



J. Serb. Chem. Soc. 91 (9) 877–893 (2026)
JSCS–5530

Voltammetric study of a detergent-stable *Actinomadura keratinilytica* lipase CPT29-cross-linked GA/BSA platinum biosensor

SELMA BOUNOUR¹, FATIHA BENAMIA^{1*}, NOURA SEMACHE¹, SAIDA ZOUGAR²,
RAHMA BENYAHIA², NOUREDDINE DADDA³ and ALI LADJAMA⁴

¹Laboratory of Applied Organic Chemistry, Chemistry Department, Faculty of Sciences, Badji Mokhtar University, P.O. Box 12, 23000 Annaba, Algeria, ²Laboratory of Environmental Engineering, Process Engineering Department, Faculty of Technology, Badji Mokhtar University, P.O. Box 12, 2300, Annaba, Algeria, ³Laboratory of Synthesis and Organic Biocatalysis, Chemistry Department, Faculty of Sciences, Badji Mokhtar University, P.O. Box 12, 23000 Annaba, Algeria and ⁴Laboratory of Applied Biochemistry and Microbiology, Biochemistry Department, Faculty of Sciences, Badji Mokhtar University, P.O. Box 12, 23000 Annaba, Algeria

(Received 7 March, revised 17 April, accepted 23 July 2026)

Abstract: This study describes the immobilization of a native lipase (LCPT29) from *Actinomadura keratinilytica* strain CPT29 isolated from poultry compost in the northeast of Algeria in order to detect ester pollutants in an aqueous environment. For this purpose, this detergent-stable lipase was immobilized with glutaraldehyde as a cross-linker, in the presence of bovine serum albumin (BSA) onto a platinum (Pt) electrode. The prepared enzyme membrane was characterized by FT-IR spectroscopy, confirming its network formation, while its coating of the Pt-electrode was evaluated using cyclic voltammetry. The effectiveness of the cross-linked enzyme membrane-coated working electrode was evaluated electrochemically by detecting propyl 4-hydroxybenzoate (PHB) as a model analyte. Under optimal conditions and at an applied potential of -250 mV vs. Ag/AgCl, the LCPT29-based biosensor showed a linear response over the concentration range from 10^{-14} to 10^{-8} mol L⁻¹ ($r = 0.991$), with a detection limit of 10^{-14} mol L⁻¹. The biosensor exhibited high sensitivity (0.0327 mA L mol⁻¹), good stability ($RSD = 0.37\%$) and significant selectivity as well as the ability to analyse trace amounts of PHB in real water samples, demonstrating its potential for electrochemical biosensing applications.

Keywords: immobilization; enzyme membrane; biosensor; electrochemical; ester pollutant.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: fatiha.benamia@univ-annaba.dz
<https://doi.org/10.2298/JSC260307038B>

INTRODUCTION

Due to their catalytic nature, which accelerates biochemical reactions in living organisms, enzymes play a crucial role in many biotechnological applications. They are essential for analytical devices used in various environmental and medical applications, including biosensors and biocatalysis.^{1,2} As recognition elements in biodetection, they provide developed biosensors with high detection capabilities, essential characteristics for analysing target compounds in complex matrices.^{3,4} Alongside these technological advances, the application of enzymes in biosensors is a current research area that is increasingly being explored.

Biosensors are devices that combine a biological recognition element, such as an enzyme, with a physicochemical transducer, thus enabling the conversion of a specific biochemical reaction into a measurable signal.⁵ Although the exploitation of commercial enzymes is widespread, their use often remains limited by their high cost, availability and sometimes their stability under specific environmental conditions.⁶ As an alternative to commercially produced enzymes, those derived from autochthonous microorganisms are cited. A wide variety of microorganisms produce enzymes, which differ in their microbial origin, chemical properties and mechanisms of action. Generally, microbial enzymes catalyze hydrolysis, oxidation or reduction reactions.⁷ Microbial lipases are the most widely used enzymes in the industrial world because they are more economical, stable and easy to culture.⁸

Lipases (EC 3.1.1.3 triacylglycerol acylhydrolase) are enzymes of the hydrolase group, mainly involved in the degradation of fats.^{9,10} They are common in nature and are made by fungi, bacteria and actinomycetes, as well as plants, animals and other microorganisms.¹¹ On an industrial scale, lipases are produced by microbes.¹² Lipase is widely employed for detecting ester-based pollutants due to its catalytic hydrolysis activity.¹³ In recent years, many enzyme electrochemical biosensors have been conceived, developed and commercialized as user-friendly and time-saving analytical methods.¹⁴ Their immobilization enhances stability, reusability, and applicability in biosensing systems.¹ Recently, numerous immobilization approaches, such as adsorption, entrapment, covalent binding and cross-linking, have been examined in the literature.¹⁵

Exploiting a detergent-stable extracellular lipase from an autochthonous strain of *Actinomyces keratinilytica* (CPT29), we developed a platinum-electrode-based enzymatic membrane. This membrane was designed to create a cost-effective, highly sensitive and selective biosensor for detecting ester-type pollutants in aquatic environments. The lipase was immobilized on a platinum electrode to form an enzymatic membrane, which was characterized by FT-IR spectroscopy and cyclic voltammetry.

EXPERIMENTAL

Chemicals and reagents

Bovine serum albumin (BSA, 99 %), aqueous solutions of glutaraldehyde (25 %), buffer solutions, glycerol (99 %) and an ester substrate were purchased from Sigma–Aldrich Chemie GmbH (Munich, Germany).

Enzyme source

In this study, the lipase¹⁶ used as a biological recognition element, was previously produced from *Actinomadura keratinilytica* strain CPT29 (GenBank accession no. KC447297) isolated from poultry compost collected from a local farm in the northeastern region of Annaba, Algeria.¹⁷

Apparatus and measurements

Electrochemical analyses were performed using a modular SP-300 potentiostat/galvanostat (Biologic Science Instruments, France), controlled by EC-Lab software (v. 11.46) for data acquisition and processing. Measurements were carried out in a three-electrode cell consisting of a platinum working electrode (0.5 cm²), a platinum wire auxiliary electrode (0.1 cm diameter), and an Ag/AgCl reference electrode. The working electrode had been previously cleaned according to a previously described procedure.¹³

Immobilization procedure

Immobilizing the enzyme on the electrode is a crucial step in biosensor development, as its efficiency depends directly on the fixation method used. Several techniques, such as adsorption, covalent bonding, or encapsulation,^{18–21} can be employed after prior activation of the surface functional groups.^{22,23}

In this study, LCPT29 was immobilized on the surface of a platinum electrode by covalent cross-linking in saturated GA vapor with BSA, in which the amino groups of proteins are expected to form a Schiff base.²⁴ During the immobilization, GA acts as a bifunctional cross-linking agent, enabling covalent bonding between the enzyme and the substrate, while BSA is often used as a stabilizing and spacing agent, promoting membrane formation on conductive surfaces. According to a previous study,²⁵ the developed biosensor was prepared by depositing a drop of lipase-based solution containing enzyme/BSA (5 %) and glycerol (10 %) in 10 mol L^{−1} PBS (90 % and pH 7.4) onto the surface of the Pt electrode. The modified working electrode was then exposed to the vapor of the saturated GA for 30 min, followed by drying at room temperature for another 30 min. Finally, it was stored at 4 °C until further use. Scanning electron microscope images (SEM, Quanta 250, FEI Company, Eindhoven, Netherlands) and FT-IR transmittance spectra (Shimadzu IRSpirit-X FTIR) were recorded to confirm the cross-linking and the membrane formation.

Enzyme activity assay

The activity of LCPT29 towards the hydrolysis of PHB was measured titrimetrically. The experiment was conducted using a method similar to that described elsewhere with slight modifications.¹³ Lipase (50 mg) was added to PHB (16.7 mol L^{−1}) in 40 mL of PBS (10 mol L^{−1}; pH 8). The mixture was stirred in a water bath at 40 °C. The kinetics of the hydrolysis reaction, were monitored using an automatic pH-stat titrator (TitroLine®7000, TitriSoft 3.0, SI Analytics GmbH, Germany). The quantity of *p*-hydroxybenzoic acid (PHBA) released was titrated by adding 0.1 mol L^{−1} of sodium hydroxide to the reaction medium. One unit (1 IU) of hydrolytic activity corresponds to 1 μmol of released acid per minute under the assay conditions used. All determinations were performed in triplicate.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Characterization of GA/BSA/LCPT29

FT-IR spectroscopy analysis. Fig. 1 shows the results of the FT-IR analysis obtained after lipase immobilization. The GA spectrum shows a peak around 1680 cm^{-1} ($\text{C}=\text{O}$ stretching vibration) attributed to the carbonyl group of the aldehydic function.²⁶ In the lipase-based membrane spectrum, this peak exhibits a slight shift, suggesting the involvement of glutaraldehyde-derived aldehydes in a chemical reaction. Furthermore, the peaks recorded around 1650 and 1540 cm^{-1} can be attributed to amide I ($\text{C}=\text{O}$ stretching vibration) and amide II ($\text{C}-\text{N}$ stretching and $\text{N}-\text{H}$ bending), respectively, which are characteristic of proteins.²⁷ Although a minor contribution of residual GA in the 1650 cm^{-1} region cannot be completely excluded, this band is predominantly associated with the protein components of the membrane (BSA and immobilized enzyme). Indeed, the same band is already observed in the spectrum of pure BSA, confirming its protein origin. Furthermore, the characteristic aldehyde band of free GA around 1680 cm^{-1} is absent or strongly attenuated in the membrane spectrum, suggesting that most of the GA was consumed during the cross-linking reaction with the amino groups of BSA and the enzyme.




Fig. 1. FT-IR spectra of GA, BSA, and the prepared biomembrane GA/BSA/LCPT29.

The increased intensity of the amide I band in the membrane, compared with that of BSA alone, may be attributed to the combined contribution of BSA and the immobilized enzyme, as well as to structural and chemical modifications induced by GA-mediated cross-linking. These interactions likely involve Schiff base formation and/or imine bond generation between aldehyde groups of GA and amino

groups of proteins.²⁸ Since the amide I region is highly sensitive to the secondary structure of proteins, changes in its intensity and profile may reflect modifications in the local structural environment of the immobilized proteins.²⁹ The FT-IR spectrum (Fig. 1) also shows a broad absorption between 3000 and 3400 cm^{-1} , indicating O–H and N–H bonds stretching vibrations,³⁰ reflecting the presence of hydrophilic groups and bound water. These spectral characteristics together confirm the successful chemical integration of BSA and lipase within the GA-cross-linked membrane.²⁸ In this region, a weaker band is observed around 2900–3000 cm^{-1} , which may be associated with C–H bond stretching vibrations. On the other hand, the absence of a clearly resolved imine (C=N) band in the spectrum could be attributed to overlap with the intense region of amide I and the low intrinsic intensity of this feature in complex protein matrices.

Morphological analysis

In accordance with the method described above, a morphological study was performed to validate the fabrication of the enzymatic membrane on the platinum electrode using SEM analysis under an accelerating voltage of 20 kV, using CBS images at magnifications of 80 $\times$ and 600 $\times$ to compare the surface morphology before and after immersion in PHB (Fig. 2a–d). In addition, ETD images at 300 $\times$ were recorded to further examine the surface changes before and after immersion (Fig. 2a' and b').




Fig. 2. SEM analysis of the platinum electrode coated with an LCPT29-based biomembrane: a and b – before; c and d – after immersion in PHB using CBS images at 80 $\times$ and 600 $\times$. Insets: ETD images at 300 $\times$ before and after immersion (a' and b', respectively).

SEM analysis (Fig. 2a and b) revealed homogeneous and stable adhesion of the biomembrane to the platinum electrode surface after deposition. The morphology of the biosensor after immersion in the target analyte was examined (Fig. 2c–d) to assess analyte diffusion to the active sites. The images show a porous structure and cavities within the BSA–GA–enzyme matrix, facilitating analyte penetration and improving access to the active sites, thus promoting mass transfer. These SEM images (Fig. 2c–d) also show brighter areas localized around the membrane pores, suggesting adsorption and/or accumulation of products resulting from the enzymatic hydrolysis of the analyte. Furthermore, ETD images (Fig. 2a' and b') confirm the surface modification before and after immersion. These observations are consistent with data from the literature¹³ and highlight the essential role of porosity in the diffusion of the analyte.

Cyclic voltammetry (CV) analysis

The SEM analysis was then validated by electrochemical characterization of the biomembrane after its deposition on the working electrode. For this purpose, CV, as a widely used technique in biosensing,^{31,32} was employed to characterize the surface of a platinum electrode³³ before and after biomembrane deposition. Measurements were performed in a 5 mmol L^{−1} [Fe(CN)₆]^{3−/4−} solution prepared in 10 mmol L^{−1} PBS buffer (pH 7.4), with a scanning potential from −0.7 to 0.7 V at 25 mV s^{−1}.

The voltammograms illustrated in Fig. 3a–b show two well-defined anodic and cathodic peaks, indicating a quasi-reversible redox process. The bare electrode (Fig. 3a) exhibits the highest peak currents, indicating rapid electron transfer, while




Fig. 3. Cyclic voltammograms recorded for bare and modified electrodes (a and b, respectively), using 5 mmol L^{−1} [Fe(CN)₆]^{3−/4−} in 10 mmol L^{−1} PBS buffer (pH 7.4) at a scan rate of 25 mV s^{−1}.

their decrease (Fig. 3b) after modification confirms the formation of a bioactive layer that limits access to the redox probe, without, however, completely blocking electron transfer.^{34,35}

Evaluation of enzymatic activity

In this study, enzymatic hydrolysis of PHB was performed to evaluate the hydrolytic activity of LCPT29 against this model analyte, prior to its use as a bioreceptor in the development of a novel biosensor. Initially, PHB was converted to PHBA by enzymatic hydrolysis using the titrimetric method described in the experimental section. The proposed reaction mechanism is illustrated in Fig. 4.




Fig. 4. Kinetic curve recorded for the hydrolysis of PHB to PHBA, catalyzed by LCPT29. The proposed mechanism for the hydrolysis of PHB and the linear portion of the curve are shown in the inset. The reactions were carried out at pH 8 and 40 °C, and their kinetics were continuously monitored using a pH meter. The error bars represent the standard deviation of three measurements.

The hydrolytic activity of the produced LCPT29 was determined from the slope of the linear portion of the kinetic curve, plotted against reaction time (inset of Fig. 4). The enzyme exhibited high activity toward the hydrolysis of PHB (4359 IU) and a higher specific activity than previously described enzymes (Table I), highlighting its potential as a novel bioreceptor in a sensitive PHB biosensor.

Optimization of biosensor response

Scan rate effect. To investigate the scan rate dependence and diffusion-controlled kinetics of the modified electrode, the $[\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6]^{3-/4-}$ redox couple was used as a standard quasi-reversible electrochemical probe. CV measurements of the

TABLE I. Comparison of the specific activity of LCPT29 with that of certain enzymes described in the literature, during the hydrolysis of PHB; LPP: lipase from porcine pancreas; PrbA: esterase from *Enterobacter cloacae* strain EM; rAoPrbA: *Aspergillus oryzae* esterase

Biocatalyst	Specific activity, IU mg ⁻¹ of enzyme	Reference
LCPT29	90.02±0.05	This work
LPP	53.25±0.02	10
PrbA	1.91±0.03	32
rAoPrbA	0.280±0.029	33

LCPT29-based biosensor were performed at scan rates ranging from 25 to 200 mV s⁻¹ over a potential range of -0.7 to 0.7 V vs. Ag/AgCl. All experiments were conducted in a 5 mmol L⁻¹ [Fe(CN)₆]^{3-/4-} solution prepared in 10 mmol L⁻¹ PBS buffer solution (pH 7.4), in the absence of PHB.

The modified electrode exhibited two well-defined redox peaks (Fig. 5), with peak currents increasing with the scan rate. The slight potential shift and the I_{pc}/I_{pa} ratio close to unity (1.03 at 100 mV s⁻¹, Table II) indicate quasi-reversible behavior.




Fig. 5. Cyclic voltammograms of the modified electrode at scan rates from 25 to 200 mV s⁻¹ over -0.7 to 0.7 V vs. Ag/AgCl, using 5 mmol L⁻¹ [Fe(CN)₆]^{3-/4-} in PBS buffer (10 mmol L⁻¹, pH 7.4). Insets show plots of anodic/cathodic current vs the square root of the scan rate and anodic/cathodic potential vs the logarithm of the scan rate.

The kinetic study of the effect of the scan rate on the anodic and cathodic peak currents (I_{pa} and I_{pc}) showed a linear relationship between the peak currents and the square root of the scan rate (inset of Fig. 5):

$$I_{pa} = 0.0276v^{1/2} + 0.0468 \quad r = 0.9974 \quad (1)$$

$$I_{pc} = -0.0231v^{1/2} - 0.0458 \quad r = 0.9968 \quad (2)$$

indicating a diffusion-controlled process.³⁸ The second inset of Fig. 5 reveals a linear dependence of E_{pa} and E_{pc} on the logarithm of the scan rate, as well as an increase in ΔE_p (Table II), confirming the quasi-reversible nature of the system.¹³

TABLE II. Current and potential peaks analysis parameters recorded for the modified platinum electrode at different scan rates

Scan rate, mV s ⁻¹	I_{pa} / mA	I_{pc} / mA	$ I_{pa}/I_{pc} $	E_{pa} / mV	E_{pc} / mV	ΔE_p / mV
25	0.162	-0.133	1.22	273	159	114
50	0.269	-0.214	1.26	284	154	131
75	0.333	-0.244	1.37	286	154	131
100	0.341	-0.311	1.03	294	143	151
125	0.428	-0.296	1.44	301	136	164
150	0.455	-0.311	1.46	304	122	182
175	0.493	-0.327	1.51	313	124	188
200	0.526	-0.348	1.51	313	115	199

Concentration effect. The calibration curve developed to study the influence of analyte concentration on the response of the biosensor designed for the detection of PHB in aqueous media was established by successive additions of increasing concentrations (from 10^{-14} to 10^{-4} mol L⁻¹) to 100 mL of an electrolyte composed of 5 mol L⁻¹ of $[\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6]^{3-/4-}$ in a 10 mol L⁻¹ PBS solution. All measurements were carried out under optimized pH and temperature conditions, within a potential window ranging from -0.7 to 0.7 V. Prior to analyte injection, the electrochemical stability and repeatability of the biosensor were evaluated by recording fourteen consecutive cyclic voltammetry cycles in the presence of the immobilized enzyme and the redox mediator $[\text{Fe}(\text{CN})_6]^{3-/4-}$. The negligible variation observed during these cycles confirmed the achievement of a stable and reproducible electrochemical response, thus ensuring reliable baseline conditions for subsequent calibration experiments. This behavior also suggests the absence of significant electrode surface passivation under the experimental conditions used.

As illustrated in Fig. 6a, the redox peak currents changed significantly with increasing PHB concentration, confirming the sensitivity of the modified electrode to PHB detection. The calibration curve (Fig. 6b) was constructed by plotting the absolute value of the cathodic peak current ($|I_{pc}|$) versus the logarithm of PHB concentration. The inset of Fig. 6b shows a strong linear relationship between the cathodic peak current and the logarithm of the PHB concentration. According to these results, this linear relationship was observed over the concentration range from 10^{-14} to 10^{-8} mol L⁻¹ (Eq. (3)). In contrast, nonlinearity between the current and the concentration was observed up to 10^{-8} mol L⁻¹, which could be due to saturation of the active sites on the surface of the biosensor.¹³

$$I_p = 0.0327 \log C + 0.4908 \quad r = 0.991 \quad (3)$$




Fig. 6. Cyclic voltammograms of the LCPT29-based biosensor recorded at different PHB concentrations in PBS at optimal reaction conditions with the corresponding calibration curve of the cathodic peak current versus the logarithm of the PHB concentration (a and b, respectively). Error bars represent the standard deviation ($n = 3$).

According to this analytical curve, the LCPT29-based biosensor demonstrated significant sensitivity ($0.0327 \text{ mA L mol}^{-1}$) with a limit of detection (LOD) of $10^{-14} \text{ mol L}^{-1}$. In order to better evaluate the analytical performance of this biosensor, a comparative study was conducted with previously published studies (Table III).

TABLE III. Comparison of PHB detection characteristics with previously published studies using CV analysis

Biosensor	$LOD / \text{mol L}^{-1}$	Linear range, mol L^{-1}	Optimum pH	Reference
1	1.0×10^{-14}	10^{-14} – 10^{-8}	8.0	This work
2	3.7×10^{-15}	10^{-14} – 10^{-9}	7.4	13
3	1.1×10^{-7}	2.7×10^{-8} – 1.07×10^{-7}	6.0	39
4	8.0×10^{-8}	2.0×10^{-6} – 20.0×10^{-6}	7.0	40

Effect of pH and temperature. pH and the temperature of the reaction medium are physicochemical parameters that significantly influence enzyme activity. For example, in hydrolysis reactions, these two experimental parameters play a crucial role. pH generally affects the macromolecular stability of the enzyme protein, while temperature increases molecular collisions and improves the solubility of the substrate in the reaction medium.^{41–44} It has been shown that, in the case of enzymes such as lipases, optimizing these two parameters is essential to ensure

their stability and maximize their enzymatic activity. Bacterial lipases are generally active in media with a wide pH range, from 3 to 12, and are thermostable between 30 and 60 °C.⁴⁵ These two parameters can also affect the response of a biosensor in terms of stability, and their optimization is therefore essential.⁴⁶

For this purpose, we investigated the influence of these two physicochemical parameters on the response of the developed biosensor in order to evaluate their effect. The experiments were conducted according to the previously mentioned operating protocol, at different temperatures between 20 and 50 °C, and by testing the reaction medium at different pH values (from 4 to 10). The response obtained at pH 7.4, corresponding to the initial experimental conditions, was included in Fig. 7a as a comparative reference to evaluate the improvement achieved after pH optimization. To facilitate interpretation, the results of the CV analysis applied for this stage of the study are presented as graphs illustrating the evolution of the peak current versus pH and temperature (Fig. 7a and b, respectively).




Fig. 7. Scatter plots of the current response of the biosensor as a function of pH and temperature (a and b, respectively). Experimental conditions: PBS, 10 mM; PHB, 10^{-7} M.

The results shown in Fig. 7a indicate that the peak current is highly dependent on the pH of the reaction medium. The biosensor response increases significantly between pH 4 and 8, while a marked decrease is observed at higher pH values. This reduction could be due to the accumulation of acidic products released during the reaction, which may locally lower the pH and create unfavorable conditions that reduce enzymatic activity and, consequently, the electrochemical response of the biosensor.⁴⁷

The results presented in Fig. 7b indicate that the biosensor response increases with temperature between 20 and 40 °C, reaching a maximum at 40 °C due to increased enzymatic activity and reaction kinetics. Above this temperature, a significant decrease is observed, which could be attributed to enzyme denaturation or biomembrane degradation,⁴⁸ consistent with previous studies.^{16,49}

Stability and selectivity of the biosensor

The stability of the LCPT29-based biosensor was studied by subjecting the modified working electrode to fourteen successive cycles until the response

stabilized. The results of the CV analysis were graphically represented by plotting the current (mA) *versus* cycle number (Fig. 8a) to better visualize the current response over successive cycles. Significant stability of the developed biosensor was observed, with a relative standard deviation (*RSD*) of 0.37 % (<5 %). The selectivity of the developed biosensor was also evaluated by comparing different potential interfering substances (α -tocopherol, glycerol, phenol, bisphenol A and cresol). α -Tocopherol and glycerol are frequently used in some industrial cosmetic formulations.^{50,51} Phenol, bisphenol A and cresol were included among the relevant environmental pollutants frequently detected in industrial effluents and wastewater.^{52,53} For consistency and reliable comparison, all interference experiments were conducted under the same experimental conditions previously optimized. The results were obtained by plotting the absolute value of the cathodic peak current versus the logarithm of PHB concentration (Fig. 8b). The significant reduction in the current signals recorded for the tested interfering substances confirms the high specificity of this biosensor for PHB.




Fig. 8. Evaluation of stability and selectivity of the LCPT29-based biosensor for sensing PHB in aqueous media (a and b, respectively).

Real sample validation of PHB

In order to evaluate the LCPT29-based biosensor's performance in real matrices, recovery experiments were carried out using tap water and river water samples spiked with different known concentrations (from 10^{-8} to 10^{-11} mol L⁻¹) of the target analyte (PHB). The analyte concentrations in the real samples were determined using the calibration curve previously established with standard solutions by cyclic voltammetry (Eq. (3)), and the recovery values were calculated:⁵⁴

$$\text{Recovery} = 100 \frac{C_{\text{found}}}{C_{\text{added}}} \quad (4)$$

where C_{found} and C_{added} denote the concentrations of analyte determined in the spiked sample and the added analyte, respectively.

As shown in Table IV, recovery rates between 90 and 97 % were obtained for both matrices tested, demonstrating the good accuracy of the LCPT29-based biosensor for the analysis of real samples. These values are within the generally accepted range (70–120 %) for trace analysis in complex matrices,^{54,55} suggesting a limited matrix effect. The low *RSD* values (< 5 %) confirm the biosensor's good accuracy and repeatability. Overall, the results show that the method is reliable and suitable for analyzing the samples studied, thus confirming the applicability of the proposed biosensor to real-world sample analysis.

TABLE IV. Recovery (%) of PHB in tap and river water samples measured using the developed LCPT29-based biosensor. Blank (0 M) corresponds to unspiked samples. Results are based on three replicate measurements ($n = 3$)

Sample	$C_{\text{added}} / \text{mol L}^{-1}$	$C_{\text{found}} / \text{mol L}^{-1}$	Recovery, %	<i>RSD</i> / %
Tap water	0	—	—	—
	10^{-8}	$10^{-8.03}$	93.5	1.43
	10^{-9}	$10^{-9.02}$	94.8	1.06
	10^{-10}	$10^{-10.02}$	95.9	1.98
	10^{-11}	$10^{-11.01}$	97.3	2.52
River water	0	—	—	—
	10^{-8}	$10^{-8.04}$	90.8	1.50
	10^{-9}	$10^{-9.02}$	95.3	1.05
	10^{-10}	$10^{-10.04}$	91.4	2.10
	10^{-11}	$10^{-11.03}$	94.0	2.46

CONCLUSION

In this work, a native, detergent-stable lipase from the *Actinomadura Keratinilytica* CPT29 strain was deposited onto a platinum working electrode for the environmental detection of organic pollutants. The formation of the membrane network was confirmed by FT-IR spectroscopy and cyclic voltammetry (CV), demonstrating successful deposition on the platinum electrode. Under optimal experimental conditions, the enzyme membrane showed a markedly improved response for the detection of PHB as a model analyte, leading to a 30-fold increase in sensitivity compared to our previous study using a commercial lipase. The results obtained in this study are satisfactory, and the successful recovery of PHB from real water samples demonstrated the practical applicability of the biosensor, which has encouraged us to consider further work to more precisely evaluate its performance in different media and with different analytes, with the aim of enabling large-scale multisensory detection.

Acknowledgement. This work was generously supported by The General Directorate for Scientific Research and Technological Development (DG-RSDT), Algerian Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research.

ИЗВОД

ВОЛТАМЕТРИЈСКО ИСПИТИВАЊЕ ПЛАТИНСКОГ БИОСЕНЗОРА СА ЛИПАЗОМ CPT29 ИЗ БАКТЕРИЈЕ *Actinomadura keratinilytica* УНАКРСНО ПОВЕЗАНОМ ПОМОЋУ GA/BSA И СТАБИЛНОМ НА ДЕТЕРГЕНТЕ

SELMA BOUNOUR¹, FATIHA BENAMIA¹, NOURA SEMACHE¹, SAIDA ZOUGAR², RAHMA BENYAHIA², NOUREDDINE DADDA³ и ALI LADJAMA⁴

¹Laboratory of Applied Organic Chemistry, Chemistry Department, Faculty of Sciences, Badji Mokhtar University, P.O. Box 12, 23000 Annaba, Algeria, ²Laboratory of Environmental Engineering, Process Engineering Department, Faculty of Technology, Badji Mokhtar University, P.O. Box 12, 23000, Annaba, Algeria, ³Laboratory of Synthesis and Organic Biocatalysis, Chemistry Department, Faculty of Sciences, Badji Mokhtar University, P.O. Box 12, 23000 Annaba, Algeria и ⁴Laboratory of Applied Biochemistry and Microbiology, Biochemistry Department, Faculty of Sciences, Badji Mokhtar University, P.O. Box 12, 23000, Annaba, Algeria

Ова студија описује имобилизацију нативне липазе (LCPT29) из која *Actinomadura keratinilytica* CPT29, изолованог из живинског компоста у североисточном Алжиру, у сврху детекције естарских загађивача у воденој средини. У ту сврху, ова липаза стабилна у детергентима имобилизована је на платинску електроду помоћу глутаралдехида као унакрсног везива, у присуству говеђег серумског албумина (БСА). Припремљена ензимска мембрана карактерисана је помоћу FT-IR спектроскопије, чиме је потврђено формирање њене мреже, као и њено наношење на платинску електроду кроз процену електрохемијских промена помоћу цикличне волтаметрије. Ефикасност радне електроде обложене унакрсно повезаном ензимском мембраном електрохемијски је процењена детекцијом пропил-4-хидроксибензоата (PHB) као модел-аналита. Под оптималним условима и при примењеном потенцијалу од -250 mV према Ag/AgCl биосензор на бази LCPT29 показао је линеаран одзив у опсегу концентрација од 10^{-14} до 10^{-8} mol L⁻¹ ($r = 0,991$), са границом детекције од 10^{-14} mol L⁻¹. Биосензор је показао високу осетљивост ($0,0327$ mA L mol⁻¹), добру стабилност ($RSD = 0,37$ %) и значајну селективност, као и могућност анализе трагова PHB у реалним узорцима воде, што доказује његов потенцијал за практичну примену.

(Примљено 7. марта, ревидирано 17. априла, прихваћено 23. јула 2026)

REFERENCES

1. M. Tadesse, Y. Liu, *Catalysts* **15** (2025) 571 (<https://doi.org/10.3390/catal15060571>)
2. D. S. Dkhar, R. P. Swain, R. Dubey, G. K. Patel, P. Chandra, *Ind. Crop. Prod.* **233** (2025) 121336 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indcrop.2025.121336>)
3. S. D. Wijayanti, L. Tsvik, D. Haltrich, *Foods* **12** (2023) 3355 (<https://doi.org/10.3390/foods12183355>)
4. K. Sonowal, P. P. Borthakur, K. Pathak, *Eng. Proc.* **106** (2025) 5 (<https://doi.org/10.3390/engproc2025106005>)
5. L. Qu, X. Zhang, Y. Chu, Y. Zhang, Z. Lin, F. Kong, X. Ni, Y. Zhao, Q. Lu, B. Zou, *Foods* **14** (2025) 1254 (<https://doi.org/10.3390/foods14071254>)

6. S. Feng, W. Guo, A. Ding, S. M. Parsa, J. Pan, D. Cheng, T. V. Tung, H. H. Ngo, *Chem. Eng. J.* **510** (2025) 161891 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2025.161891>)
7. X. Liu, C. Kokare, in *Biotechnology of Microbial Enzymes. Production, Biocatalysis and Industrial Applications*, G. Brahmachari, Ed., Academic Press, London, 2017, pp. 267–298 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-803725-6.00011-X>)
8. L. Aktar, M. L. Saha, *Bangladesh J. Bot.* **52** (2023) 979 (<https://doi.org/10.3329/bjb.v52i4.70580>)
9. H. Brockerhoff, R. G. Jensen, *Lipolytic Enzymes*, Academic Press, Inc., New York, 1974, pp.330
10. P. Desnuelle, in *The Enzymes*. 3rd ed., Boyer, Academic Press, New York, 1972, pp. 575–616
11. N. A Al-Dhabi, A. K. M. Ghilan, G. A. Esmail, M. V. Arasu, V. Duraipandian, K. Ponnurugan, *J. Infect. Pub. Health* **12** (2019) 549 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2019.01.065>)
12. H. Treichel, D. Oliveira, M. A. Mazutti, M. Di Luccio, J. V. Oliveira, *Food Bioprocess Technol.* **3** (2010) 182 (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11947-009-0202-2>)
13. L. Snani, S. Zougar, F. Benamia, I. Ghodbane, *Sen. Rev.* **41** (2021) 333 (<https://doi.org/10.1108/SR-05-2020-0113>)
14. G. Sun, X. Wei, D. Zhang, L. Huang, H. Liu, H. Fang, *Biosensors* **13** (2023) 886 (<https://doi.org/10.3390/bios13090886>)
15. Y. R. Maghraby, R. M. El-Shabasy, A. H. Ibrahim, H. M. E. S. Azzazy, *ACS Omega* **8** (2023) 5184 (<https://doi.org/10.1021/acsomega.2c07560>)
16. N. Semache, F. Benamia, B. Kerouaz, I. Belhaj, S. Bounour, H. Belghith, A. Gargouri, A. Ladjama, Z. Djeghaba, *Acta Chim. Slov.* **68** (2021) 575 (<https://doi.org/10.17344/acs.2020.6401>)
17. A. Habbeche, B. Saoudi, B. Jaouadi, S. Haberra, B. Kerouaz, M. Boudelaa, A. Badis, A. Ladjama, *J. Biosci. Bioeng.* **117** (2014) 413 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbiosc.2013.09.006>)
18. S. Kurbanoglu, S.A. Ozkan, A. Merkoçi, *Biosens. Bioelectron.* **89** (2017) 886 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2016.09.102>)
19. G. Rocchitta, A. Spanu, S. Babudieri, G. Latte, G. Madeddu, G. Galleri, S. Nuvoli, P. Bagella, M. Demartis, V. Fiore, R. Manetti, P. A. Serra, *Sensors* **16** (2016) 780 (<https://doi.org/10.3390/s16060780>)
20. R. García-Morales, A. García-García, C. Orona-Navar, J. F. Osma, K. D. P. Nigam, N. Ornelas-Soto, *J. Environ. Chem. Eng.* **6** (2018) 710 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jece.2017.12.006>)
21. J. C. Gonzalez-Rivera, J. F. Osma, *Biomed Res. Int.* **2015** (2015) 845261 (<https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/845261>)
22. J. I. Reyes-De-Corcuera, H. E. Olstad, R. García-Torres, *Ann. Rev. Food Sci. Technol.* **9** (2018) 293 (<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-food-030216-025713>)
23. M. M. Rodríguez-Delgado, G. S. Alemán-Nava, J. M. Rodríguez-Delgado, G. Dieck-Assad, G. Rocchitta, A. Spanu, S. Babudieri, G. Latte, G. Madeddu, G. Galleri, S. Nuvoli, P. Bagella, M. Demartis, V. Fiore, R. Manetti, P. A. Serra, *Sensors* **16** (2016) 780 (<https://doi.org/10.3390/s16060780>)
24. S. Erdemir, O. Sahin, A. Uyanik, M. Yilmaz, *J. Incl. Phenom. Macrocycl. Chem.* **64** (2009) 273 (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10847-009-9562-5>)

25. N. Zehani, S.V. Dzyadevych, R. Kherrat, N. Jaffrezic-Renault, *Front. Chem.* **2** (2014) 44 (<https://doi.org/10.3389/fchem.2014.00044>)
26. Z. S. Abbas, G. M. Sulaiman, M. S. Jabir, S. A. A. Mohammed, R. A. Khan, H. A. Mohammed, A. Al-Subaiyel, *Molecules* **27** (2022) 4521 (<https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules27144521>)
27. S. Yang, Z. Lian, M. Wang, P. Liao, H. Wu, J. Cao, X. Tong, T. Tian, H. Wang, L. Jiang, *Ultrason. Sonochem.* **90** (2022) 106186 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ultsonch.2022.106186>)
28. W. Zhong, L. Xu, Q. Wang, X. Shen, *J. Dairy Sci.* **108** (2025) 282 (<https://doi.org/10.3168/jds.2024-25495>)
29. D. Usoltsev, V. Sitnikova, A. Kajava, M. Uspenskaya, *Biomolecules* **9** (2019) 359 (<https://doi.org/10.3390/biom9080359>)
30. M. Chen, W. She, X. Zhao, C. Chen, B. Zhu, Y. Sun, Z. Yao, *Bioresour. Bioprocess.* **11** (2024) 7 (<https://doi.org/10.1186/s40643-023-00721-9>)
31. J. Liu, Y. Xu, S. Liu, S. Yu, Z. Yu, S. S. Low, *Biosens.* **12** (2022) 494 (<https://doi.org/10.3390/bios12070494>)
32. E. Keskin, M. Kiran, Y. Yardim, *J. Serb. Chem. Soc.* **91** (2026) 145 (<https://doi.org/10.2298/JSC250718094K>)
33. *Biosensors for Health, Environment and Biosecurity*, P. A. Serra, Ed., IntechOpen Publishers, Rijeka, 2011 (<https://doi.org/10.5772/928>)
34. E. Djaalab, M. E. H. Samar, S. Zougar, R. Kherrat, *Catalysts* **8** (2018) 233 (<https://doi.org/10.3390/catal8060233>)
35. O. Ouerghi, A. Touhami, N. Jaffrezic-Renault, C. Martelet, H. BenOuada, S. Cosnier, *IEEE Sens. J.* **4** (2004) 559 (<https://doi.org/10.1109/JSEN.2004.832858>)
36. N. Valkova, F. Lépine, L. Labrie, M. Dupont, R. Beaudet, *J. Biol. Chem.* **278** (2003) 12779 (<https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M213281200>)
37. T. Koseki, K. Mihara, T. Murayama, Y. Shiono, *FEBS Letters* **584** (2010) 4032 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.febslet.2010.08.021>)
38. S. Azzouzi, L. Rotariu, A. M. Benito, W. K. Maser, M. B. Ali, C. Bala, *Biosens. Bioelectron.* **69** (2015) 280 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2015.03.012>)
39. S.Y. Yahyaa, S. T. Ameen, K. K. Hashim, *J. Kufa Chem. Scis.* **2** (2018) 93 (<https://journal.uokufa.edu.iq/index.php/jkcs/article/view/3375>)
40. L. F. De Lima, E. A. Pereira, M. Ferreira, *Sensors Actuators, B* **310** (2020) 127893 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.snb.2020.127893>)
41. S. Iqbal, M. Irfan, F. Tabassum, H. A. Shakir, J. I. Qazi, *J. Northeast Agric. Univ.* **24** (2017) 51
42. M. Morikawa, H. Daido, T. Takao, S. Murata, Y. Shimonishi, T. Imanaka, *J. Bacteriol.* **175** (1993) 6459 (<https://doi.org/10.1128/jb.175.20.6459-6466.1993>)
43. M. Sebatini, M. Jain, P. Radha, S. Kiruthika, K. Tamilarasan, *3 Biotech.* **6** (2016) 184 (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13205-016-0501-z>)
44. S. Handayani, I. Novianingsih, A. Barkah, S. Hudiyono, *Makara. J. Sci.* **16** (2012) 141 (<https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/science/vol16/iss3/1>)
45. K. Akhter, I. Karim, B. Aziz, A. Bibi, J. Khan, T. Akhtar, *PLoS ONE* **17** (2022) e0273368 (<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0273368>)
46. A. L. Campaña, S. L. Florez, M. J. Noguera, O. P. Fuentes, P. R. Puentes, J. C. Cruz, J. F. Osma, *Biosensors* **9** (2019) 41 (<https://doi.org/10.3390/bios9010041>)

47. Y. Chen, B. Fu, G. Xiao, L.Y. Ko, T.Y. Kao, C. Fan, J. Yuan, *ACS Food Sci. Technol.* **1** (2021) 382 (<https://doi.org/10.1021/acsfoodscitech.1c00023>)
48. R. Chokkareddy, N. K. Bhajanthri, G. G. Redhi, *Biosensors* **7** (2017) 21 (<https://doi.org/10.3390/bios7020021>)
49. Ş. Alpat, A. Telefoncu, *Sensors* **10** (2010) 748 (<https://doi.org/10.3390/s100100748>)
50. Z. Zou, L. Dai, D. Liu, W. Du, *Catalysts* **11** (2021) 739 (<https://doi.org/10.3390/catal11060739>)
51. J. Kaura, A. Kumar Sarmab, M. K. Jhaa, P. Gera, *Biotechnol. Rep.* **27** (2020) e00487 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.btre.2020.e00487>)
52. J. Wang, L. Zhang, Y. He, R. Ji, *J. Hazard. Mater.* **469** (2024) 133906 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhazmat.2024.133906>)
53. R. L. Ramos, V. R. Moreira, M. C. Santos Amaral, *J. Environ. Manage.* **351** (2024) 119772 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2023.119772>)
54. A. Ganash, S. Alshammari, E. Ganash, *Molecules* **28** (2023) 19 (<https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules28010019>)
55. A. Guo, P. Amini, C. Su, E. Sharma, J. Okoroma, J. O. Okeme, *Environ. Pollut.* **375** (2025) 126342 (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2025.126342>).