

The increasing importance of carbon nanotubes and nanostructured conducting polymers in biosensors

Emer Lahiff · Carol Lynam · Niamh Gilmartin ·
Richard O’Kennedy · Dermot Diamond

Received: 31 May 2010 / Revised: 17 July 2010 / Accepted: 20 July 2010 / Published online: 13 August 2010
© Springer-Verlag 2010

Abstract The growing need for analytical devices requiring smaller sample volumes, decreased power consumption and improved performance have been driving forces behind the rapid growth in nanomaterials research. Due to their dimensions, nanostructured materials display unique properties not traditionally observed in bulk materials. Characteristics such as increased surface area along with enhanced electrical/optical properties make them suitable for numerous applications such as nanoelectronics, photovoltaics and chemical/biological sensing. In this review we examine the potential that exists to use nanostructured materials for biosensor devices. By incorporating nanomaterials, it is possible to achieve enhanced sensitivity, improved response time and smaller size. Here we report some of the success that has been achieved in this area. Many nanoparticle and nanofibre geometries are particularly relevant, but in this paper we specifically focus on organic nanostructures, reviewing conducting polymer nanostructures and carbon nanotubes.

Keywords Biosensor · Carbon nanotubes · Conducting polymers · Nanomaterials · Biomolecule immobilisation

Introduction

Investment in nanomaterials research has grown exponentially over the last number of years. This is due to the huge range of opportunities afforded by nanomaterials in areas such as clean energy (for example solar panels and hydrogen storage), environmental monitoring (sensors for harmful chemicals or biological agents), improved materials (such as stronger/lighter plastics and antimicrobial surfaces), and new products (for example nanoscale transistors). It is clear that nanotechnologies come with the potential to drive economic growth, which is why the US government set up the National Nanotechnology Initiative in 2000; since then investment has grown annually (Fig. 1). Investment by NNI member agencies for 2011 totals nearly \$1.8 billion (<http://www.nano.gov/>). Currently, most commercial success has resulted from the incorporation of nanomaterials into composites for reinforcement. This results in materials with enhanced strength which can typically be used in products such as sports equipment (for example Babolat tennis rackets). Nanomaterials are also of interest for a number of other applications, such as nanoelectronics (IBM and Intel both have active nanomaterials research programs). It is clear that nanotechnology will feature in many future products. Here we focus on the potential they offer for developing improved biosensors.

Nanomaterials are defined as matter with dimensions of between 1 and 100 nm (Fig. 2). To put this into perspective, a sheet of paper is about 100,000 nanometers thick, whereas a single gold atom is about a third of a nanometer in diameter. Nanomaterials are therefore larger than individual atoms/molecules but smaller than bulk materials, and thus have characteristic properties that completely obey neither quantum nor classical physics. Nanoparticles can be

E. Lahiff (✉) · D. Diamond
CLARITY: The Centre for Sensor Web Technologies,
National Centre for Sensor Research, Dublin City University,
Dublin 9, Ireland
e-mail: emer.lahiff@dcu.ie

C. Lynam · N. Gilmartin · R. O’Kennedy
School of Biotechnology and Biomedical Diagnostics Institute,
National Centre for Sensor Research, Dublin City University,
Dublin 9, Ireland




Fig. 1 Nanomaterials have many potential applications. The images (left) show a CNT-based flexible full-colour e-paper device (Samsung, 2008), a flexible transparent CNT composite [142] (image courtesy of

E. Lahiff), and a CNT-reinforced BMC bike used in the 2005 Tour de France. Nanotechnology is expected to generate \$2.5 trillion by 2015 (see plot on the right sourced from Lux Research Inc.)

zero, one, or two dimensional. The low dimensionality of nanoparticles results in large surface-to-volume ratios and enhanced electronic and optical properties when compared with bulk samples of the same material. They are of interest for numerous applications, including sensing, where the large surface area of nanomaterials specifically facilitates interactions with an increased number of target molecules when compared to their bulk counterparts [1–5]. Their small size is also responsible for superior electronic and optical properties which, due to quantum confinement effects, are very sensitive to minor perturbations. Thus, nanomaterials can be used to facilitate label-free detection, and to develop biosensors with enhanced sensitivities and improved response times. The use of nanoparticles in biosensors is increasing due to this enhancement in sensitivity (as seen in Table 1), which is of major importance for clinical diagnostics, as the concentration of targets can be very low in biological samples. A good example of this is DNA sensors, which generally rely on the polymerase chain reaction (PCR) for signal amplification. Developing biosensors with improved sensitivity will

eliminate the need for PCR and thus simplify DNA biosensors. This can be achieved using nanomaterials which, due to their large surface area, allow a greater number of DNA strands to be immobilised [6]. Nanomaterials can be incorporated into many types of biosensor configurations in order to develop magnetic, optical, electrical or electrochemical biodevices for the detection of many biological molecules, including nucleic acids, antibodies, proteins, toxins and bacteria [7–13]

The first biosensors were reported in the early 1960s, when a pH response was reported for a 10 mg per cent solution of glucose [14]. Since then, many advances have been made in the field, and devices are now more sensitive and more portable. In general, a biosensor can be described as a device which has a biological sensing element connected to (or integrated with) a transducer, thus transforming a biological event into a signal which can then be interpreted. The recognition biomolecule within a biosensor is highly selective, and can be immobilised by physical adsorption, entrapment or covalent attachment [8, 15–18]. The sensitivity of a biosensor is dependent on the number

Fig. 2 The relative sizes of some nanoparticles in comparison with biological molecules




Table 1 Enhanced biosensor sensitivity can be achieved by incorporating NPs

Nanoparticle	Detection system	Analyte	Limit of detection (LOD)	Reference
CP (PAni)	Photometric	Cholesterol oxidase	25 mg/dL	[71]
CP (PTCA)	Amperometric	Pyruvate oxidase	0.3 μ M	[76]
		Glutamate oxidase	0.1 μ M	[15]
		Biotin–DNA	1 nM	[77]
CP (PPy)	Amperometric	ODN	3.4×10^{-10} mol/L (0.34 nM)	[78]
CP (PANI)	Amperometric	Gonorrhea	0.5×10^{-15} M (0.5 fM)	[77]
CP (PANI)	Capacitive	Human IgG	1.87 ng mL^{-1} (1.87 ng/ml)	[144]
PANI-Au	Amperometric	Tuberculosis DNA	0.125×10^{-18} M (0.125 aM)	[77]
PANI-CNTs	Electrochemical impedance spectroscopy	NADH	1×10^{-6} M (1 μ M)	[77]
MWNT	Amperometric	Cholesterol	0.2 mmol/l (0.2 mM)	[101]
MWNT-Pt	Differential pulse voltammetry	DNA	1×10^{-11} mol/l (10 pM)	[103]
SWNT	Amperometric	PSA	4 pg/ml	[110]
SWNT	FET	Thrombin	10 nM	[145]
SWNT	FET	Carcinoembryonic antigen	300 fM	[129]

and the accessibility of the recognition biomolecules present. Nanomaterials enable the development of improved biosensors because they allow for the incorporation of a greater number of recognition biomolecules which are more readily accessible to the target species, owing to greater porosity and surface area. Nanomaterials thus typically enable lower detection limits and faster response times, and they can facilitate label-free detection, which is a major advantage [19, 20]. Many types of nanomaterials are suitable for biosensor applications, including metallic nanoparticles (such as gold), magnetic nanoparticles (such as iron oxide), semiconducting nanoparticles (such as quantum dots and silicon nanowires), and organic nanoparticles (such as conducting polymers and carbon nanotubes) [13, 20–25]. Organic materials are more likely to be biocompatible, and in this review article we will only consider organic nanomaterials. In particular, we will review conducting polymer nanostructures (CPs) and carbon nanotubes (CNTs).

Nanomaterials

Carbon nanotubes

Carbon nanotubes (CNTs), discovered by Iijima in 1991 [26], are an allotrope of carbon consisting of graphene sheets rolled up into cylinders of sp^2 -hybridised atoms. CNTs exist as single- (SWNTs), double- (DWNTs) and multiwalled (MWNTs) structures. MWNTs are essentially a number of concentric SWNTs and hence have a larger diameter (Fig. 3). The diameters of SWNTs are usually less than 2 nm, whereas the diameters of MWNTs range between 2 and 100 nm, depending on the number of shells present. CNTs are typically microns long, but tubes up to

4 cm in length have been reported [27]. Combined with their narrow diameter, this leads to excellent material properties, such as a high aspect ratio and a large surface area. CNTs can therefore be approximated to one-dimensional nanostructures [28].

The electrical properties of a CNT are determined by the tube helicity and diameter (Fig. 4) [8]. If a CNT is considered a rolled-up graphene sheet, the helicity of the tube depends on the angle at which it is rolled up, and this can be described by its chiral vector, $C_h = n\mathbf{a}_1 + m\mathbf{a}_2$ (where $\mathbf{a}_1$ and $\mathbf{a}_2$ are unit vectors of the hexagonal lattice and n




Fig. 3 A SWNT can be visualised as a rolled-up sheet of graphite capped by half of a C_{60} molecule (diagram on the left). CNTs can also exist as DWNTs and MWNTs. TEM images reveal the number of walls present (image on the right shows five, two and seven layers, respectively) [26]. Reproduced with permission from the Nature Publishing Group




Fig. 4 Nanotubes possess an armchair, zigzag or chiral structure depending on the angle at which they are rolled up (this determines the n , m and θ values)

and m are integers) [28]. The direction of C_h is perpendicular to the axis of the nanotube. The chiral angle (θ) is the angle between the vectors C_h and a_1 . The n , m and θ values for a particular CNT determine the electronic behaviour of the tube. If $(n - m)$ is a multiple of three, the tube is metallic, otherwise the tube is semiconducting [28]. This stipulates that one-third of all tubes are metallic, while the remaining two-thirds are semiconducting.

The exponential increase in CNT patents filed in recent years reflects the level of commercial interest in CNTs. However, applications for CNTs are currently limited by difficulties associated with purification and a lack of precise control over the properties (such as chirality) of the CNTs produced. At the moment, the production of one specific type of CNT is limited to the number of walls on the CNT, with some SWNT batches even containing DWNTs and MWNTs, among other types of nanostructured carbon. The specific production of a single type of chiral or semiconducting SWNT, without contaminants, is unfortunately not yet possible, and considerable batch-to-batch variation is also common. In addition, no clear-cut strategy for purification by CNT type has been discovered to date. Therefore, current CNT research is limited to working with CNT mixtures.

Early CNT research primarily focused on determining and exploiting the properties of the pristine materials. More recently, however, exploration of the chemistry of CNTs, including their functionalisation, has begun to dominate the field [29, 30]. The first attempts at the chemical functionalisation of CNTs were made in response to their poor solubility. Pristine CNTs align parallel with one another to form bundles [31], thus increasing van der Waals interactions, but also preventing their dissolution. Although pristine CNTs have been shown to form stable dispersions with the aid of surfactants [32] and biomolecules [33], or low-concentration dispersions with short-term stability in amides such as *N,N*-dimethylformamide (DMF), *N*-methylpyrrolidone (NMP), and other non-hydrogen-bonding Lewis bases [34], better solvation methods are required.

CNTs are susceptible to functionalisation mediated by oxidative processes that form reactive groups at their end-caps

and defect sites, or by direct modification of their sidewalls, both covalently and noncovalently. Covalent attachment involves the direct addition of functionality to CNTs via the formation of chemical bonds, whereas noncovalent attachment involves CNT–molecule interactions involving electrostatic, van der Waals and/or hydrophobic interactions. A high degree of covalent functionalisation, which alters carbon–carbon bonds from an sp^2 to an sp^3 structure, can, however, result in a sizeable loss of electrical conductivity for the functionalised SWNTs [35].

Since the purification of CNTs is often carried out using oxidative methods that introduce carbonyl and carboxylic acid groups at the open ends of the CNTs and at defect sites along the CNT sidewalls [36–39], this has become one of the most favoured routes for covalently attaching biomolecules to CNTs. The proliferation of amino functionalities on proteins, enzymes and antibodies, among other biomolecules, allows for facile amide functionalisation with CNT carboxylates (Fig. 5). A wide variety of biomolecules such as carbohydrates [40], oligonucleotides [41], proteins [42, 43], enzymes [44, 45] and even DNA [46–48] have been attached to CNTs in this fashion. However, such functionalisation can be difficult to reproduce, since the extent of functionalisation is dependent on the degree and type of nanotube carboxylation, which in turn varies according to CNT source.

Although rather uncontrollable, noncovalent attachment (physical adsorption) has been used effectively to attach a variety of moieties to CNTs. Unfortunately, proteins and antibodies in particular may lose their biological activities when adsorbed on a CNT surface. This can be due to a change in conformation when binding with the CNT and/or an unfavourable orientation of the active site. The interaction of biomolecules with CNTs has been of particular interest with a view to their use as biosensors [49] or for improving biocompatibility [50]. Noncovalent binding of streptavidin to CNTs has been achieved via covalent attachment to linkers that are adsorbed along the CNT axis [51]. DNA has been shown to strongly interact with CNTs, forming uniform coatings [52]. The wrapping of CNTs has recently been extended to other biopolymers, including chitosan, chondroitin sulfate and hyaluronic acid [53, 54]. Biomolecules of interest, including antibodies, may be subsequently anchored to these biopolymers wrapped around the CNTs [55].

Conducting polymer nanostructures

CPs are of interest for biosensor applications as they can be interfaced with biomolecules for effective signal transduction. CPs can be tailored to create substrates with a high surface area, controllable morphology and conductivity. These properties make them excellent transducer materials




Fig. 5 Biomolecules can be covalently attached to acid functionalities on CNT surfaces via EDC/NHS coupling with amide groups on a biomolecule (scheme shown top). TEM can be used to effectively

image CNTs before (left) and after (right) biomolecule attachment. Dark spheres represent the iron core of HRP attached to CNT surfaces (images courtesy of C. Lynam)

which can facilitate rapid electron transfer between immobilised biomolecules and an electrode surface [56]. Like metals/semiconductors, CPs can conduct charge carriers such as holes and electrons. Unlike metals/semiconductors, however, they are inexpensive and are easily prepared and modified [57]. In 1977, Alan Heeger, Alan MacDiarmid and Hideki Shirakawa discovered that the conductivity of polyacetylene rose by seven orders of magnitude when it was exposed to bromine vapour [58]. Polyacetylene is a π -conjugated polymer, meaning that there are alternating single and double bonds along the polymer backbone. In a conjugated polymer the π -electrons can become delocalised and shared along the polymer chain, enabling them to conduct electricity. CPs are extremely useful, as they combine the electrical properties of a metal with the low density and cost of a polymer. Potential applications include light-emitting diodes, photovoltaics, electrostatic discharge coatings and printable electronics [59–62]. The conductivity of a CP is, however, sensitive to its chemical environment and can be varied over several orders of magnitude (ranging typically from 10^{-10} S/m to 10^1 S/m). This change in conductivity results from a change in the bonding structure, and is accompanied by a change in the colour/spectroscopy of the material [63]. Hence, CPs are suitable for developing amperometric, potentiometric, conductometric, electrochemical, optical, calorimetric and piezoelectric biosensors [56].

However, certain CPs such as polyacetylene are unstable, thus limiting their use in practical applications. CPs such as polyaniline (PANI), polypyrrole, polythiophenes and polyethylene dioxythiophene (PEDOT) have greater stability and are more commonly investigated (Fig. 6). PANI, for example, switches between an undoped insulating emeraldine base form and a doped conducting emer-

aldine salt form (Fig. 7). Switching is reversible and accompanied by a colour change from purple to green. In the conductive form, delocalised electron pairs (called bipolarons) form along the polymer backbone and are responsible for charge transfer. Disrupting the conjugation of the polymer backbone results in a decrease in the conductivity of the material, making it suitable for sensing applications. As PANI conductivity relies on the protonation of the polymer by acid molecules, its conductivity tends to be poor in solutions at neutral pHs [64]. This can be dealt with by covalently attaching acid molecules to CP backbones, resulting in a self-doping polymer [65, 66].

The conductivity of a CP is always dependent on its oxidation state, and short-term redox stability is a limitation which all unmodified CPs suffer from. CPs also tend to suffer from poor mechanical properties; for example, polypyrrole has been reported to have poor ductility and is brittle [67]. Therefore, although CP films can be cast onto substrates, it is not generally possible to produce




Fig. 6 The chemical structures of relevant CPs. Conjugated bonds facilitate improved electron transport




Fig. 7 The chemical bonding structure of CP-PANI is sensitive to the chemical environment of the material (*left*). In its nanoform, the material is more responsive than in the bulk form (*right* shows sensing results, reproduced with permission from the American Chemical Society) [143]

robust CP films with sufficient mechanical integrity to be free-standing. The mechanical properties of CPs can, however, be improved by incorporating materials such as CNTs for reinforcement [68]. CPs also tend to have poor solubility in common solvents and are typically hydrophobic [69]. Large CP particles tend to agglomerate, resulting in poor dispersions which are difficult to process. However, using the nano (versus bulk) form of CPs tends to produce more stable homogeneous dispersions. Stable aqueous colloids of PANI nanofibres have been produced without the need for surfactant stabilisation [70].

For sensing applications, the response time and sensitivity of detection are also better for the nano as compared to the bulk form of the material (Fig. 7). This is due to the increased number of reaction sites available for interaction with a target species [71]. Until recently, nanofibres of CPs were synthesised by solution-based methods such as electrospinning. However, this process can be complicated by the fact that most CPs are difficult to dissolve. A simpler method to synthesise nanofibres is by chemical means, and Kaner et al. have demonstrated the synthesis of PANI nanofibres by interfacial polymerisation and also by a rapid mix process [72, 73]. The BET surface area of nanofibers produced using these methods is typically in the region of 40 m²/g [72].

Like other conductive nanomaterials, CPs are of interest as they enable simultaneous biomolecule immobilisation along with rapid electron transfer (facilitating enhanced communication with an electrode surface) [74–78, 79]. However, they are cheaper to produce than many other conductive nanomaterials, and properties such as roughness, porosity, hydrophobicity, stability and conductivity can be controlled. Increasing the surface roughness has been shown to increase the sensitivity of CP-based biosensors [80]. CPs can be incorporated into numerous biosensor configurations to enable low limits of detection, and can be tailored to detect a range of target biomolecules (Table 1). A key aspect in biosensor applications is the integration of the electrical component (CP) with the

biological recognition component. After immobilisation, it is critical that molecules maintain their activity and are accessible to the analyte so that hybridisation of complementary oligonucleotides, antigen–antibody binding, or enzyme-catalysed reactions can be monitored.

Biosensing

Central to much sensor research is the ability to monitor biomarkers (in particular disease biomarkers) in “real time” with high sensitivity and selectivity in real untreated samples. This demand for sensitive, rapid, “on-site” biosensor techniques has taken advantage of the latest advances in nanotechnology. To improve sensitivities, intense research has been carried out in signal amplification by nanomaterials.

CNTs

CNT electrical sensors

The oldest and most commonly used transducers in biosensors are electrochemical. Electrical detection methods are appealing because of their low cost, low power consumption, ease of miniaturisation, and potential multiplexing capability [81, 82]. Due to their size and electronic properties, CNTs can be used to develop highly sensitive and specific nanoscale biosensors [83–85]. Challenges remain, however, in creating macro-sized structures that fully utilise the properties of the individual CNT nano-components. Three approaches to the development of electrochemical biosensors using CNTs dominate the literature (Fig. 8) [86, 87]. In the simplest method, CNTs are randomly deposited onto conductive surfaces in a mat configuration (CNT mats) or packed into a micropipette for use as electrodes. This method results in an unknown configuration of CNTs which, although easy to achieve, may not offer optimal signals. However, it allows CNTs




Fig. 8 Schematic representation of biomolecular sensing using carbon nanotubes in various device configuration and signal amplification strategies [114]. Reproduced with permission from Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH

that have been prefunctionalised with biomolecules to be used. Alternatively, the CNTs can be coated with the biomolecule of interest after electrode fabrication. The second approach involves vertically aligned CNT forests, with one end in contact with the underlying electrode and the other end exposed in the electrolyte solution. This configuration may be achieved by growing the CNTs directly from the surface or by self-assembly of shortened CNTs. CNTs are typically functionalised after this electrode type has been assembled. A third type of nanoelectrode uses just a single CNT. If the type of CNT used could be controlled precisely (SWNT versus MWNT, metallic versus semiconducting), this would ultimately give the best

performance. However, the fabrication and manipulation challenges involved will limit its practical use.

For many important enzymes, direct electron transfer with conventional electrodes is not easily achieved or is too slow for sensor applications. CNTs are comparable in size to many biomacromolecules. Their nanodimensions and high aspect ratios therefore exploit the possibility of bringing CNTs into close proximity with proteins, which is not as easily achieved by bulk substrates. This close proximity allows CNTs to communicate with the redox-active sites of biomolecules, which are sometimes obscured/inaccessible due to the surrounding insulating protein shell. Effective electrical communication enables

CNTs to act as one-dimensional channels for electron transfer in proteins [88–90]. This electron transfer can be further enhanced by the rapid transfer kinetics and high electrocatalytic activity of the tips of oxidised CNTs [91, 92].

Electrochemical sensors can be based on potentiometry, amperometry, voltammetry, coulometry, AC conductivity or capacitance measurements [93]. Most CNT-based electrochemical biosensors detect biomolecules amperometrically. The range within which the sensor is sensitive is an important sensor parameter. Glucose sensors, for example, need to be sensitive in the range of a few $\mu\text{mol/l}$ to 15 mmol/L, since normal blood sugar levels are usually less than 6 mmol/L of glucose, while a level of 7 mmol/L or higher implies diabetes. Since the first biosensors, which measured glucose, were reported in the early 1960s, this has become one of the most frequently performed routine analyses in medicine. It is thus hardly surprising that an enormous amount of literature exists on glucose biosensors, and more recently CNT-based glucose biosensors, which are covered in some recent reviews [94–97]. Here we will highlight some general characteristics of these biosensors and present a few pertinent examples.

An example of a CNT-mat amperometric biosensor incorporated dispersed SWNTs with the enzyme glucose oxidase into redox polymer hydrogels [63]. These enzymatic redox composite films resulted in as much as a tenfold increase in the oxidation and reduction peak currents, while the glucose electrooxidation current was increased threefold for glucose sensors. CNT-mat electrodes do not seem to provide significant advantages in reversibility or signal-to-noise ratio compared to the best redox protein films on conventional electrodes, except in a few special cases (e.g. glucose oxidase) [98]. Rubianes and Rivas [99] showed how the use of dispersed CNTs allowed the development of highly sensitive glucose biosensors without redox mediators, metals or anti-interferent layers. The sensitivity of the CNT-mat electrode was 43 times higher than that obtained with the control graphite composite electrode, with a clinically relevant linear range and negligible interference from ascorbic acid (AA), uric acid (UA) and acetaminophen—all common blood interferents.

Even though the nanodimensions of CNTs make them amenable to close contact with the redox-active centres of proteins and enzymes, Gooding and coworkers have demonstrated that CNTs may not fully probe the protein active site [44]. In an interesting paper, they describe how a self-assembled, aligned, shortened CNT forest probes the redox-active centre of glucose oxidase, flavin adenine dinucleotide (FAD). In one experiment they conjugated glucose oxidase directly to the ends of the shortened CNTs in the aligned forest. They compared its electrochemistry to that of an array conjugated to the enzyme-active centre,

FAD, with subsequent enzyme reconstitution around the CNT-immobilised FAD. They found that the latter approach allowed for more efficient electron transfer to the glucose oxidase active centre. Hence, even though CNTs offer more efficient ways of communicating electrically with the active sites of biomolecules than traditional bulk substrates, there is still room for improvement when fabricating biosensors composed of them.

Cholesterol sensors must have sensitivities in the range of 2.5–10 mmol/L, since a total blood cholesterol level of less than ~ 5 mmol/L is considered to be risk-free whereas high cholesterol levels of greater than ~ 6 mmol/L are considered dangerous. The layer-by-layer adsorption technique was used to immobilise cholesterol oxidase in a MWNT mat immobilised on a gold electrode to create a biosensor for cholesterol [100]. The sensor response was found to be linear in the range of 0.2–6 mmol/L. In another case, a screen-printed carbon-paste electrode modified with a MWNT mat and cholesterol oxidase could detect cholesterol directly in blood in clinically relevant ranges [101]. The authors noted how CNTs promoted the electron transfer, nearly doubled the sensitivity, and improved the linearity of the electrode compared to the control. Furthermore, the CNT electrode results showed a good correlation with results from clinical assays of 31 patients' blood samples.

Detecting genomic DNA sequences and identifying mutations is vital in the treatment of inheritable and infectious diseases. Electrochemical methods are well suited to the detection of DNA, with their high sensitivity and rapid response. CNT-based DNA sensors are well covered in recent reviews [94–97], so we will highlight some general characteristics of these biosensors using examples. Sensors may be fabricated by immobilising single-stranded DNA (ssDNA) onto an electrode, allowing the hybridisation of the complementary DNA sequence to be detected by a current change. An electroactive DNA intercalator is often used to amplify the signal. A 24-base-pair DNA could be detected using differential pulse voltammetry and the intercalator daunomycin at a MWNT-mat electrode modified with complementary ssDNA [102]. This sensor exhibited good selectivity (on the order of 4 $\mu\text{A/nmol/L}$ over a linear range of 0.2–50 nmol/L) for oligonucleotide sequences with a mismatch of only a few bases. When these electrodes were decorated with Pt nanoparticles, however, a superior response was obtained, again showing the amplification achieved with nanoparticles [103]. The limit of detection for target DNA using the Pt nanoparticle-modified MWNTs was 1.0×10^{-11} mol/L.

By monitoring the electrochemical oxidation of guanine, DNA can be detected without an indicator. Labuda and coworkers [104] evaluated DNA biosensors from the redox signals of both the marker $[\text{Co}(\text{phen})_3]^{3+}$ and guanine

residues. They used screen-printed electrodes modified with nanostructured mats of MWCNT, hydroxyapatite and montmorillonite. Based on the AC voltammetric detection of guanine, a label-free DNA hybridisation sensor was developed by attaching MWNTs onto a carbon-paste electrode using a hybridisation assay [105]. The MWNT-mat electrode exhibited large signal improvements compared to the control. Screen-printed electrodes modified with MWNT, which catalysed the electrooxidation of guanine and adenine residues, were reported by Ye and Ju [106] for the fast and sensitive detection of DNA and RNA. A redox mediator can be used to improve the response of guanine oxidation. For example, $\text{Ru}(\text{bby})_3^{2+}$ allowed attomoles of oligonucleotides to be detected at ssDNA-modified MWNT forests [107]. A 17-fold higher oxidation signal for DNA oxidation at CNTs compared to a glassy carbon control electrode was reported by Wang et al. [108]. They used chronopotentiometric adsorptive stripping in the presence of copper to measure the purine nucleobases (guanine in this case). Well-defined hybridisation signals were obtained for the BRCA1 breast cancer gene with an LOD of 40 ng/mL. Gooding and coworkers have reported advantages of using bamboo-type CNTs for the oxidation of DNA bases in a mat-type configuration [109]. The presence of edge planes of graphene at regular intervals along the walls of the bamboo CNT were attributed to the enhancement in the oxidation signals of guanine residues.

Examples of where CNTs were used for amplified detection include enzyme-linked CNTs carrying numerous enzymes [110, 111]. Wang et al. [112] described the use of CNTs in two ways: for both recognition and transduction events. Target DNA strands were labelled with CNTs carrying numerous alkaline phosphatase tags. DNA target strands were captured by DNA immobilised on magnetic beads. The signal of the target analyte underwent double-step amplification in both the recognition and transduction events. The CNT alkaline phosphatase enzymatic amplification was detected using chronopotentiometric stripping at a CNT-mat electrode. The potentiometric detection of DNA was demonstrated with high sensitivity using ssDNA connected to enzyme-loaded CNTs immobilised on a glassy carbon electrode. This led to a reported detection limit of 54 aM for DNA.

Immunosensors are a good alternative to traditional immunoassays, since conventional immunoassays such as enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays (ELISAs) can be complex and laborious to perform. They use the high-affinity reaction between an antibody (the recognition element) and its corresponding antigen, in combination with a transducer. Immunosensors can be used to monitor the presence of the antibody or antigen, and either the antibody or the antigen can be immobilised or labelled depending on the assay requirements. When immobilising

the antibody, it is of crucial importance that the method of immobilisation maintains the stability and activity of the antibody.

To boost the detection sensitivity of PSA (prostate-specific antigen, a biomarker for prostate cancer) in serum, an amplification step was incorporated by combining SWNT forest immunosensors with HRP–MWNT–Ab2 bioconjugates. The secondary antibody (Ab2) and HRP tag were covalently linked to MWNTs at high ratios of 1:200 [89]. This amplification strategy improved the detection limit 100-fold to 4 pg mL⁻¹ and the sensitivity by 800-fold compared to conventional ELISA. These results highlight the excellent promise CNTs show in ultrasensitive immunoassay research in proteomics and systems biology.

CNT-FETs In addition to electrochemical sensors using CNTs as an electrode substrate, sensors based on transistor arrangements using CNTs have been developed [113]. SWNTs are the most likely candidate for miniaturising electronics beyond the microelectromechanical scale currently used in electronics. They exhibit electrical properties not shared by their multiwalled counterparts, and certain sizes of SWNTs act as semiconductors. The intrinsic bandgap in semiconducting SWNTs (typically 0.5 eV, but this is diameter dependent) allows them to be used as nanosized semiconducting channels in field-effect transistors (FETs) [114]. Since FET-based biomolecular detection does not employ fluorescence, electrochemical or magnetic tags, it has been termed a “label-free” methodology [115–117]. FETs generally consist of a substrate (gate), two microelectrodes (source and drain), and a SWNT (or SWNT network) that bridges the electrodes. Usually, the SWNTs are grown directly via chemical vapour deposition (CVD) or cast from a dispersion onto a substrate either before or after the electrodes are patterned [118]. Single-nanotube FETs require arduous screening of devices to eliminate metallic SWNTs. This need is obviated for nanotube networks cast from dispersions, where the 2:1 ratio of semiconducting to metallic SWNTs renders the likelihood of forming a continuous metallic pathway between source and drain unlikely. Sensing is based on the fact that the current flow in SWNT FETs is extremely sensitive to the binding of biomolecules and produces a detectable signal. A wide variety of applications for CNT FETs have been investigated, including the detection of proteins, antibody–antigen interactions, glucose, DNA and DNA hybridisation. The detection limit for the sensing of proteins or protein–protein interactions has generally been in the range of 100 pM to 100 nM [98].

An SWNT FET binding assay typically involves first immobilising a biological receptor, for example a nucleotide, aptamer, antibody or cofactor, thus providing recognition sites for target analytes, for example a complementary

DNA strand, protein, antigen or apoprotein. The current–voltage characteristics or conductance of the receptor-modified SWNT FET are measured prior to analyte binding. This is generally followed by a blocking step to minimise the nonspecific binding of targets. Finally, the current–voltage characteristics or the conductance of the SWNT FET device are/is measured following exposure to the analyte [119].

50-Amino-modified aptamers (oligonucleic acid or peptide molecules that bind to a specific target molecule) immobilised on a CNT FET were used to detect immunoglobulin E (IgE) [120]. The net current change increased with the IgE concentration, and a detection limit for IgE of 250 pM was reported. Li et al. [121] studied the detection of PSA with an FET consisting of a network of SWNTs. The authors measured the electronic interaction of an anti-PSA antibody in the act of capturing PSA. The interaction is thought to be a charge-transfer mechanism with a reported limit of detection of 14 pM, at a signal-to-noise ratio of 2. SWNT FET biosensors can achieve pM detection limits for DNA hybridisation [110] and antibody–antigen binding [98, 122].

CNT optical sensors

Individual semiconducting SWNTs exhibit photoluminescence, with discrete bands in the near-infrared region between 900 and 1600 nm. Since biologically relevant samples such as blood and tissue have low absorption in this region, the sharp nanotube fluorescence spectra may be detected even in a complex biological environment. Such semiconducting SWNTs were used as near-IR fluorescent tags for cell imaging and to selectively probe cell surface receptors [123]. The nanotubes were first noncovalently functionalised with amine groups using the surfactant PL-PEG-NH₂, followed by conjugation with antibodies that recognise both the CD20 cell surface receptor (Rituxan) and the HER2/neu receptor on certain breast cancer cells (Herceptin). In vitro near-IR fluorescence imaging showed specific binding of the antibody-conjugated SWNTs to the host cells, with high specificity for the different antibodies (55:1 and 20:1 for host:non-host cells).

Barone et al. linked enzyme reactions to CNT fluorescence, creating a sensor whereby an enzymatic reaction could be followed by monitoring fluorescence [124]. The authors noncovalently functionalised SWNTs with glucose oxidase (GOx) and potassium ferricyanide. The functionalisation with potassium ferricyanide quenches the SWNT fluorescence. Addition of glucose to the GOx–SWNT sensing complex resulted in the ferricyanide ions leaving the surface of the CNT, yielding a recovery of the CNT fluorescence. The authors could relate the CNT near-infrared fluorescence to the glucose concentration, and they

maintain that this type of sensor, enveloped in a small dialysis capillary, could be implanted in the body. The capillary could allow glucose to diffuse in, easily allowing sugar levels to be measured. This research demonstrates the feasibility of using CNT sensor systems in implantable biomedical sensors.

CPs

CP electrochemical sensors

An LOD of 3.4×10^{-10} mol/L was reported for a simple electrochemical oligonucleotide (ODN) sensor made using PANI nanotubes [125]. The solutions used during PANI synthesis contain polymeric acid (polymethyl vinyl ether-*alt*-maleic acid), and hence the nanotubes have residual carboxylic acid functionalities which can be used to covalently graft ODN via carbodiimide chemistry. The authors report that they expect to achieve an even lower detection limit by optimising the nanotube surface area. PANI nanowires can also be synthesised electrochemically and subsequently modified with oligonucleotides via EDC coupling between phosphate groups and the amino groups of PANI [126]. Using this method, the complimentary DNA target could be detected down to a concentration of 1×10^{-12} mol/L. DNA-functionalised polyaniline nanofibres (100 nm diameter) can also be used to specifically detect gonorrhea. Up to 0.5×10^{-15} M of complementary target could be detected by differential pulse voltammetry within 60 s of hybridisation [127]. These electrodes are found to be highly specific for distinguishing the presence of *N. gonorrhoeae* from *N. meningitidis* and other Gram-negative bacteria (such as *E. coli*). The performance of this STD sensor in clinical samples is being explored by the authors, and findings are also expected to have implications for the clinical diagnosis of other sexually transmitted diseases.

CPs can also be used to detect many other targets. For example, Dhand et al. report an electrode biosensor where cholesterol oxidase (ChOx) is covalently immobilised onto nanostructured PANI on indium tin oxide (ITO). Using this set-up, good selectivity can be achieved, and it is significant that interferents such as AA, UA, glucose, lactic acid, sodium pyruvate and urea were found to have a negligible effect on the sensor. ChOx/PANI/ITO electrodes retain about 85% activity after 11 weeks (when stored at 4 °C) and can be used ~20 times with an error range of 2–3%. Another example of a cholesterol sensor is where the electropolymerisation of an enzyme with laponite nanoparticles in a polypyrrole matrix was shown to increase the sensitivity of detection from 5.1 (without laponite nanoparticles) to $13.2 \text{ mA M}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ [128].

Along with good sensitivity and selectivity, nanostructured biosensors typically exhibit fast response

times. For example, an amperometric biosensor designed for the detection of phosphate ions has a response time of 6 s [129]. In this example, pyruvate oxidase (PyO) was covalently immobilised onto nanoparticles (5–40 nm) of poly-5,2':5',2''-terthiophene-3'-carboxylic acid (PTCA). The electron transfer rate constant from immobilised PyO was determined to be 0.65 s^{-1} , with a detection limit of $\sim 0.3\text{ }\mu\text{M}$. This biosensor can be stored and reused for up to one month without any loss in sensitivity. A similar biosensor of PTCA nanoparticles was used to covalently immobilise glutamate oxidase. Glutamate concentrations could be determined, and an LOD of $0.1\text{ }\mu\text{M}$ was reported for an in vitro measurement (wherein the biosensor was implanted into a rat's brain).

Polypyrrole is another example of a CP which can be used in the nanoform for low-LOD biomolecule detection. An example of this is where a pyrrole monomer and a biomolecule receptor (avidin) were electropolymerised within 100 nm wide channels [130]. When exposed to biotin–DNA, the conducting polymer nanowires generated a rapid change in resistance, with a sensitivity as low as 1 nM. The method described offers the advantages of the direct incorporation of functional biological molecules into the conducting-polymer nanowire during its synthesis, site-specific positioning, built-in electrical contacts, and scalability to high-density nanoarrays. Polypyrrole nanofibres were also developed with an even lower LOD of $100\text{--}200\text{ fg mL}^{-1}$. Nanofibres were used to detect salivary protein markers. An exceptionally low LOD of 10 aM was reported by the authors for IL-8 mRNA [131]. Advantages of this method include the low LOD and the fact that the detection method is label-free, along with its excellent control over nonspecific binding.

CP optical sensors

As well as electrochemical detection, nanostructured CPs can also be used for the optical detection of biomolecules. An example of this is where functionalised silica–PPy nanocomposites were used to detect anti-HSA. Flocculation of the nanocomposite dispersion occurs upon anti-HSA binding, and the system can therefore be used for visual diagnostic assays [132]. Human serum albumin (HSA) is of interest as a target, as it was previously used to detect renal disease. In another example of an HSA biosensor, pyrrole propylic acid nanowires can be synthesised electrochemically via a templated method and subsequently modified using EDC crosslinker to covalently bind anti-HSA. Using this as a platform, HSA can then be detected using optical or electrical methods. Using an FET configuration, nanomolar levels of HSA were reported [133].

Composites

By using nanostructured (versus bulk) materials, it is possible to develop biosensors which exhibit higher signal-to-background ratios, shorter response times, higher sensitivities and greater selectivity than previous biosensor configurations. Many different nanostructured geometries can be used to develop biosensors with improved sensing capabilities. However, it is also interesting to consider hybrid composites composed of two or more materials [134]. Using this approach, the advantageous properties of each constituent can be exploited. CNT and CPs can be combined together (and also with other materials) to produce improved biosensors [19, 135]. In general, the incorporation of CNTs tends to improve the sensitivity and selectivity of a biosensor [69].

Composites can be used to improve the selectivity of biosensors, for example in dopamine monitoring. Dopamine (DA) is an important neurotransmitter, and abnormal levels can be used to diagnose certain nervous diseases such as Parkinsons and epilepsy. DA is easily oxidisable, which can enable detection (levels in urine samples are typically monitored). However, other electroactive compounds are present along with DA. In particular, AA and UA can cause a problem, as they oxidise at almost the same potential, resulting in interference. The incorporation of CNTs and surfactant, along with CPs, has been used to selectively detect DA [25]. CPs can also be combined with gold, and Mathiyarasu et al. report poly(3,4-ethylenedioxythiophene), PEDOT–Au nanocomposite films for sensing DA and UA simultaneously (115 mV and 246 mV for DA and UA, respectively) [76]. It is significant that detection can be achieved in the presence of excess AA, which is present in both blood and urine, thus complicating detection. Abnormal levels of UA are symptomatic of diseases such as gout and Lesch–Nyhan syndrome. The PEDOT matrix contributes towards the peak separation (selectivity) while also promoting catalytic oxidation of the above compounds. Gold nanoparticles facilitate nanomolar sensing (sensitivity). Thus, it is possible to detect nanomolar levels of DA and UA in the presence of excess AA. This composite nanomaterial shows superior selectivity and sensitivity compared to the polymer film alone, and presents an interesting step forward, as a major challenge is to develop a sensitive and selective method for UA and DA detection [25].

Gold can also be combined with other CPs, and Prabhakar et al. [136] report a nucleic acid sensor whereby pathogen-specific DNA and PNA (peptide nucleic acid) probes were covalently immobilised onto a PANI–Au electrode. These nanostructured electrodes were then utilised for the detection of hybridisation with a complementary sequence (*M. tuberculosis* in this case).

The PNA–PANI/Au electrode exhibits a detection limit of 0.125×10^{-18} M, with the DNA–PANI/Au electrode showing 2.5×10^{-18} M. Improved specificity (1000×) was also observed for PNA–PANI/Au. Responses were observed within 30 s of hybridisation time. These DNA–PANI/Au and PNA–PANI/Au electrodes can be used 6–7 and 13–15 times, respectively. For increased sensitivity, reusability, and a better detection limit, authors recommend the development of nanocomposites and functionalised conducting polymers. In this way, it should be possible to detect other pathogens, including *Salmonella typhimurium* and *Neseria gonorrhea*.

Qu et al. report a nanostructured composite amperometric biosensor for choline [16] which is based on a functionalised CNT–PANI multilayer film. Carboxylic acid groups were attached to the CNTs, and the films were prepared using a layer-by-layer assembly method. By linking choline oxidase (CHOD), a choline biosensor was prepared with a linear response range of 1×10^{-6} to 2×10^{-3} M and a response time of 3 s. The commonly encountered interference arising from AA and UA could be rejected successfully by the polymer. The same approach can be applied to immobilise other oxidase enzymes, such as glucose oxidase and cholesterol oxidase, for the fabrication of biosensors. This anti-interference biosensor displays a rapid response, an expanded linear response range, excellent reproducibility and good stability.

Liu et al. report how polyaniline–carbon nanotube multilayer films can be prepared by the layer-by-layer assembly method and used for the stable low-potential detection of β -nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide (NADH) [7]. The carbon nanotubes are modified with poly(amino-benzenesulfonic acid), and this acts as a PANI dopant, thus shifting its electroactivity to a neutral pH environment. The resulting films show good electrocatalytic ability toward the oxidation of reduced NADH at a much lower potential than usual. The response is linear for concentrations between 5×10^{-6} and 1×10^{-3} M, and the detection limit can go down to 1×10^{-6} M. Therefore, the system shows good potential for developing dehydrogenase-based biosensors depending on NADH as a cofactor.

It is evident from the literature that incorporating nanoparticles into CNT-based glucose biosensors yields higher sensitivity. This is attributed to the enhanced catalytic activity and large surface area obtained by combining CNTs and nanoparticles. The most sensitive glucose biosensors do not, however, always operate in the most important clinical ranges, as highlighted by Balasubramanian and Burghard [94]. Tang et al. [137] have reported what can be regarded as an ideal yet practical sensor, as it exhibits good sensitivity within a large, clinically relevant detection range. In this case, a CNT forest was grown directly on the graphite substrate, followed by functionalisation with Pt nano-

particles, glucose oxidase and a thin layer of Nafion to improve stability. This system showed good reproducibility, demonstrated good correlation with independent clinical values in the analysis of glucose levels in serum, and was able to deliver a signal in less than 5 s. A comparable sensor set-up was reported by Claussen et al., who describe the fabrication of a “CNT forest”-like electrode decorated with Au-coated Pd nanocubes [138]. The outer gold surface allowed for glucose oxidase functionalisation, yielding a sensor with a wide working range and a response time of just 6 s. Glucose can also be detected by a novel multilayer Au-NP/MWNT/glucose oxidase membrane developed by Liu et al. [139]. This membrane showed excellent electrocatalytic character for glucose biosensing at a relatively low potential (-0.2 V). The resulting sensor could detect glucose at levels of up to 9.0 mM with a detection limit of 128 mM.

Conclusion and outlook

A key aspect in biosensor development is still the integration of the electrical component with the biological recognition molecule. The development of miniaturised biosensors with improved sensitivity requires the immobilisation of biomolecules (including DNA, antibodies, aptamers, PNAs and enzymes) onto a surface such that a maximum number of biomolecules per unit area can be attached while simultaneously ensuring that they are accessible to target species. Nanostructured surfaces are becoming increasingly significant in this regard, as they possess high surface-to-volume ratios, providing a greater number of sites for attachment. It is important to be able to functionalise nanostructures with specific biomolecules in a controllable and reproducible fashion. Biomolecular probes must also be carefully attached to prevent reactivity loss. We have shown that both CPs and CNTs are effective transducers which can be used for the immobilisation of biomolecules. Both materials are conductive and stable in biological systems. Future requirements include improving immobilisation efficiency, tailoring nanostructured interfaces, and integrating these optimised nanobiosensors into external circuitry. The improvement of transduction mechanisms continues to be an important focus for biosensor research, and here we have shown that CPs and CNTs show great promise as efficient transducers. Graphene is the 2D form of CNTs, and it is also becoming increasingly important for biosensor applications [96]. Quantum effects play a significant role in the behaviour of nanomaterials, and can lead to novel optical, electrical and electrochemical properties. Careful engineering of materials at the nanoscale means that their small size and novel characteristics can be exploited for practical bioapplications. Physical and chem-

ical properties of materials, such as colour and ability to conduct charge, are different at the nanoscale, making it possible to achieve a number of improvements over more traditional bulk substrates.

The use of hybrid nanomaterials is becoming increasingly popular, as it offers the opportunity to combine the advantageous properties of each individual constituent in a single composite material [140]. Composites are suitable for multiplexed biosensing, enabling the detection of multiple analytes using a single assay. The signal-to-noise ratio could be further improved using a combination of optimised nanomaterials and advanced circuitry. It is also interesting to consider the idea of personalised healthcare, where wearable sensors are becoming increasingly important [141]. Many challenges still remain in this area, including the miniaturisation of integrated sensors and the issue of power supply. Thus, as we have described, a wide range of nanomaterials and detection mechanisms are suitable for biosensing. The high surface area, porosity, and unique properties of nanomaterials facilitate the ultimate aim of a biosensor that allows a significantly lower limit of biomolecule detection. The development of nanostructured biosensors is critical for further advancing the field of medical diagnostics. Therefore, the importance of nanomaterials for biosensor development cannot be overstated.

Acknowledgements This material is based upon research supported by the Science Foundation Ireland under grant no. 05/CE3/B754. NG acknowledges the EU Seventh Framework grant no. FP7-SME-2008-232037. CL acknowledges the EU Seventh Framework Programme for support in the form of a Marie Curie Re-Integration Grant (no. PIRG02-GA-2007-224880). EL and DD acknowledge SFI 07/CE/I1147—“CLARITY: Centre for Sensor Web Technologies”, and Enterprise Ireland PC/2008/0149.

References

- Auffan M, Rose J, Bottero J, Lowry G, Jolivet J, Wiesner M (2009) *Nat Nanotech* 4:634–641
- Pushparaj VL, Shaijumon M, Kumar A, Murugesan S, CiL, Vajtai R, Linhardt RJ, Nalamasu O, Ajayan PM (2007) *Proc Nat Acad Sci USA* 104:13574–13577
- Cadek M, Coleman J, Ryan KP, Nicolosi V, Bister G, Fonseca A, Nagy JB, Szostak K, Béguin F, Blau WJ (2004) *Nano Lett* 4:353–356
- Spinks GM, Mottaghitalab V, Bahrami-Samani M, Whitten PG, Wallace GG (2006) *Adv Mater* 18:637–640
- Fanchini G, Miller S, Parekh LB, Chhowalla M (2008) *Nano Lett* 8:2176–2179
- Xu K, Huang J, Ye Z, Ying Y, Li Y (2009) *Sensors* 9:5534–5557
- Liu ZM, Li ZJ, Shen GL, Yu RQ (2009) *Anal Lett* 42:3046–3057
- Chen J, Winther-Jensen B, Lynam C, Ngamna O, Moulton S, Zhang W, Wallace GG (2006) *Electrochem Solid St Lett* 9: H68–H70
- Ko YJ, Maeng JH, Ahn Y, Hwang SY, Cho NG, Lee SH (2008) *Electrophoresis* 29:3466–3476
- Healy DA, Hayes CJ, Leonard P, McKenna L, O’Kennedy R (2007) *Trends Biotechnol* 25:125–131
- Byrne B, Stack E, Gilmartin N, O’Kennedy R (2009) *Sensors* 9:4407–4445
- Sanvicens N, Pastells C, Pascual N, Marco MP (2009) *Trends Anal Chem* 28:1243–1252
- Sepúlveda B, González-Díaz JB, García-Martín A, Lechuga LM, Armelles G (2010) *Phys Rev Lett* 104:147401
- Leland CC Jr, Champ L (1962) *Ann NY Acad Sci* 102:29–45
- Halliwel CM, Simon E, Toh C-S, Bartlett PN, Cass AEG (2002) *Anal Chim Acta* 453:191–200
- Qu F, Yang M, Jiang J, Shen G, Yu R (2005) *Anal Biochem* 344:108–14
- Rahman MA, Kwon N-H, Won M-S, Choe ES, Shim Y-B (2005) *Anal Chem* 77:4854–60
- Morrin A, Ngamna O, Killard AJ, Moulton SE, Smyth MR, Wallace GG (2005) *Electroanalysis* 17:423–430
- Hong C, Ying X, Pin-Gang H, Yu-Zhi F (2003) *Electroanalysis* 15:1864–70
- Sepúlveda B, Angelomé PC, Lechuga LM, Liz-Marzán LM (2009) *Nano Today* 4:244–51
- Wang J (2009) *ChemPhysChem* 10:1748–55
- Wanekaya AK, Chen W, Myung NV, Mulchandani A (2006) *Electroanalysis* 18:533–50
- Hahm J-i, Lieber CM (2003) *Nano Lett* 4:51–54
- Zheng G, Patolsky F, Cui Y, Wang WU, Lieber CM (2005) *Nat Biotechnol* 23:1294–1301
- Ates M, Sarac AS (2009) *Prog Org Coat* 66:337–358
- Iijima S (1991) *Nature* 354:56–58
- Dresselhaus M, Dresselhaus G, Avouris P (eds)(2001) *Carbon nanotubes (Topics in Applied Physics 80)*. Springer, Berlin
- Haddon RC (2002) *Acc Chem Res* 35:997–1113
- Tasis D, Tagmatarchis N, Bianco A, Prato M (2006) *Chem Rev* 106:1105–1136
- Wildgoose GG, Banks CE, Leventis HC, Compton RG (2006) *Microchim Acta* 152:187–214
- Thess A, Lee R, Nikolaev P, Dai H, Petit P et al (1996) *Science* 273:483–487
- Bandow S, Rao AM, Williams KA, Thess A, Smalley RE, Eklund PC (1997) *J Phys Chem B* 101:8839–8842
- Lynam C, Moulton SE, Wallace GG (2007) *Adv Mater* 19:1244–1248
- Ausman KD, Piner R, Lourie O, Ruoff RS, Korobov M (2000) *J Phys Chem B* 104:8911–8915
- Lynam C, Wallace GG, Officer DL (2007) *J Nanosci Nanotechnol* 7:3487–3494
- Mawhinney DB, Naumenko V, Kuznetsova A, Yates JT, Liu J, Smalley RE (2000) *Chem Phys Lett* 324:213–216
- Hu H, Bhowmik P, Zhao B, Hamon MA, Itkis ME, Haddon RC (2001) *Chem Phys Lett* 345:25–28
- Hu H, Ni YC, Montana V, Haddon RC, Parpura V (2004) *Nano Lett* 4:507–511
- Kong H, Gao C, Yan DY (2004) *Macromolecules* 37:4022–4030
- Chen QD, Dai LM, Gao M, Huang SM, Mau A (2001) *J Phys Chem B* 105:618–622
- Hazani M, Naaman R, Hennrich F, Kappes MM (2003) *Nano Lett* 3:153–155
- Fu KF, Huang WJ, Lin Y, Zhang DH, Hanks TW et al (2002) *J Nanosci Nanotechnol* 2:457–461
- Huang WJ, Taylor S, Fu KF, Lin Y, Zhang DH et al (2002) *Nano Lett* 2:311–314
- Liu JQ, Chou A, Rahmat W, Paddon-Row MN, Gooding JJ (2005) *Electroanalysis* 17:38–46
- Gooding JJ, Wibowo R, Liu JQ, Yang WR, Losic D et al (2003) *J Am Chem Soc* 125:9006–9007
- Williams KA, Veenhuizen PTM, de la Torre BG, Eritja R, Dekker C (2002) *Nature* 420:761

47. Dwyer C, Guthold M, Falvo M, Washburn S, Superfine R, Erie D (2002) *Nanotechnology* 13:601–604
48. Lee CS, Baker SE, Marcus MS, Yang WS, Eriksson MA, Hamers RJ (2004) *Nano Lett* 4:1713–1716
49. Chen RJ, Bangsaruntip S, Drouvalakis KA, Kam NWS, Shim M et al (2003) *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 100:4984–4989
50. Shim M, Kam NWS, Chen RJ, Li YM, Dai HJ (2002) *Nano Lett* 2:285–288
51. Chen RJ, Zhang YG, Wang DW, Dai HJ (2001) *J Am Chem Soc* 123:3838–3839
52. Guo ZJ, Sadler PJ, Tsang SC (1998) *Adv Mater* 10:701–703
53. Moulton SE, Minett AI, Murphy R, Ryan KP, McCarthy D et al (2005) *Carbon* 43:1879–1884
54. Moulton SE, Maugey M, Poulin P, Wallace GG (2007) *J Am Chem Soc* 129:9452–9457
55. Lynam C, Gilmartin N, Minett AI, O'Kennedy R, Wallace G (2009) *Carbon* 47:2337–2343
56. Gerard M, Chaubey A, Malhotra BD (2002) *Biosens Bioelectron* 17:345–359
57. Lahiff E, Woods T, Blau W, Wallace GG, Diamond D (2009) *Synth Met* 159:741–748
58. Shirakawa H, Louis EJ, MacDiarmid AG, Chiang CK, Heeger AJ (1977) *Chem Commun* 578–580
59. Gustafsson G, Cao Y, Treacy GM, Klavetter F, Colaneri N, Heeger AJ (1992) *Nature* 357:477–479
60. Greenham NC, Moratti SC, Bradley DDC, Friend RH, Holmes AB (1993) *Nature* 365:628–630
61. Arias AC, Granström M, Thomas DS, Petritsch K, Friend RH (1999) *Phys Rev B* 60:1854
62. Morrin A, Ngamna O, O'Malley E, Kent N, Moulton SE et al (2008) *Electrochim Acta* 53:5092–5099
63. Joshi PP, Merchant S, Wang Y, Schmidtke DW (2005) *Anal Chem* 77:3183–3188
64. MacDiarmid AG (2001) *Angew Chem Int Ed* 40:2581–2590
65. Yue J, Wang ZH, Cromack KR, Epstein AJ, MacDiarmid AG (1991) *J Am Chem Soc* 113:2665–2671
66. Lahiff E, Lynam C, Gilmartin N, Wallace G, O'Kennedy R, Diamond D (2009) *Mater Res Soc Symp Proc* 240-WW06-02
67. Kincal D, Kumar A, Child AD, Reynolds JR (1998) *Synth Met* 92:53–56
68. Spinks GM, Mottaghitalab V, Bahrami-Samani M, Whitten PG, Wallace GG (2006) *Adv Mater* 18:637–640
69. Guimard NK, Gomez N, Schmidt CE (2007) *Prog Polym Sci* 32:876–921
70. Li D, Huang J, Kaner RB (2008) *Acc Chem Res* 42:135–145
71. Dhand C, Singh SP, Arya SK, Datta M, Malhotra BD (2007) *Anal Chim Acta* 602:244–251
72. Huang J, Kaner RB (2003) *J Am Chem Soc* 126:851–855
73. Huang JX, Kaner RB (2006) *Chem Commun* 367–376
74. Khan R, Solanki P, Kaushik A, Singh S, Ahmad S, Malhotra B (2009) *J Polym Res* 16:363–373
75. Malhotra BD, Chaubey A, Singh SP (2006) *Anal Chim Acta* 578:59–74
76. Mathiyarasu J, Senthilkumar S, Phani KLN, Yegnaraman V (2007) *J Nanosci Nanotechnol* 7:2206–2210
77. Peng H, Soeller C, Vigar NA, Caprio V, Travas-Sejdic J (2007) *Biosens Bioelectron* 22:1868–1873
78. Sangodkar H, Sukeerthi S, Srinivasa RS, Lal R, Contractor AQ (1996) *Anal Chem* 68:779–783
79. Ahuja T, Mir IA, Kumar D, Rajesh (2007) *Biomaterials* 28:791–805
80. Wang JJ, Myung NV, Yun MH, Monbouquette HG (2005) *J Electroanal Chem* 575:139–146
81. Lisdat F, Schafer D (2008) *Anal Bioanal Chem* 391:1555–1567
82. Daniels JS, Pourmand N (2007) *Electroanalysis* 19:1239–1257
83. Wang J (2005) *Electroanal* 17:7–14
84. Yun Y, Dong Z, Shanov V, Heineman WR, Halsall HB, Bhattacharya A, Conforti L, Narayan RK, Ball WS, Schulz MJ (2007) *Nano Today* 2:30–37
85. Pumera M, Sánchez S, Ichinose I, Tang J (2007) *Sens Actuators B* 123:1195–1205
86. Wang J (2005) *Analyst* 130:421–426
87. Gooding J (2005) *Electrochim Acta* 50:3049–3060
88. Zhao YD, Zhang WD, Chen H, Luo QF, Li SFY (2002) *Sens Actuators B* 87:168–172
89. Wang JX, Li MX, Shi ZJ, Li NQ, Gu ZN (2002) *Anal Chem* 74:1993–1997
90. Davis JJ, Coles RJ, Hill HAO (1997) *J Electroanal Chem* 440:279–282
91. Li J, Cassell A, Delzeit L, Han J, Meyyappan M (2002) *J Phys Chem B* 106:9299–9305
92. Gao M, Dai LM, Wallace GG (2003) *Electroanalysis* 15:1089–1094
93. Göpel W, Jones TA, Kleitz M, Lundstroem J, Seiyama T (1991) In: Göpel W, Hesse J, Zemel JN (eds) *Sensors: a comprehensive survey*. VCH-Verlag, Weinheim
94. Balasubramanian K, Burghard M (2006) *Anal Bioanal Chem* 385:452–468
95. Rivas GA, Rubianes MD, Rodriguez MC, Ferreyra NF, Luque GL et al (2007) *Talanta* 74:291–307
96. Yang W, Ratnac KR, Ringer SP, Thordarson P, Gooding JJ, Braet F (2010) *Angew Chem Int Ed Engl* 49:2114–2138
97. Jacobs CB, Peairs MJ, Venton BJ (2010) *Anal Chim Acta* 662:105–127
98. Rusling JF, Zhang Z (2003) Designing functional biomolecular films on electrodes. In: Rusling JF (ed) *Biomolecular films: design, function, and applications* (Surfactant Series, vol 111). Marcel Dekker, New York
99. Rubianes MD, Rivas GA (2003) *Electrochem Commun* 5:689–694
100. Guo ML, Chen JH, Li J, Nie LH, Yao SZ (2004) *Electroanalysis* 16:1992–1998
101. Li G, Liao JM, Hu GQ, Ma NZ, Wu PJ (2005) *Biosens Bioelectron* 20:2140–2144
102. Cai H, Cao X, Jiang Y, He P, Fang Y (2003) *Anal Bioanal Chem* 375:287–293
103. Zhu N, Chang Z, He P, Fang Y (2005) *Anal Chim Acta* 545:21–26
104. Ferancová A, Ovádeková R, Vaníková M et al (2006) *Electroanalysis* 18:163–168
105. Kerman K, Morita Y, Takamura Y, Ozsoz M, Tamiya E (2004) *Electroanalysis* 16:1667–1672
106. Ye Y, Ju H (2005) *Biosens Bioelectron* 21:735–741
107. Li J, Ng HT, Cassell A, Fan W, Chen H et al (2003) *Nano Lett* 3:597–602
108. Wang J, Kawde AN, Musameh M (2003) *Analyst* 128:912–916
109. Heng LY, Chou A, Yu J, Chen Y, Gooding JJ (2005) *Electrochem Commun* 7:1457–1462
110. Yu X, Munge B, Patel V, Jensen G, Bhirde A, Gong JD, Kim SN, Gillespie J, Gutkind JS, Papadimitrakopoulos F, Rusling JF (2006) *J Am Chem Soc* 128:11199–11205
111. Wang J, Liu G, Jan M (2004) *J Am Chem Soc* 126:3010–3011
112. Wang J, Liu G, Jan MR (2004) *J Am Chem Soc* 126:3010–3011
113. Lin YY, Wang J, Liu G, Wu H, Wai CM, Lin Y (2008) *Biosens Bioelectron* 23:1659–1665
114. Kim SN, Rusling JF, Papadimitrakopoulos F (2007) *Adv Mater* 19:3214–3228
115. Chen RJ, Bangsaruntip S, Drouvalakis KA, Kam NWS, Shim M, Li Y, Kim W, Utz PJ, Dai H (2003) *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 100:4984–4989
116. Star A, Tu E, Niemann J, Gabriel JCP, Joiner CS, Valcke C (2006) *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 103:921–926
117. Zheng G, Patolsky F, Cui Y, Wang WU, Lieber CM (2005) *Nat Biotechnol* 23:1294–1301

118. Stokes P, Khondaker SI (2008) *Nanotechnology* 19:175202
119. Lu F, Gu L, Meziani MJ, Wang X, Luo PG, Veca LM, Cao L, Sun YP (2009) *Adv Mater* 21:139–152
120. Maehashi K, Katsura T, Kerman K, Takamura Y, Matsumoto K, Tamiya E (2007) *Anal Chem* 79:782–787
121. Li C, Currelli M, Lin H, Lei B, Ishikawa FN, Datar R, Cote R, Thompson M, Zhou C (2005) *Am Chem Soc* 127:484–485
122. Byon HR, Choi HC (2006) *J Am Chem Soc* 128:2188–2189
123. Welsher K, Liu Z, Daranciang D, Dai H (2008) *Nano Lett* 8:586–590
124. Barone PW, Baik S, Heller DA, Strano MS (2005) *Nat Mater* 4:86–92
125. Zhang L, Peng H, Kilmartin PA, Soeller C, Travas-Sejdic J (2007) *Electroanalysis* 19:870–875
126. Zhu N, Chang Z, He P, Fang Y (2006) *Electrochim Acta* 51:3758–3762
127. Singh R, Prasad R, Sumana G, Arora K, Sood S et al (2009) *Biosens Bioelectron* 24:2232–2238
128. Geetha S, Rao CRK, Vijayan M, Trivedi DC (2006) *Anal Chim Acta* 568:119–125
129. Rahman MA, Park D-S, Chang S-C, McNeil CJ, Shim Y-B (2006) *Biosens Bioelectron* 21:1116–1124
130. Ramanathan K, Bangar MA, Yun M, Chen W, Myung NV, Mulchandani A (2004) *J Am Chem Soc* 127:496–497
131. Wei F, Liao W, Xu Z, Yang Y, Wong DT, Ho C-M (2009) *Small* 5:1784–1790
132. Azioune A, Ben Slimane A, Hamou LA, Pleuvy A, Chehimi MM, et al. (2004) *Langmuir* 20:3350–3356
133. Tolani S, Craig M, DeLong R, Ghosh K, Wanekaya A (2009) *Anal Bioanal Chem* 393:1225–1231
134. Agüí L, Yáñez-Sedeño P, Pingarrón JM (2008) *Anal Chim Acta* 622:11–47
135. Cheng G, Zhao J, Tu Y, He P, Fang Y (2005) *Anal Chim Acta* 533:11–16
136. Prabhakar N, Arora K, Singh H, Malhotra BD (2008) *J Phys Chem B* 112:4808–4816
137. Tang H, Chen J, Yao S, Nie L, Deng G, Kuang Y (2004) *Anal Biochem* 331:89–97
138. Claussen JC, Franklin AD, Ul Haque A, Porterfield DM, Fisher TS (2009) *ACS Nano* 3:37–44
139. Liu Y, Wu S, Ju H, Xu L (2007) *Electroanal* 19:986–992
140. Xiao Y, Li CM (2008) *Electroanalysis* 20:648–662
141. Diamond D, Coyle S, Scarmagnani S, Hayes J (2008) *Chem Rev* 108:652–679
142. Lahiff E, Ryu CY, Curran S, Minett AI, Blau WJ, Ajayan PM (2003) *Nano Lett* 3:1333–1337
143. Virji S, Kaner RB, Weiller BH (2006) *J Phys Chem B* 110:22266–22270
144. Bandodkar A, Dhand C, Arya S, Pandey M, Malhotra B (2010) *Biomed Microdev* 12:63–70
145. So H-M, Won K, Kim YH, Kim B-K, Ryu BH et al (2005) *J Am Chem Soc* 127:11906–11907