Exploring the Potential of 3D–Printed Solvent Activated Electrodes for Salicylic Acid Analysis

Karolina Kwaczyński^{*, a}, Olga Szymaniec^a, Diana M. Bobrowska^b Lukasz Poltorak^{**, a}

a)University of Lodz, Electrochemistry@Soft Interfaces, Department of Inorganic and Analytical Chemistry, Faculty of Chemistry, University of Lodz, Tamka 12, 91–403 Lodz, Poland

b) Faculty of Chemistry, University of Bialystok, Ciolkowskiego 1K, 15–245, Bialystok, Poland

*First corresponding author: karolina.kwaczynski@chemia.uni.lodz.pl

**Second corresponding author: lukasz.poltorak@chemia.uni.lodz.pl

Table of Contents

- **Page 3 Figure S1.** ATR–FTIR spectra of the 3D printed nonactivated and activated PLA–CB electrode.
- **Page 4 Figure S2.** Profilometric microscopy images of the A) nonactivated and B) activated by tetrahydrofuran (600s) PLA–CB electrode's surface with the corresponding 3D images.
- Page 5 Figure S3. Cyclic voltammograms (CVs) recorded in different concentrations (from 1μM to 200μM) of Fe(CN)₆^{3–} solution (in 0.1M NaNO₃).
- Page 6 Figure S4. A. Cyclic voltammograms of 0.1 mM FcMeOH in 0.1 M NaNO₃ at scan rates ranging from 10 to 350 mV s⁻¹. B. Dependence of anodic and cathodic peak currents (I_p) on the square root of scan rate (v^{1/2}). C. Dependence of peak currents (I_p) on scan rate (v). D. Dependence of peak-to-peak separation (ΔE) with scan rate. E. Ratio of anodic to cathodic peak currents (I_{pa}/I_pc) as a function of scan rate. F. Log–log plot of peak current vs. scan rate.
- Page 7 Figure S5. A. Cyclic voltammograms of 0.1 mM Fc in 0.1 M NaNO₃ at scan rates ranging from 10 to 350 mV s⁻¹. B. Dependence of anodic and cathodic peak currents (I_p) on the square root of scan rate (v^{1/2}). C. Dependence of peak currents (I_p) on scan rate (v). D. Dependence of peak-to-peak separation (ΔE) with scan rate. E. Ratio of anodic to cathodic peak currents (I_{pa}/I_pc) as a function of scan rate. F. Log–log plot of peak current vs. scan rate.
- Page 8 Figure S6. A. Cyclic voltammograms of 0.1 mM DmFc in 0.1 M NaNO₃ at scan rates ranging from 10 to 350 mV s⁻¹. B. Dependence of anodic and cathodic peak currents (I_p) on the square root of scan rate (v^{1/2}). C. Dependence of peak currents (I_p) on scan rate

(v). **D.** Dependence of peak-to-peak separation (ΔE) with scan rate. **E.** Ratio of anodic to cathodic peak currents ($I_{pa}/I_{p}c$) as a function of scan rate. **F.** Log–log plot of peak current vs. scan rate.

- Page 9 Figure S7. A. Cyclic voltammograms of 0.1 mM RuHex in 0.1 M NaNO₃ at scan rates ranging from 10 to 350 mV s⁻¹. B. Dependence of anodic and cathodic peak currents (I_p) on the square root of scan rate (v^{1/2}). C. Dependence of peak currents (I_p) on scan rate (v). D. Dependence of peak-to-peak separation (ΔE) with scan rate. E. Ratio of anodic to cathodic peak currents (I_{pa}/I_pc) as a function of scan rate. F. Log–log plot of peak current vs. scan rate.
- Page 10 Figure S8. The relationship between I. peak–to–peak potential separation or II. the ratio of the anodic and cathodic peak currents plotted in function of different concentrations (from 1µM to 200µM) of A) DmFc and B) RuHex solutions (in 0.1M NaNO₃).
- Page 11 Figure S9. DPVs responses in 25mM Britton–Robinson buffer with 250 mM NaNO₃ (pH 2) containing different concentrations of SA: (Blank) supporting electrolyte, (1) sample (A. serum or B. face cream), and sample (2) + 20 μM, (3) + 40 μM,(4) + 60 μM and (5) + 80 μM standard solution of SA. The insets show the corresponding calibration graphs of SA. The error bars were constructed as confidence intervals (n = 3).
- Page 2 Figure S10. Real photos of diluted 1:1 A. serum and B. face cream in 25mM Britton–Robinson buffer with 250 mM NaNO₃ (pH 2).



Figure S1. ATR–FTIR spectra of the 3D printed nonactivated and activated PLA–CB electrode.



Figure S2. Profilometric microscopy images of the **A.** nonactivated and **B.** activated by tetrahydrofuran (600s) PLA–CB electrode's surface with the corresponding 3D images.



Figure S3. Cyclic voltammograms (CVs) recorded in different concentrations (from 1µM to 200µM) of $Fe(CN)_6^{3-}$ solution (in 0.1M NaNO₃).



Figure S4. A. Cyclic voltammograms of 0.1 mM FcMeOH in 0.1 M NaNO₃ at scan rates ranging from 10 to 350 mV s⁻¹. **B.** Dependence of anodic and cathodic peak currents (I_p) on the square root of scan rate ($v^{1/2}$). **C.** Dependence of peak currents (I_p) on scan rate (v). **D.** Dependence of peak-to-peak separation (ΔE) with scan rate. **E.** Ratio of anodic to cathodic peak currents (I_{pa}/I_pc) as a function of scan rate. **F.** Log–log plot of peak current vs. scan rate.



Figure S5. A. Cyclic voltammograms of 0.1 mM Fc in 0.1 M NaNO₃ at scan rates ranging from 10 to 350 mV s⁻¹. **B.** Dependence of anodic and cathodic peak currents (I_p) on the square root of scan rate ($v^{1/2}$). **C.** Dependence of peak currents (I_p) on scan rate (v). **D.** Dependence of peak-to-peak separation (ΔE) with scan rate. **E.** Ratio of anodic to cathodic peak currents (I_{pa}/I_{pc}) as a function of scan rate. **F.** Log–log plot of peak current vs. scan rate.



Figure S6. A. Cyclic voltammograms of 0.1 mM DmFc in 0.1 M NaNO₃ at scan rates ranging from 10 to 350 mV s⁻¹. **B.** Dependence of anodic and cathodic peak currents (I_p) on the square root of scan rate ($v^{1/2}$). **C.** Dependence of peak currents (I_p) on scan rate (v). **D.** Dependence of peak-to-peak separation (ΔE) with scan rate. **E.** Ratio of anodic to cathodic peak currents (I_{pa}/I_{pc}) as a function of scan rate. **F.** Log–log plot of peak current vs. scan rate.



Figure S7. A. Cyclic voltammograms of 0.1 mM RuHex in 0.1 M NaNO₃ at scan rates ranging from 10 to 350 mV s⁻¹. **B.** Dependence of anodic and cathodic peak currents (I_p) on the square root of scan rate ($v^{1/2}$). **C.** Dependence of peak currents (I_p) on scan rate (v). **D.** Dependence of peak-to-peak separation (ΔE) with scan rate. **E.** Ratio of anodic to cathodic peak currents (I_{pa}/I_pc) as a function of scan rate. **F.** Log–log plot of peak current vs. scan rate.



Figure S8. The relationship between I. peak–to–peak potential separation or II. the ratio of the anodic and cathodic peak currents plotted in function of different concentrations (from 1μ M to 200μ M) of A) DmFc and B) RuHex solutions (in 0.1M NaNO₃).



Figure S9. DPVs responses in 25mM Britton–Robinson buffer with 250 mM NaNO₃ (pH 2) containing different concentrations of SA: (Blank) supporting electrolyte, (1) sample (**A**. serum or **B**. face cream), and sample (2) + 20 μ M, (3) + 40 μ M,(4) + 60 μ M and (5) + 80 μ M standard solution of SA. The insets show the corresponding calibration graphs of SA. The error bars were constructed as confidence intervals (n = 3).



Figure S10. Real photos of diluted 1.1 A. serum and B. face cream in 25mM Britton– Robinson buffer with 250 mM NaNO₃ (pH 2).

Α.