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Array Preparation

Figure S1. Pin holder for rectangular pins used to print linear colorimetric sensor arrays (left) and close-up view of a rectangular pin (right).

Handheld Reader Details

Figure S2. Photographs of the handheld reader including front, rear, and cartridge bay views. Dimensions are 12.5 cm tall by 9.5 cm wide by 4.0 cm thick. The rear panel and 9 V battery were removed in order to provide a better view of the internal electronics and diaphragm micropump (located in rear image, lower right).
Table S1. Relevant component parameters of the handheld reader.

| Parameter          | Value                                      |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Scanner Size       | 12.8 cm x 9.5 cm x 4.0 cm                 |
| Scanner Weight     | 460 g + battery + cartridge               |
| Cartridge Size     | 7.9 cm x 2.8 cm x 1.0 cm                  |
| Cartridge Weight   | 11 g                                       |
| Battery Weight     | 48 g                                       |
| Static Pressure    | 550 mbar typical                           |
| Pump Rate          | 580 cm³/min typical                        |
| Current Draw       | ~400 mA                                    |
| Battery Charg       | 1200 mAh typical                           |
| Samples/Battery    | 100 typical                                |

Analyte Sample Details

Table S2. Composition of all explosive analytes and related compounds.

| Name       | Component(s)                                                                 |
|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| control    | Ambient lab air (approx. 30% rel. humidity at 24°C)                           |
| AN         | Ammonium Nitrate, farm grade (FG)                                            |
| AN-FO      | 94.48 wt% Ammonium Nitrate, FG + 5.52 wt% Fuel Oil (diesel)                  |
| AN-NM      | 66.30 wt% Ammonium Nitrate, FG + 33.70 wt% Nitromethane                       |
| C₆H₁₀O     | Cyclohexanone                                                                |
| DMDNB      | 2,3-Dimethyl-2,3-dinitrobutane                                               |
| DNT        | 2,4-Dinitrotoluene                                                           |
| H₂O₂       | Hydrogen Peroxide (30% in H₂O)                                               |
| HMTD       | Hexamethylene Triperoxide Diamine                                            |
| NM         | Nitromethane                                                                 |
| PC-S, KClO₃-S| 74.12 wt% Potassium Chlorate + 25.88 wt% Powdered Sugar                      |
| PC-FO, KClO₃-FO| 89.73 wt% Potassium Chlorate + 10.27 wt% Fuel Oil                           |
| PETN       | Pentaerythritol Tetranitrate                                                 |
| PLX        | 95.00 wt% Nitromethane + 5 wt% Ethylene Diamine (aged 24 hours)              |
| RDX        | Cyclotrimethylenetrinitramine                                                |
| TATP       | Triacetone Triperoxide                                                       |
Sampling Procedure

**Figure S3.** Photograph of sampling setup. The handheld device was held in a metal rack with a tube inserted into a glass vial containing the analyte, shown from the (A) front, and (B) side. The array cartridge is attached to a short feed tube (3.8 cm). Prior to analyte headspace sampling, the array is equilibrated to the ambient background atmosphere for 2 minutes. The feed tube is then inserted into a 7 mL glass vial for headspace sampling, and measurements were collected after 2 minutes of exposure to sample headspace at a flow rate of approximately 580 cm$^3$/minute (sccm).

One example showing a graphical form of subtraction on raw images is shown as Figure S4; note that this was figure was generated by subtracting the numeric values and constructing a bitmap for visualization. Average difference maps for each analyte class and the control are shown in Figure S5. As shown, the array responses vary considerably across the range of tested analytes.

**Figure S4.** Raw sensor images collected before (A) and after (B) exposure to AN head gas, and a scaled difference map (C, RGB color range 0-16 scaled to 0-255).
Figure S5. Average sensor response vectors of 15 explosives and related compounds. Normalized reflectance values were scaled so that the relevant response range (i.e., 0.39% to 3.9% of maximum reflectance) is displayed on an 8-bit RGB color scale (i.e., 0-255).
Limits of Detection

The limits of detection (LODs) for this sampling protocol were estimated for AN, NM, and DNT samples (representing highly responsive, moderately responsive, and weakly responsive analytes respectively) using sample masses ranging from 0.5-100 mg; calculated LODs were as follows: AN (0.13 mg), NM (0.52 mg), DNT (1.8 mg).

The limit of detection for this dataset was defined as the 99% confidence threshold using the single dimension with the highest signal-to-noise ratio. Each dimension $S_N$ is individually approximately Gaussian-distributed and not necessarily independent (i.e., covariance is significant). The function defining the detection limit is $S_{\text{max}} = \text{Max}(S_N)$, which is not Gaussian distributed; theoretically, the distribution is a form of the Error function that is well beyond the scope of this work. Further complicating the problem is the fact that the true standard deviation for the control data is not known; we instead estimate the standard deviation using a t-distribution with 6 degrees of freedom (i.e., 7 experimental trials for the control). To approach this problem, we created a simulation in which we calculated $S_{\text{max}}$ many times (10,000 trials) for 120 independent trials using the appropriate t-distribution and determined a 99% confidence threshold. For a completely dependent dataset (i.e., in which all 120 dimensions are scalar multiples of a single dimension), the probability distribution of $S_{\text{max}}$ reduces down to the probability distribution of $S_N$, which has already been estimated as a t-distribution with 6 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the detection limit threshold is somewhere between the fully-dependent value and the fully-independent value: $S_{\text{max}} = 3.707$ to $S_{\text{max}} = 9.080$. Based on the scree plot from the PCA data, approximately 95% of the total variance was captured in 16 dimensions; therefore, we chose to instead use 16 independent t-distributed dimensions to develop a 99% confidence threshold. This lead to a value where $S_{\text{max}} = 6.28$; coincidentally, this is very close to halfway between the thresholds estimated for the fully-dependent and fully-independent values.

Limits of detection were then calculated as follows. Response values for a control sample were collected (seven independent trials). Response values were also collected in triplicate trials at several different sample masses: AN: 0.5 mg, 1 mg, 2 mg, 5 mg, 10 mg, 20 mg; NM: 2 mg, 5 mg, 10 mg, 20 mg, 50 mg; DNT: 5 mg, 10 mg, 20 mg, 50 mg. A single-point LOD was then calculated for each trial and dimension using LODsingle = Mass * 6.28 * StdDevControl / (ResponseTrial - ResponseAvgControl); the calculated LOD for a trial is then the maximum LODsingle among all dimensions for the trial. Plotting LOD vs. sample mass, second-order least-squares interpolation gave polynomials of the form $A x^2 + Bx + C$ with the following $R^2$ values (AN = 0.8675, NM = 0.9864, DNT = 0.9755). These 2nd order polynomials were then solved for $y = x$, corresponding to the position where the calculated LOD was equal to sample mass (AN = 0.32 mg, NM = 1.31 mg, DNT = 5.19 mg). Note that single-point LOD estimates calculated using the lowest tested sample mass (AN: 0.5 mg, NM: 2 mg, DNT: 5 mg) deviated only slightly from the values calculated using quadratic fitting (AN = 0.39 => 21% higher, NM = 1.53 => 17% higher, DNT = 4.83 => 7% lower).
Principal Component Analysis

As shown in the main text (Figure 4), a large number of principal components were required in order to adequately describe the dataset (i.e., 16 dimensions are required to capture greater than 95% total variance). In order to demonstrate how this translates into discrimination ability (or lack thereof) by PCA two-dimensional score plots and to compare this sensor array to other works that rely on low dimensional data and PCA for analysis, the first four principal components were plotted as shown in Figure S6. Upon cursory examination, it is obvious that PCA using the first two dimensions provides adequate discrimination for some analytes (e.g., AN, AN-NM, AN-FO, NM, etc) but shows essentially no discrimination for others (e.g., both nitroalkanes, both chlorate-containing analytes, and HMTD all appear to be inseparable using the first two dimensions). Extending this to the third and fourth dimensions, additional analytes are able to be discriminated (TATP, H2O2, cyclohexanone, etc) but there is still significant overlap among many analytes. High dimensionality data is not easily interpreted by two-dimensional graphs, which is why more sophisticated analyses (e.g., HCA and SVM) are required for colorimetric sensor array data.

Figure S6. PCA two-dimensional score plots for the first and second and for the third and fourth principal component axes. Two dimensional plots of the first four components show essentially no discrimination among several analyte classes (e.g., nitroalkanes, chlorate-containing species, HMTD). This reflects the very high dimensionality of the colorimetric sensor array data: the first four dimensions contain only 35.5%, 15.8%, 12.5%, and 9.9% of the total variance, respectively.
\textsuperscript{1}H-NMR spectra of DMDNB and PETN

\textsuperscript{1}H-NMR spectra of DMDNB (2,3-dimethyl-2,3-dinitrobutane) and PETN (pentaerythritol tetranitrate) were collected with a Varian 500 MHz NMR spectrometer with a narrow-bore coil (Varian Inc, Palo Alto, CA, USA). The limit of detection of this method was defined as the point at which peaks could no longer be resolved from baseline noise (i.e., \(3 \times \text{100 mol} \% \div \sigma_{\text{baseline}}\)).

Since DMDNB and PETN were unable to be distinguished from each other, it was suspected that the PETN sample might have contained significant amounts of DMDNB (which is commonly used as a taggant for PETN and other explosives). However, NMR analysis conclusively disproved this hypothesis. The absence of any detectable DMDNB peak in the PETN spectrum (Figure S7) indicates that the amount of DMDNB present in the PETN sample is less than the detection limit of the method, which was estimated to be approximately 0.02 mol \%. This detection limit is slightly below the concentration expected for a standard taggant (~ 0.04 mol \%).\textsuperscript{1,3}

\textbf{Figure S7.} \textsuperscript{1}H-NMR spectra of DMDNB and PETN showing both a full range and zoomed in on the primary DMDNB peak at 1.79 ppm.
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