# Fluorophore signal and detection enhancement in nanowire biosensors

Nicklas Anttu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Physics, Faculty of Science and Engineering, Åbo Akademi University, FI-20500 Turku, Finland

Author to whom correspondence should be addressed: nicklas.anttu@abo.fi

#### Abstract

Semiconductor nanowires have been demonstrated as an efficient platform for fluorescence-based biosensors. Here, we study theoretically how GaP nanowires (i) enhance the excitation intensity at the position of fluorophores attached to the nanowire sidewall, (ii) enhance the probability to collect photons emitted from the fluorophores by directing them preferentially into the numerical aperture of collection objective, and (iii) through the Purcell effect increase the quantum yield of fluorophores. We find that the optimum diameter depends strongly on the fluorophore emission wavelength. In addition to an overall signal-detection scheme, we model imaging-based detection of the fluorescence.

### Introduction

Elongated nanostructures, in the form of high-refractive index nanowires, aligned vertical to a conventional planar substrate offer two prospects for a paradigm shift with new optical effects for fluorescence-based biosensors (see Figure 1 for a schematic of the geometry).<sup>1-7</sup> The prospect of this geometry for the biosensor is to enhance signal compared to the current industry-standard planar sensor. An enhancement by a factor of 10 was recently demonstrated in experiments with semiconductor nanowire-based fluorescent biosensors compared to the industry-standard planar plastic substrate.<sup>6</sup>



**Figure 1**. (a)-(d) The four optical effects and (e) image formation that we model and analyse for fluorescence based nanowire optical biosensors.

Biosensors based on fluorescent labels are industry-standard for reliable and reproducible detection of low-concentrations of biomarkers with high specificity.<sup>6,8</sup> Such fluorescence-based biosensors are fabricated within a flow cell to allow flushing of liquids through the biosensor, both for functionalization as well as for binding of biomarkers from biological fluid samples to the surface of the biosensor. As an example realization: First, the surface of the biosensor is functionalized with ligands that are designed to specifically bind the biomarkers of interest. In the next step, the biological fluid sample is flushed through the biosensor: If biomarkers of interest are present in the sample, they will bind selectively to the corresponding ligands. In the final step, the sample is flushed with

fluorescently labelled secondary recognition elements that bind selectively to the biomarkers. Then, fluorescence signal from the labels, in an optical read-out measurement, indicates the presence of the biomarkers in the sample. Such fluorescence-based biosensors find currently use, for example, in cancer,<sup>9</sup> asthma,<sup>10</sup> and heart disease diagnostics.<sup>11</sup>

Compared to the industry-standard planar biosensors, the nanowire-based biosensor offers, through diffraction effects, a combination of five novel optical mechanisms that affect the signal (Figure 1). These effects modify the excitation light, the light emitted by the fluorophore, and the imaging of the fluorescence onto a detection camera chip.

Our results show that, with optimized geometry for the nanowires, which is dependent on the excitation and emission wavelength, a considerable signal enhancement can be reached. Furthermore, we expect to reach a high signal detection level even with a small numerical aperture (NA) for the combined excitation and detection system. Thus, the nanowire-based biosensor offers the prospect of high-signal biosensing with a portable, low-cost low-NA optical read-out system, even out in the field, i.e., a lab-on-a-chip system.<sup>6</sup>

When it comes to the imaging of the fluorescence, at the optimized diameter the nanowire imaging is almost as sharp as with a test fluorophore in liquid in best focus, despite fluorophores binding along a nanowire length of 2000 nm.

### Methods

We consider light in a wavelength range of  $400 < \lambda < 900$  nm for the excitation light and fluorescence emission. This wavelength range covers a broad range of fluorophores of interest. The light-scattering is described by the Maxwell equations, and we take into account the optical response of the constituent materials through their refractive index n.<sup>12</sup> We solve numerically for the light-scattering in the three-dimensional nanowire system (see Supporting Information for details).

#### Geometry and refractive indexes

We consider a GaP nanowire on top of a GaP substrate, with a liquid of refractive index n = 1.33, that is, similar to that of water, surrounding the nanowire (see Figure 1 for a schematic). The length of the nanowire is L and the diameter is D. On top of both the nanowire and the substrate, we have a thin, 10 nm thick, SiO<sub>2</sub> coating to ascertain biocompatibility of the surface.<sup>6</sup> For the SiO2, we use tabulated values<sup>13</sup> of  $n \approx 1.45$ , and for GaP tabulated values from Ref. [<sup>14</sup>].

For GaP, Re(n)  $\approx$  3.4 in the wavelength range 400 <  $\lambda$  < 900 nm that we study. On the other hand, Im(n) of the GaP gives rise to absorption, which can be quantified for example through the absorption length  $L_{abs}$  of bulk GaP. For GaP, the band-to-band absorption seizes at the bandgap wavelength of  $\approx$ 550 nm beyond which GaP is non-absorbing (in the wavelength range that we study, with possible absorption through optical phonons at even longer wavelengths). GaP has an indirect bandgap, with the stronger, direct optical transitions starting at  $\lambda \approx$  450 nm. Therefore, at  $\lambda =$  500 nm,  $L_{abs}$  shows a relatively large value of 10 µm, which decreases to 1 µm at  $\lambda =$  450 nm and 100 nm at  $\lambda =$  400 nm.

#### Modelling of signal enhancement in signal-integration mode

We consider the following optical effects (see the Supporting Information for details): The enhancement of the excitation intensity at the location of the fluorophore,  $\text{ENH}_{exc}$ , the enhancement in the fraction of emitted photons that are collected,  $\text{ENH}_{coll}$ , the modification of the Purcell factor,  $C_{\text{Purcell}}$ , and the parasitic absorption of emitted photons,  $A_{\text{parasitic}}$ . Here, it is important to note that all these four optical properties depend on the materials and geometry of the nanowire system, as well as on the position of the fluorophore.  $C_{\text{Purcell}}$  modifies the quantum yield of the fluorophore,

leading to a modification of the quantum yield given by  $\text{ENH}_{QY}$  (see Supporting Information for details). Here,  $\text{ENH}_{exc}$ ,  $\text{ENH}_{coll}$ ,  $C_{Purcell}$ , and  $\text{ENH}_{QY}$  are with reference to a test fluorophore free in a test liquid with the same n = 1.33 as for the liquid surrounding the nanowire.

 $\mathrm{ENH}_{\mathrm{exc}}$  depends on the wavelength of the incident light and the angle(s) from which the light is incident from. When light is incident from within a given numerical aperture ( $\mathrm{NA}_{\mathrm{exc}}$ ), we calculate  $\mathrm{ENH}_{\mathrm{exc}}$  by integration over the angles within the  $\mathrm{NA}_{\mathrm{exc}}$  (see Supporting Information for details). Similarly,  $\mathrm{ENH}_{\mathrm{coll}}$  depends on the emission wavelength and the emission angles that are collected. When light is collected with a given  $\mathrm{NA}_{\mathrm{coll}}$ , we calculate  $\mathrm{ENH}_{\mathrm{coll}}$  by integration over the angles within the  $\mathrm{NA}_{\mathrm{coll}}$  by integration over the angles within the  $\mathrm{NA}_{\mathrm{coll}}$  of the collection optics contributes to the detection signal.

 $C_{\text{Purcell}}$  and  $A_{\text{parasitic}}$  depend on the emission wavelength (distribution), but not on the excitation wavelength, and are independent also of the excitation and collection optics used, and hence independent of  $NA_{\text{exc}}$  and  $NA_{\text{coll}}$ .

We assume a case where we are far from excitation saturation (see Supporting Information for details). In that case, the fluorescence signal enhancement is given by:

$$ENH_{sig} = ENH_{exc}ENH_{coll}ENH_{QY}.$$
(1)

We denote by angled brackets, e.g.,  $\langle \text{ENH}_{\text{exc}} \rangle$ , averaging over the axial position of the fluorophore along the sidewall. The axially averaged signal-enhancement is thus given by  $\langle \text{ENH}_{\text{sig}} \rangle = \langle \text{ENH}_{\text{exc}} \text{ENH}_{\text{coll}} \text{ENH}_{\text{QY}} \rangle$ . In our study,  $A_{\text{parasitic}}$  enters  $\text{ENH}_{\text{sig}}$  through  $\text{ENH}_{\text{coll}}$  since parasitic absorption leads to a lower collection probability.

#### Modelling of signal enhancement in imaging-mode

In the imaging mode, we consider the image that the fluorescence creates in an image plane, that is, when the far-field emission is focused with an imaging lens. Then, compared to the signal-integration mode above, we have here as an additional parameter  $z_{\text{focal}}$ , the position of the focal plane of the imaging optics. In our study, we calculate the 2D spatial distribution of the signal in the image plane (e.g. the camera chip). For technical details of how the imaging modelling is performed, see the Supporting Information.

#### Results



**Figure 2**. Enhancement of incident intensity for fluorophores at the side wall of GaP nanowires of L = 2000 nm in length with a 10 nm thick SiO<sub>2</sub> coating. Dependence of enhancement ENH<sub>exc</sub> for  $\lambda_{exc} = 640$  nm as function of (a) axial position, with z = 0 at the substrate surface and z = 2000 nm at the top of the nanowire, for NA<sub>exc</sub> = 1 and nanowire diameter D = 115 nm, (b) as a function of D for NA<sub>exc</sub> = 1 after averaging along the axial position, that is, <ENH<sub>exc</sub>>, and (c) <ENH<sub>exc</sub>> as a function of NA<sub>exc</sub> for D = 115 nm. (d) Same as (a) but here in addition with diameter dependence. (e) Same as (b) but here in addition with wavelength dependence. (f) Same as (c) but here in addition with diameter dependence.

We show results for the excitation enhancement in Figure 2. In Figure 2(a), we see ENH<sub>exc</sub>  $\approx$  5 for varying binding position z along the nanowire axis. There is a clear interference pattern due to the incident light and light reflected from the substrate interface. This standing wave pattern is evident also in Figure 2(d) that shows the dependence on z and D for the excitation wavelength  $\lambda_{exc}$  = 640 nm and NA<sub>exc</sub> = 1. In Figure 2(f), it is seen that the strongest enhancement occurs around  $\theta = 0$  for a nanowire diameter of D = 115 nm where the HE<sub>11</sub> fundamental waveguide mode is excited strongly.<sup>15</sup> Thus, by decreasing NA<sub>exc</sub> we can increase <ENH<sub>exc</sub>> to a value of approximately 15 from the value of approximately 5 at NA<sub>exc</sub> = 1 (Figure 2(c)), in line with our previous results.<sup>16</sup> We note that the maximum is quite broad in wavelength in Figure 2(e) at a given D. Thus, even a rather broadband LED light source with 100 nm FWHM would cause only a minor decrease in the peak excitation enhancement. From Figure 2(b), it appears that we have a range of approximately ±10 nm around the optimum D in which only a very minor decrease in <ENH<sub>exc</sub>> occurs. The optimum diameter depends on  $\lambda_{exc}$  and shifts almost linearly with  $\lambda_{exc}$  (a linear shift would be expected<sup>16</sup> if the refractive indexes of the constituent materials were completely wavelength independent).





**Figure 3**. Enhancement of the collection of emission from fluorophores at the side wall of GaP nanowires of L = 2000 nm in length with a 10 nm thick SiO<sub>2</sub> coating as a function of (a) emission wavelength and nanowire diameter for a fixed NA<sub>coll</sub> = 1 and (b) NA<sub>coll</sub> and nanowire diameter for a fixed emission wavelength of 670 nm. (c) Line cut from (b) at D = 115 nm.

When looking at the collection enhancement in Figure 3(a), we find similar wavelength dependence as for the excitation enhancement in Figure 2(e). However, for the collection enhancement, the optimum diameter at a given wavelength is shifted to a slightly lower value and broadened. With NA<sub>coll</sub> = 1, we reach  $\langle \text{ENH}_{coll} \rangle \approx 2.0$  in Figure 3(a). The maximum in  $\langle \text{ENH}_{coll} \rangle$  is quite broad in wavelength in Figure 3(a). Therefore, the effect from a moderately broadened emission spectrum of a fluorophore will be minor. Indeed, compared to the sharp emission peak in Figure 3(a), the drop in the peak value of  $\langle \text{ENH}_{coll} \rangle$  is on the order of 5% when the FWHM of the fluorescence spectrum increases to 100 nm (data not shown).

By decreasing  $NA_{coll}$ ,  $\langle ENH_{coll} \rangle > 6.0$  can be reached (Figure 3(b) and Figure 3(c)). However, such an increase in  $\langle ENH_{coll} \rangle$  by decreasing  $NA_{coll}$  can cause a drop in actual signal, while increasing signal relative to the signal from the test fluorophore in the liquid with the same  $NA_{coll}$ . In other words, such an increase in  $\langle ENH_{coll} \rangle$  by decreasing  $NA_{coll}$  might drop the actual signal while increasing signal-to-noise ratio if the dominating noise has optical origin and originates homogeneously from all angles within the  $NA_{coll}$  of the collection objective.

In Figure 4, we see that with the nanowire present, with  $NA_{coll} = 0.2$ , we collect 3.4% of the emitted photons, while with  $NA_{coll} = 1.0$ , we collect 34%. In the test liquid, with  $NA_{coll} = 0.2$ , we collect 0.057% of the emitted photons, while with  $NA_{coll} = 1.0$ , we collect 17%.



**Figure 4**. Collection efficiency, that is, the fraction of emitted photons collected into NA<sub>coll</sub>. Here, averaging over axial position on the nanowire surface is performed. For the nanowires, D = 115 nm and L = 2000 nm is used. We show also the corresponding value for the fluorophore in the test liquid (dashed line) where the value goes toward 0.5 when NA<sub>coll</sub>  $\rightarrow$  1.33, in which case the collection is from the whole top hemisphere since n = 1.33 is used for the refractive index of the liquid.

#### Purcell factor and parasitic absorption



**Figure 5**. (a) Purcell factor and (b) parasitic absorption of emission from fluorophores at the side wall of GaP nanowires of L = 2000 nm in length with a 10 nm thick SiO<sub>2</sub> coating as a function of emission wavelength and nanowire diameter. (c) Line cut from (a) at  $\lambda_{em} = 670$  nm.

We find that the Purcell factor is above unity for all diameter and emission wavelength values that we study (Figure 5(a)). See Figure 5(c) for a line-cut for the example emission wavelength  $\lambda_{em}$  = 670 nm. The Purcell factor peaks at approximately D = 140 nm, which is shifted to a slightly larger value compared to the D = 115 nm that optimized <ENH<sub>coll</sub>> for the same  $\lambda_{em}$  = 670 nm in Figure 3(b). By comparing Figure 5(a) and Figure 3(a), we find that the peaks in  $C_{Purcell}$  are in general shifted to slightly larger diameter values compared to the peaks in <ENH<sub>coll</sub>>.

Noticeable parasitic absorption occurs for  $\lambda < 450$  nm (where the direct optical transitions in GaP start), and values beyond 0.6 show up there (Figure 5(b). For longer wavelengths, the parasitic loss is minor due to the weak indirect optical transitions in GaP, and for  $\lambda > 550$  nm, absorption seizes when entering the bandgap.

#### Signal enhancement

We consider here three values for  $QY_0$ , the quantum yield for the fluorophore in the test liquid, before modification by the Purcell factor when the nanowire and substrate are present. The modification of the QY is given by  $ENH_{QY} = C_{Purcell}/(C_{Purcell}QY_0 + (1 - QY_0))$  (see Supporting Information). The values we consider are  $QY_0 = 0_+$ , 0.33, and 1. With  $QY_0 = 0_+$  we denote a very low value of the quantum yield, approaching zero, in which case  $ENH_{QY} = C_{Purcell}$ . For a very high QY fluorophore, that is, when  $QY_0 = 1$ ,  $ENH_{QY} = 1$  independent of  $C_{Purcell}$ .

We start with considering  $\lambda_{exc} = 640$  nm and  $\lambda_{em} = 670$  nm (Figure 6). Such a detuning of 30 nm between excitation and emission wavelength, which can be accomplished by the choice of excitation wavelength for a given fluorophore emission wavelength, is motivated by the fact that both excitation (that happens at  $\lambda_{exc}$ ) and collection enhancement (that happens at  $\lambda_{em}$ ) in Figures 2 and 3 show rather broad peak. Thus, with 30 nm detuning, we expect to reach a rather optimized diameter that works well to enhance simultaneously excitation and collection. Indeed, we have found (not shown) that we can allow approximately 50 nm detuning between  $\lambda_{exc}$  and  $\lambda_{em}$  before the peak value of  $\langle ENH_{sig} \rangle$  starts to drop noticeably. Furthermore, a 30 nm detuning enables to easily use a long-pass filter in detection to filter out excitation light in actual experiments.

With  $NA_{coll} = NA_{exc} = 1$  (Figure 6(a)), we find for  $\langle ENH_{sig} \rangle$  a peak value of 22.7 for  $QY_0 = 0_+$ , 15.5 for  $QY_0 = 0.33$ , and 9.4 for  $QY_0 = 1$ , all at D = 120 nm. With  $NA_{coll} = 1$  and  $NA_{exc} = 0.2$  (Figure 6(b)), we find for  $\langle ENH_{sig} \rangle$  a peak value of 63.9 for  $QY_0 = 0_+$  at D = 120 nm, 45.1 for  $QY_0 = 0.33$  at D = 110 nm, and 29.1 for  $QY_0 = 1$  at D = 110 nm. With  $NA_{coll} = NA_{exc} = 0.2$  (Figure 6(c)), we find for  $\langle ENH_{sig} \rangle$  a peak value of 213 for  $QY_0 = 0_+$  at D = 120 nm, 147 for  $QY_0 = 0.33$  at D = 115 nm, and 91.6 for  $QY_0 = 1$  at D = 115 nm.

Since the difference between  $\langle ENH_{sig} \rangle$  for  $QY_0 = 0_+$  and  $QY_0 = 1$  is proportional to  $C_{Purcell}$ , we estimate from the difference in the respective peak values in Figure 6 a  $C_{Purcell}$  of approximately 2.3, in good agreement with the values for  $C_{Purcell}$  in Figure 3(c).



**Figure 6.** Signal enhancement as a function of nanowire diameter from fluorophores, averaged over axial position, that is,  $\langle \text{ENH}_{\text{sig}} \rangle$  for GaP nanowires of *L* = 2000 nm in length with 10 nm thick SiO<sub>2</sub> coating. Here,  $\lambda_{\text{exc}} = 640 \text{ nm}$ ,  $\lambda_{\text{em}} = 670 \text{ nm}$ , and we show results for  $\text{QY}_0 = 0_+$ , 0.33, and 1. (a)  $\text{NA}_{\text{coll}} = \text{NA}_{\text{exc}} = 1$ , (b)  $\text{NA}_{\text{coll}} = 1$  and  $\text{NA}_{\text{exc}} = 0.2$ ; and (c)  $\text{NA}_{\text{coll}} = \text{NA}_{\text{exc}} = 0.2$ .

As long as both the excitation and emission wavelength are above 450 nm where the strong absorption in GaP seizes, we can find optimum diameter for different emission wavelength, that is, for fluorophores emitting at different wavelength (see Figure 6 where a 30 nm detuning is assumed between  $\lambda_{exc}$  and  $\lambda_{em}$ ). The optimum diameter shows a rather linear shift with  $\lambda_{em}$ , as expected<sup>16</sup> since the constituent materials show only a minor wavelength dependence of their refractive indexes.



**Figure 6**. Signal enhancement as a function of emission wavelength and nanowire diameter from fluorophores, averaged over axial position, that is,  $\langle \text{ENH}_{\text{sig}} \rangle$  for GaP nanowires of L = 2000 nm in length with a 10 nm thick SiO<sub>2</sub> coating. Here, NA<sub>exc</sub> = NA<sub>coll</sub> = 1, the excitation wavelength is related to the emission wavelength through a 30 nm offset, that is,  $\lambda_{\text{exc}} = \lambda_{\text{em}} - 30$  nm, and we assume QY<sub>0</sub> = 0.33.

#### Imaging results

Above, we considered the signal-integration detection scheme where all light entering the collection objective contributes to signal. Here, we perform imaging, and we depict the image plane as consisting of detector pixels in a 2D array, thus talking about light at varying pixel position (corresponding to varying *x*-*y* position in the image plane).

Here, we are especially interested in the image sharpness around the position of the nanowire. Therefore, we focus on how much of the overall intensity captured by the collection objective that falls within a disc of radius  $r_{detection}$  centered on the nanowire. In other words, we are interested in the integrated intensity on the pixels within a disc of radius  $r_{detection}$  relative to the integrated intensity on all pixels, which we denote REL<sub>img</sub>. (The integration of the signal over all the pixels corresponds to the above signal-integration scheme).



**Figure 7.** REL<sub>img</sub>, the integrated intensity on the pixels within a disc of radius  $r_{detection}$  relative to the integrated intensity on all pixels as a function of *D* and *z*, the axial binding position of the fluorophore along the side-wall of the nanowire. *z* = 0 denotes the substrate surface and *z* = 2000 nm the tip of the nanowire. We consider *L* = 2000 nm, NA<sub>exc</sub> = NA<sub>coll</sub> = 1,  $\lambda_{exc}$  = 640 nm,  $\lambda_{em}$  = 670 nm, and QY<sub>0</sub> = 1. (a)  $r_{detection}$  = 250 nm, (b)  $r_{detection}$  = 385 nm, and (c)  $r_{detection}$  = 500 nm.  $z_{focal}$  = 2000 nm, that is, we focus to the tip of the nanowire.



Figure 8. Same as Figure 7 but after averaging over z, the axial binding position of the fluorophore.

We considered the example case of L = 2000 nm,  $NA_{exc} = NA_{exc} = 1$ ,  $\lambda_{exc} = 640$  nm,  $\lambda_{em} = 670$  nm, and  $QY_0 = 1$ , with  $z_{focal} = 2000$  nm, that is, we focus to the tip of the nanowires (Figure 7). For  $r_{detection} = 250$ , 385, and 500 nm (Figures 7(a), 7(b), and 7(c), respectively), we see similar *D* and *z* dependence, with increasing  $REL_{img}$  with increasing  $r_{detection}$ . For the smallest diameters considered, REL<sub>img</sub> is the highest when the fluorophore binds close to the tip of the nanowire, while for  $D \approx 130$  nm, we find a rather slow drop in  $REL_{img}$  when *z* moves away from the tip of the nanowire. Also with the largest *D* considered,  $REL_{img}$  is noticeably higher for *z* in the vicinity of the tip. We assign this *D* and *z* dependence on  $REL_{img}$  to a lightguiding effect<sup>3</sup> in the nanowires. From our results, it appears that at  $D \approx 130$  nm, lightguiding funnels efficiently fluorescence emission to the tip of the nanowire irrespective of the axial binding position of the nanowire. Then, by placing the focal plane at the tip of the nanowire, as in Figure 7, we can obtain a sharp image of the emission, irrespective of the actual axial binding position of the fluorophore.

We show in Figure 8 results for  $\langle \text{REL}_{\text{img}} \rangle$ , that is after averaging over the axial binding position of the nanowire. For *D* = 130 nm, we find  $\langle \text{REL}_{\text{img}} \rangle$  = 0.69, 0.63, and 0.45 for  $r_{\text{detection}}$  = 500 nm,  $r_{\text{detection}}$  = 385 nm, and  $r_{\text{detection}}$  = 250 nm, respectively. For comparison, we calculated for the same NA<sub>coll</sub> = 1 and  $\lambda_{\text{em}}$  = 1 the REL<sub>img</sub> for the fluorophore in the test liquid. When in best focus in the test liquid, that is, when  $z_{\text{focal}}$  coincides with the *z*-position of the fluorophore, our modelling yields REL<sub>img</sub> = 0.79, 0.72, and 0.51 for  $r_{\text{detection}}$  = 500, 385, and 250 nm, respectively, centered on the fluorophore. When we are 1000 nm out of focus in the test liquid, these values drop to REL<sub>img</sub> = 0.39, 0.25, and 0.12. When we are 2000 nm out of focus in the test liquid, these values drop to REL<sub>img</sub> = 0.067, 0.047, and 0.027.

Thus, when it comes to the imaging of the fluorescence, at the optimized diameter in Figure 7, the imaging of the fluorophores bound to the nanowire is almost as sharp as for a test fluorophore in liquid in best focus, despite the fluorophores binding along the nanowire length of 2000 nm, that is, up to 2000 nm away from the focal plane.

#### Discussion

Typically, if possible, the use of a high quantum yield fluorophore is advisable in order to increase the signal. However, in certain cases, only a low quantum yield fluorophore might fulfil requirements on excitation and emission wavelength range that needs to be used, as well as the stability required for the detection. Thus, it is important to know the level of signal enhancement for different quantum

yield of the fluorophore in the test liquid. We considered in this study fluorophores with low, intermediate, and high quantum yield (Figure 6).

We found a very promising signal enhancement by the factor of 64 for low quantum yield fluorophore and 29 for high quantum yield fluorophore in Figure 6(b) for  $NA_{coll} = 1$  and  $NA_{exc} = 0.2$ . There, we benefit from the excitation enhancement that occurs strongest at close to normal incidence (see Figures 2(c) and 2(f)). In addition, there is collection enhancement by approximately a factor of 2, and in the case of low quantum yield fluorophore a quantum yield enhancement by a factor of approximately 2.2. In principle, we could enhance the excitation intensity to increase the signal in the linear excitation regime (see Supporting Information for details). However, in many cases, there is a limit on the excitation intensity that we wish to use due to heating of the sample and/or autofluorescence. Thus, thanks to the nanowire structure, we can use a lower excitation intensity that is enhanced at the position of the fluorophore at the sidewall of the nanowire.<sup>16</sup>

The signal enhancement by the factor of 213 for a low quantum yield fluorophore and 92 for a high quantum yield fluorophore in Figure 6(c) for  $NA_{coll} = NA_{exc} = 0.2$  is very promising for signal detection with a small numerical aperture (NA) for the combined excitation and detection system. Thus, the nanowire-based biosensor offers the prospect of high-signal biosensing with a portable, low-cost low-NA optical read-out system, even out in the field, i.e., a lab-on-a-chip system.<sup>6</sup> Here, it should be mentioned that the signal enhancement factor is relative to performing the detection with the same  $NA_{coll} = NA_{exc} = 0.2$  for the fluorophore in the test liquid. It might be more fair to compare to the case of using a higher  $NA_{coll}$  of for example 1.0 in the test liquid. In that case, the signal collected in the test liquid increases by a factor of 30 (see Figure 4). Thus, the actual signal with the low NA-optics with the nanowire biosensor, increases by a factor or 213/30  $\approx$  7 and 92/30  $\approx$  3 for the low and high QY fluorophore, compared to using the high NA-optics for the case of the fluorophore in the test liquid.

When it comes to the imaging of the fluorescence, at the optimized diameter the nanowire imaging is almost as sharp as with a test fluorophore in liquid in best focus, despite fluorophores binding along the nanowire length of 2000 nm. However, the optimum diameter for image sharpness appears at a slightly larger value than for the signal enhancement, which corresponds to integration from all pixels (compare Figure 8 with Figure 6(a)). Thus, depending on the detection scheme, that is imaging or non-imaging, slightly different optimization strategy for the nanowire geometry might be needed.

# Acknowledgement

We acknowledge financial support from the Waldemar von Frenckell foundation and the Research Council of Finland project 359066 (HPC-Phot). We acknowledge discussions about the nanowire biodetector with the Heiner Linke group, the Fredrik Höök group, the Christelle Prinz Group, and the Thoas Fioretos group. We are especially thankful for the discussions with Rubina Davtyan about the optics modelling and optical response of the nanowire biosensor.

### Disclosures

N.A. has financial interests in AlignedBio AB, Sweden.

### References

 ten Siethoff, L.; Lard, M.; Generosi, J.; Andersson, H. S.; Linke, H.; Månsson, A. Molecular Motor Propelled Filaments Reveal Light-Guiding in Nanowire Arrays for Enhanced Biosensing. *Nano Lett.* 2014, 14 (2), 737–742. https://doi.org/10.1021/nl404032k.

- (2) Frederiksen, R. S.; Alarcon-Llado, E.; Krogstrup, P.; Bojarskaite, L.; Buch-Månson, N.; Bolinsson, J.; Nygård, J.; Fontcuberta i Morral, A.; Martinez, K. L. Nanowire-Aperture Probe: Local Enhanced Fluorescence Detection for the Investigation of Live Cells at the Nanoscale. ACS Photonics 2016, 3 (7), 1208–1216. https://doi.org/10.1021/acsphotonics.6b00126.
- (3) Verardo, D.; Lindberg, F. W.; Anttu, N.; Niman, C. S.; Lard, M.; Dabkowska, A. P.; Nylander, T.; Månsson, A.; Prinz, C. N.; Linke, H. Nanowires for Biosensing: Lightguiding of Fluorescence as a Function of Diameter and Wavelength. *Nano Lett.* **2018**, *18* (8), 4796–4802. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.nanolett.8b01360.
- (4) Verardo, D.; Agnarsson, B.; Zhdanov, V. P.; Höök, F.; Linke, H. Single-Molecule Detection with Lightguiding Nanowires: Determination of Protein Concentration and Diffusivity in Supported Lipid Bilayers. *Nano Lett.* 2019, 19 (9), 6182–6191. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.nanolett.9b02226.
- (5) Du, B.; Tang, C.; Zhao, D.; Zhang, H.; Yu, D.; Yu, M.; C. Balram, K.; Gersen, H.; Yang, B.; Cao, W.; Gu, C.; Besenbacher, F.; Li, J.; Sun, Y. Diameter-Optimized High-Order Waveguide Nanorods for Fluorescence Enhancement Applied in Ultrasensitive Bioassays. *Nanoscale* **2019**, *11* (30), 14322– 14329. https://doi.org/10.1039/C9NR02330E.
- (6) Verardo, D.; Liljedahl, L.; Richter, C.; Agnarsson, B.; Axelsson, U.; Prinz, C. N.; Höök, F.; Borrebaeck, C. A. K.; Linke, H. Fluorescence Signal Enhancement in Antibody Microarrays Using Lightguiding Nanowires. *Nanomaterials* 2021, *11* (1), 227. https://doi.org/10.3390/nano11010227.
- (7) Valderas-Gutiérrez, J.; Davtyan, R.; Sivakumar, S.; Anttu, N.; Li, Y.; Flatt, P.; Shin, J. Y.; Prinz, C. N.; Höök, F.; Fioretos, T.; Magnusson, M. H.; Linke, H. Enhanced Optical Biosensing by Aerotaxy Ga(As)P Nanowire Platforms Suitable for Scalable Production. ACS Appl. Nano Mater. 2022, 5 (7), 9063–9071. https://doi.org/10.1021/acsanm.2c01372.
- (8) Chen, Z.; Dodig-Crnković, T.; Schwenk, J. M.; Tao, S. Current Applications of Antibody Microarrays. *Clinical Proteomics* **2018**, *15* (1), 7. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12014-018-9184-2.
- (9) Mellby, L. D.; Nyberg, A. P.; Johansen, J. S.; Wingren, C.; Nordestgaard, B. G.; Bojesen, S. E.; Mitchell, B. L.; Sheppard, B. C.; Sears, R. C.; Borrebaeck, C. A. K. Serum Biomarker Signature-Based Liquid Biopsy for Diagnosis of Early-Stage Pancreatic Cancer. *J Clin Oncol* **2018**, *36* (28), 2887– 2894. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2017.77.6658.
- (10) Joseph, J.; Benedict, S.; Safa, W.; Joseph, M. Serum Interleukin-5 Levels Are Elevated in Mild and Moderate Persistent Asthma Irrespective of Regular Inhaled Glucocorticoid Therapy. *BMC Pulmonary Medicine* **2004**, *4* (1), 2. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2466-4-2.
- (11) Arakelyan, A.; Petrkova, J.; Hermanova, Z.; Boyajyan, A.; Lukl, J.; Petrek, M. Serum Levels of the MCP-1 Chemokine in Patients with Ischemic Stroke and Myocardial Infarction. *Mediators of inflammation* **2005**, *2005* (3), 175–179.
- (12) Anttu, N.; Mäntynen, H.; Sorokina, A.; Turunen, J.; Sadi, T.; Lipsanen, H. Applied Electromagnetic Optics Simulations for Nanophotonics. J. Appl. Phys. 2021, 129 (13), 131102. https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0041275.
- (13) Malitson, I. H. Interspecimen Comparison of the Refractive Index of Fused Silica\*,†. J. Opt. Soc. Am., JOSA **1965**, 55 (10), 1205–1209. https://doi.org/10.1364/JOSA.55.001205.
- (14) Borghesi, A.; Guizzetti, G. Gallium Phosphide (GaP). In *Handbook of Optical Constants of Solids*; Palik, E. D., Ed.; Academic Press: Boston, 1985; pp 445–464. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-054721-3.50021-6.
- (15) Anttu, N. Absorption of Light in a Single Vertical Nanowire and a Nanowire Array. *Nanotechnology* **2019**, *30* (10), 104004. https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6528/aafa5c.
- (16) N. Unksov, I.; Anttu, N.; Verardo, D.; Höök, F.; N. Prinz, C.; Linke, H. Fluorescence Excitation Enhancement by Waveguiding Nanowires. *Nanoscale Advances* **2023**, *5* (6), 1760–1766. https://doi.org/10.1039/D2NA00749E.

# Supporting information

# Fluorophore signal and detection enhancement in nanowire biosensors

Nicklas Anttu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Physics, Faculty of Science and Engineering, Åbo Akademi University, FI-20500 Turku, Finland

Author to whom correspondence should be addressed: nicklas.anttu@abo.fi

## Electromagnetic description of excitation and emission

We assume time-harmonic fields, and we solve for the **E** and **H** fields in complex notation with convention for time-dependence of the form  $\exp(-i\omega t)$  where  $\omega = 2\pi c/\lambda$  with c the speed of light in vacuum and  $\lambda$  the (vacuum) wavelength.

We assume dipole-type excitation and emission of the fluorophore. Furthermore, we assume an inherently isotropic dipole. Then, the excitation probability of the fluorophore is given by the  $|\mathbf{E}|^2$  of the incident light at the location of the fluorophore. Similarly, the emission and hence emission modification of the dipole can be modelled by an electrical dipole, represented by a dipole moment  $\mathbf{p}$ , and we average over x, y, and z oriented dipole moment for a given fluorophore position to mimic an isotropic dipole. Note that the generalization to a non-isotropic underlying optical response of the fluorophore is straight-forward to take into account by taking appropriately weighted average of  $|E_x|^2$ ,  $|E_y|^2$ , and  $|E_z|^2$  of the excitation light at the location of the dipole, with the weighting given by the x, y, and z component of the fluorophore at the excitation wavelength. Similarly, we can take into account a non-isotropic dipole in emission by appropriate weighting of the response of x, y, and z oriented dipole moment for the emission for the fluorophore at the excitation wavelength.

# Modelling of Purcell factor and parasitic absorption

We perform individual modelling for x, y, and z oriented dipole emitter at a given position, with dipole moment strength p. For each orientation of the dipole moment, in our simulations, we integrate the Poynting vector through the surface of a sphere of 4 nm in diameter, centered at the dipole position. This integration yields  $P_{em,i}$  the power emitted by the dipole (here, i indicated the orientation of the dipole moment). Then, the Purcell factor is defined as:

$$C_{\text{Purcell}} = \frac{P_{em,x} + P_{em,y} + P_{em,z}}{P_{ref}} = \frac{P_{tot}}{P_{ref}}.$$
(S1)

Here,  $P_{ref} = 3P_{homog.dip}$  with  $P_{homog.dip}$  the emission power from a dipole in a homogenous surrounding of the same refractive index as of the material in which the dipole is placed (i.e., the liquid surrounding the nanowires in our case), and  $P_{homog.dip}$  can be calculated analytically.<sup>2</sup>

For the modelling of the parasitic absorption in the nanowire, we extract for each modelled dipole orientation  $P_{abs,i}$ , the power absorbed in the nanowire (which we obtain as a volume integration of the spatially resolved absorption in nanowire volume). Then,  $A_{Parasitic}$  is the fraction of emitted light that is parasitically absorbed and obtained by calculating the probability that emitted light from a certain dipole orientation is parasitically absorbed and multiplying with the probability that the emission occurs through that dipole orientation:

$$A_{\text{Parasitic}} = \frac{P_{abs,x}}{P_{em,x}} \times \frac{P_{em,x}}{P_{tot}} + \frac{P_{abs,y}}{P_{em,y}} \times \frac{P_{em,y}}{P_{tot}} + \frac{P_{abs,z}}{P_{em,z}} \times \frac{P_{em,z}}{P_{tot}} = \frac{P_{abs,x} + P_{abs,y} + P_{abs,z}}{P_{tot}}.$$
 (S2)

Due to the circular symmetry of the system, we have only *r* and *z* dependence in  $C_{Purcell}$  and  $A_{Parasitic}$  (in addition to  $\lambda$  dependence).

In our simulations of the nanowire, the dipole emitter is placed 5 nm from the oxide surface, and therefore the sphere of 4 nm radius in the calculation of  $P_{em,i}$  is in a non-absorbing region. We perform the simulations with a step of 50 nm in the *z* position of the dipole, with linear interpolation of the results for positions between the modelled positions.

# Modelling of excitation enhancement

For the excitation, we assume an incoherent angular spectrum to resemble the illumination in a wide-field microscope in the Köhler illumination configuration. In other words, we assume that the incident light can be described as an incoherent superposition of plane waves. Thus, similarly as in Ref. [3], for the wide-field illumination, we assume incoherent plane waves at the excitation wavelength  $\lambda_{exc}$  from within the excitation numerical aperture NA<sub>exc</sub>, with  $\theta_{NA,exc} = \arcsin(\frac{NA_{exc}}{n_{inc}})$  the maximum incident angle and  $n_{inc}$  the refractive index of the material on the incidence side (i.e., the liquid surrounding the nanowire in our simulations). Then, the enhancement of the excitation intensity, relative to the case of a fully homogenous medium, at location **r** is given by:

$$EXC_{enh}(\mathbf{r}, \lambda_{exc}) = \frac{\sum_{pol=s,p} \int_0^{\theta_{NA,exc}} \int_0^{2\pi} |\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}, \lambda_{exc}, \theta_{inc}, pol)|^2 \sin(\theta_{inc}) d\phi_{inc} d\theta_{inc}}{\sum_{pol=s,p} \int_0^{\theta_{NA,exc}} \int_0^{2\pi} (E_{inc})^2 \sin(\theta_{inc}) d\phi_{inc} d\theta_{inc}}.$$
 (S3)

Here,  $E_{inc}$  is the electric field strength of the incident plane waves, which we set independent of incidence angle and polarization.  $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}, \lambda_{exc}, \theta_{inc}, \phi_{inc}, pol)$  is the electric field strength at position  $\mathbf{r}$  caused by an incident plane wave from a direction given by polar angle  $\theta_{inc}$  and azimuth angle  $\phi_{inc}$  for polarization pol (in our simulations, we use *s* and *p* polarization, but any set of two orthogonal polarization states should work). Importantly, when modelling  $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}, \lambda_{exc}, \theta_{inc}, \phi_{inc}, pol)$ , we include a fully coherent description of the light from that incidence angle, but the contribution from two different angles, or polarization states, is taken in an incoherent manner where it is thus the  $|\mathbf{E}|^2$ -contributions that are added/integrated in Eq. (S3).

Then,  $\text{EXC}_{\text{enh}}$  is the enhancement relative to the excitation intensity in the system with homogeneous liquid without nanowire, oxide, or substrate. For our case of the circular symmetric system, with the illumination from all azimuth angles, we have dependence on just *r* and *z*, such that  $\text{EXC}_{\text{enh}}(r, z, \lambda_{\text{exc}})$ .

In the simulations for the excitation enhancement, we consider a region of 10 nm in extent in the radial direction on top of the oxide layer, and we average the excitation enhancement from this region to yield the *z*-dependent excitation enhancement value. We extract values with a 10 nm step in *z*, and we use a 5° step in the simulation of  $\theta_{inc}$ . Since we integrate in Eq. (S3) over all azimuth angles, a single simulation in azimuth angle is sufficient if we from that results instead integrate over the azimuth angle for position (for details, see the Supporting Information in Ref. [3]). Thus, we have from the modelling information of the  $\theta_{inc}$  dependence of the excitation modification, which can be useful for analyzing the underlying optical mechanisms.

### Modelling of collection enhancement

For the calculation of the collection enhancement for emission at wavelength  $\lambda_{\rm em}$ , we use Lorentz reciprocity<sup>2,4,5</sup> to yield information of the enhancement of the emission to within the collection numerical aperture NA<sub>coll</sub>, with  $\theta_{\rm NA,coll} = \arcsin\left(\frac{{\rm NA_{coll}}}{n_{\rm coll}}\right)$  the maximum incident angle and  $n_{\rm coll}$  the refractive index of the material on the collection side (in our results, we consider collection on the same side as the excitation, and then  $n_{\rm coll} = n_{\rm inc}$ ). With the Lorentz reciprocity, the information of how an incident plane wave couples to the position of a dipole reveals how the dipole emits in the reciprocal direction from which the plane wave is incident.<sup>2,4,5</sup> Furthermore, when we consider an a dipole emitter with isotropic underlying optical response, the averaged emission from all three dipole moment orientations to a given polarization state in emission is proportional to  $|\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}, \lambda_{\rm em}, \theta_{\rm inc}, p_{\rm ol})|^2$ .<sup>2,4,5</sup>

Then, the collection enhancement, relative to the case of a fully homogenous medium, at location  ${f r}$  is given by:

$$\operatorname{ENH}_{\operatorname{coll}}(\mathbf{r},\lambda_{\operatorname{em}}) = \left[\sum_{pol=s,p} \int_{0}^{\theta_{\operatorname{NA,coll}}} \int_{0}^{2\pi} |\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r},\lambda_{\operatorname{em}},\theta_{\operatorname{inc}},pol)|^{2} \sin(\theta_{\operatorname{inc}}) d\phi_{\operatorname{inc}} d\theta_{\operatorname{inc}} / \sum_{pol=s,p} \int_{0}^{\theta_{\operatorname{NA,coll}}} \int_{0}^{2\pi} (\operatorname{E}_{\operatorname{inc}})^{2} \sin(\theta_{\operatorname{inc}}) d\phi_{\operatorname{inc}} d\theta_{\operatorname{inc}} \right] \times \frac{1}{C_{\operatorname{Purcell}}(\mathbf{r},\lambda_{\operatorname{em}})}.$$
(S4)

Here, the normalization with the Purcell factor corrects for the fact that the total emitted power scales with the Purcell factor, and the Lorentz reciprocity theorem includes<sup>2,4,5</sup> this enhancement of total emitted power. Note that with this definition, the effect of parasitic absorption in the nanowire is included implicitly through  $\text{ENH}_{\text{coll}}$ , and  $A_{\text{Parasitic}}$  can be used for separately analyzing how much of the emitted light is lost due to parasitic absorption in the nanowire.

In more detail, 
$$\left[\frac{\sum_{pol=s,p} \int_{0}^{\theta_{NA,coll}} \int_{0}^{2\pi} |E_{i}(\mathbf{r},\lambda_{em},\theta_{inc},pol)|^{2} \sin(\theta_{inc}) d\phi_{inc} d\theta_{inc}}{\sum_{pol=s,p} \int_{0}^{\theta_{NA,coll}} \int_{0}^{2\pi} (E_{inc})^{2} \sin(\theta_{inc}) d\phi_{inc} d\theta_{inc}}\right] \text{ with } i = x, y, z \text{ yields the}$$

power emitted from a dipole with *i* oriented dipole moment in the vicinity of the nanowire into the collection objective, normalized to the summed power emitted from three orthogonal dipoles in the homogeneous surrounding. We call this fraction  $\frac{P_{em,i,NA-coll}}{\sum_j P_{ref,j,NA-coll}}$ . Thus, Eq. (S4) is equivalent to  $\frac{\sum_i P_{em,i,NA-coll}}{\sum_j P_{ref,j,NA-coll}} \times \frac{1}{C_{Purcell}} = \frac{\sum_i P_{em,i,NA-coll}}{\sum_j P_{ref,j,NA-coll}} \times \frac{3P_{homog,dip}}{[P_{em,x}+P_{em,y}+P_{em,z}]} = \frac{\sum_i P_{em,i,NA-coll}}{[P_{em,x}+P_{em,y}+P_{em,z}]} / \left[\frac{\sum_j P_{ref,j,NA-coll}}{3P_{homog,dip}}\right]$ =  $\left[\sum_i \frac{P_{em,i,NA-coll}}{P_{em,i}} \frac{P_{em,i,NA-coll}}{[P_{em,x}+P_{em,y}+P_{em,z}]}\right] / \left[\frac{\sum_j P_{ref,j,NA-coll}}{P_{homog,dip}} \frac{P_{homog,dip}}{3P_{homog,dip}}\right]$ , which is indeed the fraction of emitted power propagating into the collection objective from three orthogonally oriented dipole

emitted power propagating into the collection objective from three orthogonally oriented dipole moments in the vicinity of the nanowire, normalized to the fraction of emitted power propagating into the collection objective from three orthogonally oriented dipole moments in the homogenous surrounding (the first fraction in both the denominator and nominator denotes the fraction of emitted power of a specific dipole moment orientation that propagates into the collection objective; and the second fraction denotes the probability that the emission occurs through that dipole moment orientation).

For our case of the circular symmetric system, with collection to all azimuth angles, we have dependence on just *r* and *z* (in addition to  $\lambda_{exc}$  dependence), such that  $ENH_{coll}(r, z, \lambda_{em})$ .

In the simulations for the collection enhancement, we consider a region of 10 nm in extent in the radial direction on top of the oxide layer, and we average the collection enhancement from this region to yield the *z*-dependent excitation enhancement value. We extract values with a 10 nm step in *z*, and we use a 5° step in the simulation of  $\theta_{inc}$ . Since we integrate in Eq. (S4) over all azimuth angles, a single simulation in azimuth angle is sufficient if we from that results instead integrate over the azimuth angle for position (for details, see the Supporting Information in Ref. [3])

#### Modification of the quantum yield and de-excitation rate

We assume a simple model for the fluorophore de-excitation with two competing pathways, one radiative, which causes the emission of the photons in the detected signal, with rate  $\Gamma_{rad}$  and one non-radiative with rate  $\Gamma_{nr}$ . Thus, the total de-excitation rate is  $= \Gamma_{rad} + \Gamma_{nr}$ , the de-excitation time constant is given by  $\tau = 1/\Gamma$ , and the probability for emission of a photon during de-excitation is given by  $QY = \Gamma_{rad}/\Gamma = \Gamma_{rad}/(\Gamma_{rad} + \Gamma_{nr})$ . This simple two-pathway model should be applicable for realistic fluorophores if the following assumptions are fulfilled: (i) The internal conversion within the fluorophore occurs considerably faster than the final radiative or non-radiative decay, and (ii) re-

excitation, after non-radiate decay, from an intermediate energy state back to the excited state, which could give rise to delayed fluorescence, is negligible.<sup>6</sup>

As described above, for  $C_{Purcell}$ , we use a dipole model where we average over x, y, and z oriented dipole moment, to represent emission from an inherently unpolarized fluorophore, and normalize to the emission in the test liquid, which in our case has n = 1.33. Thus, we obtain a relative Purcell factor with reference to the test liquid medium, which is a factor of n higher than that of vacuum.<sup>1</sup> We chose to work with this relative Purcell factor throughout since the QY and decay lifetime of fluorophores are typically tabulated in such a test liquid, and hence, as discussed below, modified by the relative Purcell factor.

We assume that the fluorophore in the reference liquid, where thus  $C_{Purcell} = 1$ , shows a QY of QY<sub>0</sub> and  $\tau$  of  $\tau_0$  (thus,  $\Gamma_0 = 1/\tau_0$ ). The Purcell factor modifies  $\Gamma_{rad}$  such that  $\Gamma_{rad} = C'_{Purcell}\Gamma_{rad,0}$ ,<sup>4</sup> and for simplicity, we assume that the non-radiative pathway stays unaffected when the fluorophore is brought to the vicinity to the nanowire (and possibly bound to it by molecular linking). Then, it follows that  $QY = C_{Purcell}QY_0/(C_{Purcell}QY_0 + (1 - QY_0))$ . Thus, we can define a QY enhancement factor as  $QY = ENH_{QY}QY_0$  where  $ENH_{QY} = C_{Purcell}/(C_{Purcell}QY_0 + (1 - QY_0))$ . Similarly, the de-excitation time constant is modified to  $\tau = \frac{\tau_0}{1+(C_{Purcell}-1)QY_0}$ , and we can define a de-excitation speed-up factor as  $ENH_{1/\tau} = 1 + (C_{Purcell} - 1)QY_0$ . Note that since  $ENH_{QY}$  and  $ENH_{1/\tau}$  depend only on the Purcell factor, they are independent of  $NA_{exc}$  and  $NA_{coll}$ .

#### Model for fluorescence signal enhancement in signal-integrating collection

Here, we assume a signal-integrating collection scheme where all photons propagating within  $NA_{coll}$  contribute to the fluorescence signal.

We consider two limiting cases for the excitation/de-excitation cycle: (1) Far-from saturation regime where the fluorophore is most of the time in the ground state, and hence the excitation limits the rate of the excitation/de-excitation cycle and hence signal. (2) Close to saturation regime where the fluorophore is most of the time in the excited state, and the signal is hence limited by the de-excitation rate  $1/\tau$ .

Then, for the case (1), that is, far from excitation saturation, the signal enhancement is given by

$$ENH_{sig} = ENH_{exc}ENH_{coll}ENH_{QY}.$$
(S5)

Here, two special cases follow, one for fluorophores with low  $QY_0$  (close to zero) where  $ENH_{QY} \rightarrow C_{Purcell}$  and one for high  $QY_0$  (close to 1) where  $ENH_{QY} \rightarrow 1$ . In this way, we obtain  $ENH_{sig} = ENH_{exc}ENH_{coll}C_{Purcell}$  and  $ENH_{sig} = ENH_{exc}ENH_{coll}$  for the limiting cases of  $QY_0$ , respectively.

For case (2), that is, close to saturation, the effect of  $\text{ENH}_{\text{exc}}$  disappears, and instead  $\text{ENH}_{1/\tau}$  modifies the excitation/de-excitation rate:

 $\text{ENH}_{\text{sig}} = \text{ENH}_{1/\tau} \text{ENH}_{\text{coll}} \text{ENH}_{\text{QY}}$ . Here, for low  $\text{QY}_0$ ,  $\text{ENH}_{1/\tau} \rightarrow 1$  and  $\text{ENH}_{\text{QY}} \rightarrow C_{\text{Purcell}}$ , and for high  $\text{QY}_0$ ,  $\text{ENH}_{1/\tau} \rightarrow C_{\text{Purcell}}$  and  $\text{ENH}_{\text{QY}} \rightarrow 1$ . Thus, in both these limiting cases of  $\text{QY}_0$ ,  $\text{ENH}_{\text{sig}} = \text{ENH}_{\text{coll}}C_{\text{Purcell}}$ .

In the main text, we assume case (1), that is, the case far from excitation saturation.

Note that if using a broadband excitation source, we should average  $\text{ENH}_{\text{exc}}$  over the incidence spectrum. Similarly, for a broad emission spectrum from the fluorophore, we should average  $\text{ENH}_{\text{coll}}$ ,

 $\text{ENH}_{\text{QY}}$ , and  $\text{ENH}_{1/\tau}$  over the emission spectrum. Unless otherwise stated, we assume a narrow excitation and emission spectrum for simplicity.

Finally, we typically consider as signal enhancement the axially averaged signal enhancement, that is,  $\langle \text{ENH}_{\text{sig}} \rangle = \langle \text{ENH}_{\text{exc}} \text{ENH}_{\text{coll}} \text{ENH}_{\text{QY}} \rangle$  or  $\langle \text{ENH}_{\text{sig}} \rangle = \langle \text{ENH}_{1/\tau} \text{ENH}_{\text{coll}} \text{ENH}_{\text{QY}} \rangle$ , depending on if we are looking at case (1) or (2) for the excitation.

Here, we don't include the bleaching dynamics of fluorophores, in which fluorophores tend to turn into a non-emitting state after a certain number of cycles. However, the above modelling of the modification of the excitation/de-excitation cycle can be used for assessing how much we enhance the bleaching rate in the vicinity of the nanowire, as detailed in our previous work.<sup>3</sup>

## Modelling of fluorescence image

The simulations for the imaging-mode detection is based on the same dipole model as used for the Purcell factor and parasitic absorption above. We use the RETOP package<sup>8</sup> to perform a near-field to far-field transformation NFFT (the RETOP package performs the NFFT even when a substrate is present). The far-field emission that enters the collection objective is assumed to be focused into an image plane. Thus, we assume that the collection objective functions also as the imaging objective such that NA<sub>coll</sub> defines the far-field light that is used in the image formation. Thus, the imaging objective focuses the far-field emission onto the image plane, and the image formation process can be calculated in Fourier space as detailed below.<sup>7</sup>

We describe the far-field emission direction in terms of the  $k_x$  and  $k_y$  components in the Fourier space, such that  $k_x = \sin(\theta) \cos(\varphi) k_0$  and  $k_y = \sin(\theta) \sin(\varphi) k_0$  with  $\theta$  and  $\varphi$  here the polar and azimuth angle that describe the propagation direction (and  $k_0 = 2\pi/\lambda$ ). Then, for each  $k_x$ - $k_y$  pair, we obtain a phase factor  $k_{\text{farfield}}(k_x, k_y)$  that describes the propagation of the far-field component along the optical axis (which is assumed to be parallel to the *z* axis) and the electric field intensity  $\mathbf{E}_{farfield}(k_x, k_y)$  of the far-field component. The extraction of these far-field components is performed relative to a reference *z*-plane located at  $z_{\text{ref}}$ . To take into account  $z_{\text{focal}}$ , the position of the focal plane that we have chosen, we multiply each far-field component with the corresponding shift compared to  $z_{\text{ref}}$ . That is, we multiply each far-field component with the respective exp  $[ik_{\text{farfield}}(k_x, k_y)(z_{\text{ref}} - z_{\text{focal}})]$ .

We use a grid in  $k_x$  and  $k_y$  in the extraction of far-field direction in RETOP to allow the use of fast-Fourier transform (FFT) to speed up the calculation of the image creation. We use a cut-off in the farfield when  $\sqrt{(k_x)^2 + (k_y)^2} > NA_{img}k_0$ , with  $NA_{img}$  the numerical aperture of the objective used for the imaging (and we assume  $NA_{img} = NA_{coll}$  if not stated otherwise). For such cut-off directions, we set the far-field intensity to zero to allow direct use of FFT. After that, we assume magnification of M= 1 for simplicity, which allows us to perform the FFT directly on that far-field spectrum, without additional transformations as would be needed if  $M \neq 1$ .<sup>7</sup>

Thus, from the FFT we obtain the  $E_x$ ,  $E_y$  and  $E_z$  that the far-field components gives rise to when focused to the image plane. We assume that the corresponding  $|\mathbf{E}|^2$  in the image plane yields the signal intensity in the image-based detection [thus, we assume that detector in the image plane is polarization independent and with perfect anti-reflection coating (or at least not showing wavelength, incidence angle, or polarization dependent reflection)].

We denote the result from the above image calculation by  $|\mathbf{E}(x, y)_i|^2$  (where the subscript *i* denotes that the image originates from dipole with dipole moment oriented in the *i* direction). Since the farfield component includes modification in the far-field emission intensity due to the modified emission power of the dipole, we normalize with the total power emitted by the dipole (the effect of the modified emission power of the dipole is already included through the modified quantum yield). Furthermore, we take into account the excitation enhancement and quantum yield enhancement as multiplicative factors similarly as when modelling the signal-integrating detection mode. For the overall image from the three orthogonal dipole moments, we thus have for the image intensity:  $\mathrm{ENH}_{\mathrm{exc}}\mathrm{ENH}_{\mathrm{QY}}\sum_{i}\frac{|\mathbf{E}(x,y)_i|^2}{P_{em,i}}\frac{P_{em,i}}{P_{em,x}+P_{em,y}+P_{em,z}}$  where the second fraction gives the probability that the emission occurs through dipole orientation *i*.

Finally, we normalize the intensity in the image plane with the peak intensity in the corresponding image of reference homogenous system when the reference dipole is in focus (that is, when  $z_{focal}$  coincides with the *z* position of the dipole in the reference surrounding), and for the case of isotropic dipole emitter, we model for the homogenous surrounding the image from three orthogonal orientations for the dipole moment (for the homogeneous system, both excitation enhancement and quantum yield enhancement are equal to unity by definition).

## Electromagnetic simulations

We perform the solving of the Maxwell equations with the finite element method in Comsol Multiphysics for the 3D geometry of the vertical nanowire on top of a substrate, covered by an oxide layer. We consider two types of modelling: (i) the scattering of an incident plane wave to yield the  $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}, \lambda, \theta_{\text{inc}}, \phi_{\text{inc}}, pol)$  for Eqs. (S3) and (S4) and (ii) emission from a dipole emitter as needed for the Purcell factor and analysis of parasitic absorption. From the dipole emitter simulation, we also obtain with the RETOP package<sup>8</sup> the near-field to far-field transformation, needed for the image creation when analyzing signal-detection in imaging mode.

#### References

- Sorokina, A.; Lipsanen, H.; Anttu, N. Designing Outcoupling of Light from Nanostructured Emitter in Stratified Medium with Parasitic Absorption. *Journal of Applied Physics* 2022, 131 (22), 223104. https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0088387.
- (2) Anttu, N.; Mäntynen, H.; Sorokina, A.; Kivisaari, P.; Sadi, T.; Lipsanen, H. Geometry Tailoring of Emission from Semiconductor Nanowires and Nanocones. *Photonics* 2020, 7 (2), 23. https://doi.org/10.3390/photonics7020023.
- (3) N. Unksov, I.; Anttu, N.; Verardo, D.; Höök, F.; N. Prinz, C.; Linke, H. Fluorescence Excitation Enhancement by Waveguiding Nanowires. *Nanoscale Advances* **2023**, *5* (6), 1760–1766. https://doi.org/10.1039/D2NA00749E.
- (4) Anttu, N.; Mäntynen, H.; Sorokina, A.; Turunen, J.; Sadi, T.; Lipsanen, H. Applied Electromagnetic Optics Simulations for Nanophotonics. *J. Appl. Phys.* **2021**, *129* (13), 131102. https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0041275.
- (5) Anttu, N. Modifying the Emission of Light from a Semiconductor Nanowire Array. *Journal of Applied Physics* **2016**, *120* (4), 043108. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4960017.
- (6) Lakowicz, J. R.; Malicka, J.; Gryczynski, I.; Gryczynski, Z.; Geddes, C. D. Radiative Decay Engineering: The Role of Photonic Mode Density in Biotechnology. J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys. 2003, 36 (14), R240. https://doi.org/10.1088/0022-3727/36/14/203.
- (7) Çapoğlu, İ. R.; Rogers, J. D.; Taflove, A.; Backman, V. Chapter 1 The Microscope in a Computer: Image Synthesis from Three-Dimensional Full-Vector Solutions of Maxwell's Equations at the

Nanometer Scale. In *Progress in Optics*; Wolf, E., Ed.; Progress in Optics; Elsevier, 2012; Vol. 57, pp 1–91. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-44-459422-8.00001-1.

(8) Yang, J.; Hugonin, J.-P.; Lalanne, P. Near-to-Far Field Transformations for Radiative and Guided Waves. *ACS Photonics* **2016**, *3* (3), 395–402. https://doi.org/10.1021/acsphotonics.5b00559.