A new method for cartap detection with high sensitivity and selectivity based on the inner filter effect between GSH-Cu NCs and Au NPs

Haijian Liu^{ab*}, Libin Dong^a, Miao Wang^a, Guofu Huang^{ab*}

^a Shandong Peninsula Engineering Research Center of Comprehensive Brine Utilization, Weifang

University of Science and Technology, Shouguang, 262700 Weifang, China

^b Weifang Key Laboratory of Pollution Control and Resource Utilization of Chemical Wastewater,

Weifang University of Science and Technology, Shouguang, 262700 Weifang, China

*Corresponding author:

Haijian Liu, E-mail: liuhaijian.1987@163.com

Guofu Huang, E-mail: 280525600@qq.com

Fig.S1 The fluorescence intensity of GSH-Cu NCs stored at 4 °C for 2 months.



Fig.S2 Photostability of the GSH-Cu NCs measured with a fluorescence spectrophotometer at 20 min intervals ($\lambda ex = 430$ nm).



Fig.S3 The fluorescence intensity of GSH-Cu NCs in the presence of different concentrations of NaCl.



Fig.S4 Fluorescence intensity of GSH-Cu NCs in the presence of difference Au NPs concentrations (0, 0.58, 0.87, 1.17, 1.46, 1.75, 2.62, 2.93 nM).



Fig.S5 (a) different concentrations of Au NPs with 80 nM cartap, (b) different pH in the presence of 80 nM cartap and 1.75 nM Au NPs and (c) the incubation time in the presence of 80 nM cartap, 1.75 nM Au NPs, pH 7.0. Δ F represents the fluorescence changes with and without cartap.







(c)



Fig.S6 Fluorescence emission spectra (A), (C) and the corresponding fluorescence changes (B), (D) of the GSH-Cu NCs and Au NPs system with various interfering substances.



Fig.S7 (A)TEM image of Au NPs; (B)TEM image of AuNPs after the addition of cartap.



Fig.S8 DLS images of AuNPs (A) and AuNPs after the addition of cartap (B).



Methods	Range	LOD	Ref
CB[7]-PAL complex	30–8770 nM	10 nM	1
Au NPs	180–2190 nM	150 nM	2
Au@Ag nanoparticles	20–240 nM	22.64 nM	3
CdTe QDs and Au NPs	40–1830 nM	30 nM	4
CdTe QDs and MA-Au NPs	20–100 nM	4.02 nM	5
CDs and Au NPs	5-300 nM	3.84 nM	6
GSH-Cu NCs and Au NPs	7-100 nM	3.34 nM	This work

Table S1 Comparison of analytical performance of some assays for cartap detection.

 Table S2 Detection of cartap in Chinese cabbage samples via the proposed method

 and GC-MS method

		The proposed method		GC-MS method	
Sample	Spiked	Found	Recovery ± RSD	Found	Recovery ± RSD
	(nM)	(n M)	(%) (n = 3)	(nM)	(%) (n = 3)
Chinese	20	21.36	106.8 ± 5.82	19.28	96.4 ± 3.57
cabbage	40	36.57	91.4 ± 4.26	41.67	104.2 ± 1.54
	80	75.23	94 ± 2.89	78.81	98.5 ± 3.63

- 1. X. Jing, L. M. Du, H. Wu, W. Y. Wu and Y. X. Chang, J. Integr. Agric., 2012, 11, 1861-1870.
- W. Liu, D. H. Zhang, Y. F. Tang, Y. S. Wang, F. Yan, Z. H. Li, J. L. Wang and H. S. Zhou, *Talanta*, 2012, 101, 382-387.
- 3. P. Y. Yuan, R. Z. Ma and Q. H. Xu, Sci. China: Chem., 2016, 59, 78-82.
- 4. J. J. Guo, X. Liu, H. T. Gao, J. X. Bie, Y. Zhang, B. F. Liu and C. Y. Sun, *RSC Adv.*, 2014, 4, 27228-27235.
- H. X. Wu, C. J. Hou, H. B. Fa, L. Dong, Y. Ma, M. Yang, C. H. Shen, J. Zhou and D. Q. Huo, *Nano*, 2016, 11.
- 6. Y. X. Yang, J. Z. Hou, D. Q. Huo, X. F. Wang, J. W. Li, G. L. Xu, M. H. Bian, Q. He, C. J. Hou and M. Yang, *Microchim. Acta.*, 2019, **186**, 1-8.