Supporting Information

Rapid Quantitative Analysis of Urinary Nicotine Metabolites via High-performance Nanoconcentrator

Chenyu Yang^a, Man Zhang^a, Huaqing Lin^{c*}, Nianrong Sun^{b*}, Chunhui Deng^{a*}

^a Center for Medical Research and Innovation, Shanghai Pudong Hospital, Fudan University Pudong Medical Center, Department of Chemistry, Institutes of Biomedical Sciences, Fudan University, 201399, China; *Email: chdeng@fudan.edu.cn
^b Department of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Zhongshan Hospital, Fudan University, Shanghai, 200032, PR China; *Email: sunnianrong@fudan.edu.cn
^c Shanghai Tobacco Group Co. Ltd, Shanghai 200082, PR China; *Email: linhq@sh.tobacco.com.cn

Contents

Figure S1. EDS of the magnetic nanoconcentrator.

Figure S2. The full scope of pore size distribution.

Figure S3. Rapid magnetic response of the magnetic nanoconcentrator.

Figure S4. Optimization of the amount of the nanoconcentrator for magnetic enrichment.

Figure S5. Optimization of incubation time of magnetic enrichment.

Figure S6. The effect of temperature on magnetic enrichment.

Figure S7. The LOD of cotinine and norcotinine detected by the nanoconcentrator.

Figure S8. The relationship between LDI-TOF-MS intensity and added concentration.



Figure S1. EDS of the magnetic nanoconcentrator.



Figure S2. The full scope of pore size distribution.



Figure S3. Rapid magnetic response of the magnetic nanoconcentrator.



Figure S4. Optimization of the amount of the nanoconcentrator for magnetic enrichment. Data are presented as mean \pm standard variation, n = 3.



Figure S5. Optimization of incubation time of magnetic enrichment. Data are presented as mean \pm standard variation, n = 3.



Figure S6. The effect of temperature on magnetic enrichment. Data are presented as mean \pm standard variation, n = 3.



Figure S7. The LOD of cotinine and norcotinine detected by the nanoconcentrator. Data are presented as mean \pm standard variation, n = 3.



Figure S8. The relationship between LDI-TOF-MS intensity and added concentration. Data are presented as mean \pm standard variation, n = 3.

	HQC	MQC	LQC
CV/%	17.7	38.7	33.9
Accuracy/%	117.6	103.2	90.0

Table S1. Method validation for cotinine (n = 3).

Table S2. Method validation for norcotinine (n = 3).

	HQC	MQC	LQC
CV/%	16.3	22.5	16.6
Accuracy/%	85.1	117.4	122.2