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Abstract

Electrochemical oxidation of phenol on carbon electrodes has often been associated with problems such as serious adsorption, formation of electro-inactive tarry polymer and surface fouling. Thus, it is highly challenging to develop phenol electrochemical sensor without encountering such problems. Alternately, biosensors, those comprise of enzymes such as tyrosinase and polyphenol oxidase, were widely used for the aforesaid purpose. Here in, we introduce an ultra-low cost 6B grade pencil graphite, pre-anodized at 2 V vs. Ag/AgCl, designated as 6B-PGE*, where *=preanodized), as a novel electrochemical sensor for surface fouling-free and efficient differential voltammetric (DPV) detection of phenols (meta-cresol and phenol) in pH 7 phosphate buffer solution (PBS). A well-defined cyclic voltammetric peak at 0.65±0.02 V vs. Ag/AgCl, which is stable under multiple electrochemical cycling, was noticed upon electrochemical-oxidation of meta-cresol and phenol at 6B-PGE*. The 6B-PGE* showed eight times higher DPV current signal and 60 mV lower oxidation potential than that of non-preanodized electrode (PGE) for the phenol detection. Under an optimal DPV condition, the 6B-PGE* showed a linear calibration plot with current linearity in a range 40-320 µM with current sensitivity and detection limit (signal-to-noise=3) values 1.43 µA µM⁻¹ cm⁻² and 120 nM respectively. Six repeated detections of 80 µM meta-cresol without any interim surface cleaning process showed a relative standard deviation (RSD) value 0.21%. This electro-analytical approach was validated by testing total phenolic contents in three different insulin formulations containing with an electrode recovery value ~100%.

Keywords: Preanodized pencil graphite; mono-phenol detection; insulin formulation; surface fouling-free.
1. Introduction

Human insulin is a polypeptide hormone secreted by pancreatic β cells, which is composed of 51 amino acids, 21-residue α-chain + 30-residue β-chain linked by two disulfide bonds.¹ It plays a key role in regulating the glucose metabolism.¹⁻³ Lack of control on insulin level in blood causes diabetes in which Type-I case patients depend on external insulin for their survival and while Type-II patients suffer from a "relative" insulin deficiency.⁴ As per the world health organization (WHO) about 347 million people worldwide have diabetes.⁵ Thus, dependency on external insulin flourished the insulin market by 7% of the annual rate and prospered with $16.7 billion insulin sales.⁶ Generally, insulin is an unstable protein and is prone to degrade by microbes at room temperature.⁷ To prevent from the microbial degradation, about 3 mg mL⁻¹ phenolic preservative/s like meta-cresol, phenol and/or methyl paraben were often added to the pharmaceutical insulin.⁸⁻¹¹ Unfortunately, in some clinical cases, phenol and meta-cresol create adverse effects like allergy, urticaria, rash, angioedema, hypotension and dyspnea on patients health. If the meta-cresol is replaced with methyl paraben preservative, significant improvement in the clinical condition was noticed.¹⁰⁻¹² Furthermore, the phenolic preservatives in insulin were found to interacted with the polymer material used in the drug administration products and altered their bio-activity.¹¹ Thus, a simple and sensitive sensor for phenolic preservatives in insulin is highly needed for strict quality and quantity controls. Here in, we report a unique electroanalytical detection method using an ultra-low cost pencil as an efficient sensor for total phenol content in insulin formulations.

In the literature, separation coupled spectroscopic and electrochemical methods, in which high performance liquid chromatography and capillary electrophoresis as separation systems and UV-visible, fluorescence and amperometric i-t techniques as detectors, were often reported for
the phenolic compounds detection. Note that, the chromatography based detection techniques are expensive and require large amount of high purity solvents and a well-trained technical personnel. In addition, owing to its low absorption co-efficient, derivatization based spectroscopic detection methods were widely used for sensitive detection of phenols. On the other hand, electro-analytical detection technique offers simple, less-expensive and sensitive analytical approach and it can be extendable to miniaturization as well. Unfortunately electrochemical oxidative detection of phenols on solid electrodes like glassy carbon electrode (GCE), platinum and gold follows tarry polymeric product and serious surface fouling problems which then led to unstable current signals. For instance, Mathiyarasu et al reported about 80% decrement in the anodic current at ~1 V vs. Ag/AgCl and electro-inactive polymeric products upon the electrochemical oxidation of 50 µM phenol on a GCE surface in pH 7 phosphate buffer solution (PBS). Note that the removal of the tarry polymers formed on the electrode surface and electrode-renewal are tedious. Qin et al adopted repetitive CV cycling of their working electrode at a potential window -0.4 to 0.8 V vs. SCE until background current become constant as a cleaning step prior to the each measurements. Recently, carbon nanotube (CNT) modified GCEs were used for surface fouling-free electrochemical detection of monophenols such as phenol and para-cresol. The graphitic impurity present in the CNT was reported to be the key for the electrochemical detection. Nevertheless, high preparation cost and tedious purification procedures are limitations of the CNTs for further analytical applications. Meanwhile, phenol biosensors composed of specific enzymes like tyrosinase and polyphenol oxidase were reported for polymerization- and adsorption-free sensing of phenols in a neutral pH solution. Besides, associated problems like instability in room temperature and complicated purification methods and high cost often restrict the biosensors for cost-effective routine
analysis.\textsuperscript{31} As pointed out by Pumera and his co-workers and our group about the CNT’s graphitic impurity responsible for the phenol electrocatalytic oxidation reaction, here our interest is to exploit an ultra-low cost pencil graphite as an alternative electrochemical sensor for the mono-phenols.

Due to its low cost, good mechanical stability and electrical features, PGEs were often utilized as electrochemical sensors in analytical chemistry.\textsuperscript{35-44} Table 1 provides existing examples of various PGE modified systems used for the sensing of mono and diphenols detections.\textsuperscript{35,37,38,42,43} Note that except with the 1.4 V activated PGE,\textsuperscript{38} all other sensors encountered serious surface adsorption complications.\textsuperscript{35,37,42,43} In fact, the 1.4 V activated PGE also had surface renewability problem for the phenol detection.\textsuperscript{38} Alternatively, fresh PGEs, as a disposable sensor, were used for each measurements. Interestingly, a 2 V vs. Ag/AgCl pre-anodized (in pH 7 PBS) 6B-pencil graphite, designated as 6B-PGE* where *=preanodized, introducing in this work showed highly stable and selective detection of phenol unlike to the previous electrodes with surface fouling and renewal problems in a neutral pH solution (Table 1). Using this new sensor, selective detection of phenol and \textit{meta}-cresol in three different insulin formulations were successfully detected with recovery values \textasciitilde100%.

2. Experimental

2.1 Materials and Reagents

Insulin (\textasciitilde99\% purity) and parafilm® M were obtained from Sigma-Aldrich, USA. Phenol (\textasciitilde98\% purity), \textit{meta}-cresol (\textasciitilde98\% purity), anhydrous sodium dihydrogen phosphate (\textasciitilde98\% purity) and anhydrous disodium hydrogen phosphate (\textasciitilde98\% purity) were procured from
Merck, Germany. Other chemicals were of analytical grade and used as received without any further purification. All the aqueous solutions were prepared using deionized and alkaline KMnO$_4$ double distilled water. Unless otherwise stated, pH 7 PBS of 0.1 M ionic strength was used as a supporting electrolyte. Different pencil of grades viz., 2H, HB, B, 2B, 3B, 4B, 6B and 8B manufactured by Camlin, India were purchased from a local book store at VIT University campus. Caution! Because phenols are corrosive, proper care must be taken during handling.

2.2 Apparatus and preparation of working electrode

Voltammetric measurements were carried out using a CHI 440B electrochemical workstation, USA with 10 mL working volume. The three electrode system consists of a cylindrical pencil graphite (PGE) of dimension 3mm×40mm, where the cylindrical portion covered by a non-conductive parafilm leaving a disc portion (bottom) of geometrical surface area 0.0707 cm$^2$, as a working electrode (Fig. S1†), Ag/AgCl with 3M KCl as a reference electrode and platinum wire as a counter electrode. Prior to the electrochemical measurements, the surface of 6B-PGE is mechanically cleaned by polishing with a bio-analytical system polishing kit (BASi, USA). 6B-PGE* is prepared by potentiostatic polarization of the PGE at an applied potential of 2 V vs. Ag/AgCl for 180 s in pH 7 PBS (Scheme 1, A and B). The optimized DPV parameters used for electrochemical detection of meta-cresol in this work are: initial potential=0.1 V; final potential=1.0 V; increment potential=0.004 V; amplitude=0.05 V; pulse width=0.2 s; pulse period=0.5 s. All the experiments were carried out in 25±2°C temperature.

Raman spectra was recorded using Peakseeker Pro Raman Spectrometer (Agiltron, USA) using a 532 nm laser probe. Fourier transform-infrared (FT-IR) spectral (4000-400 cm$^{-1}$) measurements were done by KBr pellet method using an IR Affinity-1 Fourier transform
Infrared spectrometer (Shimadzu, Japan). A D8 Advanced diffractometer (Bruker, Germany) instrument with Cu Kα source \( (\lambda=1.5418 \text{ Å}) \) was used for X-ray diffraction (XRD) studies.

2.3. Real Sample Analyses

Three commercially available insulin samples viz., soluble insulin injection I.P (Sample #1; insulin=40 IU/mL+phenol=0.65 mg/mL+ \textit{meta}-cresol=1.5 mg/mL), biphasic isophane insulin injection I.P (Sample #2; 40 IU/mL+phenol=0.65 mg/mL+ \textit{meta}-cresol=1.5 mg/mL) and isophane insulin injection I.P (Sample #3; insulin=40 IU/mL+ \textit{meta}-cresol=3.0 mg/mL) purchased from a local pharmaceutical store in Vellore were used as real samples. For analysis, sample #1-#3 of volumes 15, 10 and 15 µL respectively were directly added to 10 mL of blank pH 7 PBS and subjected to quantitative measurements.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Electrochemical and catalytic behaviors of the 6B-PGE*

Fig. 1A and 1B are continuous CV responses of 6B-PGE* with 160 µM \textit{meta}-cresol (Fig. 1A, curve b) and phenol (Fig. 1B, curve b) in pH 7 PBS. An appreciable electrochemical oxidation signal at 0.65±0.02 V vs. Ag/AgCl (irreversible type; A2 peak) with both, but a new redox peak at 0.30±0.02 V vs. Ag/AgCl (reversible type; A1/C1 redox peak) selectively with phenol, were noticed. After the electrochemical experiment, respective 6B-PGE*s were medium transferred to a blank pH 7 PBS and were CV cycled again as in the curve c of Fig. 1A and 1B. No redox response with \textit{meta}-cresol-, whereas a specific surface confined redox peak at 0.30±0.02 V vs. Ag/AgCl (A1/C1) with phenol-exposed 6B-PGE* were noticed. Qualitatively similar CV responses were noticed if 6B-PGE* is subjected to DPV with phenol and \textit{meta}-cresol
in pH 7 PBS (Fig. 1C, curves a and b). However, a quantitative comparison of CV and DPV results was showed about 100 mV negative shift in the A2 peak potential with DPV, which may be due to the pulse parameters such as increment potential, amplitude, pulse width and pulse period used in this technique (Fig. 1C). It is obvious that electrochemical detection of meta-cresol on the 6B-PGE* is freed from the serious adsorption and pre-peak problems, in this work. Based on our previous report, redox peak noticed at 0.25±0.02 V vs. Ag/AgCl (A1/C1) with phenol in this work can be assigned as a surface confined hydroquinone’s redox species on the 6B-PGE*. This surface confined redox peak was found to be not interfering the phenol detection peak noticed at 0.55±0.03 V vs. Ag/AgCl (A2). Following conclusions can be drawn from the above observations: (i) both meta-cresol and phenol oxidize at same magnitude (peak current and potential are same) on 6B-PGE* in pH 7 PBS, (ii) a new surface confined peak is selectively noticed with phenol oxidation (A1/C1), but not with the meta-cresol, (iii) the phenol oxidation peak observed at 0.55±0.03 V vs. Ag/AgCl (A2) is not interfered by the 0.25±0.02 V vs. Ag/AgCl peak (A1/C1) and (iv) meta-cresol is not active enough to form any surface confined peak/s (A1/C1) on 6B-PGE*. Overall, the specific oxidation peak observed at 0.55±0.01 V vs. Ag/AgCl on 6B-PGE* is highly suitable for quantitative electrochemical detection of monophenols in pH 7 PBS.

Initially, meta-cresol was taken as a model to study the phenol sensing by DPV technique. Fig. 2A is a comparative DPV responses of 6B-PGE* and 6B-PGE for the detection of 160 µM meta-cresol in pH 7 PBS. As can been seen, the 6B-PGE* showed a well-defined oxidation peak at 0.55±0.01 V vs. Ag/AgCl (A2), which is 60 mV lower in potential and about eight times higher in the peak current signal than the non-preanodized electrode, 6B-PGE. This observation ascribes electrocatalytic feature of the 6B-PGE* for the meta-cresol oxidation in this
work (Fig 1A, curves a and b). In order to understand the surface feature, both 6B-PGE and 6B-PGE* were subjected to electrochemical (CV with K₃[Fe(CN)₆]) and physicochemical characterizations (XRD, Raman and FT-IR spectroscopies). Fig. 2B is a comparative CV responses of 6B-PGE* and 6B-PGE with 5 mM K₃[Fe(CN)₆] at scan rate 10 mV s⁻¹ in 0.1 M KCl solution. A well defined redox peak at an equilibrium potential, \( E_{1/2} = \frac{(E_{pa}+E_{pc})}{2} \) = 0.205±0.02 V vs. Ag/AgCl with a peak-to-peak separation, \( \Delta E_p = E_{pa} - E_{pc} \), where the \( E_{pa} \) and \( E_{pc} \) are anodic and cathodic peak potentials, 0.087±0.03 V vs. Ag/AgCl were noticed with 6B-PGE*; while the values with 6B-PGE are 0.195±0.03 V vs. Ag/AgCl and 0.106±0.03 V respectively. The lower \( \Delta E_p \) value observed with 6B-PGE* than the 6B-PGE denotes facile electron-transfer behavior of the preanodized system. Previously, it has been reported that preanodization of GCE and screen-printed carbon electrodes creates oxygen rich functional groups like, carbonyl (\( >C=O \)), phenolic (Ph-OH), alcoholic (-C-OH), carboxylic (-COOH) and ether (-C-O-O-) on its outer surface and further helps the promotion of electron oxidation/reduction of certain small molecules and biochemistries. 46-49 It is expected that similar kind of oxygen functional groups might be formed on the surface of the 6B-PGE* and might be assisted the electrocatalytic oxidation of meta-cresol (Scheme 1C and 1D) in this work. In fact, observed two times higher back ground current signal with 6B-PGE* over 6B-PGE is due to the oxygen functional groups present on the 6B-PGE* surface (Fig. 2B).

### 3.2. Physicochemical characterization of the 6B-PGE*

To probe the surface characteristics, 6B-PGE* and 6B-PGE either in the form of powder or in native electrode were subjected to XRD, Raman and FT-IR spectroscopic characterizations. XRD of 6B-PGE* and 6B-PGE were showed broad 20 peaks at 30 and 41° corresponding the
graphitic structures of the pencil (Fig. 3A). No significant variation in the XRD patterns was noticed before and after the preanodization procedure, which may indicate absence of any crystallinity change of graphitic structure against the preanodization. On the other hand, the XRD analysis is not sensitive enough to identify the generated functional group on the 6B-PGE* surface. Raman spectroscopic characterization is a powerful tool to probe the alteration in the graphitic structures. In general, graphitic materials display specific D and G bands at wavenumber ~1330 and 1570 cm\(^{-1}\) due to the disordered (sp\(^3\) bonded sites) and ordered hexagonal carbon (sp\(^2\) bonded sites) structures respectively and the intensity ratio of D and G bands, i.e., \(I_D/I_G\) can be taken as a measure for the graphitic disorder-ness.\(^{50}\) Note that the oxygen rich functionalities such as quinone, phenol and alcoholic functional groups are responsible for the D band of the graphitic material. Fig. 3B is a comparative Raman spectroscopic responses of 6B-PGE and 6B-PGE* that showing D and G bands at 1351±5 and 1568±5 cm\(^{-1}\) as like conventional graphitic materials (CNT and graphite).\(^{50,51}\) Calculated peak intensity ratio, \(I_D/I_G\) values are 0.107 and 0.245 respectively for the 6B-PGE and 6B-PGE* samples. It is obvious that the 6B-PGE* has 2.3 times higher \(I_D/I_G\) ratio value than that of 6B-PGE. Conversion of some sp\(^2\) graphitic units to sp\(^3\)-carbon-oxygen functionalities is a likely reason for the higher \(I_D/I_G\) value.

To support the result, powders of 6B-PGE and 6B-PGE* samples were further subjected to FT-IR characterization as in Fig. 3C. IR peaks corresponding to the hydroxyl (-OH, 3429 cm\(^{-1}\)), sp\(^2\) carbons (>CH=CH<, 1633 and 1588 cm\(^{-1}\) and 1377cm\(^{-1}\) (bending mode)) and >CH\(_2\) (antisymmetric and symmetric mode at 2920 and 2846 cm\(^{-1}\)) functional groups were noticed both with the 6B-PGE and 6B-PGE* samples.\(^{28}\) Beside, IR peak intensities of the 6B-PGE* sample are significantly higher than the 6B-PGE. In particularly, about two fold enhancement in the \(\nu_{OH}\) stretching signal at 3430±5 cm\(^{-1}\) with 6B-PGE* over 6B-PGE was noticed (Fig. 3C, curves a and
b). These results confirm creation of oxygen rich functional groups on the 6B-PGE* upon the pre-anodization process.

3.3. Effect of pencil grade

In general, pencils are made up of clay-graphite composite.\textsuperscript{52} It is expected that graphitic part in the phenol is a key for the electrochemical activity in this work. To understand the graphite contribution, different grade pencils \textit{viz.}, 2H, HB, B, 2B, 3B, 4B, 6B and 8B, where B and H denotes hardness and blackness respectively (graphite/clay ratio increase with increase in the B grade), were subjected to electrochemical detection of 160\,$\mu$M \textit{meta}-cresol as in Fig. 2C. It is obvious that the grade of pencil has some influence on the phenol oxidation reaction. A linear increase in trend between DPV peak current and pencil blackness, up to 6B grade, after that decrease in the trend was noticed. With 8B-PGE*, problems like serious adsorption of the phenol and surface fouling and hence remarkable decrement in the current signal, were obtained. Meanwhile, the respective non-preanodized pencil graphite electrodes (PGEs of 2H-8B grades) showed poor DPV signals for the phenol detection (Fig. 2C, curve b). Since the 6B-PGE* has showed maximum peak current response, it is chosen as an optimal electrode for further analytical studies in this work.

3.4. Analytical measurements

Interrelated DPV parameters were systematically optimized for \textit{meta}-cresol detection as: initial potential= 0.1 V; Final potential=1.0 V; increment potential=0.004 V; amplitude =0.05 V; pulse width=0.2 s; pulse period=0.5 s. Under this optimal condition, effect of concentration of \textit{meta}-cresol on the 6B-PGE* was examined by DPV technique as in Fig. 4A. A systematic
increase in the DPV peak current with increase in *meta*-cresol concentration was observed. To verify the surface adsorption and retention of the phenol oxidation peak, soon after the *meta*-cresol experiment, the 6B-PGE* is replaced to a blank pH 7 PBS and repeated the DPV (Fig. S2†). If *meta*-cresol is adsorbed on the surface, then, it can be identified as a surface confined peak at 0.55±0.01 V vs. Ag/AgCl in the blank pH 7 PBS. Interestingly, there is no peak signal noticed at 0.55±0.01 V vs. Ag/AgCl with the medium transferred 6B-PGE* (Fig. S2†). This observation specifies absence of any adsorbed product on the surface. Fig. 4B is a calibration plot, showing linearity in a concentration window 40-320 μM with current sensitivity 0.101 μA μM⁻¹ (1.43 μA μM⁻¹ cm⁻²). Beyond 320 μM of *meta*-cresol concentration, saturation in the DPV peak current response was noticed. Fig. 4C, curve a, is a DPV of six repetitive detections of 80 μM of *meta*-cresol using 6B-PGE*. A relative standard deviation (RSD) value 0.21% was noticed. Note that, the above repetitive measurements were all carried out without pre-concentration and any interim pretreatment procedures, unlike to the conventional electrochemical sensors.²⁵ Calculated detection limit, $D_L$ (signal-to-noise=3) value is 120 nM. This detection limit and current sensitivity values noticed in this work are better than that of some of the literature reports. For instance, the sensitivity value observed in this work is about 2–5 times higher over some of the graphite and biosensors based reports; Kelgraf graphite composite (0.02 μA μM⁻¹),¹⁴ GCE/Osmium-poly(1-vinylimidazole)/tyrosinase (0.05 μA μM⁻¹)¹⁵ and Platinum/poly acrylonitrile/polyaniline/polyphenol oxidase (0.06 μA μM⁻¹)³²,³⁴ modified electrodes. Likewise, the detection limit calculated in this work is about 300 and 1.5 times lesser than edge plane pyrolytic graphite (30000 nM)⁴¹ and GCE/Osmium-poly(1-vinylimidazole)/tyrosinase (156.4 nM)¹⁵ modified electrodes respectively. Although some of the PGE sensors reported in literature have showed slightly better analytical performance in terms of
higher sensitivity\textsuperscript{42,43} and lower detection limit,\textsuperscript{43} but in consideration with the followings; surface fouling character, simple preparation, reusability and quick operation procedures, present system is superior over the aforementioned reports.

3.5. Interference study

Influence of some interfering biochemicals such as ascorbic acid (AA) and uric acid (UA) on the detection of 80 \textmu M of meta-cresol were next examined as in Fig. 4C, curves a-d. Interestingly, without and with addition of 300 \textmu M AA and 450 \textmu M of UA to the above, there were no significant alterations in the meta-cresol oxidation current signals noticed. The UA gets oxidized at 0.3 V vs. Ag/AgCl, and this signal has not influencing the meta-cresol detection peak existing at 0.55±0.01 V vs. Ag/AgCl. Note that, there is no specific current signal observed for the AA oxidation on 6B-PGE* (Fig. 4C, curve b). Presumably, at neutral pH, AA may exist as anionic form (pK\textsubscript{a}= 4.1) and hence it might be strongly repelled by the anionic oxygen functional groups such as -COO\textsuperscript{-} and O\textsuperscript{-} of the 6B-PGE*\textsuperscript{53}.

3.6. Real sample analyses

Total phenol content in three different commercially available insulin injections, sample #1-#3 were tested using 6B-PGE* by a standard addition approach (Fig. 5). Since meta-cresol and phenol showed quantitatively similar DPV responses at 0.55±0.01 V vs. Ag/AgCl (Fig. 1C), for simplicity purpose meta-cresol is taken as an internal standard for the measurement of total phenolic content in the real samples. Table 2 is the analytical data for quantification of the total phenolic content in the real samples, #1-#3. The detected total phenolic content values in the real samples are; 2.29, 2.04 and 3.15 mg mL\textsuperscript{-1}. These values were closely matching with the
respective labeled values of the real samples, #1-#3. Calculated electrode recovery values are ~100%.

4. Conclusions

An ultra-low cost 6B-pencil graphite preanodized at 2 V vs. Ag/AgCl for 180 s showed efficient differential pulse voltammetric sensing of phenolic preservative/s in the insulin formulations in pH 7 PBS. Oxygen rich functional groups such as phenolic, carboxylic, carbonyl and ether created on the preanodized 6B-pencil graphite surface were found to be responsible for the efficient electrochemical oxidation of the mono-phenols in this work. DPV parameters were systematically optimized. Under an optimal condition, the preanodized 6B-pencil graphite electrode showed linear current response against concentration of phenol in a window 40-320 µM with current sensitivity and regression values of 0.101 µA µM⁻¹ and 0.999 respectively. Calculated detection limit value was 0.12 µM. The working electrode can be reusable and renewable without any pretreatment procedures, unlike to the conventional electrodes with series interim surface cleaning steps. Total phenolic content in three different insulin pharmaceutical samples were successfully detected with recovery values ~100%. The developed sensor in this work is suitable for electrochemical detection of various phenols in pharmaceuticals, tea, wine and environmental samples and can be extended as an electrochemical detector in flow injection analysis too.
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Figure Captions

**Fig. 1** Continuous CV responses of 6B-PGE* without (curve a) and with (curve b) 160 µM of meta-cresol (A) and phenol (B) and its medium transferred responses in a blank pH 7 PBS (curves c in A and B) at a scan rate 50 mV s\(^{-1}\). (C) DPV of 6B-PGE* with 80 µM phenol (b) and meta-cresol (a) in pH 7 PBS. Respective chemical structures and plausible electrochemical reactions responsible for the A1 and A2 peaks were given as insets. DPV conditions are: initial potential= 0.1 V; Final potential=1.0 V; increment potential=0.004 V; amplitude=0.05 V; pulse width=0.2 s; pulse period=0.5 s.

**Fig. 2** (A) Comparative DPV responses of 6B-PGE* (a) and 6B-PGE (b) for the detection of 160 µM of meta-cresol and curves (c) and (d) are DPVs of 6B-PGE* with insulin and without meta-cresol in pH 7 PBS. (B) CV responses of 6B-PGE and 6B-PGE* with 5 mM Fe(CN)\(_6\)\(^{3-}\) in 0.5 M KCl at scan rate 10 mV s\(^{-1}\). (C) Plots of DPV peak current density (j/µA cm\(^2\)) values against different grade pencil graphites before (a) and after pre-anodization (b) for the detection of 160 µM of meta-cresol in pH 7 PBS. Shades of different pencil grades’ were displayed as Fig. 2C inset. Other DPV conditions are as in the Fig. 1.

**Fig. 3** (A) XRD, (B) Raman and (C) FT-IR spectra of 6B-PGE* (a) and 6B-PGE (b)

**Fig. 4** (A) DPV responses of 6B-PGE* on successive sensing of 40-400 µM of meta-cresol in 10 mL pH 7 PBS, (B) plot of the DPV peak current vs. [meta-cresol] and (C) six repeated DPV responses of 6B-PGE* for the detection of 80 µM of meta-cresol without (curve a) and with ascorbic acid (AA; curve b), uric acid (UA; curve c) and mixture of UA+AA (curve d) in pH 7 PBS. Other DPV conditions are as in the Fig. 1.

**Fig. 5** Typical DPV responses of 6B-PGE* for the detection of total phenolic content (meta-cresol+phenol) in three different pharmaceutical insulin real samples (A-C) by a standard addition approach. Other DPV conditions are as in the Fig. 1.
Table 1. Details for the analytical data of various PGE’s reported in the literature for monophenols and diphenols detection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Electrode</th>
<th>Activation</th>
<th>Analyte</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>$E_{pa}$ (V)</th>
<th>Sens. (A·M⁻¹·cm⁻²)</th>
<th>$D_0$ (M)</th>
<th>Real Sample</th>
<th>Remarks/limitations</th>
<th>Ref. No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. H-PGE</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>4-nitrophenol</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.9$^a$</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1.1$a$</td>
<td>Tap water</td>
<td>• Electrode fouling noticed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Single-use type sensor</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PGE/ Au</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>meta-cresol</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.55$^b$</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Electrode fouling noticed</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• For qualitative detection purpose only.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. HB-PGE$^*/$</td>
<td>at 1.4 V for 60 s in pH 4.80</td>
<td>4-octylphenol, 4-nonylphenol &amp; 4-tert-octyl phenol</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.7$^a$</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.25$a$</td>
<td>Effluent</td>
<td>• Single-use type sensor</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 2 – 12 hrs time required for CNT modification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. PGE$^*$</td>
<td>at -0.3 to 2.0 V in pH 12.46</td>
<td>Bisphenol</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.75$^b$</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>0.0031$^b$</td>
<td>River water</td>
<td>• Pre-concentration procedure involved</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Electrode fouling noticed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Single-use type sensor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. HB-PGE</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Caffeic acid &amp; Trolox</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.8$^a$</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.42$a$</td>
<td>Tea samples</td>
<td>• Electrode fouling noticed</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Single-use type sensor</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 6B-PGE$^*$</td>
<td>at 2 V for 180 s in pH 7</td>
<td>meta-cresol &amp; phenol</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>0.55$^b$</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.12$a$</td>
<td>Pharmaceutical insulin</td>
<td>This work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fouling free</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Renewable/reusable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No pre-concentration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PGE= Pencil-lead electrode; *= preanodized; CNT=carbon nanotube; DPV=differential pulse voltammetry; #1= vs. Carbon (semi reference); #2= vs. Ag/AgCl; #3=vs. SCE; #a=DPV; #b=Adsorptive Stripping DPV.
Table 2. Analytical result for electrochemical detection of phenolic preservatives in pharmaceutical insulin real samples using 6B-PGE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Sample #1</th>
<th>Sample #2</th>
<th>Sample #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R+S1</td>
<td>R+S2</td>
<td>R+S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Linear equation</td>
<td>$y=0.15+0.102x$</td>
<td>$y=1.75+0.110x$</td>
<td>$y=1.25+0.088x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Regression</td>
<td>0.981</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Original detected (µM) (R)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Added (µM) (R+S1-S3)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Found (µM)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Recovery (%)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Detected phenol (mg mL$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Labeled phenol (mg mL$^{-1}$)#1</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R=Real sample; S1-S3= Different standard (meta-cresol) concentrations; #1=Total phenol content.
Scheme 1

Scheme 1. Photograph of a 6B-pencil graphite (PGE) (A), cartoon for a 6B-PGE, prepared using parafilm by wrapping on the cylindrical surface portion of the pencil graphite (B), a 2V-180 s/pH 7 PBS preanodized 6B-PGE (6B-PGE*) (C) and selective phenol oxidation reaction scheme on 6B-PGE* at 0.55 V vs. Ag/AgCl in pH 7 PBS.
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Fig. 1  Continuous CV responses of 6B-PGE* without (curve a) and with (curve b) 160 µM of meta-cresol (A) and phenol (B) and its medium transferred responses in a blank pH 7 PBS (curves c in A and B) at a scan rate 50 mV s⁻¹. (C) DPV of 6B–PGE* with 80 µM phenol (b) and meta-cresol (a) in pH 7 PBS. Respective chemical structures and plausible electrochemical reactions responsible for the A1 and A2 peaks were given as insets. DPV conditions are: initial potential= 0.1 V; Final potential=1.0 V; increment potential=0.004 V; amplitude=0.05 V; pulse width=0.2 s; pulse period=0.5 s.
Fig. 2

(A) Comparative DPV responses of 6B-PGE* (a) and 6B-PGE (b) for the detection of 160 µM of meta-cresol and curves (c) and (d) are DPVs of 6B-PGE* with insulin and without meta-cresol in pH 7 PBS. (B) CV responses of 6B-PGE and 6B-PGE* with 5 mM Fe(CN)$_6^{3/-}$ in 0.5 M KCl at scan rate 10 mV s$^{-1}$. (C) Plots of DPV peak current density (j/µA cm$^{-2}$) values against different grade pencil graphites before (a) and after pre-anodization (b) for the detection of 160 µM of meta-cresol in pH 7 PBS. Shades of different pencil grades’ were displayed as Fig. 2C inset. Other DPV conditions are as in the Fig. 1.
Fig. 3

(A) XRD, (B) Raman and (C) FT-IR spectra of 6B-PGE* (a) and 6B-PGE (b)
Fig. 4

(A) DPV responses of 6B-PGE* on successive sensing of 40-400 µM of meta-cresol in 10 mL pH 7 PBS, (B) plot of the DPV peak current vs. [meta-cresol] and (C) six repeated DPV responses of 6B-PGE* for the detection of 80 µM of meta-cresol without (curve a) and with ascorbic acid (AA; curve b), uric acid (UA; curve c) and mixture of UA+AA (curve d) in pH 7 PBS. Other DPV conditions are as in the Fig. 1.
Typical DPV responses of 6B-PGE* for the detection of total phenolic content (meta-cresol+phenol) in three different pharmaceutical insulin real samples (A-C) by a standard addition approach. Other DPV conditions are as in the Fig. 1.
A low-cost pre-anodized 6B-pencil graphite (6B-PGE*) showed as a fouling-free and renewable electrochemical sensor for mono-phenols and can be used for the detection of mono-phenolic preservatives in pharmaceutical insulin formulations.