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Figure S1: Cyclic voltammogram peak current analysis of of $\mathrm{pDNA} / \mathrm{CysFl} / \mathrm{Au}$ bioelectrode as a function of scan rate ( $10-300 \mathrm{mV} / \mathrm{s}$ ). (A) Variation of current with square root of scan rate and $(\mathbf{B})$ variation of potential with $\log$ of scan rate.

3.6.2. Estimation of the association constant between cDNA and pDNA/CysNf/Au bioelectrode.

The association constant $\left(\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{a}}\right)$ for binding interaction was determined using the Langmuir isotherm approach in which the isotherm assumes equal binding energy for all binding sites. For $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{a}}$ estimation, the change in Rct was related to the binding of cDNA with immobilized pDNA and is represented by the following equation:
$\mathrm{M}=1-\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ct}}(\mathrm{pDNA}) / \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ct}}(\mathrm{cDNA})$
where M , is the number of occupied binding sites and $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ct}}(\mathrm{pDNA}), \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ct}}(\mathrm{cDNA})$ represents the charge transfer resistance before and after hybridization with cDNA, respectively. In the Langmuir isotherm, M can be related to association constant using the following equation:
$\mathrm{M}=\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{C} / 1+\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{C}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{C}=\mathrm{M} / 1-\mathrm{M} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{a}}$ is the association constant and C is the concentration of molecules in the solution. From eqs 2 and 3 above
$\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{C}=\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ct}}(\mathrm{cDNA})-\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ct}}(\mathrm{pDNA}) / \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ct}}(\mathrm{pDNA})$
$\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{C}=\Delta \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ct}} / \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ct}}(\mathrm{pDNA})$
Using eq 5, the curve was plotted between $\Delta \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ct}} / \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ct}}(\mathrm{pDNA})$ and the concentration of cDNA (Fig. S2) and it was revealed that $\Delta \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ct}} / \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ct}}(\mathrm{pDNA})$ varies linearly with the concentration and follows the linear equation
$\Delta \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ct}} / \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ct}}(\mathrm{pDNA})=3.5852+0.2432 \log \mathrm{cDNA}$
with a correlation coefficient of $0.998 . \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{a}}$ was estimated from the slope of the regression equation and found to be $0.243 \mathrm{M}^{-1}$.


Figure S2. Linearity plot between $\Delta \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ct}} / \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ct}(\mathrm{pDNA})}$ as a function of cDNA concentration $\left(10^{-6}\right.$ -$\left.10^{-15} \mathrm{M}\right)$ in $5 \mathrm{mM}\left[\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{CN})_{6}\right]^{3-14-} \mathrm{PBS}$ solution at pH 7 for measurement of $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{a}}$.

Table S1

| S. No. | Bare gold <br> $\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | CysFI/Au <br> ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | pDNA/CysFl/Au ( ${ }^{( }$) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2h | 4h | 6h | 8h | 12h | 18h |
| 1 | 97.96 | 54.95 | 42.46 | 31.21 | 29.65 | 29.13 | 28.98 | 28.42 |
| 2 | 97.92 | 55.03 | 42.35 | 30.98 | 29.02 | 29.23 | 29.08 | 28.93 |
| 3 | 97.83 | 54.69 | 41.98 | 30.95 | 29.38 | 28.82 | 29.12 | 28.63 |
| 4 | 97.90 | 54.83 | 42.42 | 30.89 | 29.68 | 29.20 | 29.18 | 29.22 |

Table S1: Variation in the contact angle of $\mathrm{Au}, \mathrm{CysFl} / \mathrm{Au}$, and $\mathrm{pDNA} / \mathrm{CysFl} / \mathrm{Au}$ ODT/Au as a function of time.

## Table S2

| Sl. <br> No | Electrode | Solution <br> resistance <br> $\left(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{s}}, \mathbf{\Omega}\right)$ | Charge <br> transfer <br> resistance <br> $\left(\mathbf{R}_{\text {ct }}, \boldsymbol{\Omega}\right)$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathrm{CysFl} / \mathrm{Au}$ | 84.2 | 250.4 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathrm{EDC} / \mathrm{NHS}$ activated <br> $\mathrm{CysFl} / \mathrm{Au}$ | 24.0 | 16.7 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathrm{pDNA} / \mathrm{CysFl} / \mathrm{Au}$ | 24.2 | 47.5 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | Complementary DNA <br> on $\mathrm{pDNA} / \mathrm{CysFl} / \mathrm{Au}$ | 74.0 | 149.3 |

Table S2: The change in $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ct}}$ value for $\mathrm{CysFl} / \mathrm{Au}, \mathrm{EDC} / \mathrm{NHS}$ activated $\mathrm{CysFl} / \mathrm{Au}$, $\mathrm{pDNA} / \mathrm{CysFl} / \mathrm{Au}$ and complementary DNA on $\mathrm{pDNA} / \mathrm{CysFl} / \mathrm{Au}$ as a function of time.

Table S3

| No. of <br> cycle | Before <br> hybridization <br> $\left(\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{ct}}, \boldsymbol{\Omega}\right)$ | After <br> hybridization <br> $\left(\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{ct}}, \boldsymbol{\Omega}\right)$ | \% change in <br> hybridization <br> efficiency |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 47.28 | 148.23 | 0.76 |
| 2 | 47.23 | 146.07 | 2.21 |
| 3 | 47.02 | 143.04 | 4.24 |
| 4 | 46.88 | 139.89 | 6.35 |
| 5 | 46.54 | 136.26 | 8.78 |
| 6 | 46.02 | 133.45 | 10.37 |

Table S3: Comparison of the change in hybridization efficiency for $\mathrm{pDNA} / \mathrm{CysFl} / \mathrm{Au}$ bioelectrode with repeated denaturation and rehybridization process.

