## **Supporting information**

## An ESIPT fluorescence probe based on the double-switch recognition mechanism for selective and rapid detection of hydrogen sulfide in living cells

Hongwei Guan<sup>†,E</sup>, Aixia Zhang<sup>‡,E</sup>, Peng Li<sup>d</sup>, Lixin Xia<sup>\*,‡</sup> and Feng Guo<sup>\*,†</sup>

\*Key Laboratory of Industrial Ecology and Environmental Engineering (Ministry of Education),
School of Food and Environment, Dalian University of Technology, Panjin 124000, P.R.China.
\*Department of Chemistry, Liaoning University, Shenyang 110036, P.R.China.

## Contents

| Scheme S1 The synthetic route of HBTSeSe                                                        | S2    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Figure S1 The absorption spectrum of the probe react with H <sub>2</sub> S                      |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Figure S2 Linear relationship between fluorescence intensity and H <sub>2</sub> S concentration | S2    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Figure S3 Limit of detection                                                                    | \$3   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Figure S4 NMR data                                                                              |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Figure S5 HRMS data                                                                             | S4    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Figure S6 The pH trituration experiment                                                         | S4    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Figure S7 MTT assay                                                                             |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Figure S8 Confocal fluorescence images of the cell induced by different concentration PMA.      | S5    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Figure S9. (A-G) Confocal fluorescence images of RAW264.7                                       |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Table S1. The absorbance of MTT assay with different HBTS                                       | e S e |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| concentration                                                                                   | S 7   |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Scheme S1. The synthetic route of HBTSeSe.



**Figure S1.** The absorption spectrum of the probe  $(10\mu M)$  react with different concentration of H<sub>2</sub>S (DMSO/PBS = 1:1).



Figure S2. Linear relationship ( $R^2=0.98$ ) between fluorescence intensity at 460nm of HBTSeSe and  $H_2S$  concentration.



Figure S3. The limit of detection was calculated as 0.19  $\mu$ M.



Figure S4. <sup>1</sup>H-NMR (400MHz, DMSO-d6) of Compound 3



Figure S5. <sup>1</sup>H-NMR (400MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>) of HBTSeSe and mass spectra (ESI-) of C<sub>14</sub>H<sub>10</sub>O<sub>4</sub>Se<sub>2</sub>



Figure S6. <sup>13</sup>C-NMR (400MHz, CDCl3) of HBTSeSe



Figure S7. HRMS (ESI+) of the mixture contains HBTSeSe and Na<sub>2</sub>S



Figure S8. HBTSeSe probe fluorescence intensity before and after adding H<sub>2</sub>S with changes in PH



**Figure S9.** (A-G) Confocal fluorescence images of RAW264.7 incubated by HBTSeSe (10 $\mu$ M) for 20 min and subsequently incubated by different concentration PMA for 30 min. Panel A, 0.0  $\mu$ g/ml PMA; Panel B, 0.05 $\mu$ g/ml PMA; Panel C, 0.1 $\mu$ g/ml PMA; Panel D, 0.2 $\mu$ g/ml PMA; Panel E, 0.4 $\mu$ g/ml PMA; Panel F, 0.8 $\mu$ g/ml PMA; Panel G, 1.0  $\mu$ g/ml PMA.( $\lambda_{ex} = 405$ nm, scale bar = 20 $\mu$ M). All images were collected at the same microscopy settings.

| Test    | HBTSeSe Concentration (µM) |       |        |        |        |       |       |        |       |        |
|---------|----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|
| Number  | 0                          | 0.01  | 0.1    | 1      | 5      | 10    | 25    | 50     | 100   | 200    |
| 1       | 0.629                      | 0.637 | 0.684  | 0.695  | 0.593  | 0.736 | 0.734 | 0.837  | 0.86  | 0.852  |
| 2       | 0.639                      | 0.663 | 0.643  | 0.715  | 0.647  | 0.698 | 0.737 | 0.856  | 0.849 | 0.900  |
| 3       | 0.621                      | 0.640 | 0.642  | 0.683  | 0.712  | 0.700 | 0.735 | 0.897  | 0.854 | 0.898  |
| 4       | 0.600                      | 0.619 | 0.610  | 0.647  | 0.735  | 0.687 | 0.708 | 0.759  | 0.863 | 0.892  |
| 5       | 0.555                      | 0.636 | 0.579  | 0.721  | 0.669  | 0.654 | 0.751 | 0.718  | 0.784 | 0.829  |
| Average | 0.6088                     | 0.639 | 0.6316 | 0.6922 | 0.6712 | 0.695 | 0.733 | 0.8134 | 0.842 | 0.8742 |

Table S1. The absorbance of MTT assay with different HBTSeSe concentration.

The toxicity of the HBTSeSe probe was tested by MTT assay before the probe is subjected to cell testing. The RAW264.7 cells grown in the log phase were first counted using a cell counter and adjusted to a concentration of  $1 \times 10^6$  cells/mL. The cells were seeded directly on 96-well plates at a volume of 200 µL per well. The 96-well microplate was placed in a CO<sub>2</sub> incubator for 24 hours, and the culture solution was subtracted. Then add different concentrations of probes (0, 0.01, 0.1, 1, 5, 10, 25, 50,100,200 µM) and continue to incubate RAW264.7 cells for 24 h, deducting the probe solution. 150 µL of MTT solution at a concentration of 0.5 mg/mL was added to each well for 4 h to remove the remaining MTT solution. Add 150 µL of DMSO to each well to dissolve the formazan, and then measure the absorbance of the solution at 460 nm in each well on a microplate reader. From the experiment data, we can know that it is nontoxicity for cells when the concentration of HBTSeSe was 10 µM.