Bio-distribution and interaction with dopamine of fluorescence nanodots from roasted chicken

Xunyu Song,^{a,b} Haitao Wang,^{a,b} Run Zhang,^c Chenxu Yu^d and Mingqian Tan^{a,b*}

^aSchool of Food Science and Technology, Dalian Polytechnic University, Qinggongyu

an1, Ganjingzi District, Dalian 116034, Liaoning, P. R. China

^bNational Engineering Research Center of Seafood, Dalian 116034, Liaoning, P. R.

China

^cAustralian Institute for Bioengineering and Nanotechnology, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, 4072, Australia

^dDepartment of Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering, Iowa State University,

Ames, IA 50011, USA

*Tel & Fax: +86-411-86318657. E-mail: mqtan@dlpu.edu.cn, ORCID:

000000275350035.



Fig. S1 TEM images of the sample from (a) raw chicken and (b) roast chicken at 150 °C.



Fig. S2 High resolution TEM (HR-TEM) image of (a) FND-200, (b) FND-250 and (c)

FND-300.



Fig. S3 FTIR spectra of FND-200, FND-250 and FND-300 extracted from the roasted chicken.



Fig. S4 (a) XPS survey spectrum of FND-200. (b) High-resolution C_{1s} spectrum of FND-200. (c) High-resolution O_{1s} spectrum of FND-200.



Fig. S5 (a) XPS survey spectrum of FND-250. (b) High-resolution C_{1s} spectrum of FND-250. (c) High-resolution O_{1s} spectrum of FND-250.



Fig. S6 (a) XPS survey spectrum of FND-300. (b) High-resolution C_{1s} spectrum of FND-300. (c) High-resolution O_{1s} spectrum of FND-300.



Fig. S7 Photostability of FNDs under incandescent lamp.



Fig. S8 (a) Waterfall mapping of transverse (T_2) relaxation times measured from the roasted chicken at different roasted temperature. (b) Relative contrast intensity of MRI image of the roast chicken at different temperature.



Fig. S9 Laser scanning confocal microscopy images of HePG2 cells under bright field, by excitation at 405 nm. Cells without FNDs were used as a control. Scale bar = 30μ m.



Fig. S10 FL emission spectra of FDN-250, FCs-1 and FCs-2 under the excitation wavelength of 365 nm.



Fig. S11 Change of particle size of FCs.



Fig. S12 Cytotoxicity of FND-200, FND-250 and FND-300, against HePG2 cell

line at concentration of 0, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, 1, 2 and 4 mg/mL.

Sample	C (%)	N (%)	O (%)	O/C (%)	N/C (%)
FND-200	77.02	3.19	19.55	25.38	4.14
FND-250	67.75	14.27	17.46	25.77	21.06
FND-300	67.61	15.36	16.40	24.26	22.72

Table S1. Elemental content of FNDs.

Temperature	T (ma)	T (ma)	T (ma)	4	4	4
(°C)	<i>I</i> ₂₁ (IIIS)	I ₂₂ (ms)	I ₂₃ (IIIS)	A ₂₁	A ₂₂	A ₂₃
0	5.37±2.73	43.29±0.00	305.39±0.00	3.28±1.89	190.25±13.40	2.07±0.74
150	5.17±1.06	23.70±1.86	135.65±37.50	3.79±0.90	112.97±2.44	3.20±1.10
200	3.91±0.80	19.67±1.62	121.46±18.59	5.39±3.09	95.27±11.26	3.77±0.74
250	2.81±0.43	13.02±1.99	115.72±16.11	10.52±1.94	22.37±3.37	3.05±0.89
300	2.02±0.28	9.57±2.65	44.17±11.30	5.43±1.33	10.26±3.37	4.55±0.91

Table S2. Relaxation data of roasted chicken at different temperatures.

Peak area A_{21} , A_{22} and A_{23} are the measured peak area value per gram chicken sample.