



Analytical Methods

Polymer Modified Carbon Fiber-Microelectrodes and Waveform Modifications Enhance Neurotransmitter Metabolite Detection

Journal:	<i>Analytical Methods</i>
Manuscript ID	AY-ART-12-2018-002737.R1
Article Type:	Paper
Date Submitted by the Author:	01-Feb-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Zestos, Alexander; American University, Chemistry Raju, Dilpreet; American University, Chemistry Mendoza, Alexander; American University, Chemistry Mohanaraj, Sanuja; American University, Chemistry Wonnenberg, Pauline; American University, Chemistry Sarbanes, Mulugeta; American University, Chemistry Truong, Carly; American University, Chemistry

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Polymer Modified Carbon Fiber-Microelectrodes and Waveform Modifications Enhance**
4 **Neurotransmitter Metabolite Detection**
5

6 Dilpreet Raju, Alexander Mendoza, Pauline Wonnenberg, Sanuja Mohanaraj, Mulugeta Sarbanes, Carly
7 Truong and Alexander G. Zestos*

8
9
10 Department of Chemistry
11 Center for Behavioral Neuroscience
12 American University
13 Washington, D.C. 20016
14 zestos@american.edu
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Abstract

Carbon-fiber microelectrodes (CFMEs) have been used for several years for the detection of neurotransmitters such as dopamine. Dopamine is a fundamentally important neurotransmitter and is also metabolized at a subsecond timescale. Recently, several metabolites of dopamine have been shown to be physiologically important such as 3-methoxytyramine (3-MT), 3,4-dihydroxyphenylacetic acid (DOPAC), and homovanillic acid (HVA). Many of these neurotransmitter metabolites are currently only detected with microdialysis coupled with liquid chromatography with relatively low temporal and spatial resolution. Current electrochemical methods such as the dopamine waveform (scanning from -0.4 to 1.3 V at 400 V/sec) are utilized to electrostatically repel anions such as DOPAC and promote dopamine adsorption to the surface of the electrode. Moreover, polymer coatings such as Nafion have been shown to electrostatically repel anions such as 5-hydroxyindoleacetic acid (5-HIAA). In this study, we develop novel polymer and waveform modifications for enhanced DOPAC detection. Applying the DOPAC waveform (scanning from 0 to 1.3 V at 400 V/sec) enhances DOPAC detection significantly because it does not include the negative holding potential of the dopamine waveform. Moreover, positively charged cationic polymers such as polyethyleneimine (PEI) allow for the preconcentration of DOPAC to the surface of the carbon fiber through an electrostatic attraction. The limit of detection for DOPAC for PEI coated CFMEs with the DOPAC waveform applied is 58.2 ± 2 nM as opposed to 291 ± 10 nM for unmodified electrodes applying the dopamine waveform ($n = 4$). This work offers promise for the development of novel electrode materials and waveforms for the specific detection of several important biomolecules such as dopamine metabolite neurotransmitters.

Introduction

Carbon-fiber microelectrodes (CFMEs) have been utilized for the past forty years as the standard for neurotransmitter detection such as dopamine.¹ Dopamine is a crucially important neurotransmitter for understanding sex², learning, motivation, movement, Parkinson's disease³, drug abuse⁴⁻⁶, and other disorders.⁷ The physical and chemical properties of CFMEs make them ideal electrode materials for dopamine detection. First and foremost, carbon fibers are made from loosely ordered sheets of graphene that are pyrolyzed from polyacrylonitrile (PAN) at high temperatures. Other carbon fibers are pitch-based and have varying response to cations and anions based on their related conductivities.⁸ The thermal and electrochemical etching of carbon fibers breaks carbon-carbon bonds and increases surface roughness, hence increasing the electroactive surface area.^{9,10} Moreover, electrochemical etching also functionalizes the end groups of carbon fibers (primarily basal plane carbon) with negatively charged carboxylate (carboxylic acid), hydroxyl, and oxide groups at the end of edge plane carbon.¹¹ The negative charge of the functionalized carbon fibers are conducive for the detection of dopamine. At a physiological pH of 7.4, the amine of dopamine is protonated, thus making it a positively charged cationic molecule.^{12,13} The cationic dopamine adsorbs to the surface of the negatively charged carbon fiber through an electrostatic interaction, which allows for adsorption and preconcentration onto the surface of the electrode and enhances the sensitivity of neurotransmitter detection.

Recently, the physiological importance of dopamine metabolites has also been realized. Dopamine is metabolized on a subsecond timescale. Pre-synaptically, dopamine is metabolized to 3,4-dihydroxyphenylacetic acid (DOPAC) via monoamine oxidase (MAO), while it is metabolized post-synaptically to 3-methoxytyramine (3-MT) by catechol-o-methyltransferase (COMT).¹⁴ Furthermore, both DOPAC and 3-MT are been further metabolized to homovanillic acid (HVA) by the enzymes, COMT and MAO, respectively.¹⁵ The depletion of norepinephrine (another metabolite of dopamine) was

1
2
3 postulated to cause Parkinson's Disease until Hornykewicz and colleagues observed significantly lower
4
5 levels of dopamine in the basal ganglia and degeneration of nigrostriatal dopamine-containing neurons
6
7 in post-mortem brains of patients¹⁶. Although 3-MT was once thought to be physiologically inactive,¹⁷
8
9 multiple studies have shown that it is an important neuromodulator in the brain.^{14, 17} 3-MT has also been
10
11 found to be an important neuromodulator and agonist of the human trace amine associated receptor
12
13 (TAAR1).¹⁵ DOPAC detection has also been vital for understanding and studying Parkinsonism,^{18, 19} foot-
14
15 shock,²⁰ conditioned stress,²¹ and other drug related effects.^{22, 23} MAO²⁴ and COMT²⁵ inhibitors such as
16
17 entacapone are potent therapeutics utilized for Parkinson's disease, which highly regulate DOPAC levels
18
19 by altering dopamine metabolism. The sensitivity for dopamine detection at CFMEs is over ten times
20
21 greater with respect to DOPAC even though DOPAC is found in higher concentrations in certain brain
22
23 regions due to the electrostatic repulsion of the negatively charged DOPAC at the surface of the
24
25 negatively charged oxide-functionalized CFME.^{26, 27}
26
27
28
29

30 Analytical method development has frequently been utilized to enhance the detection of
31
32 neurotransmitters and metabolites. Altering the waveform applied and the chemical and physical
33
34 properties of the electrode materials can allow for fine tuning the electrochemical sensitivity for
35
36 enhanced neurotransmitter selectivity and detection. Novel waveform modifications have been
37
38 developed for the electrochemical detection of neurotransmitters such as dopamine,^{9, 10} serotonin,²⁸
39
40 adenosine,^{29, 30} histamine,³¹ tyramine,³² octopamine,³³ hydrogen peroxide,^{34, 35} and neuropeptides,^{36, 37}
41
42 among others. Moreover, polymer and other electrode coatings such as Nafion,^{38, 39} poly(3,4-
43
44 ethylenedioxythiophene) PEDOT-Nafion,^{40, 41} overoxidized-polypyrrole,⁴² vertically aligned carbon
45
46 nanotube forests,⁴³ functionalized carbon nanotubes,⁴⁴ and others have been used to enhance
47
48 neurotransmitter detection by increasing conductivity and reducing surface fouling.⁴⁵
49
50
51

52 In this study, we utilize a combination of waveform modifications and polymer coatings to test
53
54 for the enhancement of DOPAC selectivity and discrimination from dopamine when detected with CFMEs
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 using FSCV. Polymer coatings such as polyethyleneimine (PEI) and Nafion were used to functionalize the
4 surface of the CFMEs to discriminate dopamine and DOPAC. PEI coatings on the surface of CFMEs applied
5 a more positive charge to the surface of the electrode due the protonation of the nitrogen functionalized
6 groups, which electrostatically attract the negatively charged anionic DOPAC. Conversely,
7 electrodeposition of Nafion onto the surface of the CFME coated the electrode with a thin negatively
8 charged polymer that electrostatically attracts dopamine, but repels DOPAC. Moreover, we have
9 developed the novel “DOPAC waveform” that is similar to the traditional “dopamine waveform¹⁰” except
10 that it has a holding potential of 0 V instead of -0.4 V. This prevents that electrostatic repulsion of DOPAC
11 from the surface of the electrode at the negative holding potential. This work will provide a novel
12 enhancement for DOPAC selectivity, detection at subsecond timescale, and a possibly future greater
13 understanding of this important metabolite for *in vivo* measurements.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Results and Discussion**

28 **Surface Characterization of Polymer Coated CFMEs**

29
30
31
32 As with dopamine, DOPAC oxidation is a two-electron process where the catechol is oxidized to
33 a quinone (Figure 1). The process is quasi-reversible where not all of the DOPAC that is oxidized is
34 reduced back down to DOPAC on the reverse scan. The only structural difference between dopamine
35 and DOPAC is the presence of a carboxyl group instead of an amine. This functional group is of vital
36 importance in understanding the electron transfer kinetics and adsorption of dopamine to the surface of
37 carbon fibers or polymer coated fiber materials. At a physiological pH of 7.4, the amine of dopamine is
38 protonated to give it an overall positive charge. At the same pH, the carboxyl group of DOPAC is
39 deprotonated giving it an overall negative charge. In order to develop waveforms and electrode
40 materials that are conducive to DOPAC rather than dopamine, the overall negative charge of the
41 electrode must be reduced, and a positive charge must be applied instead.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 As shown in the Scanning electron microscopy (SEM) images, the bare carbon fiber
4
5 microelectrodes have deep grooves and ridges as they are thermally spun from polyacrylonitrile (PAN)
6
7 and pyrolyzed at temperatures above 1,000 K.¹⁻⁸ These bare unmodified CFMEs are approximately 7
8
9 microns in diameter and were utilized for control testing comparisons with polymer modified
10
11 microelectrodes (Figure 2A). Furthermore, CFMEs were electrodeposited with either Nafion (Figure 2B)
12
13 or polyethyleneimine (Figure 2C). CFMEs were dipped into a 5% weight perfluorinated Nafion resin in
14
15 aliphatic alcohols and electrodeposited upon applying a + 1 V potential. As shown in Figure 2B, a thin
16
17 and uniform layer of Nafion was electrodeposited throughout the entire surface of the carbon fiber.
18
19 Nafion is a commonly utilized polymer (ionomer) that allows for the movement of cations, but not
20
21 anions. Nafion coatings create a thin, uniform negatively charged electrode surface that will
22
23 electrostatically attract the positively charge cationic dopamine, while electrostatically repelling anions
24
25 such as DOPAC, uric acid (UA), or ascorbic acid (AA).
26
27
28
29

30 Moreover, polyethyleneimine (PEI, 5,000 M_n, 20% in methanol, Sigma-Aldrich, Milwaukee) was
31
32 also electrodeposited onto the surface of CFMEs. The amine group of PEI is protonated and hence
33
34 positively charged at a physiological pH of 7.4 of phosphate buffered saline (PBS). Therefore, we
35
36 hypothesize that PEI coatings onto the surface of CFMEs will electrostatically attract anions such as
37
38 DOPAC allowing for adsorption, while lowering sensitivity for other cations through electrostatic
39
40 repulsion. PEI was electrodeposited onto the surface of CFMEs using the triangle waveform by cycling
41
42 from 1.5 V to -0.8 V to 1.5 V at a 100 mV/sec scan rate for approximately 300 s. The electrodes were
43
44 then dried for approximately 1 hour in the oven at 80°C. The PEI polymer aggregated onto the surface of
45
46 CFMEs to form a complete and thorough coating on the surface (Fig. 2C). Gold sputtering was utilized to
47
48 enhance the conductivity, and hence resolution, of the polymer coated fibers. PEI modified
49
50 microelectrodes have been shown to enhance neurotransmitter detection when used to form carbon
51
52 nanotube (CNT fiber) microelectrodes.⁴⁶ The amine group of the PEI is hypothesized to physisorb to the
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 surface of the graphitic carbon, thus inducing an intermolecular charge transfer and making a more
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

surface of the graphitic carbon, thus inducing an intermolecular charge transfer and making a more
conductive substrate that can be used as an electrode material for neurotransmitter detection with
FSCV.⁴⁷ Furthermore, EDS spectra were also collected from the images of the polymer-coated CFMEs.
The presence of C, N, and O confirmed the identity of the deposited PEI polymer (Supplementary
Information Fig. 1A), while presence of C and F confirmed the deposition of Nafion onto the surface of
the carbon fiber (Supplementary Information Fig. 1B).

Comparison of polymer coatings for Dopamine and DOPAC detection.

After constructing and modifying CFMEs with Nafion and PEI, we compared the sensitivity of
these modified electrodes for DOPAC detection. As expected, bare CFMEs had higher sensitivity towards
DOPAC in comparison to Nafion coated CFMEs. The oxide groups of CFMEs are negatively charged, thus
allowing for dopamine preconcentration and adsorption to the surface, enhancing detection, and
allowing for lower limits of detection and higher sensitivities. However, this does not hold true for
DOPAC, which is electrostatically repelled by the negatively charged Nafion. On the other hand, PEI
coatings also allowed for higher sensitivity measurements of DOPAC vs. bare and Nafion coated
microelectrodes.

We then determined the effect of the electrodeposition of Nafion and PEI polymers on the
surface of CFMEs on the detection of dopamine, DOPAC, ascorbic acid, and uric acid using FSCV.
In Figure 3, we show example cyclic voltammograms of 1 μ M Dopamine (DA), 5 μ M DOPAC, 200 μ M
ascorbic acid (AA), and 20 μ M uric acid (UA) on bare and polymer coated microelectrodes. These are
concentrations of neurotransmitters within the broad physiological range as shown in the literature.^{46, 48}
The application of Nafion coatings had no significant effect on the sensitivity for dopamine detection
(Figure 3A). On the other hand, the negatively charged Nafion significantly reduced the sensitivity for
DOPAC detection (Figure 3B, $p = .0415$, $n = 4$, t-test), ascorbic acid (Figure 3C, $p = .0025$, $n = 4$, t-test),
and (uric acid, $p = .0012$, $n = 4$, t-test) as shown with example cyclic voltammograms of uncoated and

1
2
3 Nafion coated CFMEs to the left and normalized (dividing all peak oxidative currents by the largest
4 current and multiplying by 100) averages to the right. As expected, the negatively charged Nafion
5 electrostatically repels the negatively charged anionic molecules from the surface of the carbon fiber,
6 thus significantly reducing sensitivity in comparison to bare uncoated CFMEs
7
8
9
10

11
12 The effect of PEI coatings on the sensitivity for the same four aforementioned molecules were
13 then compared to bare uncoated CFMEs as shown in the example cyclic voltammograms (left) and bar
14 charts (right) shown in Figures 3 E-H. The electrodeposition of PEI polymer onto the surface of the
15 electrode had no effect on the sensitivity of detection for dopamine (Figure 3E) ascorbic acid (Figure
16 3G), or uric acid (Figure 3H). On the other hand, the electrodeposition of PEI onto the surface of CFMEs
17 significantly enhanced DOPAC detection ($p = .0057$, $n = 4$, t-test). The explanation for these phenomena
18 has yet to be determined. We hypothesize that the positively charged PEI polymer, protonated at a
19 physiological pH, electrostatically attracts the negatively charged DOPAC (deprotonated and negatively
20 charged at a physiological pH of 7.4). The same observation does not hold true for uric acid for ascorbic
21 acid, most likely because the catechol Hs of DOPAC induce hydrogen bonding interactions and the
22 phenol of DOPAC undergoes π - π stacking interactions with graphitic edge plane carbon, which is not
23 present in either uric acid or ascorbic acid. Furthermore, we also hypothesize that PEI coatings on
24 carbon fibers are not thick enough to electrostatically repel dopamine from the surface of the carbon
25 fiber to decrease sensitivity because the carbon fiber (functionalized with negatively charged oxide
26 groups, Supplementary Information Figure 1A) and the dopamine waveform (including the negative
27 holding potential) are optimal for dopamine detection, which overcome any influence of the PEI coating
28 to possibly repel dopamine. Previous studies have shown that wet-spun PEI-carbon nanotube fiber
29 microelectrodes enhance the detection and co-detection of dopamine and serotonin most likely due to
30 an intermolecular charge transfer from the imine of the PEI to the carbon fiber, thus making a more
31 conductive electrode substrate.^{46, 47}
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In comparison to dopamine oxidation, the peak shape for DOPAC CVs are much broader due to
4 slower electron transfer kinetics from electrostatic repulsion. Electrodeposition with PEI increases peak
5 oxidative current possibly due to functionalizing the surface of the electrode with a slight positive
6 charge, thus reducing the electrostatic repulsion. PEI contains positively charged imine groups that are
7 protonated in the physiological buffer, phosphate buffered saline (PBS). Therefore, it electrostatically
8 attracts the negatively charged DOPAC allowing for increased adsorption to the surface of the electrode,
9 and thus providing for a markedly higher sensitivity with respect to uncoated CFMEs.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 **Effect of Polymer Coatings on Time Response**

19
20
21 It is expected that the deposition of polymer onto the surface of electrode will markedly
22 increase the response time of the electrode for the respective analyte. This phenomenon occurs
23 because the polymer creates an extra layer through which the analyte must diffuse in order to adsorb
24 onto the surface of the carbon-fiber microelectrode. This observation has been noted in studies
25 concerning the electrodeposition of Nafion onto the surface of CFMEs for enhanced serotonin
26 detection,³⁸ enzyme immobilization for glucose biosensing,⁴⁹ glucose oxidase,⁵⁰ and chitosan coatings⁵¹
27 for CFMEs. To examine this, we performed several flow injection analysis experiments to determine the
28 effect of polymer coatings on time response. As expected, the bare unmodified CFME had the fastest
29 time response to 5 μ M DOPAC and yielded a relatively square current vs. time (I vs. T) trace
30 (Supplementary Information Fig. 2A). The PEI coated CFME had a slightly slower and more “curved” I vs.
31 T trace (Supplementary Information Fig. 2B). The current vs. time trace for the Nafion coated CFMEs
32 (Supplementary Information 2C) were more “pointed” and had the greatest deviation from the square
33 current vs. time trace of uncoated CFMEs. The slower time response for polymer coated electrodes was
34 expected, though the polymer coated electrodes should still be able to detect fast changes of
35 neurochemicals *in vivo*.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 It has been previously shown that pH shifts have been known to occur when detecting acidic
4 compounds such as DOPAC at relatively high concentrations.²⁶ To check for pH shifts, we performed
5 flow injection analysis experiments where we diluted .1 M (.1 N) perchloric acid in PBS buffer (1.25 mM
6 phosphate) without the presence of the neurotransmitter stock solution similar to a flow injection
7 analysis experiment for dopamine. The cyclic voltammogram produced yielded a strong peak at -0.1 V,
8 comparable to pH shifts for DOPAC found in the literature as shown in the Supplementary Information
9 Figure 3.²⁶ After increasing the concentration of buffer to 12.5 mM phosphate, the peak disappeared,
10 thus allowing us to hypothesize that a more concentrated buffer prevents the occurrence of pH shifts
11 during experimentation.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Flow cell characterization of polymer coated CFMEs**

24
25 After noticing the increase in sensitivity for detection of PEI coatings for DOPAC, we wanted to
26 determine whether this coating affected adsorption control of either dopamine (1 μ M) or DOPAC (5
27 μ M) to the surface of the carbon fiber-microelectrode. To determine this, we performed several
28 experiments including stability, scan rate, and concentration testing. As shown in Figure 4, PEI coatings
29 did not have any effect on the adsorption control of dopamine or DOPAC to the surface of CFMEs, thus
30 illustrating their utility as coatings for enhanced neurochemical detection. PEI coated CFMEs displayed a
31 stability towards dopamine and DOPAC response in the flow cell for a period of at least four hours,
32 which is the typical duration of an *in vivo* experiment with CFMEs (Figure 4A). Moreover, we also show
33 that peak oxidative current of DOPAC cyclic voltammograms are also linear with respect to scan rate for
34 the detection of dopamine and DOPAC at CFMEs. We also altered the scan rates from 50 V/sec to 1,000
35 V/sec and observed a linear relationship with respect to scan rate and peak oxidative current for both
36 dopamine (1 μ M) and DOPAC (5 μ M) that denoted adsorption control to the surface of the electrode
37 (Figure 4B). For more diffusion controlled analytes, peak oxidative current would be proportional to the
38 square root of scan rate. Furthermore, we also observed a linear relationship for concentration (up to 10
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 μM) and peak oxidative current (Figures 4C and 4D). After 10 μM , both DOPAC and dopamine become
4 saturated at the surface of the electrode where all adsorption sites have been occupied, which explains
5 the asymptotic curve at higher concentrations. This explains the asymptotic curve for higher
6 concentrations of these neurotransmitters.
7
8
9
10

11 **DOPAC Waveform Testing**

12
13
14 The “dopamine” waveform applied a potential that scans from -0.4 V to 1.3 V, at 400 V/sec has
15 long been seen as the ideal waveform for dopamine detection with fast scan cyclic voltammetry.¹⁰
16 Scanning to 1.3 V renews the surface of the electrode through electrochemical etching, which prevents
17 analyte saturation, surface fouling, functionalizes the electrode surface with negatively charged oxide
18 groups (oxide, hydroxy, carbonyl, carboxyl, ketones, etc.),¹¹ and breaks carbon-carbon bonds to increase
19 the surface roughness and, hence, the electroactive surface area to make the electrode more sensitive
20 for dopamine detection.¹⁰ Setting the holding potential to -0.4 V makes the electrode surface more
21 negative, which allows for the adsorption of cationic catecholamines such as dopamine.^{12, 13} However,
22 upon applying the dopamine waveform, the CFMEs become less sensitive for anionic analytes such as
23 DOPAC and ascorbic acid because the negatively charged electrode electrostatically repels the like-
24 charged DOPAC (Figure 3).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 In order to increase the sensitivity for DOPAC measurements with CFMEs and FSCV, we
40 increased the holding potential (lower limit) of the waveform from -0.4 V to -0.1 V, 0 V, and 0.1 V,
41 respectively as shown in the modified triangle waveform in Figure 5A. We purposefully chose a positive,
42 neutral, and negative potential limit to test our electrostatics hypothesis on the sensitivity of DOPAC
43 detection for CFMEs using FSCV. The positive (0.1 V) and neutral (0 V) potential lower limit waveforms
44 have average peak oxidative current markedly higher than that of the negative holding potential, -0.1 V
45 (Figure 5B, One-way ANOVA, Tukey’s multiple comparisons test, (-0.1 V vs. 0 V, $p = .0161$) and (-0.1 V vs.
46 0.1 V, $p = .0174$), $n=3$ for both. Example cyclic voltammograms for 10 μM DOPAC using the varied
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 potential limits (holding potential) are shown in Figure 5C (scanning from -1 V to 1.3 V), Figure 5D
4 (scanning from 0 V to 1.3 V), and Figure 5E (scanning from .1 V to 1.3 V). As expected, the positive and
5
6 neutral waveforms produced significantly higher peak oxidative currents than the waveform with the
7
8 negative holding potential, which most likely electrostatically repels the negatively charged DOPAC
9
10 molecule from the surface of the electrode. Therefore, we chose the DOPAC waveform to be from 0 V to
11
12 1.3 V because 0 V is the highest potential lower limit that does not reduce the sensitivity for DOPAC
13
14 detection. One consequence of increasing the potential lower limit though was the loss of the reduction
15
16 peak of DOPAC since the DOPAC waveform does not contain a negative holding potential of -0.4 V unlike
17
18 the dopamine waveform, which could potentially hinder selectivity with respect to multiplexing with
19
20 other analytes. However, several analytes such as adenosine,^{29, 52} adenosine triphosphate (ATP),³⁰ and
21
22 hydrogen peroxide^{34, 35, 53-55} are selectively detected without the presence of a reduction peak.
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Characterization of DOPAC using the DOPAC Waveform.**

29
30 Using the DOPAC waveform, we also tested for adsorption control of DOPAC to the surface of
31
32 the CFME. Since DOPAC is no longer electrostatically repelled by the negatively charged electrode, it is,
33
34 thus, more likely to adsorb to the surface of a neutral or positively charged electrode surface. As shown
35
36 in Figure 6, the response to DOPAC and dopamine using the DOPAC waveform was stable over a period
37
38 of four hours, which is the typical length of an *in vivo* experiment (Figure 6A). Also, when using the
39
40 DOPAC waveform, concentration was proportional to peak oxidative current (from 500 nM - 10 μ M).
41
42 Upon increasing the concentration of dopamine and DOPAC from 10 μ M to 100 μ M, the analytes also
43
44 became saturated at the surface of the electrode because all the sites for adsorption at the surface of
45
46 the electrode have become occupied. Furthermore, peak oxidative currents of dopamine and DOPAC
47
48 were also found to be linear with respect to scan rate upon varying the scan rate from 50 V/sec to 1,000
49
50 V/sec. Therefore, this illustrates that both DOPAC and dopamine were found to be adsorption controlled
51
52 at the surface of the CFME even in the absence of a negative holding potential. If DOPAC were diffusion
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 controlled at the surface of the electrode, then peak oxidative current would be proportional to the
4 square root of scan rate, which was not observed in this case. We hypothesize that adsorption occurs at
5 the surface of the electrode possibly through a π - π stacking interaction mechanism and hydrogen
6 bonding (from the catechol Hs) of the phenyl group of DOPAC and dopamine to the oxide groups that
7 are present on the surface of the carbon fiber microelectrode when utilizing the DOPAC waveform.
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 **Co-Detection of Dopamine and DOPAC**

15
16
17 Lastly, we also tested the combination of the DOPAC waveform and polymer coatings to the
18 surface of CFMEs for both dopamine and DOPAC sensitivity. As expected, PEI coated electrodes had
19 significantly higher sensitivities for DOPAC detection with respect to bare CFMEs utilizing the dopamine
20 waveform. The limit of detection for DOPAC with the PEI coated CFMEs and the DOPAC waveform
21 applied is 58.2 ± 2 nM as opposed to 291 ± 10 nM for unmodified electrodes applying the dopamine
22 waveform ($n = 4$). Again, the positive charge applied to the surface of the electrode is hypothesized to
23 induce an electrostatic attraction with the negatively charged anionic DOPAC. Also, the DOPAC
24 waveform does not contain the negative holding potential (potential lower limit) of the dopamine
25 waveform, which would electrostatically repel DOPAC from the surface of the electrode. As shown in
26 Figure 7A, a mixture containing 1 μ M DOPAC and 1 μ M dopamine was measured using FSCV and DOPAC
27 and dopamine were differentiated and co-detected when placed in the flow cell together and analyzed
28 with PEI-CFMEs with dopamine waveform applied. The dimple in the oxidation peak for the cyclic
29 voltammogram allows dopamine to be differentiated from DOPAC. We hypothesize that the application
30 of the PEI coatings must have altered the electron transfer kinetics of dopamine and DOPAC to the
31 surface of the CFME to have caused this peak shift. The electron transfer kinetics of DOPAC to the
32 surface of the electrode are slower on CFMEs due to the presence of negatively charged oxide groups at
33 the surface which electrostatically repel anions from the surface. The right shift of the reduction peak
34 relative to dopamine in the cyclic voltammograms denotes the presence of DOPAC. We have
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ascertained that dopamine is the peak on the left as increasing concentrations of dopamine used in the
4 mixture increase the left peak (2 μM dopamine: 1 μM DOPAC, Figure 7B), while increasing
5 concentrations of DOPAC (1 μM dopamine: 2 μM DOPAC) increase the right peak (Figure 7C). Despite
6 the presence of the PEI polymer, we hypothesize that dopamine still has faster electron transfer kinetics
7 at the surface of the carbon fiber due to the presence of negatively charged oxide groups, which still
8 slightly repel DOPAC adsorption from the surface as shown in the EDS measurements of the PEI coated
9 carbon fiber (Supplementary Information, Figure 1A). The converse is also true when testing with lower
10 concentrations of both DOPAC and dopamine reduce the peak oxidation currents of the right and left
11 peaks, respectively. Furthermore, PEI-CNT fiber microelectrodes have been used to differentiate and co-
12 detect mixtures of serotonin and dopamine.⁴⁶ We hypothesize that the altered electrode surface of the
13 PEI polymer allows for differential adsorption of both dopamine and DOPAC to the surface of the CFME.

24 **Methods and Materials**

25 Dopamine, DOPAC, ascorbic acid, and uric acid were obtained from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO).
26 A 10 mM stock solution was prepared in 0.1 M perchloric acid and diluted to 1.0 - 100 μM daily with
27 phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) (131.5 mM NaCl, 3.25 mM KCl, 1.2 mM CaCl_2 , 12.5 mM NaH_2PO_4 1.2
28 mM MgCl_2 , and 2.0 mM Na_2SO_4 with the pH adjusted to 7.4). All aqueous solutions were made with
29 deionized water (Millipore, Billerica, MA). Epon 828 Epoxy was obtained from Miller-Stephenson (Morton
30 Grove, IL) and Diethylenetriamine hardener was obtained from Fisher Scientific (Waltham, MA).

31 **Instrumentation**

32 Fast Scan Cyclic Voltammetry (FSCV) was performed with the WaveNeuro FSCV system with a 5
33 M Ω headstage (Pine Instruments, Durham, NC, USA). Data was collected using HDCV software
34 (University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, Mark Wightman) and a computer interface board (National
35 Instruments PC1e-6363, Austin, TX, USA).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 A triangle waveform was applied to the electrode from a holding potential of -0.4 V or 0 V to 1.3
4
5 V and back at a scan rate of 400 V/s and a frequency of 10 Hz unless otherwise noted. A silver-silver
6
7 chloride wire was used as the reference electrode. Samples were tested in a flow injection analysis
8
9 system (In-Vitro/FSCV Microelectrode Flow Cell with xyz micromanipulator Translational Stage, Pine
10
11 Instruments, Durham, NC). Buffer and samples were pumped through the flow cell at 2 mL/min unless
12
13 otherwise noted using the NE-300 Just Infusion™ Syringe Pump (New Era Pump Systems, Farmingdale,
14
15 NY).

16
17
18 For the traditional waveform, the electrode was scanned from -0.4 to 1.3 V vs. silver-silver
19
20 chloride (Ag/AgCl, .197) reference electrode and back at a scan rate of 400 V/s and a wave application
21
22 frequency of 10 Hz. The waveform for enhanced DOPAC detection was scanned from 0 V to 1.3 V at 400
23
24 V/sec and a wave application frequency of 10 Hz. Both the scan rates (100 – 1,000 V/sec) and
25
26 concentrations (100 nM – 100 μM) were varied from lower to higher values only. The electrodes were
27
28 allowed to equilibrate for approximately 10 min to allow the CFME to equilibrate at the waveform
29
30 applied and prevent electrode drift between each run. A 5 kHz low pass filter was used for experiments
31
32 with scan rates greater than 400 V/s. All data was background subtracted to remove any non-Faradaic
33
34 currents by averaging 10 CVs. Electrodes were tested at a flow rate of 2 mL/min using the
35
36 aforementioned syringe pump.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Electrode Construction**

44
45 Carbon fibers (.007 mm, Goodfellow, Huntingdon, England) were aspirated into cylindrical glass
46
47 capillaries (1.2 mm by 0.68 mm, A-M Systems, Inc., Carlsborg, WA) using a vacuum pump (DOA-P704-AA,
48
49 GAST, Benton Harbor, MI) to form carbon-fiber microelectrodes. The capillary was pulled to form two
50
51 electrodes on a vertical pipette puller (Narishige, model PC-100 and PE-22, Tokyo, Japan), and the fiber
52
53 cut to lengths of approximately 100-150 microns. Glass insulated electrodes were epoxied with Epon 828
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 epoxy (Miller-Stephenson, Morton Grove, IL) and diethylenetriamine (Sigma Aldrich, Milwaukee, WI).
4
5 Protruding carbon-fiber microelectrode tips were dipped in the epoxy hardener mixture (0.8% by mass
6
7 resin) for approximately 15 seconds and then rinsed in acetone to wash away any excess residual
8
9 acetone.⁵⁶ The electrodes were cured in the oven for 3 h at 165°C.

12 **Electrodeposition of polymers onto CFMEs**

14 The electrodeposition of Nafion[®] perfluorinated resin solution, 5 wt % in lower aliphatic alcohols
15 and water onto the surface of carbon-fiber microelectrodes (CFMEs) was performed as previously
16
17 described.³⁸ The carbon-fiber microelectrode was immersed in a Nafion perfluorinated resin solution (5%
18
19 weight in lower aliphatic alcohols and water, Sigma-Aldrich, Milwaukee, WI), and a potential of 1 volt was
20
21 applied vs. Ag/AgCl reference electrode for approximately 60 s. The CFMEs were then dried in the oven 1
22
23 h at 80°C.

25 CFMEs were also modified in polyethyleneimine (PEI) polymer. Linear PEI polymer (M_n 5,000,
26
27 Sigma Aldrich, Milwaukee, WI) was dissolved in methanol to make a 20% mass solution. The CFME was
28
29 lowered into the PEI solution. A triangle waveform scanning from +1.5 V to -0.8V and back to +1.5 V was
30
31 applied a scan rate of 100 mV/s. Electrodeposition occurred over five minutes. The CFMEs were cycled
32
33 with the waveform applied in a 25 mL beaker containing the PEI polymer dissolved in methanol with
34
35 respect to the Ag/AgCl reference electrode (0.197 V).

41 **Scanning Electron Microscopy**

43 Scanning electron microscopy images (SEM) images were obtained with a JEOL JSM-IT100 (JEOL,
44
45 Tokyo, Japan). Bare or polymer modified carbon fiber microelectrodes were sputter-coated with gold in
46
47 Denton Desk II sputter coater at 100 millitorr and 45 milliamps current. They were then placed onto
48
49 conductive tape, which was then inserted into the stage. The working distance was set to 10 mm and
50
51 slightly adjusted to obtain optimal resolution and magnification, while the accelerating voltage was 5 kV.
52
53 Furthermore, the same JEOL software was also used to perform Energy-dispersive x-ray spectroscopy
54
55

1
2
3 (EDS/EDX) measurements for chemical identification of polymers on the surface of the carbon-fiber
4
5 microelectrode. The collection time was approximately three minutes.
6

7 **Data Analysis**

8
9
10 All data analysis was performed in Graph Pad Prism 7. The limit of detection was extrapolated to
11
12 a concentration where $S/N = 3$. Statistical analysis was performed with either a student's t-test or one-
13
14 way ANOVA. Statistical significance was set to $p < 0.5$. All error bars are standard error of the mean
15
16 (SEM) unless otherwise noted.
17

18 **Conclusions**

19
20
21 As we continue to gain a further understanding of the physiological importance of the
22
23 neurotransmitter metabolites of dopamine, there exists a greater need to detect these metabolites
24
25 selectively with a high temporal resolution approaching the rate that they are enzymatically
26
27 metabolized. This study has depicted the usage of polymer and waveform modifications as methods for
28
29 enhancing the detection of neurotransmitter metabolites using fast scan cyclic voltammetry. PEI
30
31 coatings on the surface of carbon electrodes were shown to enhance DOPAC detection through
32
33 electrostatic interactions of the amine to the negatively charged carboxyl groups. Furthermore, utilizing
34
35 the DOPAC waveform has also significantly enhanced DOPAC detection by not applying the negative
36
37 holding potential, which will electrostatically repel anionic metabolites such as DOPAC. The combined
38
39 usage of novel waveforms and polymer modifications have significantly increase high sensitivity and
40
41 temporal resolution measurements of DOPAC at lower limits of detection and allows for the
42
43 differentiation between DOPAC and dopamine when tested in varying ratios in the flow cell. Future
44
45 work includes measuring multiple neurotransmitter metabolites such as 3-methoxytyramine,
46
47 homovanillic acid, norepinephrine, normetanephrine, and others in addition to performing *in vivo*
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 measurements.

1
2
3 **Conflicts of Interest**
4

5 There are no conflicts to declare.
6

7 **Acknowledgments**
8

9 The authors would like to acknowledge the Faculty Research Support Grant at American
10 University, NASA-CAS Fellowship, and NSF-MRI #1625977. We also acknowledge Andrea Brothers for her
11 assistance with gold sputtering and SEM/EDS measurements.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. M. L. Huffman and B. J. Venton, *Analyst*, 2009, **134**, 18-24.
2. M. Morissette and T. Di Paolo, *Neuroendocrinology*, 1993, **58**, 16-22.
3. J.-H. Kim, J. M. Auerbach, J. A. Rodríguez-Gómez, I. Velasco, D. Gavin, N. Lumelsky, S.-H. Lee, J. Nguyen, R. Sánchez-Pernaute and K. Bankiewicz, *Nature*, 2002, **418**, 50.
4. A. G. Zestos, C. A. Carpenter, Y. Kim, M. J. Low, R. T. Kennedy and M. E. Gnegy, *ACS Chemical Neuroscience*, 2018.
5. C. Carpenter, A. G. Zestos, R. Altshuler, R. J. Sorenson, B. Guptaroy, H. D. Showalter, R. T. Kennedy, E. Jutkiewicz and M. E. Gnegy, *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 2017, **42**, 1940.
6. A. G. Zestos, S. R. Mikelman, R. T. Kennedy and M. E. Gnegy, *ACS chemical neuroscience*, 2016, **7**, 757-766.
7. C. A. Zarate, J. B. Singh, P. J. Carlson, J. Quiroz, L. Jolkovsky, D. A. Luckenbaugh and H. K. Manji, *Bipolar disorders*, 2007, **9**, 561-570.
8. M. L. Huffman and B. J. Venton, *Electroanalysis: An International Journal Devoted to Fundamental and Practical Aspects of Electroanalysis*, 2008, **20**, 2422-2428.
9. R. B. Keithley, P. Takmakov, E. S. Bucher, A. M. Belle, C. A. Owesson-White, J. Park and R. M. Wightman, *Analytical chemistry*, 2011, **83**, 3563-3571.
10. P. Takmakov, M. K. Zachek, R. B. Keithley, P. L. Walsh, C. Donley, G. S. McCarty and R. M. Wightman, *Analytical chemistry*, 2010, **82**, 2020-2028.
11. J. G. Roberts, B. P. Moody, G. S. McCarty and L. A. Sombers, *Langmuir*, 2010, **26**, 9116-9122.
12. B. D. Bath, H. B. Martin, R. M. Wightman and M. R. Anderson, *Langmuir*, 2001, **17**, 7032-7039.
13. B. D. Bath, D. J. Michael, B. J. Trafton, J. D. Joseph, P. L. Runnels and R. M. Wightman, *Analytical chemistry*, 2000, **72**, 5994-6002.
14. P. L. Wood and C. A. Altar, *Pharmacological Reviews*, 1988, **40**, 163-187.
15. T. D. Sotnikova, J.-M. Beaulieu, S. Espinoza, B. Masri, X. Zhang, A. Salahpour, L. S. Barak, M. G. Caron and R. R. Gainetdinov, *PLoS One*, 2010, **5**, e13452.
16. H. Bernheimer, W. Birkmayer, O. Hornykiewicz, K. Jellinger and F. Seitelberger, *Journal of the neurological sciences*, 1973, **20**, 415-455.
17. F. Karoum, S. J. Chrapusta and M. F. Egan, *Journal of neurochemistry*, 1994, **63**, 972-979.
18. D. Goldstein, C. Holmes, I. Kopin and Y. Sharabi, *Neurology*, 2016, **86**, 11. 006.
19. D. Goldstein, C. Holmes, A. Stefani and Y. Sharabi, *Autonomic Neuroscience: Basic and Clinical*, 2015, **192**, 129.
20. A. Y. Deutch, S.-Y. Tam and R. H. Roth, *Brain research*, 1985, **333**, 143-146.
21. F. Fadda, A. Argiolas, M. R. Melis, A. Tissari, P. Onali and G. Gessa, *Life sciences*, 1978, **23**, 2219-2224.
22. T. Zetterström, T. Sharp, A. Collin and U. Ungerstedt, *European journal of pharmacology*, 1988, **148**, 327-334.
23. B. Fornstedt, E. Rosengren and A. Carlsson, *Neuropharmacology*, 1986, **25**, 451-454.
24. M. R. Liebowitz, E. Hollander, F. Schneier, R. Campeas, L. Welkowitz, J. Hatterer and B. Fallon, *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 1990, **82**, 29-34.
25. E. Nissinen, H. Nissinen, H. Larjonmaa, A. Väänänen, T. Helkamaa, I. Reenilä and P. Rauhala, *Journal of neural transmission*, 2005, **112**, 1213-1221.
26. P. Takmakov, M. K. Zachek, R. B. Keithley, E. S. Bucher, G. S. McCarty and R. M. Wightman, *Analytical chemistry*, 2010, **82**, 9892-9900.
27. M. L. Heien, M. A. Johnson and R. M. Wightman, *Analytical chemistry*, 2004, **76**, 5697-5704.
28. B. P. Jackson and R. M. Wightman, *Brain research*, 1995, **674**, 163-166.
29. M. L. Pajski and B. J. Venton, *ACS chemical neuroscience*, 2010, **1**, 775-787.

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27
 - 28
 - 29
 - 30
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33
 - 34
 - 35
 - 36
 - 37
 - 38
 - 39
 - 40
 - 41
 - 42
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48
 - 49
 - 50
 - 51
 - 52
 - 53
 - 54
 - 55
 - 56
 - 57
 - 58
 - 59
 - 60
30. A. E. Ross and B. J. Venton, *Analytical chemistry*, 2014, **86**, 7486-7493.
31. M. E. Denno, E. Privman, R. P. Borman, D. C. Wolin and B. J. Venton, *ACS chemical neuroscience*, 2016, **7**, 407-414.
32. H. Fang, M. L. Pajski, A. E. Ross and B. J. Venton, *Analytical Methods*, 2013, **5**, 2704-2711.
33. S. E. Cooper and B. J. Venton, *Analytical and bioanalytical chemistry*, 2009, **394**, 329-336.
34. J. G. Roberts, K. L. Hamilton and L. A. Sombers, *Analyst*, 2011, **136**, 3550-3556.
35. A. L. Sanford, S. W. Morton, K. L. Whitehouse, H. M. Oara, L. Z. Lugo-Morales, J. G. Roberts and L. A. Sombers, *Analytical chemistry*, 2010, **82**, 5205-5210.
36. S. Karra, W. P. Griffith, R. T. Kennedy and W. Gorski, *Analyst*, 2016, **141**, 2405-2411.
37. A. C. Schmidt, L. E. Dunaway, J. G. Roberts, G. S. McCarty and L. A. Sombers, *Analytical chemistry*, 2014, **86**, 7806-7812.
38. P. Hashemi, E. C. Dankoski, J. Petrovic, R. B. Keithley and R. Wightman, *Analytical chemistry*, 2009, **81**, 9462-9471.
39. P. Hashemi, P. L. Walsh, T. S. Guillot, J. Gras-Najjar, P. Takmakov, F. T. Crews and R. M. Wightman, *ACS chemical neuroscience*, 2011, **2**, 658-666.
40. S. Demuru and H. Deligianni, *Journal of The Electrochemical Society*, 2017, **164**, G129-G138.
41. R. F. Vreeland, C. W. Atcherley, W. S. Russell, J. Y. Xie, D. Lu, N. D. Laude, F. Porreca and M. L. Heien, *Analytical chemistry*, 2015, **87**, 2600-2607.
42. M. J. Peairs, A. E. Ross and B. J. Venton, *Analytical Methods*, 2011, **3**, 2379-2386.
43. N. Xiao and B. J. Venton, *Analytical chemistry*, 2012, **84**, 7816-7822.
44. C. B. Jacobs, T. L. Vickrey and B. J. Venton, *Analyst*, 2011, **136**, 3557-3565.
45. L. Yang, D. Liu, J. Huang and T. You, *Sensors and Actuators B: Chemical*, 2014, **193**, 166-172.
46. A. G. Zestos, C. B. Jacobs, E. Trikantopoulos, A. E. Ross and B. J. Venton, *Analytical chemistry*, 2014, **86**, 8568-8575.
47. E. Muñoz, D. S. Suh, S. Collins, M. Selvidge, A. B. Dalton, B. G. Kim, J. M. Razal, G. Ussery, A. G. Rinzler and M. T. Martínez, *Advanced Materials*, 2005, **17**, 1064-1067.
48. C. Yang, C. B. Jacobs, M. D. Nguyen, M. Ganesana, A. G. Zestos, I. N. Ivanov, A. A. Puretzky, C. M. Rouleau, D. B. Geohegan and B. J. Venton, *Analytical chemistry*, 2015, **88**, 645-652.
49. L. Z. Lugo-Morales, P. L. Loziuk, A. K. Corder, J. V. Toups, J. G. Roberts, K. A. McCaffrey and L. A. Sombers, *Analytical chemistry*, 2013, **85**, 8780-8786.
50. S. K. Smith, L. Z. Lugo-Morales, C. Tang, S. P. Gosrani, C. A. Lee, J. G. Roberts, S. W. Morton, G. S. McCarty, S. A. Khan and L. A. Sombers, *ChemPhysChem*, 2018, **19**, 1197-1204.
51. C. E. Donahue, D. R. Miller, T. W. Beger, T. W. Johann and R. B. Keithley, *Analytical Methods*, 2018, **10**, 1565-1576.
52. R. P. Borman, Y. Wang, M. D. Nguyen, M. Ganesana, S. T. Lee and B. J. Venton, *ACS chemical neuroscience*, 2016, **8**, 386-393.
53. L. R. Wilson, S. Panda, A. C. Schmidt and L. A. Sombers, *Analytical chemistry*, 2017, **90**, 888-895.
54. C. J. Meunier, E. C. Mitchell, J. G. Roberts, J. V. Toups, G. S. McCarty and L. A. Sombers, *Analytical chemistry*, 2017.
55. J. G. Roberts, M. A. Voinov, A. C. Schmidt, T. I. Smirnova and L. A. Sombers, *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 2016, **138**, 2516-2519.
56. A. G. Zestos, M. D. Nguyen, B. L. Poe, C. B. Jacobs and B. J. Venton, *Sensors and Actuators B: Chemical*, 2013, **182**, 652-658.




Figure 1: Schematic of DOPAC Oxidation. Similar to dopamine, DOPAC is also a catechol that undergoes reversible oxidation and reduction in a two-electron transfer. Unlike dopamine, DOPAC contains a carboxyl group instead of an amine and is negatively charged at a physiological pH.




Figure 2: SEM Images of A). A bare uncoated carbon fiber approximately 7 microns in diameter. B). A carbon fiber electrodeposited in a Nafion solution for approximately 5 minutes. A thin layer of polymer evenly coats the surface of the electrode. C). Polyethyleneimine (PEI) Coated Carbon fibers. The disappearance of the ridges in Figures 2B and 2C indicate that the carbon fibers have been coated in a thin layer of polymer. Small dots on the surface of the fibers are remnants of gold sputtering that were utilized to increase the conductivity, and hence resolution, of the images.




Figure 3

Figure 3. Effect of Polymer Coatings on Dopamine, DOPAC, Ascorbic Acid, and Uric Acid Detection

Example cyclic voltammograms of 1 μM Dopamine (DA), 5 μM DOPAC, 200 μM ascorbic acid (AA), and 20 μM uric acid (UA) on bare and polymer coated microelectrodes. The effect of Nafion coatings in comparison to uncoated electrodes on the sensitivity for **3A**. Dopamine detection, **3B**. DOPAC detection (t-test, $p = .0415$), **3C**. Ascorbic Acid (t-test, $p = .0025$), and **3D**. Uric Acid (t-test, $p = .0012$) is shown above with example cyclic voltammograms of uncoated and Nafion coated CFMEs to the left and normalized averages to the right. Negatively charged coatings electrostatically repel anions (DOPAC, ascorbic acid, and uric acid) from the surface of the electrode and hence decrease sensitivity. The effect of PEI coatings on sensitivity for **3E**. dopamine detection, **3F**. DOPAC detection (t-test, $p = .0057$), **3G**. ascorbic acid, and **3H**. uric acid are shown above with example cyclic voltammograms of uncoated and PEI coated CFMEs to the left and normalized averages to the right ($n = 4$). PEI coatings on the surface of CFMEs enhance the sensitivity of DOPAC detection, but not the other analytes.




Figure 4. Adsorption Control Testing of the Polymer Coated CFMEs. 4A. The PEI coated electrodes display a stability towards DOPAC detection (peak oxidative current) for at least four hours. 4B. Scan rate. The peak oxidative current for dopamine (1 µM) and DOPAC (5 µM) cyclic voltammograms are linear with respect to scan rate (50 V/sec – 1,000 V/sec), thus denoting adsorption control to the surface of the polymer coated CFMEs. Figure 4C. The peak oxidative currents for the cyclic voltammograms for DOPAC are linear with respect to concentration up from 100 nM to 10 µM. At higher concentrations, DOPAC is saturated at the surface of the electrode, which blocks sites for further adsorption, hence the asymptotic curve. Figure 4D, shows that concentration is linear with respect peak oxidative current at lower concentrations (at 10 µM or less), $R^2 = 0.9963$ ($n = 3$).




Figure 5. DOPAC Voltammetry at DOPAC Waveform on Uncoated CFMEs. **A.** The proposed DOPAC waveform is similar to the “Dopamine” waveform except that the holding potential is 0 V and not -0.4 V. The waveform applied scans from 0 V to 1.3 V at 400 V/sec. **B.** Comparison of 10 μ M DOPAC percent normalized (dividing all peak oxidative currents by the largest current and multiplying by 100) detection using the positive, neutral, and negative potential lower limits. The positive and neutral lower limit waveforms have average peak oxidative current markedly higher than the positive waveform, One-way ANOVA, Tukey’s multiple comparisons test. (-1 vs. 0 V, $p = .0161$), (-1 V vs. .1 V, $p = .0174$), $n=3$ for both. Example Cyclic Voltammogram of 10 μ M DOPAC using the varied lower potential limits (holding potential). **C.** Scanning from -1 V to 1.3 V. **D.** Scanning from 0 V to 1.3 V. **E.** Scanning from .1 V to 1.3 V




Figure 6. Adsorption Control Testing of the DOPAC waveform applied to Uncoated CFMEs. 6A.

Applying to the DOPAC waveform electrodes display a stability towards dopamine ($1 \mu\text{M}$) and DOPAC ($5 \mu\text{M}$) detection (peak oxidative current) for at least four hours. 6B. Scan rate. The peak oxidative current for dopamine ($1 \mu\text{M}$) and DOPAC ($5 \mu\text{M}$) cyclic voltammograms are linear with respect to scan rate ($50 \text{ V/sec} - 1,000 \text{ V/sec}$), thus denoting adsorption control to the surface of CFMEs when the DOPAC waveform is applied. Figure 6C. The peak oxidative currents for the cyclic voltammograms for dopamine and DOPAC are linear with respect to scan rate up from 500 nM to $10 \mu\text{M}$. At higher concentrations, dopamine is saturated at the surface of the electrode, which blocks sites for further adsorption, hence the asymptotic curve. Figure 6D shows that both peak oxidative currents for both DOPAC and dopamine are linear at lower concentrations, up to $10 \mu\text{M}$ where the analytes are not yet saturated at the surface of the electrode.






Figure 7. Co-detection of Dopamine and DOPAC using PEI Electrodes and the Dopamine Waveform.

Various concentrations of dopamine and DOPAC were prepared in a solution of buffer and injected into the flow cell and were detected with PEI coated CFMEs utilizing the dopamine waveform. A. The cyclic voltammogram of a solution containing 1 μM dopamine and 1 μM DOPAC. B. The cyclic voltammogram of a solution containing 2 μM dopamine and 1 μM DOPAC. C. The cyclic voltammogram of a solution containing 1 μM dopamine and 2 μM DOPAC. The peak oxidative currents of DOPAC (right) and dopamine (left) can be clearly distinguished from one another using PEI modified CFMEs.

For TOC Only



DOPAC OXIDATION



PEI-CFME

WAVEFORM