Supporting Information for

Tuning Atomically Dispersed Fe Sites in Metal-Organic Frameworks

Boosts Peroxidase-Like Activity for Sensitive Biosensing

Weiqing Xu¹, Yikun Kang², Lei Jiao¹, Yu Wu¹, Hongye Yan¹, Jinli Li¹, Wenling Gu¹, Weiyu Song^{2, *}, Chengzhou Zhu^{1, *}

¹Key Laboratory of Pesticide and Chemical Biology of Ministry of Education, International Joint Research Center for Intelligent Biosensing Technology and Health, College of Chemistry, Central China Normal University, Wuhan, 430079, People's Republic of China

²State Key Laboratory of Heavy Oil Processing, China University of Petroleum, Beijing 102249, People's Republic of China

Weiqing Xu and Yikun Kang contributed equally to this work

*Correponding authors. E-mail: songwy@cup.edu.cn (Weiyu Song); czzhu@mail.ccnu.edu.cn (Chengzhou Zhu)

S1 Instruments

Transmission electron microscopy (TEM) experiments were performed using a FEI Talos F200x (super-x). The element contents were obtained by inductively coupled plasma optical emission (ICP-OES) spectrometry (Agilent 8800). Powder X-ray diffraction (XRD) patterns were carried using a Tensor 27. The functional groups were analyzed using a NEXUS870 FT-IR spectrometer. X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) measurements were used by a VG Multilab 2000 (Thermo Fisher, USA). Electron paramagnetic resonance (EPR) measurements were obtained by an EMXmicro-6/1 (Bruker, Germany). Ultrapure water was obtained from a Milli-Q purification system (Millipore, MA, USA). All the UV-vis and fluorescence spectra were obtained from a multimode reader (Tecan Spark, Switzerland).

S2 Experimental Section

S2.1 Preparation of MIL-101

FeCl₃•6H₂O (675 mg, 2.5 mmol) and terephthalic acid (206 mg, 1.25 mmol) were dissolved in 15 mL N,N-dimethylformamide (DMF) and then the solution was vigorously stirred for 1 h. After that, the mixture transported to a Teflon-lined autoclave for 15 hours at 110 °C. The orange products were washed with DMF and ethanol three times. Finally, the solvent was dried overnight at 80 °C to obtain the powder.

S2.2 Preparation of NO₂-MIL-101

FeCl₃•6H₂O (675 mg, 2.5 mmol) and 2-nitroterephthalic acid (264 mg, 1.25 mmol) were dissolved in 15 mL DMF and then the solution was vigorously stirred for 1 h. After that, the mixture transported to a Teflon-lined autoclave for 12 h at 110 °C. The orange products were washed with DMF and ethanol three times. Finally, the solvent was dried overnight at 80 °C to obtain the powder.

S2.3 Preparation of NH₂-MIL-101

FeCl₃•6H₂O (675 mg, 2.5 mmol) and 2-aminoterephthalic acid (226 mg, 1.25 mmol) were dissolved in 15 mL DMF and then the solution was vigorously stirred for 1 h. After that, the mixture transported to a Teflon-lined autoclave for 12 h at 110 °C. The orange products were washed with DMF and ethanol three times. Finally, the solvent was dried overnight at 80 °C to obtain the powder.

S2.4 Specific Activity of Nanozymes

The specific activity (SA), which is defined as activity units per milligram of nanozyme, was evaluated in different concentrations of nanozymes [S1]. The nanozyme activity (units) was calculated using Eq. (S1):

$$b_{nanozyme} = \frac{V \times (\frac{\Delta A}{\Delta t})}{\varepsilon \times 1}$$
 (S1)

 $b_{nanozyme}$ is the catalytic activity of nanozyme expressed in units. V is the total volume of the reaction solution (μ L); ϵ is the molar absorption coefficient of the colorimetric TMB (39,000 (M⁻¹ cm⁻¹). 1 is the path length of light traveling in the cuvette (cm); A is the absorbance value; and $\Delta A/\Delta t$ is the initial rate of change in absorbance at 652 nm min⁻¹.

Calculate the SA of the nanozyme $(U \text{ mg}^{-1})$ by nanozyme: $a_{nanozyme} = b_{nanozyme}/[m]$. Where $a_{nanozyme}$ is the SA expressed in units per milligram $(U \text{ mg}^{-1})$ nanozymes, and [m] is the nanozyme weight (mg) of each assay.

S2.5 Verification of Intermediate (•OH)

The blue methylene blue (MB) could be degraded to the colourless products in the presence of •OH. Therefore, MB was usually employed to verify the existence of •OH by colorimetric assay [S2]. The nanozymes (1 mg mL⁻¹, 100 μ L) were added into the HAc-NaAc buffer (0.1 M, pH 3.0, 1 mL) containing H₂O₂ (1 M, 1 mL) and MB (1 mM, 100 μ L), respectively. Then, the absorbance of the reaction solution was monitored after 1.5 h.

S2.6 Computation Details

For the calculation of the energy change diagram of reaction, we followed the mechanism in the acidic environment as Eqs. S2-S5:

$$H_2O_2 + * \to H_2O_2 *$$
 (S2)

$$H_2O_2^* \to OH^{*+} \bullet OH \tag{S3}$$

$OH^* + H^+ + e^- \rightarrow H_2O^*$	(S4)
$\mathrm{H_2O}^* \to \mathrm{H_2O} + *$	(\$5)

S2.7 Interference Study for AChE Detection

A series of proteins were chosen to measure the anti-interference ability of the NO₂-MIL-101 based biosensor. Instead of AChE, 50 μ L 10 μ g mL⁻¹ HRP (horseradish peroxidase), LAC (Laccase), GOx (Glucose oxidase), INV (Invertase), and BSA (bovine serum albumin) were added into the reaction system respectively. The absorbance values at 652 nm were recorded to evaluate the interference effect.

S2.8 Recovery Test for AChE

Human serum samples diluted 100 times for the recovery test of AChE. Then different concentration AChE were added into the diluted serum samples for the recovery tests.

S2.9 Colorimetric Detection of Paraoxon-ethyl

AChE (50 mU mL⁻¹, 50 μ L, pH 7.4) and different concentration paraoxon-ethyl (50 μ L) were incubated for 30 min 37 °C. The ATCh (10 mM, 30 μ L, pH 7.4) was introduced into this system for another 30 min. The subsequent processes were the same as the procedure of AChE detection and the absorbance of this system was named as A₁. Two parallel experiments were carried out at the same time. For one paraoxon-ethyl was not added into the reaction system (A). For another, the paraoxon-ethyl and ATCh were not added into the reaction system (A₀). The inhibition rate was used to measure the amounts paraoxon-ethyl, and the inhibition rate was calculated by Eq. S6:

Inhibition (%)=
$$\frac{(A_1-A)}{(A_0-A)} \times 100\%$$
 (S6)

S2.10 Interference Study for Paraoxon-ethyl Detection

A series of interference substances were chosen to measure the anti-interference ability of the NO₂-MIL-101 based biosensor. Instead of paraoxon-ethyl, 50 μ L 1 μ g mL⁻¹ Na⁺, Ca²⁺, Mg²⁺, glucose and 50 μ L 100 ng mL⁻¹ avermectin, tebuconazole, chlorothalonil, fipronil were added into the reaction system respectively. The absorbance values at 652 nm were recorded to evaluate the interference effect.

S2.11 Recovery Test for Paraoxon-ethyl

Tap and river water samples were spiked with paraoxon-ethyl after a filtration. Besides, the rice and apple samples were washed with ultrapure water and then dried at room temperature. Then, 3 g of sample was placed into an ultrasonic bath for 5min before being centrifuged for 10 min (12,000 rpm). Later, a different amount of OP was added into the real samples. The concentration of the real samples was determined by the calibration curve.



S3 Supplementary Figures and Tables

Fig. S1 a Full range XPS and b N 1s spectra of different nanozymes



Fig. S2 Effect of pH on the relative activity of different nanozymes



Fig. S3 a Absorption spectra and b absorbance values (664 nm) of different nanozymes in H_2O_2/MB solution



Fig. S4 Steady-state kinetic analyses for NH₂-MIL-101 using Michaelis-Menten equation as the non-linear least-squares regression. **a** Concentration of H_2O_2 was 0.5 M and the TMB concentration was varied. **b** Concentration of TMB was 10 mM and the H_2O_2 concentration was varied



Fig. S5 Steady-state kinetic analyses for MIL-101 using Michaelis-Menten equation as the non-linear least-squares regression. **a** Concentration of H_2O_2 was 0.5 M and the TMB concentration was varied. **b** Concentration of TMB was 10 mM and the H_2O_2 concentration was varied



Fig. S6 Steady-state kinetic analyses for NO₂-MIL-101 using Michaelis-Menten equation as the non-linear least-squares regression. **a** Concentration of H_2O_2 was 0.5 M and the TMB concentration was varied. **b** Concentration of TMB was 10 mM and the H_2O_2 concentration was varied



Fig. S7 a Effects of temperature on the relative activity of NH₂-MIL-101, MIL-101, NO₂-MIL-101, and HRP. **B** Reproducibility of the resultant MOFs



Fig. S8 a Charge density difference of NO₂-MIL-101 between MIL-101 and nitro ligands. **b** Side view of charge density difference of NO₂-MIL-101. The charge decrease of the dangling bond marked with red line at active site



Fig. S9 Influence of the **a** ATCh and **b** NO₂-MIL-101 concentration (the original concentration) on the performance of NO₂-functionalized MIL-101-based biosensor



Fig. S10 Influence of the temperature on the performance of NO₂-functionalized MIL-101-based biosensor



Fig. S11 Reproducibility of NO₂-MIL-101-biosensor for the detection of **a** AChE and **b** OP



Fig. S12 Stability of NO₂-MIL-101-biosensor for the detection of a AChE and b OP

Nanozymes	Mass ratio (mg mg ⁻¹)	Atomic concentration (%)
NH ₂ -MIL-101	0.13	4.54
MIL-101	0.16	4.69
NO ₂ -MIL-101	0.15	4.15

 Table S1 Content of Fe in different nanozymes

The mass ratio was obtained by ICP-OES, and the atomic concentration was obtained by XPS.

 Table S2 Maximum reaction rate (V_{max}) and Michaelis constant (K_m) of different nanozymes

Nanozymes	Substrate	V _{max} (×10 ⁻⁷ M s ⁻¹)	K _m (×10 ⁻³ M)
NH ₂ -MIL- 101	TMB	2.89	8.71
	H_2O_2	2.33	2.61
MIL- 101	TMB	6.01	6.71
	H_2O_2	4.53	1.80
NO ₂ -MIL- 101	TMB	15.03	9.01
	H_2O_2	8.89	1.10

Table S3 Integration of the project electronic density of states (PDOS) to Fermi level of each split Fe 3d orbit on MIL-101, NH₂-MIL-101, and NO₂-MIL-101

Split Fe 3d orbit	MIL-101	NH ₂ -MIL-101	NO ₂ -MIL-101
d _{xy}	3.771	3.439	3.434
d _{yz}	3.464	3.621	3.550
d _{xz}	3.185	3.294	3.596
d_{z^2}	3.880	3.812	3.337
$d_{x^2-z^2}$	3.588	3.590	3.573

Table S4 ICOHP of HO*-Fe bond in MIL-101, NH2-MIL-101, and NO2-MIL-101

ICOHP	MIL-101	NH ₂ -MIL-101	NO ₂ -MIL-101
HO*-Fe	-4.11	-4.13	-4.80

Samples	Spiked	Measured	\mathbf{P}_{222}	RSD (%)	
	concentration	concentration	Recovery (70)		
Company	10 mU mL ⁻¹	9.6 mU mL ⁻¹	96.0	2.85	
Serum	50 mU mL ⁻¹	51.5 mU mL ⁻¹	102.1	4.64	

Table S5 Recoveries of AChE in serum samples (n=3)

Table S6 Recoveries of OP in tap and river water, rice and apple (n=3)

Samples	Spiked concentration	Measured concentration	Recovery (%)	RSD (%)
Top water	50 ng mL ⁻¹	47.3 ng mL ⁻¹	94.5	2.84
Tap water	100 ng mL ⁻¹	91.4 ng mL ⁻¹	91.4	3.79
	50 ng mL ⁻¹	47.71 ng mL ⁻¹	95.42	4.84
River water	100 ng mL ⁻¹	97.72 ng mL ⁻¹	97.72	2.63
Disc	50 ng mL ⁻¹	48.98 ng mL ⁻¹	97.96	4.07
Rice	100 ng mL ⁻¹	99.08 ng mL ⁻¹	99.08	4.11
Apple	50 ng mL ⁻¹	52.78 ng mL ⁻¹	105.56	3.42
	100 ng mL ⁻¹	107.15 ng mL ⁻¹	107.15	2.93

Table S7 Comparison of different biosensors for the detection of AChE

Biosensor	Method	Linear range (mU mL ⁻¹)	LOD (mU mL ⁻¹) Refs.	
Poly{1,4-phenylene-[9,9 - bis(4-phenoxybutylsulfo nate)]fluorene-2,7-diyl} (PFP-SO3 ⁻)	Fluorescent	-	50	[S3]
PAA-CeO ₂	Fluorescent	0.263 - 50	0.263	[S4]
AuNCs-Cu ²⁺	Fluorescent	0.05 - 2.5	0.05	[S5]
Citrate-CeO ₂	Colormetric	0 - 1400	3.5	[S6]
Au@PDA NPs hydrogel	Colorimetric	2.5 - 25	0.9	[S7]
NO ₂ -MIL-101	Colorimetric	0.2 - 50	0.1	This work

PAA: Polyacrylic Acid, PDA: Polydopamine.

D,		Linear range	LOD	ЪĆ
Biosensor	Method	(ng mL ⁻¹)	(ng mL ⁻¹)	Reis.
PAA-CeO ₂	Fluorescent	100 - 1000	27	[S4]
AChE-MnO ₂ -TMB	Colorimetric	1 - 100	1.0	[S8]
CDs/DNTB/ATCh/AChE	Colorimetric or fluorescent	1 - 1000	0.4	[S9]
Fe-N-C SAzymes	Colorimetric	100 - 10000	0.97	[S10]
AChE/AuPt-PDA	Electrochemistry	0.5 - 1000	0.185	[S11]
NO ₂ -MIL-101	Colorimetric	8 - 800	1.0	This work

Table S8 Comparison of different paraoxon-ethyl biosensors

Supplementary References

- [S1] B. Jiang, D. Duan, L. Gao, M. Zhou, K. Fan et al., Standardized assays for determining the catalytic activity and kinetics of peroxidase-like nanozymes. Nat. Protoc. 13, 1506-1520 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41596-018-0001-1
- [S2] Z. Wang, Y. Zhang, E. Ju, Z. Liu, F. Cao et al., Biomimetic nanoflowers by self-assembly of nanozymes to induce intracellular oxidative damage against hypoxic tumors. Nat. Commun. 9, 3334 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-05798-x
- [S3] F. Feng, Y. Tang, S. Wang, Y. Li, D. Zhu, Continuous fluorometric assays for acetylcholinesterase activity and inhibition with conjugated polyelectrolytes. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 46, 7882-7886 (2007). https://doi.org/10.1002/ange.200701724
- [S4] S.-X.Zhang, S.-F. Xue, J. Deng, M. Zhang, G. Shi, T. Zhou, Polyacrylic acidcoated cerium oxide nanoparticles: an oxidase mimic applied for colorimetric assay to organophosphorus pesticides. Biosens. Bioelectron. 85, 457-463 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2016.05.040
- [S5] J. Sun, X. Yang, Gold nanoclusters–Cu²⁺ ensemble-based fluorescence turn-on and real-time assay for acetylcholinesterase activity and inhibitor screening. Biosens. Bioelectron. 74, 177-182 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2015.06.013
- [S6] H. Cheng, S. Lin, F. Muhammad, Y.-W. Lin, H. Wei, Rationally modulate the oxidase-like activity of nanoceria for self-regulated bioassays. ACS Sens. 1, 1336-1343 (2016). https://doi.org/10.1021/acssensors.6b00500
- [S7] J. Zhang, L. Mou, X. Jiang, Hydrogels incorporating Au@ polydopamine

nanoparticles: robust performance for optical sensing. Anal. Chem. **90**, 11423-11430 (2018) https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.analchem.8b02459

- [S8] X. Yan, Y. Song, X. Wu, C. Zhu, X. Su, D. Du, Y. Lin, Oxidase-mimicking activity of ultrathin MnO₂ nanosheets in colorimetric assay of acetylcholinesterase activity. Nanoscale 9, 2317-2323 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1039/C6NR08473G
- [S9] H. Li, X. Yan, G. Lu, X. Su, Carbon dot-based bioplatform for dual colorimetric and fluorometric sensing of organophosphate pesticides. Sens. Actuat B-Chem. 260, 563-570 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.snb.2017.12.170
- [S10] Y. Wu, L. Jiao, X. Luo, W. Xu, X. Wei et al., Oxidase-like Fe-N-C single-atom nanozymes for the detection of acetylcholinesterase activity. Small 15, 1903108 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1002/smll.201903108
- [S11] Y. Wu, L. Jiao, W. Xu, W. Gu, C. Zhu, D. Du, Y. Lin, Polydopamine-capped bimetallic AuPt hydrogels enable robust biosensor for organophosphorus pesticide detection. Small 15, 1900632 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1002/smll.201900632