

Analytical Methods

Accepted Manuscript



This is an *Accepted Manuscript*, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this *Accepted Manuscript* with the edited and formatted *Advance Article* as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about *Accepted Manuscripts* in the [Information for Authors](#).

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard [Terms & Conditions](#) and the [Ethical guidelines](#) still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this *Accepted Manuscript* or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.

Cite this: DOI: 10.1039/c0xx00000x

www.rsc.org/xxxxxx

ARTICLE

A tin-bismuth alloy electrode for cathodic stripping voltammetric determination of iron in coastal waters

Mingyue Lin,^{a,b} Dawei Pan,^{*a} Xueping Hu,^{a,b} Fei Li^c and Haitao Han^a

Received (in XXX, XXX) Xth XXXXXXXXX 20XX, Accepted Xth XXXXXXXXX 20XX

DOI: 10.1039/b000000x

We employed the home-made tin-bismuth alloy electrode (SnBiE) as the working electrode with 1-(2-pyridylazo)-2-naphthol (PAN) as the complexing ligand to detect trace iron. This method is based on the cathodic reduction of Fe(□)-PAN complex to Fe(□)-PAN complex at SnBiE by using adsorptive cathodic stripping voltammetry. The experimental parameters such as pH values, concentrations of buffer solution, accumulation potential, accumulation time and the concentrations of PAN were optimized, and interference by other ions were investigated in detail. The response of Fe(□) was linear in the range of 1 nM to 900 nM with a detection limit of 0.2 nM (after 60 s of accumulation, s/n=3). This method can also be applied to the determination of iron in coastal rivers and sea water with satisfactory results.

Introduction

It is now recognized that iron plays a vitally important biological role in seawater^{1,2} because iron is one of the essential micro-nutrient elements for all organisms³ and it believes to be a limited or co-limited nutrient for phytoplankton growth in several oceanic waters (HNLC region, namely high nutrient and low chlorophyll).^{4,5} The concentrations of iron are much higher due to terrestrial inputs but bioavailability may still be quite low⁶ and iron has been proposed to be a growth-limited factor for microorganisms in coastal environments.^{7,8} Besides, iron can determine what phytoplankton species dominate⁹ with subsequent implications for the cycling of other elements (e.g. Si, N, and P).

To better understand the biological and chemical processes effecting iron distribution and cycling in coastal environments, it is urgently needed to develop simple analytical tools specifically designed to determine the total dissolved iron in coastal waters.

To achieve this goal, many techniques have been developed to detect and quantify iron, such as atomic absorption spectrometry (AAS),¹⁰ inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry (ICP-MS),^{11,12} electrothermal atomic absorption spectrometry (ETAAS),¹³ spectrophotometry,¹⁴ and so on. However, these methods are relatively expensive for ultra-trace determination of iron and can suffer from interferences.¹⁵ Besides, the expensive and bulky devices also restrict their use in laboratory based determination and on-site experiments. Comparatively, stripping analysis is recognized as an extremely sensitive electrochemical technique for iron determination due to its advantages in relatively low cost, portable instrument, and high sensitivity, etc.¹⁶ Cathodic stripping voltammetry (CSV) based on mercury electrode¹⁷⁻²² is the most widely used electrochemical technique for iron determination in natural and sea waters. Several ligands such as catechol,¹⁷ 1-nitroso-2-naphtol (NN),^{18,19} 2-(2-thiazolyazo)-p-cresol (TAC),²⁰ and 2,3-dihydroxynaphtalene (DHN),^{21,22} etc, have been developed. However, the well-known

toxicity and handling inconveniences of mercury have recently restricted its use. Since bismuth-based electrode was introduced as a favorable alternative mercury-free electrode material by Wang's group,^{23,24} it has been widely used in stripping electroanalytical determination of metal ions due to its low toxicity and similar properties to Hg electrode.²⁵ Bismuth film electrode (BiFE) has been successfully applied in trace iron determinations with the aid of ligands, e.g. as 1-(2-pyridylazo)-2-naphthol (PAN)²⁶ and triethanolamine (TEA)²⁷. However, bismuth film is not homogeneous, because the morphology depends on the plating potential and substrate electrode has a profound effect on the nucleation and growth of the bismuth deposit.²⁸ Lately, tin has been proposed as a new electrode material based on the mechanism of bismuth film electrode because the position of tin and bismuth is catercorner in element periodic table and tin may has similar characters to bismuth.²⁹ Besides, tin is also an environmental-friendly material with a very low toxicity.³⁰ It has been successfully applied in determination of trace metals, such as Cr³⁺,²⁹ Cd²⁺,^{29,31,33} Zn²⁺,^{31,32} Pb²⁺,³² Cu²⁺,³² Ti³⁺,³² and so on. Moreover, the tin/bismuth film electrode which was modified by in situ depositing tin and bismuth on a poly(p-aminobenzene sulfonic acid) coated glassy carbon electrode showed a better stripping current response than the traditional bismuth and tin film electrode.³³ However, the preparation of this kind tin/bismuth film electrode is relatively complex. Recently, the tin-bismuth alloy electrode (SnBiE) has been reported in our lab to have better electrochemical properties than BiFEs and has been successfully applied in Zn²⁺ and Cd²⁺ analysis.^{34,35}

In the present work, the Fe(□)/Fe(□)-PAN complex, in a slightly acidic supporting electrolyte of acetate, was studied using the home-made SnBiE as the working electrode and adsorptive cathodic stripping voltammetry. Experimental parameters, including the pH values and concentrations of acetate buffer, the

accumulation potential and time, and the concentrations of PAN have been investigated in detail. Additionally, the practical application of SnBiE has been successfully carried out for total dissolved iron in coastal waters. Besides, the results achieved using SnBiE were compared with BiFEs and other electrochemical methods, which showed SnBiE has a better response and practical use in iron determinations.

Experimental Section

Reagents and Apparatus

All chemicals used were of analytical grade purity, except HCl was Guaranteed Reagents. Aqueous solutions were made with deionized water (18.2 M Ω cm specific resistance) produced by Pall Cascada laboratory water system. Standard stock solutions of Cu²⁺, Zn²⁺, Cd²⁺, Cr³⁺, Hg²⁺, As³⁺, Ag⁺, Al³⁺, Ni²⁺, Pb²⁺, Mg²⁺, Mn²⁺, Co²⁺, humic substances (HS), ethylene diamine tetraacetic acid (EDTA), sodium dodecyl benzene sulfonate (SDBS), cetyltrimethyl ammonium bromide (CTAB), and NaCl were obtained from Sinopharm Chemical Reagent and diluted as required. Iron standard solutions were prepared from chloride of Fe³⁺ (Sinopharm Chemical Reagent Co., Ltd., China.) in 0.1 M HCl. 0.1 M acetate buffer solution (pH 3.5-5.5) were prepared with sodium acetate and acetic acid.

All electrochemical experiments were performed on a CHI 660D Electrochemical Work Station (Shanghai CH Instruments, Shanghai, China) with a conventional three-electrode system. A SnBiE was served as a working electrode, a Ag/AgCl (saturated KCl solution) was used as a reference electrode, and a platinum foil counter electrode was employed as an auxiliary electrode. Inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry (ICP-MS, ELAN DRC, Perkin Elmer Instruments, USA) was used for comparative testing. All experiments were conducted at room temperature (25 °C).

Preparation of real coastal water samples

River water samples were collected from two local rivers which flow into the Bohai Sea (Jiehe and Xiaoqinghe, Shandong Province). Sea water sample was collected from the Bohai Sea. The samples were filtered by 0.45 μ m membrane filters after collection, then saved in FEP bottles and kept at 4 °C until determination. To remove the organic complexes and liberate iron from complexes with natural ligands, the total dissolved iron in water samples was determined after UV-digestion (30 min, 500 W, Metrohm MVA-UV 705) at pH less than 2.0.

Preparation of SnBiE

Sn-Bi alloy wires (Sn:Bi, 42:58 wt.%, 1 mm in diameter, purity 99.99%) were purchased from KAIT Electronic Material Co., Ltd, China). SnBiE was made of a Sn-Bi alloy wires (2 cm) encapsulated in Teflon with a copper wire to conduct. To get a smooth and bright surface, SnBiE was polished using aqueous alumina slurry (0.3 and 0.05 μ m), then washed with deionized water and acetone thoroughly before use.

Analytical procedures

The analysis of Fe(□) was performed in 0.1 M acetate buffer (pH 4.5) containing 2 μ M PAN as complexing agent. It had two main steps, including accumulation and stripping out. First,

Fe(□)-PAN complex was accumulated onto the surface of SnBiE under the potential of -0.3 V vs. Ag/AgCl for 60 s with stirring. After equilibration period of 10 s, the stripping voltammetry was carried out from -0.3 V to -0.54 V with increment of 0.004 V by differential pulse voltammetry (DPV).

Results and discussion

Cyclic voltammetry

The voltammetric behaviors of Fe(□)-PAN based on SnBiE were studied in 0.1 M acetate buffer solution (pH 4.5). The potential range was from -0.55 V to -0.25 V. As shown in Fig. 1, SnBiE has shown a low background current and no signal was observed for the solution containing 2 μ M PAN in the absence of Fe³⁺ (curve a). The reduction peak of free PAN was not obtained in the potential range on the SnBiE, which was different from the previous report,²⁶ suggesting that SnBiE has better advantages for Fe³⁺ determination than BiFE. After the addition of 30 nM Fe³⁺, a cathodic peak of Fe(□)-PAN was obtained at -0.47 V (curve b) during the negative scan. No obvious peaks were observed in the positive scan, suggesting that the reduction of the complex is an irreversible process. Here, one point needs to be stated is that the reduction of Fe(□)-PAN was carried out on a partly oxidized SnBiE because the oxidation peak of Sn at SnBiE in pH 4.5 is -0.6V. During the accumulation and determination of Fe(□)-PAN on the surface of SnBiE, the competitive oxidation of Sn from Sn-Bi alloy was simultaneously. Considering Sn could not be thoroughly oxidized in such a short time (about 90 s), the surface of SnBiE was partly oxidized.




Fig. 1. Cyclic voltammograms of the SnBiE in 0.1 M acetate buffer (pH 4.5) containing 2 μ M PAN in the absence (curve a) and presence (curve b) of 30 nM Fe³⁺, with an accumulation potential of -0.3 V, an accumulation time of 60 s, and a scan rate of 50 mV s⁻¹.

Effect of pH and concentration of acetate buffer

Considering Fe³⁺ is easily hydrolyzed in slightly acidic and alkaline environments, and the formation and stability of Fe(□)-PAN complex are strongly dependent on solution's pH, as well as the Sn-Bi alloy can be dissolved in strong acidic solution, the pH values of the buffer solution are controlled in the medium acidity. The influence of 0.1 M acetate buffer's pH on the cathodic signals of the complex was investigated in the range from 3.5 to 5.5. As shown in Fig. 2(a), the maximum peak current of the complex was obtained at pH 4.5, and the peak current decreased gradually at a lower pH value which probably owing to the high background current caused by the hydrogen dissolving. Moreover, the peak current decreased with the pH values above 4.5, which

was probably due to the decomposition of Fe(□)-PAN complex. Fig. 2(b) shows the results obtained from the measurements carried out in different concentrations of acetate buffer which were varied from 0.01 M to 0.3 M. The results showed that 0.1 M acetate buffer presented the highest cathodic peak current, because the buffer concentration which is too high or too low may influence the ionic strength. Therefore, the 0.1 M acetate buffer of pH 4.5 was selected as the optimum experimental condition. The relationship between the peak potential (E_p) and pH was also investigated. E_p was shifted in a negative direction when pH increased from 3.5 to 5.5 and the linear regression equation was $E_p = -0.057pH - 0.184$ ($R^2=0.963$). According to the Nernstian theory, the slope of 57 mV pH^{-1} was close to the expected value of 59 mV pH^{-1} at 25 °C, indicating that the equal numbers of protons and electrons were involved.³⁶




Fig. 2. Effect of the pH values of 0.1 M acetate buffer solution (a) and concentrations of acetate buffer (b) on the peak current of Fe(□)-PAN complex at SnBiE ($n=3$). Conditions: 30 nM Fe^{3+} , $2 \text{ }\mu\text{M PAN}$; with an accumulation potential of -0.3 V , and an accumulation time of 60 s.

Effect of accumulation potential

The signal due to the stripping of Fe(□)-PAN complex based on the SnBiE was studied over different accumulation potentials (Fig. 3). As shown in Fig. 3, the signal was nearly 0 A when the accumulation potential was set to -0.6 V , because the set potential caused the reduction of Fe(□)-PAN to Fe(□)-PAN. Then, the peak current increased when the potential varied from -0.6 V to -0.3 V , this probably owing to the positive charged complex would be strongly adsorbed on the negative charged surface of the SnBiE. Besides, the peak current decreased at a potential more positive than -0.3 V because of the given potentials cannot fully negative charged the surface of the SnBiE to adsorb enough Fe(□)-PAN complex. The optimum accumulation potential was chosen -0.3 V , and this value was used in all succeeding measurements.




Fig. 3. Effect of accumulation potential on the stripping peak current of Fe(□)-PAN complex ($n=3$). Conditions: supporting electrolyte of 0.1 M acetate buffer (pH 4.5) containing $2 \text{ }\mu\text{M PAN}$ and 30 nM Fe^{3+} . Other conditions are same as in Fig. 2.

Effect of accumulation time

The amount of the Fe(□)-PAN complex accumulated at the surface of SnBiE is related to the accumulation time, thus the effect of accumulation time on the peak current was studied in the range between 10 s and 300 s, as illustrated in Fig. 4. It is seen that the peak current of the complex increased rapidly as the accumulation time increased to 120 s, and then tended to increase slowly. Though a longer accumulation time can improve the sensitivity, a short accumulation time of 60 s was chosen as a good compromise between sensitivity and time of analysis for succeeding studies.




Fig. 4. Effect of accumulation time on the peak current of Fe(□)-PAN complex ($n=3$). Conditions: supporting electrolyte of 0.1 M acetate buffer (pH 4.5) containing $2 \text{ }\mu\text{M PAN}$ and 30 nM Fe^{3+} . Other conditions are same as in Fig. 2.

Effect of the concentration of PAN

The concentration of PAN affects the peak current of the complex greatly and its effect on the voltammetric response of the complex was examined in the range of 0.5 to $7 \text{ }\mu\text{M}$ in 0.1 M acetate buffer containing 30 nM Fe^{3+} . From Fig. 5, the maximum peak current was obtained for $2 \text{ }\mu\text{M}$. For the concentrations of PAN lower than $2 \text{ }\mu\text{M}$ were too dilute to have enough deposition points. For higher concentrations of PAN, a significant decrease was obtained owing to competitive adsorption between PAN and Fe(□)-PAN complex on the electrode. Besides, the voltammetric curves were broader than low concentrations of PAN. Thus, the optimum PAN concentration was chosen as $2 \text{ }\mu\text{M}$.




Fig. 5. Effect of the concentrations of PAN on the peak current of 30 nM Fe^{3+} in 0.1 M acetate buffer (pH 4.5) ($n=3$). Other conditions are same as in Fig. 2.

5 Effect of scan rate

To obtain the kinetic parameters, the effect of scan rate with the current peak of the $\text{Fe}(\square)$ -PAN complex was studied from 5 to 200 mV s^{-1} by linear sweep voltammetry. The peak current increased linearly with the increasing scan rate and the equation was calculated as $i_p = -0.068v - 1.59$ ($R^2=0.988$), indicating it is a typical adsorption-controlled process. Besides, the relationship between the peak potential and $\log v$ was found to be $E_p = -0.112 \log v - 0.47$ ($R^2=0.955$), suggesting it is an irreversible process.

15 Calibration curve, detection limit and reproducibility

The calibration curve for determination of $\text{Fe}(\square)$ at the SnBiE was established under the optimal conditions mentioned above (Fig. 6). For 60 s of accumulation time, a linear relationship between the cathodic peak current and the concentration of Fe^{3+} was obtained in the range of 1 nM to 900 nM with a regression equation expressed as $i_p = -0.124C - 5.42$ ($R^2=0.995$). The detection limit of Fe^{3+} for 60 s accumulation was calculated to be 0.2 nM ($s/n=3$), which is lower than that at BiFE using PAN as the complexant,²⁶ BiFE using TEA and BrO_3^- as the complexant and catalytic agent, respectively.²⁷ In addition, the linear range is much wider than two methods based on the BiFE mentioned above. Besides, the detection limit of Fe^{3+} on our environmental-friendly SnBiE is lower than most of mercury electrodes and other modified carbon electrodes,¹⁵ which shows that our SnBiE has a significant advantage in iron determination. The RSD of repeatability was calculated to be 3.7 % based on the six successive determinations of 30 nM Fe^{3+} and the RSD of reproducibility was 4.3 % according to the six independent SnBiEs' determinations.




Fig. 6. Voltammetric responses of Fe^{3+} at the SnBiE, the concentrations of Fe^{3+} are from 1 nM to 900 nM in 0.1 M acetate buffer solution containing 2 μM PAN. Inset is the calibration curve of Fe^{3+} in the linear range. Other conditions are same as in Fig. 2.

Interferences study

The influence of possible interfering species was studied by adding various foreign species into 0.1 M acetate buffer (pH 4.5) containing 100 nM Fe^{3+} and 2 μM PAN under the optimized experimental conditions. The interfering species were added at different concentrations until they produce a 5% change of the initial peak current. The results showed that 50-fold Cd^{2+} , Cr^{3+} , Hg^{2+} , As^{3+} and Ag^+ , 30-fold Ni^{2+} , Pb^{2+} and Al^{3+} , 20-fold Zn^{2+} , Cu^{2+} and Mg^{2+} , 10-fold Mn^{2+} and Co^{2+} had no influence on the peak current, this agreed to the previous reports that such metal ions cannot form stable complexes with PAN under pH 4.5, and most of their reduction peak potentials were not in the given potential range.³⁷⁻⁴⁰ Considering the organic species in natural waters can be absorbed on the surface of the electrode or chelated with iron, and the surface active substances have a profound effect on the stripping responses on BiFEs,⁴¹ which will cause the obvious changes of current response. The influence of HS, EDTA, SDBS, CTAB has also been studied. Adding 20-fold CTAB, 10-fold SDBS, HS and EDTA would significantly decrease the peak currents, but the signals would return to the original values after UV-digestion because all the organic substances have been destroyed. Besides, our method did not interfere with the addition of NaCl at a concentration lower than 0.01M, so the effect of salinity was under control because the real sample analysis was carried out in acetate buffer after at least 50-times dilution. To better eliminate the influences for real seawater samples, standard addition method was used.

Practical applications

To evaluate the practical applications of the established method based on the novel SnBiE, the total dissolved iron of the river water and seawater samples were analyzed by using standard addition method. The UV-digested water samples were diluted 1000 times for detection under the optimal conditions. The adsorptive cathodic stripping voltammetry of the digested seawater sample at SnBiE are shown in Fig. 7. The concentration of total dissolved iron can be calculated from fitted curve (inset of Fig. 7), and the result is consistent with the data obtained by ICP-MS, which shows that the SnBiE exhibits good performance for iron determination in seawater. Besides, to better illustrate its accuracy in practical analysis, the results obtained by this method and ICP-MS were compared in Table 1. The data were in a good accordance, indicating the capability of the SnBiE for iron determinations in real water samples.




Fig. 7. Voltammetric responses of Fe^{3+} in seawater sample at the SnBiE by using standard addition method of standard additions of 0, 40, 100, 160, 240 nM Fe^{3+} (from top to bottom). The inset is the fitted curve of Fe^{3+} measurement obtained from standard addition. Conditions: 0.1 M acetate buffer (pH 4.5), 2 μM PAN. Other conditions are same as in Fig. 2.

Table 1 Comparison of the established method and ICP-MS for determination of total dissolved iron in real water samples ($n=3$)

Samples	Detected by this method (μM)	Detected by ICP-MS (μM)
Coastal river water 1	23.8 \pm 2.3	24.3 \pm 2.4
Coastal river water 2	44.0 \pm 3.2	43.2 \pm 3.1
Coastal sea water	45.9 \pm 2.2	45.4 \pm 2.7

Conclusions

The SnBiE has been successfully used for total dissolved iron in real water samples with good accuracy and precision. Compared to the methods based on the bismuth film electrode, the established method based on SnBiE has several advantages, such as easy fabrication, no requirement of any pretreatment, a more suitable potential range, wider linearity and lower detection limit for iron determination. This method based on SnBiE will be of great benefit to investigate the effects of iron in aquatic biogeochemistry.

Notes and references

^a Key Laboratory of Coastal Environmental Processes and Ecological Remediation, Yantai Institute of Coastal Zone Research (YIC), Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS); Shandong Provincial Key Laboratory of Coastal Environmental Processes, YICCAS, Yantai Shandong 264003, P. R. China. Tel.: +86 535 2109155. E-mail: dwpan@yic.ac.cn

^b University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, P. R. China.

^c The Key Lab in Molecular and Nano-materials Probes of the Ministry of Education of China, College of Chemistry, Chemical Engineering and Materials Science, Shandong Normal University, Jinan Shandong 250014, P. R. China

- J. H. Martin, S. E. Fitzwater and R. M. Gordon, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 1990, **4**, 5-12.
- M. J. Behrenfeld, A. J. Bale, A. S. Kolber, J. Aiken and P. G. Falkowski, *Nature*, 1996, **383**, 508-511.
- R. Crichton, J. R. Boelaert, *Inorganic Biochemistry of Iron Metabolism: From Molecular Mechanisms to Clinical Consequences*. John Wiley and Sons, Chichester, England, 2001.
- K. H. Coale, K. S. Johnsons, S. E. Fitzwater, R. M. Gordon, S. J. Tanner, F. P. Chavez, L. Ferioli, C. Sakamoto, P. Rogers, F. J.

- Millero, P. Steinberg, P. Nightingale, D. Cooper, W. P. Cochlan, M. R. Landry, J. Constantinou, G. Rollwagen, A. Trasvina and R. Kudela, *Nature*, 1996, **383**, 495-501.
- J. H. Martin and S. E. Fitzwater, *Nature*, 1988, **331**, 341-343.
- A. L. Rose and T. D. Waite, *Aquat. Sci.*, 2003, **65**, 375-383.
- W. Sunda and S. A. Huntsman, *Mar. Chem.*, 1995, **50**, 189-206.
- M. L. Wells, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 1991, **38**, 1379-1395.
- D. A. Hutchins, G. R. DiTullio, Y. Zhang, K. W. Bruland, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 1998, **43**, 1037-1054.
- S. Berman, J. McLaren and S. Willie, *Anal. Chem.*, 1980, **52**, 488-492.
- J. Wu and E. A. Boyle, *Anal. Chim. Acta*, 1998, **367**, 183-191.
- R. M. Boiteau, J. N. Fitzsimmons, D. J. Repeta and E. A. Boyle, *Anal. Chem.*, 2013, **85**, 4357-4362.
- M. Grotti, M. L. Abelmoschi, F. Soggia and R. Frache, *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.*, 2003, **375**, 242-247.
- M. Grotti, F. Soggia, F. Ardini and R. Frache, *J. Anal. At. Spectrom.*, 2009, **24**, 522-527.
- M. Lu, N. V. Rees, A. S. Kabakaev and R. G. Compton, *Electroanalysis*, 2012, **24**, 1693-1702.
- J. Wang, *Analytical electrochemistry*, 3rd edition, Wiley, New York.
- C. M. G. Van den Berg, *Sci. Total Environ.*, 1986, **49**, 89-99.
- A. E. Witter, B. L. Lewis and G. W. Luther III, *Deep-Sea Res.*, Part II, 2000, **47**, 1517-1539.
- T. Nagai, A. Imai, K. Matsushige, K. Yokoi and T. Fukushima, *Limnology*, 2004, **5**, 87-94.
- P. L. Croot and M. Johansson, *Electroanalysis*, 2000, **12**, 565-576.
- C. M. G. van den Berg, *Anal. Chem.*, 2006, **78**, 156-163.
- L. M. Laglera, J. Santos-Echeandía, S. Caprara and D. Monticelli, *Anal. Chem.*, 2013, **85**, 2486-2492.
- J. Wang, J. Lu, B. Hocevar and P. A. M. Farias, *Anal. Chem.*, 2000, **72**, 3218-3222.
- J. Wang and J. Lu, *Electrochem. Commun.*, 2000, **2**, 390-393.
- J. Wang, J. Lu, U. A. Kirgoz, S. B. Hocevar and B. Ogorevc, *Anal. Chim. Acta*, 2001, **434**, 29-34.
- R. Segura, M. I. Toral and V. Arancibia, *Talanta*, 2008, **75**, 973-977.
- A. Bobrowski, K. Nowak and J. Zarębski, *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.*, 2005, **382**, 1691-1697.
- A. Kro'licka and A. Bobrowski, *Electrochem. Commun.*, 2004, **6**, 99-104.
- W. W. Zhu, N. B. Li and H. Q. Luo, *Talanta*, 2007, **72**, 1733-1737.
- Toxicological profile for tin and tin compounds, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, August 2005. <http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/toxprofiles/tp55.pdf>.
- Y. Q. Tian, N. B. Li and H. Q. Luo, *Electroanalysis*, 2009, **21**, 2584-2589.
- E. Czop, A. Economou and A. Bobrowski, *Electrochim Acta*, 2011, **56**, 2206-2212.
- C. H. Xiong, H. Q. Luo and N. B. Li, *J. Electroanal. Chem.*, 2011, **65**, 19-23.
- D. Pan, L. Zhang, J. Zhuang, T. Yin and W. Qin, *Microchim. Acta*, 2012, **177**, 59-66.
- D. Pan, L. Zhang, J. Zhuang, W. Lu, R. Zhu and W. Qin, *Mater. Lett.*, 2012, **68**, 472-474.
- R. S. Nicholson, *Anal. Chem.*, 1965, **37**, 1351-1355.
- L. Yiheng and W. Wenzhong, *Metall. Anal. (China)*, 1995, **15**, 13-16.
- J. Vuković, S. Matsuoka, K. Yoshimura, V. Grdinić, R. J. Grubešić and O. Županić, *Talanta*, 2007, **71**, 2085-2091.
- A. Corsini, I. M. Yih, Q. Fernando and H. Freiser, *Anal. Chem.*, 1962, **34**, 1090-1093.
- A. Mohadesi, Z. Motallebi and A. Salmanipour, *Analyst*, 2010, **135**, 1686-1690.
- J. Wang, R. P. Deo, S. Thongngamdee and B. Ogorevc, *Electroanalysis*, 2001, **13**, 1153-1156.