



# Acetylcholinesterase biosensor based on prussian blue-modified electrode for detecting organophosphorous pesticides

Xia Sun, Xiangyou Wang\*

School of Agriculture and Food Engineering, Shandong University of Technology, NO. 12, Zhangzhou Road, Zibo 255049, Shandong Province, PR China

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 16 February 2010

Received in revised form 15 April 2010

Accepted 19 April 2010

Available online 28 April 2010

### Keywords:

Biosensor

Prussian blue

Acetylcholinesterase

Pesticide residue

Modified electrode



## ABSTRACT

In this study, a novel acetylcholinesterase (AChE) biosensor was developed based on dual-layer membranes (chitosan membrane and prussian blue membrane) modifying glassy carbon electrode (GCE). A chitosan membrane was used for immobilizing AChE through glutaraldehyde cross-linking attachment to recognize pesticides selectively. A prussian blue (PB) membrane was electrodeposited on the surface of GCE to enhance electron transfer. Before the detection, the chitosan enzyme membrane was quickly fixed on the surface of PB/GCE with O-ring to prepare an amperometric AChE-PB/GCE sensor for organophosphorus (OP) pesticides. The electrochemical behaviour of AChE-PB/GCE was studied, and the results showed that the chitosan membrane as carrier can absorb a large amount of enzyme, and PB has a significant synergistic effect towards enzymatic catalysis. As a result of these two important enhancement factors, the proposed biosensor exhibited extreme sensitivity to OP pesticides compared to the other kinds of AChE biosensor. The influences of phosphate buffer pH, substrate concentration, incubation time of pesticide on the response of the fabricated biosensor were investigated. Under optimum conditions, the inhibition rates of these pesticides were proportional to their concentrations in the range of  $0.01\text{--}10\text{ }\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ,  $0.05\text{--}10\text{ }\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ,  $0.03\text{--}5\text{ }\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ , and  $0.05\text{--}10\text{ }\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ , respectively. The detection limits were found to be  $2.5\text{ ng l}^{-1}$  for dichlorvos,  $15\text{ ng l}^{-1}$  for omethoate,  $5\text{ ng l}^{-1}$  for trichlorfon and  $10\text{ ng l}^{-1}$  for phoxim. Moreover, the biosensor exhibited good reproducibility and stability, and it was suitable for trace detection of OP pesticide residue.

© 2010 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Organophosphorus (OP) compounds are harmful to the health of human beings, therefore, the development of fast and sensitive detection methods become more and more important. Recently biosensor techniques based on the inhibition of acetylcholinesterase (AChE) activity have gained considerable attention due to the advantages of simplicity, rapidity, reliability and low cost devices (Tanimoto de Albuquerque and Ferreira, 2007; Ramírez et al., 2008). Several types of AChE-based amperometric, potentiometric, or optical biosensors have been described (Mulchandani et al., 1999; Viveros et al., 2006). For amperometric AChE-based biosensor, the inhibition of enzyme activity is monitored by the change of oxidation current of the thiocholine (TCh) at a certain potential. (Liu et al., 2006; Du et al., 2007a,b; Schulze et al., 2003). The reaction equation is shown as follows (Wu et al., 2009):



Improvements on amperometric biosensor have mainly focused on two aspects. One is to improve electrocatalytic ability and enhance electron transfer through the modification of working electrode at a lower potential. A variety of modification methods have been employed, such as cobalt phthalocyanine (Parham and Rahbar, 2010), multi-walled carbon nanotubes (MWNTs) (Du et al., 2010; Tsai et al., 2008; Sun et al., 2010), 7,7,8,8-Tetracyanoquinodimethane (TCNQ) (Bucur et al., 2006) and prussian blue (PB) (Shulga and Kirchhoff, 2007; Suprun et al., 2005; Arduini et al., 2006; Wu et al., 2009). Among these methods, prussian blue has attracted enormous interest for the fabrication of electrochemical biosensors that possess conductive sensing interface, catalytic properties and conductivity properties (Suprun et al., 2005; Arduini et al., 2006; Wu et al., 2009).

The other technique is to improve the efficiency of enzyme immobilization (Gao et al., 2005; Sun et al., 2008a,b). Commonly, enzymes were immobilized on electrode surfaces directly (Du et al., 2008; Du et al., 2007a,b; Yin et al., 2009), which has many disadvantages, such as weak protection of the immobilized enzyme and elaborate pretreatment of the electrode surface before the actual immobilization. In contrast, by immobilizing enzyme on a membrane, the enzyme membrane can be easily replaced when enzyme's activity is lost. Moreover, there are multiple options for

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +86 533 2786558.

E-mail address: [wxy@sdu.edu.cn](mailto:wxy@sdu.edu.cn) (X. Wang).

analyte detection based on the choice of enzyme to immobilize on the membrane (one electrode–multiple membranes–multiple enzymes) (Marinov et al., 2009; Ivanov et al., 2010; Shimomura et al., 2009).

Chitosan as membrane material contains large groups of -NH<sub>2</sub> and -OH which is preferable to maintain the high biological activity of the immobilized biomolecules. In addition, chitosan also has the properties of nontoxicity and low cost. Therefore, it is widely used as carrier material for enzyme immobilization (Du et al., 2008; Gong et al., 2009).

As mentioned above, using a replaceable chitosan membrane as carrier material can provide a favorable microenvironment, load a large amount of enzyme and prolong the enzyme storage life, and it is a simple operation to replace enzyme membrane, rather than immobilize enzyme on a new electrode when enzyme's activity lost. Using PB membrane to modify the glassy carbon electrode (GCE) can improve electrocatalytic ability and enhance electron transfer, therefore, can obtain high amperometric signals with a corresponding low detection limit. Based on these consideration, we introduced a novel dual-layer membrane (chitosan membrane and PB modified membrane) modified biosensor. To the best of our knowledge, this kind of biosensor has not yet been reported. The aim of this work was to develop a fast, simple, inexpensive, stable and highly sensitive AChE biosensor for OP pesticides. The experimental conditions related to the performance of the fabricated biosensor (pH, substrate concentration, inhibition time) were investigated in detail. Four kinds of OP pesticides were then analyzed with this biosensor demonstrating the high sensitivity and stability of this method.

## 2. Experimental

### 2.1. Apparatus

Cyclic voltammograms and amperometric *i*-*t* curve were performed with CHI660D electrochemical workstation (Shanghai Chenhua Co., China). The working electrode was glassy carbon electrode (*d* = 3 mm) or modified glassy carbon electrode. A saturated calomel electrode (SCE) and platinum electrode were used as reference and auxiliary electrodes, respectively.

### 2.2. Reagents

Acetylcholinesterase was purchased from Nuoyawei Biology Tech. Co. (Shanghai, China). Acetylthiocholine iodide (ATChI), glutaraldehyde (25%) and bovine serum albumin (BSA) were provided by Sigma. Cellulose nitrate microporous membrane with an aperture of 0.45 μm was purchased from Hangzhou Rikang Purification Equipment Co. (Hangzhou, China). Pesticides were standard products. Chitosan (95% deacetylation), phosphate buffer (PBS, pH 8.0) and other reagents were of analytical grade.

### 2.3. Preparation of PB modified AChE biosensor

#### 2.3.1. Preparation of chitosan membrane

A solution was prepared with 0.1 g chitosan added to 10 ml of acetate solution (1%, mass ratio), and the mixture was centrifuged for 5 min in high-speed centrifuge at 3000 rpm to remove insoluble particles. Finally, the pretreated cellulose nitrate microporous membrane was immersed in this sol for 12 h, and then immersed in phosphate buffer (PBS, 0.1 mol l<sup>-1</sup>, pH 8.0) for 12 h, dried and stored for use (Qiang et al., 2007).

#### 2.3.2. The AChE immobilization

A solution of 100 μl of AChE liquid (100 U ml<sup>-1</sup>), 30.0 μl of BSA (1.0%), 10 μl of glutaraldehyde (5.0%), and 360 μl of PBS (0.1 mol l<sup>-1</sup>, pH 8.0) were mixed in a 1 ml of centrifuge tube. A chitosan membrane was immersed in it for 8 h at 4 °C. Finally, enzyme membrane was washed with PBS (0.1 mol l<sup>-1</sup>, pH 8.0), immersed in PBS (0.1 mol l<sup>-1</sup>, pH 8.0), and stored at 4 °C before use (Sun et al., 2008a,b).

#### 2.3.3. Electrode modification with PB

The A solution was a mixture of 2 mM K<sub>3</sub>[Fe(CN)<sub>6</sub>], 2 mM FeCl<sub>3</sub>, 0.1 M KCl, and 10 mM HCl, and the B solution was a mixture of 0.1 M KCl and 10 mM HCl. First, a potential of +0.4 V was applied to the electrode in solution A for 60 s and then the electrode was transferred to the B solution, and scanned by cyclic voltammetry from -0.05 and 0.35 V at a rate of 50 mV s<sup>-1</sup> for 12 times. The electrode surface was rinsed with double-distilled water. Finally, the electrode was stored at room temperature (Jin and Hu, 2008).

#### 2.3.4. Preparation of AChE-PB/GCE

Before the detection, the chitosan enzyme membrane was quickly fixed on the surface of PB/GCE with O-ring to prepare an amperometric AChE-PB/GCE sensor for OP pesticides (See supporting information, Fig. S1)

### 2.4. Amperometric analysis of pesticides

The AChE-PB/GCE biosensor was tested by amperometric *i*-*t* curve (*i*-*t*) at a potential of 600 mV (versus SCE). After 100 μl of ATChI (15 mg ml<sup>-1</sup>) solution was injected into the cell, and the peak current was recorded as *I*<sub>0</sub>. The cell was washed with double-distilled water between measurements.

For OP pesticide detection, the AChE-PB/GCE was incubated in a given concentrations of pesticide for 10 min. Then it was transferred to PBS (0.1 mol l<sup>-1</sup>, pH 8.0), and 100 μl of ATChI was injected. The peak current was recorded as *I*<sub>1</sub>. The inhibition rate of pesticides was calculated as follows:


$$I\% = \frac{(I_0 - I_1)}{I_0} \times 100\%$$

where *I*<sub>0</sub> was the peak current of ATChI at the AChE-PB/GCE biosensor, and *I*<sub>1</sub> was the peak current of ATChI at the AChE-PB/GCE biosensor with pesticide inhibition.

## 3. Results and discussion

### 3.1. Electrochemical behaviour of AChE-PB/GCE

Fig. 1 showed the cyclic voltammograms of AChE/GCE and AChE-PB/GCE in the presence and absence of 100 μl of ATChI (15 mg ml<sup>-1</sup>) in PBS (pH 8.0) at a scan rate of 100 mV s<sup>-1</sup>. No peak was observed at GCE (curve a) and AChE-PB/GCE (curve b) in PBS. After 100 μl of ATChI was injected into PBS, the cyclic voltammogram of AChE-PB/GCE identified an oxidation peak at 570 mV (curve d), and the non-modified AChE/GCE also appeared an oxidation peak at 900 mV (curve c). The oxidation peak (curve c and d) came from the oxidation of thiocholine, hydrolysis product of ATChI, catalyzed by immobilized AChE. Fig. 1 also showed that this peak current (curve d) had a sharp increase and the peak potential shifted negatively compared to those on the electrode without PB (AChE/GCE) (curve c). One reason was the presence of PB on the surface of GCE, which possessed a relatively large specific surface area and an inherent, high electricity conducting ability, thus they could enhance the rates of catalyzed reactions as well as the electron transfer rate at a lower potential, which was comparable with that reported electrochemical (Arduini et al., 2006; Wu et al., 2009). The other



**Fig. 1.** Cyclic voltammograms, GCE (a); PB/GCE (b); AChE/GCE (c) and AChE-PB/GCE (d) in pH 8.0 PBS containing 100  $\mu\text{l}$  of ATChI ( $15 \text{ mg ml}^{-1}$ ). Scan rate:  $100 \text{ mV s}^{-1}$ .

reason for obtaining high peak current was the use of chitosan membrane, which provided a biocompatible microenvironment around the enzyme molecule to stabilize its biological activity and prevented the enzyme leaking out from chitosan membrane effectively. Dual-layer membranes had synergistic effects towards enzymatic catalysis, thus, the oxidation peak current was higher than previously reported (Wu et al., 2009; Du et al., 2007a,b; Yin et al., 2009) at a certain potential, which can improve detection sensitivity.

### 3.2. Optimization of experimental parameters

#### 3.2.1. Phosphate buffer pH

Fig. 2a showed that the current increase with an increase of pH value up to 8.0, and then it decreased at higher pH value. Obviously, pH value had a significant influence on the peak current of AChE-PB/GCE, and the maximum peak current appeared at pH 8.0. Thus, an 8.0 pH of phosphate buffer was used in the subsequent experiment.

#### 3.2.2. ATChI concentration


Fig. 2b showed that the peak current increase when the ATChI concentration was less than  $15 \text{ mg ml}^{-1}$ , whereas the peak current had no change with the further increase in the concentration of ATChI. The reason might be that the velocity of enzyme catalyzing substrate reaches equilibrium, so with subsequent increases of the substrate concentration, the velocity of enzyme catalyzing substrate did not increase. Thus, the ATChI concentration of  $15 \text{ mg ml}^{-1}$  was selected.

#### 3.2.3. Incubation time on inhibition

Fig. 2c showed that the peak current of AChE-PB/GCE decrease greatly with an increase of incubation time in the OP pesticides solution. When the incubation time was longer than 10 min, the curve trended to maintain a stable value, which indicated that the binding interaction with active target groups in enzyme could reach saturation. Thus, the optimum incubation time of 10 min was selected.


### 3.3. Determination of pesticides

As shown in Fig. 3, when substrate was injected into the buffered solution, an anodic current at potentials of 600 mV was observed (a–g). When AChE-PB/GCE was incubated in the standard solution of dichlorvos at a known concentration for 10 min, the peak current decreased drastically (curve b–g) compared with no inhibitor (curve a). The peak current was decreased to 52.43% after exposure to  $100 \text{ ng l}^{-1}$  dichlorvos. At exposure to higher dichlorvos con-



**Fig. 2.** Optimization of experimental parameters, effect of phosphate buffer pH on AChE-PB/GCE (a); effect of ATChI concentration on AChE-PB/GCE (b) and effect of the incubation time of pesticides on the AChE-PB/GCE (c).

centration ( $1 \mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ), the peak current decreased to 94.02%. The inhibition rate of AChE activity and the logarithm of dichlorvos concentration have a certain linear relationship (Gao et al., 2005) in the range from  $10 \text{ ng l}^{-1}$  to  $1 \mu\text{g l}^{-1}$  (Fig. 3), with the correlation coefficient of 0.9968. The detection limit was  $2.5 \text{ ng l}^{-1}$ .



**Fig. 3.** Amperometric  $i-t$  curve of AChE-PB/GCE in PBS ( $0.1 \text{ mol l}^{-1}$ , pH 8.0) injected 100  $\mu\text{l}$  of ATChI ( $15 \text{ mg ml}^{-1}$ ), after incubation in  $0 \text{ ng l}^{-1}$  (a),  $10 \text{ ng l}^{-1}$  (b),  $30 \text{ ng l}^{-1}$  (c),  $100 \text{ ng l}^{-1}$  (d),  $300 \text{ ng l}^{-1}$  (e),  $500 \text{ ng l}^{-1}$  (f) and  $1000 \text{ ng l}^{-1}$  (g) dichlorvos solution with 10 min.

**Table 1**  
Detection of four kinds of pesticides with the AChE-PB/GCE.

| Pesticides  | Linear range                                   | Equation of linear regression | Correlation coefficient | R.S.D. | Detection limit        |
|-------------|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--------|------------------------|
| Dichlorvos  | 10 ng l <sup>-1</sup> to 10 µg l <sup>-1</sup> | $I = 32.3 \lg c - 10.9$       | 0.9968                  | <4.1%  | 2.5 ng l <sup>-1</sup> |
| Omethoate   | 50 ng l <sup>-1</sup> to 10 µg l <sup>-1</sup> | $I = 22.015 \lg c + 6.5147$   | 0.9931                  | <5.1%  | 15 ng l <sup>-1</sup>  |
| Trichlorfon | 30 ng l <sup>-1</sup> to 5 µg l <sup>-1</sup>  | $I = 23.514 \lg c + 9.5466$   | 0.9871                  | <5.3%  | 5 ng l <sup>-1</sup>   |
| Phoxim      | 50 ng l <sup>-1</sup> to 10 µg l <sup>-1</sup> | $I = 21.624 \lg c + 0.0087$   | 0.9947                  | <4.3%  | 10 ng l <sup>-1</sup>  |

As shown in Table 1, the AChE-PB/GCE had very low detection limit for four kinds of pesticides (dichlorvos, omethoate, trichlorfon and phoxim), however, the detection limits were different, which indicated AChE-PB/GCE had different sensitivity for different OP pesticides.

### 3.4. Reactivation of the biosensor

The AChE inhibited by OP pesticides can be reactivated by immersion in PBS (0.1 mol l<sup>-1</sup>, pH 8.0). It was observed that AChE modified electrode inhibited by dichlorvos (500 ng l<sup>-1</sup>) can resume 95.1% original activity after immersion in PBS (0.1 mol l<sup>-1</sup>, pH 8.0) for 20 min (See supporting information, Fig. S2).

The experimental results also indicated that PBS itself play a role as a reagent of reactivation of AChE, which had a good reactivation effect with immersion in PBS (0.1 mol l<sup>-1</sup>, pH 8.0) for sufficient time. Compared with using TMB-4 or 2-PAM as reagent of reactivation previously reported (Anitha et al., 2004; Luckarift et al., 2007), this method was simple and reliable.

### 3.5. Precision of measurements and stability of biosensor

The precision intra-assay of the biosensors was evaluated by assaying three enzyme membranes on the same electrode for ten continuous determinations after exposure to a certain concentration pesticides. Similarly, the inter-assay precision was estimated by assaying three enzyme membranes on six different electrodes. The average relative standard deviation (R.S.D.) of intra-assay and inter-assay were found to be 4.8 and 3.5%, respectively, indicating acceptable reproducibility.

## 4. Conclusions

We have successfully developed an amperometric biosensor for highly selective and sensitive determination of OP pesticides residues. A remarkably low detection limit has been achieved through modifying GCE with dual-layer membranes. The PB membrane had a significant synergistic effect towards enzymatic catalysis, and chitosan membrane as carrier material absorbed more enzymes. Based on these two important enhancement factors, the detecting current of biosensor evidently was amplified correspondingly. Therefore, this biosensor obtained significantly higher sensitivity and a lower detection limit. Thus, it is more suitable for trace detection of OP pesticides residue compared with the other AChE biosensor.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 30972055), Scientific and Technological Project of Shandong Province (No. 2008GG10009027), and the Natural Science Foundation of Shandong Province (No. Q2008D03).

## Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at doi:10.1016/j.bios.2010.04.028.

## References

- Arduini, F., Ricci, F., Tuta, C.S., Moscone, D., Amine, A., Paleschi, G., 2006. Anal. Chim. Acta 58, 155–162.
- Anitha, K., Mohan, S.V., Reddy, S.J., 2004. Biosens. Bioelectron. 20, 848–856.
- Bucur, B., Fournier, D., Danet, A.F., Marty, J.M., 2006. Anal. Chim. Acta 562, 115–121.
- Du, D., Huang, X., Cai, J., Zhang, A.D., 2007a. Sens. Actuators B: Chem. 127, 531–535.
- Du, D., Huang, X., Cai, J., Zhang, A.D., 2007b. Biosens. Bioelectron. 23, 285–289.
- Du, D., Chen, S.Z., Song, D.D., Li, H.B., Chen, X., 2008. Biosens. Bioelectron. 24, 475–479.
- Du, D., Wang, M.H., Cai, J., Zhang, A.D., 2010. Sens. Actuators B 146, 337–341.
- Gao, H.L., Kang, T.F., Wang, X.Q., Lu, L.P., 2005. Environ. Chem. 24, 707–710.
- Gong, J.M., Liu, T., Song, D.D., Zhang, X.B., Zhang, L.Z., 2009. Electrochem. Commun. 11, 1873–1876.
- Ivanov, Y., Marinov, I., Gabrovska, K., Dimcheva, N., Godjevargova, T., 2010. J. Mol. Catal. B: Enzym. 63, 141–148.
- Jin, G.D., Hu, X.Y., 2008. Chin. J. Anal. Lab. 27, 14–17.
- Liu, Y., Qu, X.H., Guo, H.W., Chen, H.J., Liu, B.F., Dong, S.J., 2006. Biosens. Bioelectron. 21, 2195–2201.
- Luckarift, H.R., Greenwald, R., Bergin, M.H., Spain, J.C., Johnson, G.R., 2007. Biosens. Bioelectron. 23, 400–406.
- Marinov, I., Gabrovska, K., Velichkova, J., Godjevargova, T., 2009. Int. J. Biol. Macromol. 44, 338–345.
- Mulchandani, A., Mulchandani, P., Chen, W., Wang, J., Chen, L., 1999. Anal. Chem. 71, 2246–2249.
- Parham, H., Rahbar, N., 2010. J. Hazard. Mater. 177, 1077–1084.
- Qiang, Z.B., Chen, Y.S., Guo, H.W., Liu, J.Q., 2007. J. Dong Hua Univ. 33, 212–215.
- Ramírez, G.V., Fournier, D., Silva, M.T.R., Marty, J.L., 2008. Talanta 74, 741–746.
- Schulze, H., Vorlová, S., Villatte, F., Bachmann, T.T., Schmid, R.D., 2003. Biosens. Bioelectron. 18, 201–209.
- Shimomura, T., Itoh, T., Sumiya, T., Mizukami, F., Ono, M., 2009. Enzyme Microb. Technol. 45, 443–448.
- Shulga, O., Kirchhoff, J., 2007. Electrochem. Commun. 9, 935–940.
- Suprun, E., Evtugyn, G., Budnikov, H., Ricci, F., Moscone, D., Paleschi, G., 2005. Anal. Bioanal. Chem. 383, 597–604.
- Sun, X., Wang, X.Y., Wang, X.Y., Liu, Z., 2008a. Int. J. Food Eng. 4, article7.
- Sun, X., Wang, X.Y., Liu, Z., 2008b. Int. J. Food Eng. 4, article4.
- Sun, X., Wang, X.Y., Zhao, W.P., 2010. Sensor Lett. 8, 247–252.
- Tanimoto de Albuquerque, Y.D., Ferreira, L.F., 2007. Anal. Chim. Acta 596, 210–221.
- Tsai, Y.C., Chen, S.Y., Lee, C.A., 2008. Sens. Actuators B: Chem. 13, 96–101.
- Viveros, L., Paliwal, S., McCrae, D., Wild, J., Simonian, A.A., 2006. Sens. Actuators B: Chem. 115, 150–157.
- Wu, H.Z., Lee, Y.C., Lin, T.K., Shih, H.C., Chang, F.L., Lin, H.P.P., 2009. J. Taiwan Inst. Chem. Eng. 40, 113–122.
- Yin, H.S., Ai, S.Y., Xu, J., Shi, W.J., Zhu, L.S., 2009. J. Electroanal. Chem. 637, 21–27.