1. The construction of standard curve for the detection of enzyme activity.

Experiment: 0.15 mol L⁻¹ Tris buffer (pH 8.0) was used to prepare 1.8×10^{-4} mol L⁻¹ DTNB solution. Then 0.025, 0.050, 0.075, 0.100 and 0.125 mmol L⁻¹ L-cysteine hydrochloride was respectively dissolved in the DTNB solution. After that, the AChE-functionalized 2D-PC was respectively placed into a series of L-cysteine hydrochloride solutions and UV absorbance at 412 nm was monitored.

| Table S1 Data of Standard Curve | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Concentration of L- | | | | |
| cysteine | Absorbance | Absorbance | Absorbance | Absorbance |
| hydrochloride | 1 | 2 | 3 | average |
| (mmol.L ⁻¹) | | | | |
| 0.025 | 0.32253 | 0.3224 | 0.3225 | 0.322477 |
| 0.050 | 0.65044 | 0.65027 | 0.65001 | 0.65024 |
| 0.075 | 0.972 | 0.97182 | 0.97154 | 0.971787 |
| 0.100 | 1.26311 | 1.26312 | 1.26234 | 1.262857 |
| 0. 125 | 1.59422 | 1.59169 | 1.59354 | 1.59315 |
| 0.150 | 1.89241 | 1.89133 | 1.89098 | 1.891573 |
| 0. 175 | 2.21499 | 2.21065 | 2.21872 | 2.214787 |



Figure S1 Standard Curve of L-cysteine hydrochloride

2. Measurement of binding amounts of AChE

2.1. Standard curve

Experiment: 2 mL obtained G-250 solution was mixed with 50 μ L AChE solution varied from 0.5 to 3.0 mg/mL (adjusted with 0.15 mol L-1 Tris-HCl buffer, pH=7.4) and UV absorbance at 595 nm was measured.



Figure S2 Standard Curve of AChE solution

2.2. Detection of AChE-functionalized 2D-PC

The amount of AChE on film (mg cm⁻²) meets following equation: $m = 4(A_0 - A_1)/(0.25 \times 12K)$ (S1)

where A_0 and A_1 are AChE solution before and after modification respectively, K is the slope of standard curve, 4 is the volume of AChE solution, 0.25 is the area of every film, 12 represents the amount of films.

The change of absorbance $({}^{A_0} - A_1)$ and the amounts of AChE on film were depicted in table S2.

| | sample 1 | sample 2 | sample 3 | sample average |
|--|----------|----------|----------|-------------------|
| Change of absorbance | 0.1046 | 0.1517 | 0.1131 | 0.1231 |
| The amounts of AChE on film (mg cm ⁻²) | 0.36 | 0.53 | 0.39 | 0.43 |

Table S2 data of AChE-functionalized 2D-PC

3. water-solubility of organophosphates

| organophosphates | dipterex | dichlorvos | malathion | methidathion | acephate | glufosinate- ammonium |
|------------------|----------|------------|--|---|----------|--------------------------|
| water-solubility | soluble | soluble | 4.39×10^{-4} mol/L (slightly soluble) | 7.94 × 10 ⁻⁴ mol/L (slightly soluble) | soluble | soluble |

Table S3 Water-solubility of some organophosphates ^a.

^a Data sources: https://www.baidu.com/

4. Calculations of limit of detection (LOD)

We surmised that there was a linear correlation between particle spacing of our sensor and dipterex concentration at the range of $0\sim10^{-14}$ mol L⁻¹ before calculations. We measured the responsivity of our AChE-PC sensor to a 50 mL of dipterex at a concentration of 10^{-14} mol L⁻¹ and a 38 nm decrease in particle spacing was observed. The resulting responsivity was calculated as S=38 × 10^{14} nm/(mol L⁻¹). At the blank solution, the average standard deviation is σ =8.9 nm. As a consequence, the LOD= $3.3 \times \sigma/S=7.7 \times 10^{-15}$ mol L⁻¹.

5. Performance comparison of different materials

| ruble 5 r comparison of various analytical methods for sensing barm analogs | | | | | |
|---|--------------|--|--|------------|--|
| Method Names | Analyte | Strengths/ Weakness | Sensitivity | References | |
| AChE- functionali zed 2D-PC | Diptere x | S: detecting organophosphate with high sensitivity; miniaturized; simple detection device; simple preparation; W: can't detect dipterex in complex environment until now. | LOD: 0.77 x 10 ⁻ ¹⁴ mol L ⁻¹ | This study | |
| 3D-PC biosensor | Sarin | S: detecting a real chemical warfare with high sensitivity; | LOD: 10 ⁻¹⁵ mol L ⁻¹ | [1] | |

Table S4 Comparison of various analytical methods for sensing Sarin analogs

| | | W: can't detect Sarin in | | | | |
|---------|-------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----|--|--|
| | | complex environment until | | | | |
| | | now | | | | |
| | | S: high sensitivity; using a | | | | |
| SERS | 1717 | portable device; | LOD: ~13 fmol | | | |
| | VX; | W: relatively high cost; | (VX); ~670 fmol | [2] | | |
| | tabun | require extensive sample | (tabun) | | | |
| | | pre-treatment; | | | | |
| | | S: enormous electro- | | | | |
| | DMMP | magnetic enhancement: | | | | |
| SERS | ; PMP; | W: relatively high cost | LOD: lower than | [3] | | |
| 2210 | DEPA; | require extensive sample | 1 ppm; | | | |
| | CEES | nre-treatment. | | | | |
| | VX and | S: could distinguish the | | | | |
| | its | nerve agent VX and its | | | | |
| | hydroly | hydrolysis products. | | | | |
| SERS | sis | W· relatively high cost. | 50-100ug L ⁻¹ | [4] | | |
| | product | require extensive semple | | | | |
| | product | require extensive sample | | | | |
| | 8 | Se high appointivity large | | | | |
| | DCP | S: nigh sensitivity; large | | | | |
| | | emission shift; | | | | |
| CIEE/FS | | W: time-consuming; | LOD: 1 / nmol L- | [5] | | |
| | | require extensive sample | 1 | | | |
| | | pre-treatment; relying on | | | | |
| | | sophisticated instruments | | | | |
| | | S: sufficient separation of | | | | |
| | | these four compounds in | | | | |
| | DMT: | environmental forensic | LOD: 0.015- | | | |
| HPLC- | DET: | analysis of samples with | 0.025mg L ⁻¹ | | | |
| MS/CE- | DPT; DIT | minimum sample pre- | (HPLC-MS); | [6] | | |
| UV | | treatment; | 1.5-2mg L ⁻¹ (CE- | | | |
| | | W: time-consuming; | UV) | | | |
| | | require extensive sample | | | | |
| | | pre-treatment; relying on | | | | |

| | | sophisticated instruments | | |
|---------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------|
| | | S: could detect real | | |
| SPME/GC | TnBP; | samples; good alternative | | |
| | | extraction method; | LOD: 0.2 ng L^{-1} | |
| | | W: time-consuming; | (TnBP); 1.5ng L ⁻ | [7] |
| -1415 | I LI II | require extensive sample | ¹ (TEHP) | |
| | | pre-treatment; relying on | | |
| | | sophisticated instruments | | |
| | | S: realized qualitative and | | |
| | 1/ | quantitative determination | | |
| | nesticid | of pesticide residues in | | |
| SPME/GC | Pesticia | mangoes; | LOD: 1.0-3.3 | [8] |
| -MS | residue | W: time-consuming; | μg kg ⁻¹ | [0] |
| | s | require extensive sample | | |
| | | pre-treatment; relying on | | |
| | | sophisticated instruments | | |
| | | S: gas detection; short | | |
| | Tabun, Sarin, Soman, VX | detection time (2.8s) | | |
| IMS/DMS | | W: time-consuming; | LOD: 20 μ σ m ⁻³ | [9] |
| | | require extensive sample | LOD. 20 Fg III | [2] |
| | | pre-treatment; relying on | | |
| | | sophisticated instruments | | |
| | | S: could detect sample in a | | |
| | DMMP | variety of sample matrixes | | |
| IM(tof)M S | | (water, kerosene, gasoline, | | |
| | | diesel); | LOD: lower than | [10] |
| | | W: time-consuming; | 1000 ppm; | |
| | | require extensive sample | | |
| | | pre-treatment; relying on | | |
| | | sophisticated instruments | | |

Abbreviation: surface-enhanced Raman scattering (SERS); dimethyl methylphonate (DMMP); pinacolyl methylphosphonate (PMP); diethyl phosphoramidate (DEPA); chloroethyl ethylsulfide (CEES); cyclization-induced emission enhancement (CIEE); fluorescence spectrum (FS); diethyl chlorophosphate (DCP); high-performance liquid

chromatography-mass spectrometry (HPLC-MS); capillary electrophoresis with direct ultraviolet detection (CE-UV); N, N-(dialkyl)aminoethanesulfonicacids, where alkyl = methyl, ethyl, n-propyl or iso-propyl (DMT, DET, DPT, and DIT, re-spectively); solid-phase microextraction (SPME); gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS); tri-n-butyl phosphate (TnBP); tris (2-ethylhexyl) phosphate (TEHP); ion mobility spectrometry (IMS); differential mobility spectrometry (DMS); ion mobility orthogonal reflector time-of-flight mass spectrometer (IM-(tof)MS);

References:

[1] C. X. Yan, F. L. Qi, S. G. Li, J. Y. Xu, C. Liu, Z. H. Meng, L. L. Qiu, M. Xue, W. Lu and Z. Q. Yan, Talanta, 2016, 159, 412-417.

[2] A. Hakonen, T. Rindzevicius, M.S. Schmidt, P.O. Andersson, L. Juhlin, M. Svedendahl, A. Boisen, M. Kall, Detection of nerve gases using surface-enhanced Raman scattering substrates with high droplet adhesion, Nanoscale 8 (2016) 1305-1308.

[3] F. Yan, T. Vo-Dinh, Surface-enhanced Raman scattering detection of chemical and biological agents using a portable Raman integrated tunable sensor, Sensor. Actuat. B-Chem. 121 (2007) 61-66.

[4] S. Farquharson, A. Gift, P. Maksymiuk, F. Inscore, Surface-enhanced Raman spectra of VX and its hydrolysis products, Appl. Spectrosc. 59 (2005) 654-660.

[5] A.K. Mahapatra, K. Maiti, S.K. Manna, R. Maji, S. Mondal, C. Das Mukhopadhyay, P. Sahoo, D. Mandal, A cyclization-induced emission enhancement (CIEE)-based ratiometric fluorogenic and chromogenic probe for the facile detection of a nerve agent simulant DCP, Chem. Commun. 51 (2015) 9729-9732.

[6] I. Rodin, A. Stavrianidi, R. Smirnov, A. Braun, O. Shpigun, I. Rybalchenko, New Techniques for Nerve Agent Oxidation Products Determination in Environmental Water by High-Performance Liquid Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry (HPLC-MS) and Capillary Electrophoresis (CE) with Direct Ultraviolet (UV) Detection, Environ. Forensics 14 (2013) 87-96.

[7] Y.C. Tsao, Y.C. Wang, S.F. Wu, W.H. Ding, Microwave-assisted headspace solidphase microextraction for the rapid determination of organophosphate esters in aqueous samples by gas chromatography-mass spectrometry, Talanta 84 (2011) 406-410.

[8] A. Menezes Filho, F.N. dos Santos, P.A. de Paula Pereira, Development, validation and application of a methodology based on solid-phase micro extraction

followed by gas chromatography coupled to mass spectrometry (SPME/GC-MS) for the determination of pesticide residues in mangoes, Talanta 81 (2010) 346-354.

[9] M. Maziejuk, M. Ceremuga, M. Szyposzynska, T. Sikora, A. Zalewska, Identification of organophosphate nerve agents by the DMS detector, Sensor. Actuat. B-Chem. 213 (2015) 368-374.

[10] W.E. Steiner, S.J. Klopsch, W.A. English, B.H. Clowers, H.H. Hill, Detection of a chemical warfare agent simulant in various aerosol matrixes by ion mobility timeof-flight mass spectrometry, Anal. Chem. 77 (2005) 4792-4799.

6. Calculated wavelength of 2D-PC

6.1 The 2D Bragg diffraction equation.

The diffraction process of 2D-PC was illustrated in figure S3, while white source (S1, S2) illuminated below the sample at an incidence angle of 45° (θ), and the structural color was recorded above the sample along the normal.



Figure S3 Illustration of the diffraction process of 2D-PC

The path difference Δ was given by

$$\Delta = n_{air}(AB) = n_{air}(p\sin\theta) = p\sin\theta = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}d\sin\theta$$
(S2)

Where n_{air} is the refractive index of air ($n_{air}=1$), p is the distance between adjacent lattice rows. θ is the incidence angle. According to reference¹, p is relate to the lattice spacing (d) by

$$p = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}d \ (S3)$$

According to Bragg's law, while the path difference (Δ) is equal to a whole number of wavelengths, the diffraction will be strengthened. So the path difference meets following equation:

$$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}d\sin\theta = m\lambda \,(S4)$$

Where m is the diffraction order, λ is the diffracted wavelength. While the incidence angle was fixed, and we surmise the diffraction was the first-order diffraction. According to the determination of particle spacing, we can also calculate the diffracted wavelength of 2D-PC in different condition.



Figure S4 AChE-functionalized 2D-PC (\blacklozenge) and unfunctionalized 2D-PC (\blacktriangle) for dipterex detection.