3]
Electrochemiluminescence	ZnO@CdS nanorods	$3.0 \times 10^2 - 1.0 \times 10^4$	256	[4]
Atomic force microscope	Au microcantilever	$1.0 \times 10^3$ - $1.0 \times 10^5$	300	[5]

Table S1 Comparison of different cytosensor material for HepG2 cell detection.

[1] D. Sun, J. Lu, Z. Chen, Y. Yu, M. Mo, *Analytica Chimica Acta* **2015**, *885*, 166.

- [2] B. Yang, B. Chen, M. He, B. Hu, Anal. Chem. **2017**, *89*, 1879.
- [3] L. Wang, S. Ma, X. Wang, D. Liu, S. Liu, X. Han, J. Mater. Chem. B 2013, 1, 5021.
- [4] D. Liu, L. Wang, S. Ma, Z. Jiang, B. Yang, X. Han, S. Liu, *Nanoscale* **2015**, *7*, 3627.
- [5] X. Chen, Y. Pan, H. Liu, X. Bai, N. Wang, B. Zhang, *Biosens.* Bioelectron. 2016, 79, 353.