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ABSTRACT
Graphene-based nanomaterials have emerged as a novel type of materials with exceptional physicochemical properties and numerous applications in various areas. In this review, we summarize recent advances in studying interactions between graphene and biosystems. We first provide a brief introduction on graphene and its derivatives, and then discuss on the toxicology and biocompatibility of graphene, including the extracellular interactions between graphene and biomacromolecules, cellular studies of graphene, and in vivo toxicological effects. Next, we focus on various graphene-based practical applications in antibacterial materials, wound addressing, drug delivery, and water purification. We finally present perspectives on challenges and future developments in these exciting fields.
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1 Introduction
Graphene is the fundamental building element of many carbon allotropes including graphite, charcoals, carbon nanotubes (CNTs) and bucky balls. Since its discovery in 2004 [1], graphene has rapidly emerged as a family of highly promising nanomaterials with unique electronic, optical and catalytic properties that can be exploited for numerous applications in energy, environment, and biomedicine. In particular, the coupling of graphene with biology brings exciting research focuses. Due to their large surface areas, superior physical and chemical properties, graphene-based nanomaterials has emerged as an attractive candidate to act as nanoscale building blocks for biological researches. The strong van der Waals force between graphene nanosheets facilitate incorporating molecules or nanomaterials (e.g., polymer or nanoparticles) to form multifunctional nanocomposites, which is effective to improve their properties and enhance their performance toward biosystems. In addition, based on their inherent antibacterial properties, graphene can be used as a new effective and green antibacterial agent with a severe cell inactivation toward bacteria. Also importantly, graphene-based nanomaterial is renewable and easy to fabricate with low cost and fast preparation techniques, compared to traditional metals and metal oxides. The research ranges from fundamental studies on the interactions between graphene and biomolecules to various graphene-based practical applications including antibacterial materials, cell culture substrates, biosensors and drug delivery carriers. While several excellent reviews have appeared with the focus on some of these topics [2–5], there has not been a comprehensive review that summarizes the research progress in graphene-based nanomaterials in biosystems.

In this review, we summarize recent advances in the biocompatibility, toxicology and applications of graphene-based nanomaterials in biosystems (Fig. 1). We first briefly describe the structures, properties

Figure 1 Overview of the biocompatibility, toxicology and applications of graphene-based nanomaterials in biosystems.
and synthesis of graphene, graphene derivatives, and graphene-based composites. Sequentially, we focus on the recent advances in the toxicology and biocompatibility of graphene in biosystems, including the extracellular interactions between graphene and biomacromolecules (e.g., nucleic acids, proteins, and peptides), the way of graphene influences on the biological responses of viruses and cellular metabolism, how graphene enters cells, in vivo toxicological effects of graphene on animals and plants, and toxicological concerns regarding its potential applications. Next, we summarize the recent achievements and advancements in the antibacterial activities of graphene, its derivatives and graphene-based nanocomposites, the mechanisms of graphene-mediated antibacterial properties, and other applications in wound addressing, drug delivery, and water purification. Finally, we suggest some significant prospects, further developments and opportunities in this emerging and promising field.

2 Brief descriptions of graphene-based nanomaterials

2.1 Graphene and graphene derivatives

Graphene, a two-dimensional layer of sp$^2$-hybridized single-atom-scale carbon, has caught appreciable attention due to its extraordinary intrinsic strength, high surface area, fast electron mobility, high thermal conductivity, and strong Young's modulus. Each carbon atom in the lattice has the s, p$_x$, and p$_y$ atomic orbitals that hybridize to form covalent sp$^2$ bonds, which gives rise to C–C–C bond angles of 120° and the chicken-wire-like layers. In the hexagonal ring, three valence electrons on each carbon in the lattice form the σ bond, which makes carbon atoms bonded together. A π orbital known as the valence band, is formed by the remaining p$_\pi$ orbital on each carbon atom overlaps with its neighbors. The π orbital is also called the conduction band that contributes to delocalized electrons. Graphene-based nanomaterials contain not only “pristine” graphene, but also chemical modified graphene as graphene derivatives that have been treated by chemical modifications [6] for covalent bonding with pendant groups, such as graphene oxide (GO) and reduced graphene oxide (rGO). GO contains epoxy and carbon radicals in the basal planes, while its edges are decorated with carboxyl and hydroxyl groups. The amount of oxygen groups depends significantly on the preparation approaches, including direct oxidation of graphite and subsequent exfoliation of carbon sheets that are deeply oxidized. The intrinsic properties of graphene make that GO can partly be reduced going toward graphene-like sheets, which is generally referred as rGO. Chemical doping is another effective approach to synthesize doped-graphene, which is used to tailor the nature of graphene. In doped graphene, other elements, such as nitrogen atoms, boron atoms, and sulfur atoms, are introduced into the hexagonal lattice of graphene and replace the carbon atoms. Usually, the doped-atoms are under 10% of the whole system. Except modifying the natural properties of graphene, the morphologies can also be shaped, such as two-dimensional (2D) graphene nanosheets (GNSs) [1], zero-dimensional (0D) graphene quantum dots (GQDs) [7], and one-dimensional (1D) graphene nanoribbons (GNRs) [8].

Up to now, the synthesis procedures of graphene and its derivatives can be classified into two main categories: physical and chemical approaches. Physical approaches utilize exfoliation of a graphene layer from bulk graphite by disrupting the van der Waals forces between the stacked sheets, including mechanical exfoliation, and direct liquid phase exfoliation. Chemical approaches build up various graphene-based nanomaterials through chemical reaction, including epitaxial growth, chemical vapor deposition (CVD), chemical oxidation, chemical reduction, and so on. The structures of graphene, its derivatives, and graphene-based composites as well as their related prepared approaches are shown in Fig. 2.

2.2 Physically grown graphene

In graphite, the interactions between adjacent graphene layers formed via van der Waals forces are extremely weak [9]. This causes the delamination of bulk graphite into individual graphene sheets under mechanical forces. Geim and his co-workers first mechanically exfoliated graphene by using adhesive tapes in 2004 [1], which has been credited with the explosive growth of interest in graphene in recent years. This simple approach can keep the structural integrity of graphene; however, it has low efficiency, and the size and orientation of available graphene sheets are generally uncontrollable with the lateral size up to tens of microns.

Liquid-phase exfoliation is another typical physical synthesis approach, which is prepared by sonicating graphite in the presence of certain solvents. This direct method is based on one-step physical process by using liquids as exfoliation media, such as organic solvents, ionic liquids, and surfactant solutions. Coleman et al. [10] developed graphene dispersions in the forms of monomolecular graphene sheets, which are free from oxides and defects. The yield of monolayer graphene in N-methyl pyrrolidone (NMP) dispersions was 28%, corresponding to an overall yield of approximately 1 wt.%. However, the low concentration of obtained graphene, which was below 0.01 mg/mL$^{-1}$, made it difficult to concentrate and isolate from the viscous solvents.

2.3 Chemically produced graphene

CVD technique has been widely used to produce large-scale and high-quality graphene films with low/no oxygen content and defect-free hexagonal lattice. Hong, Choi and co-workers [11] used CVD technique to grow and transfer few-layer graphene films on a large scale on a ~ 300 nm-thick nickel layer on a SiO$_2$/Si substrate. Besides nickel, copper (Cu) is another ideal metal in CVD synthesis. Bea et al. [12] developed the roll-to-roll production of monolayer 30-inch graphene films through CVD technique onto flexible and large copper substrates. The films presented low resistances of ~ 125 Ω·m$^{-1}$ and 97.4% optical transmittance, which was superior to that grown on indium tin oxides. Recently, Chen et al. [13] found the lattice constant of monolayer graphene as-grown on Cu via CVD was expanded to around 7.5% of its relaxed value using electronic and lattice structure analysis.

Epitaxial growth of graphene film formed by thermal decomposition and vacuum graphitization on insulating carbon-containing or metal substrate, has also been reported [14–16]. After Si atoms was evaporated from the substrate, uniform ordered graphene films in
the size of few microns was produced on silicon carbide (SiC) surface through vacuum high-temperature annealing and carbon segregation. This technique could obtain high-quality graphene films. Unfortunately, it requires special conditions of high temperature and vacuum environment, and expensive costs for only small-size graphene film.

The most common way to prepare graphene for biological research is chemical reduction of GO to rGO, involving deep oxidation of graphite, followed exfoliation of GO by sonication irradiation, and reduction by chemical or thermal methods. Hummer's method [17] is used as the most common approach for producing GO. Currently, there are several improved techniques to Hummer oxidation by using different oxidizing agents/acids or under different reaction conditions. Ruoff et al. [18] prepared a free-standing GO paper by flow-directed assembly method, possessing higher tensile modulus and fracture strength than many other paper-like materials. Marcano et al. [19] improved Hummer's methods by elimination NaNO₃, increasing the concentration of KMnO₄, and using a mixture of H₂SO₄/H₃PO₄, which obtained a high oxidized GO with free generation of toxic gases (NO₂). rGO can be obtained by chemical or thermal reduction treatments heated above 100 °C using reducing agents, such as hydrazine, hydrogen, etc. Li et al. [20] reduced GO dispersions to stable graphene colloids via hydrazine reduction under controlled conditions, which provided a simple method to prepare single-layer chemical converted graphene sheets with thickness of ~1 nm. Recently, Chhowalla's group [21] further simplified the method to reduce GO into rGO by using few seconds long microwave pulses. The microwave-reduced GO showed CVD graphene-like Raman features, as well as atomic-scale highly ordered structures.

2.4 Graphene-based composites

Graphene-based composites as filler materials where graphene is used as a base to disperse in or incorporation of other nanomaterials, such as metal nanostructures [22–24], semiconductor nanostructures [25–27], and polymers [28, 29]. Chemical reduction, hydrothermal method, microwave-assisted growth, solution mixing, in situ growth are often used to prepare graphene-based composites [30]. Kamat et al. [31] first decorated gold nanoparticles (AuNPs) by chemical reduction of AuCl₄⁻ ions with NaBH₄ on octadecylamine (ODA) modified graphene suspended in tetrahydrofuran (THF) medium. Gao et al. [32] reported the preparation of a graphene-Cds QD composite using a one-pot process, where simultaneously brought about the reduction of GO and the formation of Cds on graphene. Graphene-polymer composites required polymer matrices, such as poly-N-vinyl carbazole (PVK), poly(methyl methacrylate) (PMMA), Poly(L-lysine) (PLL), and polycaproacte (PCL) [33].

3 Graphene in biosystems: toxicology and bio-compatibility

In this section, we first introduce studies on the interactions between graphene and biomacromolecules in extracellular environment. Then we summarize the progress on the cytotoxicity of graphene, and how graphene enters cells, and how it affects cellular metabolism. Furthermore, we describe the in-vivo toxicity of graphene in various organs and model animals by demonstrating biodistribution of graphene, and their toxicological effects. Finally, we bring about an overview on the toxicityology of graphene, and how we could circumvent this problem to realize real-world applications.

3.1 Interactions between graphene and biomacromolecules

3.1.1 Interactions between graphene and nucleic acids

It is well known that nucleic acids are essential in transmitting and expressing information through protein synthesis in living entities. Recently, a series of functional nucleic acids [34] are produced by a combinatorial method called in-vitro selection or systematic evolution of ligands by exponential enrichment (SELEX), functioning beyond the conventional genetic roles. The programmable pairing of DNA single strands into precisely engineered, connecting double helices make it an ideal material for assemblage of nano-architectures [35–39], such as DNA nanotube/nanowire [40], DNA array [41] and DNA origami [42–44], for advancing bioimaging [45–48], biomedicine [49, 50], and biomolecular sensing [51–53]. Thus, the study of interaction between graphene and nucleic acids is well appealing towards biomedical applications.

Up until now, some experimental studies regarding the absorption and desorption mechanisms between graphene and nucleic acids have been reported. Mann and co-workers [54] reported a method of utilizing single-stranded DNA (ssDNA) to prepare stable aqueous graphene suspensions sheets, which proposed a surface binding model for ssDNA/graphene interactions via non-covalent hydrophobic and electrostatic/hydrogen bonding between purine/pyrimidine bases of ssDNA and the carboxylic and phenolic groups of graphene. In general, the binding affinity between graphene and ssDNA via noncovalent interactions (i.e., π-π stacking interactions and hydrophobic forces) is much higher than those between graphene and double-stranded DNA (dsDNA) or tertiary DNA structures. Chen and co-workers [55] demonstrated that GO could bind dye-labeled ssDNA and quench its fluorescence, where GO has lower affinity for dsDNA than for ssDNA. Fan et al. [56] developed a GO-based multicolor fluorescent DNA analysis and performed a molecular dynamic (MD) simulation to study the interaction differences between ssDNA and dsDNA with GO. As a result, the nucleobases of ssDNA lay nearly flat on the GO surface that led to the strong absorption by GO. Such interaction was ascribed to the π-π stacking interactions between its nucleobases and hexagonal rings of GO. Whereas, the nucleobases of dsDNA in helical structure were shielded, so that GO could not stably adsorb it (Fig. 3(a)). Li's group [57] constructed graphene-based fluorescence resonance energy transfer (FRET) aptasensor for detection of thrombin by assembling FAM-labeled aptamer on graphene. When thrombin was introduced, it caused the conformational change of aptamer that induced the recovery of fluorescence (Fig. 3(b)). Liu and Maheshwari et al. [58] reported the binding efficiency of DNA to GO surface depends on DNA length, salt, pH, solvent, and temperature. As reported, short DNA strands usually had faster kinetics and higher adsorption efficiency than long DNA strands. Also, higher salt concentration, lower pH value, and additional organic solvent facilitated the absorption of DNA on GO.

Kumar et al. [59] compared the interactions of DNA, polyamide (PNA) and polycarbamatenucleic acid (PCNA) oligomers with GO. They claimed that PNA and D-/L-PCNA possessed higher quenching efficiencies than that of DNA due to no generation of electrostatic charge repulsions. Yang et al. [60] reported that ssRNA showed similar adsorption and desorption abilities towards GO to ssDNA, as well as effective protection from enzymatic cleavage. Huang and co-workers [61] explored the size effect of nGO on ssDNA binding. They found that nGO sheets with ~200 nm lateral dimensions had the highest quenching efficiency, while nGO sheets of ~40 nm exhibited much weaker quenching efficiency (Fig. 3(c)).

Based upon the above findings, nucleic acid/graphene complexes have been used for DNA hybridization [62], DNA sequencing [63], protein identification [64], and cancer cell realization [65]. Fan and Hu et al. [64] used different DNA elements with high-precision identification for given analytes to set a small library of "ensemble aptamers" possessing "lock-and-key" recognition with molecular or cellular targets. Wang and Zhou et al. [62] determined the binding kinetics and affinity of DNA hybridization in real-time based on
multi-channel graphene field-effect transistor (FET) sensors, where an analytical model was described for the evaluation of probe density, hybridization efficiency, and the maximum signal response.

In addition, some signal amplification strategies, such as rolling circulation amplification (RCA) [66, 67], hybridization chain reaction (HCR) [68], exonuclease III (Exo III)-triggered recycling of the targets [69, 70], have also been coupled to improve the properties of graphene/nucleic acids complexes. For example, Li’s group [66] developed a graphene-based biosensing platform for ultrasensitive detection of thrombin and ATP based on rGO and rolling circulation amplification (RCA) (Fig. 3(d)). Fan’s group [68] utilized GO as nanoprobes to investigate the interactions between GO and different DNA structures and real-time monitor HCR and RCA amplification process (Fig. 3(e)).

Apart from experimental studies, some theoretical researches have also been carried out regarding the binding mechanisms between graphene and nucleic acids. Gowtham et al. [71] investigated the interaction of nucleobases with graphene using density-functional theory (DFT) framework, finding the calculated binding energy in the order as \( G > A \approx T > C > U \). Rao and co-workers [72] optimized the structures of nucleobase/graphene and calculated binding energies following the sequence of \( G > A > T > C \) by using the Jaguar computational package. Bhattacharyya et al. [73] reported ab initio quantum chemical calculations of graphene/nucleobase complexes by dispersion corrected DFT. It was found that large graphene sheets with curvatures might be more stable for nucleobase binding.

3.1.2 Interactions between graphene and proteins

Proteins are fundamental elements in all living organisms, which has physiological activities within cells. For nanomaterials to enter biological mediums, the first thing to encounter are the interaction with proteins (i.e., proteins, lipids, enzymes) [74–76]. Therefore, investigations of the interactions between graphene and proteins are essential for study the cellular uptake and biological toxicity of graphene.

Seo et al. [77] explored the adsorption topography on the surface of GO by atomic force microscopy (AFM). The antibody was particularly linked on the edges and folded structures of GO where were rich of carboxylic acid groups. Fan and Liu et al. [78] found that GO was an efficient quencher for fluorescent conjugated oligomer FBT with extensive \( \alpha \)-mannose side. In the presence of concanavalin A (ConA), the specific binding between FBT and ConA prevented GO/FBT interact which led to light-up sensing of lectin and Escherichia Coli (E. coli) (Fig. 3(f)). Dravid et al. [79] used nGO with 20 nm lateral dimensions as artificial receptor to identify 48 unknown proteins at concentrations of 100 and 10 nM. Liu and Peng et al. [80] studied the effects of PEGylation on serum behaviors of GO by using LC-MS/MS and Western blot analysis. They found PEGylated nGO (PEG-nGO) generated a nanointerface that significantly reduced serum protein binding and complement C3 activation. Niu and Chi et al. [81] investigated the interactions between stabilized chemical converted graphene (sCCG) and blood proteins. It is revealed that the sCCG/protein binds via the \( \pi-\pi \)
interactions.

Investigation of the peptide-graphene interactions can be useful for understanding the protein functions within cells [82-84]. Huang et al. [82] developed a GO-based fluorescence resonance energy transfer (FRET)-biosensor using fluoresce in isothiocyanate (FITC)-labeled octreotide (FOC) (Fig. 3(g)). As a result, FOC showed a high absorption affinity and high kinetics for GO via electrostatic forces and π-π interactions, but a lower quenching efficiency of 78% than that for ssDNA. Very recently, Chen et al. [83] experimentally and theoretically studied the interactions between two peptides (cecropin P1 and MSI-78(C1)) and graphene via sum frequency generation vibrational spectroscopy and MD simulation (Fig. 3(h)). They found that the competition between planar and charged hydrophilic residues significantly affected the peptide-graphene interactions.

3.2 Cellular studies of graphene

3.2.1 Graphene and viruses

Some global infectious diseases that threat to human health have been caused by emerging and reemerging viruses, like Ebola, Zika, MERS-CoV and avian influenza virus. Owing to the superior physiochemical properties, graphene-based nanomaterials have been focused on the biological responses of viruses, including the capture and destruction, attachment inhibition, and detection of viruses. Min et al. [85] developed a multiplexed GO-based helicase assay (mGOHA) based on GO to screen viral enzymes: inhibitors of HCV NS3 helicase and severe acute respirator syndrome coronavirus (SARS CoV) helicase. As a result, 22 inhibitors of HCV NS3 helicase, 26 of SARS CoV helicase and 24 of both helicases was discovered from a 10,000 small molecule library. Wang and Tang et al. [86] demonstrated that GO could act as a label-free material for detection and disinfaction of enteric viruses: EV71 and H9N2. GO can effectively interact with viruses, as well as significantly improve the destruction, removal and disinfaction that achieved at least 6-log inactivation. Gadanken and Sarid et al. [87] prepared sulfonated magnetic nanoparticles functionalized reduced graphene oxide (SMRGO) to capture and photothermally destroy herpes simplex virus type 1 (HSV-1). They found that SMRGO could be served as an effective antiviral agent (~ 99.99%) with a short capture time of 7 min. Gadanken et al. [88] reported that HSV-1 infections were inhibited by GO and partially reduced sulfonated GO (rGO-SO3) via a competitive inhibition mechanism. Recently, Adeli and Haag et al. [89] synthesized highly active functionalized graphene sheets containing 6% graphene and 94% sulfated polyglycerol, which are able to trap 20 virions by individual sheets with the size of ~ 1 μm × 1 μm.

Moreover, some graphene and its derivatives-based biosensing assays have been employed for analyzing viruses. For instance, colorimetric analysis of respiratory syncytial virus (RSV) using AuNP-GO hybrids [90], and graphene-FET biochip for Zika virus detection have been reported [91]. To obtain mechanically reinforced ultrathin membranes, Yoo and co-workers [92] developed a novel method to unidirectionally align M13 viruses on GO sheets in large ultrathin membranes, Yoo and co-workers [92] developed a novel method to unidirectionally align M13 viruses on GO sheets in large ultrathin membranes, Yoo and co-workers [92] developed a novel method to unidirectionally align M13 viruses on GO sheets in large ultrathin membranes, Yoo and co-workers [92] developed a novel method to unidirectionally align M13 viruses on GO sheets in large ultrathin membranes, Yoo and co-workers [92] developed a novel method to unidirectionally align M13 viruses on GO sheets in large ultrathin membranes. To obtain mechanically reinforced AuNP-GO hybrids [90], and graphene-FET biochip for Zika virus assays have been employed for analyzing viruses. For instance, graphene also serves as a preconcentration platform for osteogenic inducers for stem cell differentiation [94]. Studies also suggest that graphene-based nanomaterials treated by macromolecules exhibited good biocompatibility. Recent study [95] revealed that pristine graphene improved cell adhesion and proliferation, but it exhibits no influence on cell stress for both nonneuronal and neuronal cells, such as the mitochondrial membrane potential (MMP), the morphology and the autophagy levels. The functionalization of artificial peroxidase and extracellular matrix protein on graphene surface could improve the adhesion/growth capability of MCF-7 cells [96]. Both experimental observations and MD simulations showed that GO substrates treated by a mild thermal annealing process promoted the capture of Class II MHC-positive cell induced by oxygen clustering [97]. Besides acting as a good substrate, graphene has been designed as hybrid scaffold for tissue engineering applications. Fox example, the graphene-nanofiber hybrid scaffold by coating different amount of GO on the polymeric nanofiber (polycaprolactone) could cause selective differentiation of neural stem cells (NSCs), wherein a higher amount of GO facilitated cell differentiation into mature oligodendrocytes (Fig. 4(a)) [98]. Furthermore, a 3D GO/polymer hydrogel [99] served as an active cell scaffold for reversible cell capture triggered by near-infrared (NIR) light. Custom made 3D graphene micropatterns fabricated by a LightScribe DVD writer were used as scaffolds for guiding neuronal cell alignment [100].

Till now, there are conflicting conclusions on the cytotoxicity of graphene. Various cytotoxicity methods suggested GO could hardly enter A549 cells and has no obvious cytotoxicity in a dose-dependent manner [101]. In vitro experiments revealed that GO showed no obvious cytotoxicity against Hela cells because of its ultra-small size and high oxygen content [102]. Compared to single-walled carbon nanotube (SWCNT), graphene exhibited a low cytotoxic effect on PC12 cells in concentration- and shape-dependent manner [103]. However, another study indicated that GO could induce cytotoxicity and apoptosis in human lung cancer cells (BEAS-2B cell lines) [104]. Interestingly, when GO was coated with fetal bovine serum (FBS), it could greatly mitigate the cytotoxicity against A549 cells and eliminate cell membrane damage. It was also found that the cytotoxicity of FBS-coated GO showed little or no dependency on temperature (Fig. 4(b)) [105]. Similarly, reducing cytotoxicity of GO/rGO mediated by blood proteins coating was also demonstrated by MD simulations [106].

The cytotoxicity of graphene exhibits concentration, size, shape and time dependency. The toxicity intensity was in accordance with increasing graphene concentration or incubation time [101, 103]. Ultrasmall GO nanosheet with lateral size less than 50 nm displayed lower cytotoxicity and higher cellular uptake than large sized GO nanosheets [107]. A comparative study [108] revealed that the cytotoxicity of graphene-based materials increased as the lateral size decreased and functional groups density increased, by assessing the interaction between GO, thermally rGO and chemically rGO and human lung cells (BEAS-2B and A549). On the contrary, another recent study found that large GO with micrometer size was more likely to damage cell membrane and cause pro-inflammatory response than small GO with nanometer size [109]. Besides that, surface oxidation state of graphene had a significant impact on the induction of cytotoxicity in mammalian cells and lung, Hydroxylated GO (hGO) with highest carbon radical led to much more lipid peroxidation and cell death in THP-1 and BEAS-2B cells. GO exhibited lesser effects, and rGO had minimal toxicity (Fig. 4(c)) [110].

3.2.2 Graphene and mammalian cells

Like other carbon nanomaterials (i.e., CNTs), graphene-based nanomaterials could also influence cell morphology, adhesion, differentiation, migration, proliferation and cytoskeleton organization. Graphene paper have provided an ideal platform for the growth and proliferation of the mouse fibroblast cell line (L-929) [93]. Likewise,
accumulation of intracellular reactive oxygen species (ROS), leading to the activation of MAPKs- and TGF-beta signaling pathways which triggered Bim and Bax. Consequently, the caspase 3 were activated and the apoptosis was initiated. In another study [112], it was observed that GO treatment of cells simultaneously elicited the over production of H2O2 was triggered by oxidative and thermal irradiation with concentration-dependency, implying the application of GO to direct interact with it. GO/PP elevated and accelerated the electron transfer between cyt c and H2O2, as well as destroyed the inherent antioxidant defense system, eventually leading to apparent toxicity to worms.

3.3 In-vivo studies of graphene

3.3.1 Graphene in organs

Some study [117] found that GO predominantly deposited in lung and induced pulmonary edema and granuloma formation after being injected intravenously at a high dosage of 10 mg·kg⁻¹ body weight (Fig. 5(a)), which showed relative longer blood circulation half time and lower uptake in reticuloendothelial system (RES) than other carbon nanomaterials. Surface modified graphene-based nanomaterials with improved dispersion and stability significantly mediated biodistribution and translocation of graphene in organs. For instance, PEGylated nGO mainly accumulated in liver and spleen that were excreted by renal and fecal clearance [118], in which the PEG coating could decrease the retention of nGO in RES and promote the clearance of nGO from the organs [119]. Similarly, GO-dextran (GO-DEX) conjugate was also trapped in RES organs including liver and spleen, which showed clearance from the blood without apparent short-term toxicity in treated mice [120]. PEGylated GO derivatives exhibited no clear tissue uptake via oral administration, but high accumulation in RES including liver and spleen after intraperitoneal injection [121]. Unlike PEGylated GO, PEGylated rGO was distributed on major organs such as liver, spleen, kidney and brain after intraperitoneal and intravenous administration. Repeated administration of PEGylated rGO could cause severe liver injury, congestion in kidney and enhanced proliferation of splenocytes (Fig. 5(b)) [122]. Moreover, a carboxylated photoluminescent GQD prepared from carbon fiber show no acute toxicity or morphological changes, most of which accumulated in liver, spleen, lung, kidney, and tumor sites at 24 h after intravenous injection [123]. Finally, GQDs did not induced accumulation in major organs possibly due to the metabolism through kidneys, as well as no obvious in vivo toxicities due to the ultrasmall size and high oxygen content of GQD [102].

3.3.2 Graphene in animals

The toxic effects of graphene to animals have also been investigated [124]. In vivo toxicological study revealed that multifunctional graphene with fluorescence and magnetic properties did not cause any significant abnormalities nor influence the survival rate of zebrafish. In vivo whole-animal imaging confirmed that multifunctional graphene co-localized and evenly biodistributed from the head to tail in zebrafish [125]. The toxicity of GO and PEGylated poly-L-lysine (GO/PP) functionalized GO were explored under stress conditions using a simple animal model, C. elegans worm. The results showed that GO/PP facilitated the electron transfer that impaired the inherent antioxidant defense system, and eventually triggered nanotoxicity to worms [116]. Graphene-TiO₂ composite film could inactivate the C. elegans nematodes under solar light irradiation with concentration-dependency, implying the application in destruction of minuscule animals on biological environments [126].
GO exposure did not induce obvious toxicity on after 30 days of culture [130]. Interestingly, under normal levels, inhibition of photosynthesis and imbalance of nutrient homeostasis significantly caused root elongation, impairment of hair production, mediated by the overproduction of ROS [129]. Likewise, GO resulting in significant growth inhibition and biomass decrease tomato, and red spinach in a concentration-dependent manner.

3.3.3 Graphene in plants—phytotoxicity

Graphene showed toxic effects on terrestrial plants of cabbage, tomato, and red spinach in a concentration-dependent manner, resulting in significant growth inhibition and biomass decrease mediated by the overproduction of ROS [129]. Likewise, GO demonstrated negative effects on the growth of wheat plants, which significantly caused root elongation, impairment of hair production, inhibition of photosynthesis and imbalance of nutrient homeostasis after 30 days of culture [130]. Interestingly, under normal levels, GO exposure did not induce obvious toxicity on Arabidopsis plants in seed germination, shoot and root development of seedlings, and flowering time. GO did not accumulated in mesophyll and parenchyma cells [131, 132]. However, under drought or salt stress conditions, it influenced the development of the seedlings, and induced the translocation of GO from the roots to the leaves [131]. In another study, it was found that GO accumulated in the root at 112 g/g after 15 days using 13C-stable labeling of the C-skeleton, which inhibited the growth of wheat, altered root structure and cellular ultrastructure [133].

3.4 Toxicological concerns of graphene

Similar to other inorganic nanomaterials, graphene has also been challenged by toxicological concerns in regard to its potential biomedical applications. There are several inevitable issues should be taken into account in graphene toxicology, such as valid amount, toxicity criteria, irreversible/reversible toxic effect, and joint toxicity. First of all, the target dose is a direct and valid concentration in the biological response studies in the detailed experiments; unfortunately, numerous studies have used exposure dose to represent concentration-bioreponse relationships, which resulted in a false relevance for cytotoxic effects. On the other hand, current acceptance criteria for toxicity tests are unknown. In spite of certain inconsistencies in some experimental results and hypotheses of the toxicity mechanisms, a wealth of reports agree that physicochemical properties of graphene-based nanomaterials significantly affect the toxicological responses, such as sizes, charges, coatings, and structural defects of graphene. To compare the nanotoxicity obtained under different conditions, an acceptance criterion for toxicity tests, including choice of statistical assumptions, statistical procedures, or set of experimental conditions, is necessary. Also, a long-term test upon multiple administrations to evaluate the risks of graphene is lacking. Despite many studies reported in vivo behaviors, the irreversible/reversible toxic effects of graphene are unclear because the acute toxic assays often ignored the reversible or delayed effects upon target organs. Last but not least, the literatures have been reported that joint toxicity is greatly different from single toxicity [134, 135]. Synergistic effects can occur between metal ions, organic materials, or biomolecules with graphene. And so the concern of joint toxicity should be paid enough attention, avoiding overestimation or underestimation the graphene toxicity.

4 Applications

Based on their inherent antibacterial properties, as well as superior physiochemical properties, graphene-based nanomaterials have been employed as a novel and green antibacterial material, as well as other applications in the fields of wound addressing, tissue engineering scaffolds, drug delivery, and water purification. In this section, we will give an overview of recent achievements and advancements wherein graphene-based nanocomposites have been applied.

4.1 Antibacterial applications of graphene-based nanomaterials

Bacterial infection is one of the worldwide public health concerns, particularly in poor regions and income countries. Despite antibiotics are widely used as effective antibacterial agent, bacterial resistance makes it difficult to therapy the infection. To address this issue, novel antibacterial agents, like CNTs, metal/metal oxide NPs, have been investigated. In recent years, due to the inherent bacterial toxicity and negligible cytotoxicity, considerable efforts have been devoted to exploring antimicrobial activities of graphene-based nanomaterials, involving two forms: pristine graphene family and graphene-based composites.

4.1.1 Antibacterial activities of graphene and its derivatives

Pristine graphene family mainly contains graphene, GO and rGO,
whose antibacterial activities are caused by physical damages or chemical effects. Huang and Fan et al. [136] first reported the antibacterial activity of GO and rGO nanosheets (Fig. 6(a)). After treatment with 85 g/mL GO/rGO for 2 h, the growth of \( E. coli \) was almost completely suppressed, with a viability loss up to > 90%. Moreover, macroscopic freestanding GO/rGO paper made by vacuum filtration also exhibited the superior antibacterial effect, which could open up new opportunities for developing antibacterial material. Akhavan et al. [137] studied the bacterial toxicity of graphene nanowalls (GONWs) prepared by electrophoretic deposition (EPD) and reduced graphene nanowalls (RGNWs) obtained by hydrazine reduction. Both GONWs and RGNWs exhibited bacterial cytotoxicity to Gram-negative \( E. Coli \) bacteria and Gram-positive \( Staphylococcus aureus \) (S. aureus) bacteria. In particular, RGNWs exhibited higher antibacterial activity than GONW because of more sharp edges of the nanowalls leading to more cell membrane damage of the bacteria (Fig. 6(b)). Chen and co-workers [138] compared the bacterial toxicity of graphite (Gt), graphite oxide (GtO), GO and rGO using \( E. coli \) as a bacterial model. Under the same conditions, GO exhibited the highest antibacterial activities, followed by rGO, graphite, and GtO (Fig. 6(c)). Besides the antibacterial activities described above, the investigations of GO against dental pathogens has also been reported by Tang et al. [139]. Three typical dental bacterial, including \( S. mutans, P. gingivalis \) and \( E. nucleatum \), were chosen to estimate the bacterial toxicity of nGO sheets. It was clearly confirmed that GO showed prominent antibacterial effect toward dental bacterial by using 3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyl tetrazolium bromide (MTT) reduced assay, colony forming units.

Figure 6  Antibacterial activities of graphene-based nanomaterials. (a) Antibacterial activities of GO and rGO sheets and papers. Top: schematics showing antibacterial activities of GO and rGO against \( E. coli \); middle: AFM image of GO nanosheets, TEM image of \( E. coli \) treated with GO nanosheets, and loss of \( E. coli \) cell viability incubated with GO and rGO nanosheets, and loss of \( E. coli \) cell viability; bottom: photograph of freestanding GO paper, and photograph and SEM image of \( E. coli \) growth on GO paper. (b) SEM image of GONWs prepared by EPD, and cytotoxicity of GONWs and RGNWs against \( E. coli \) and \( S. aureus \). (c) Top: antibacterial activity graphene-based nanomaterials (80 \( \mu \)g/mL) to \( E. coli \); bottom: different concentrations of GO and rGO after incubation with \( E. coli \) for 2 h. (d) Top: antibacterial activities of GO to three typical dental bacterial evaluated by MTT assay; bottom: live/dead fluorescent staining images showing that after 2 h treatment with isotonic saline (control) and GO of \( P. gingivalis \) cells. (e) A schematic representation of how surface curvature match affect the GQDs’ antimicrobial activities. (f) Schematic illustration of fabrication of graphene-AgNPs-Si nanohybrids as a SERS platform for molecular detection to bacterial capture, discrimination, and inactivation. (a)–(f) Adapted with permission from Refs. [136], [137], [138], [139], [143], and [153], © American Chemical Society 2010, 2010, 2011, 2015, 2016 and 2018, respectively.
Many factors related to the physicochemical properties of graphene-based material, such as lateral dimension, surface area, layer number, surface chemistry, and shape, can influence their antimicrobial effects. The size of GO sheet was a main factor influencing graphene's antibacterial activity. GO sheet with a larger size induced higher antibacterial activity than do smaller one [140, 141], either induced by direct insertion or cutting [137, 141] or lipid extraction of phospholipids [141] on treatment with graphene nanosheets. On the contrary, Elimelech et al. found that the cell inactivation of GO with surface coatings increased by 4 times as the average area of GO decreased from 0.65 to 0.01 m². It was mediated via oxidative mechanisms because of intensive defects in smaller GO sheets [142]. The source material and bacterial shape were also associated with antibacterial properties of graphene. It was reported that [143] GQDs prepared from GO sheets (GO-GQDs) did not show antibacterial ability, whereas GQDs synthesized by rupturing Co cage (Co-GQDs) could effectively eliminate S. aureus, but not other three bacteria, Bacillus subtilis (B. subtilis), E. coli, and Pseudomonas aeruginosa (P. aeruginosa). It seemed that surface Gaussian-curvature match between a GQD and a bacterium membrane might determine whether GQD cause the damaging the integrity of bacterial cell envelope (Fig. 6(e)). The doping of nitrogen (N) was considered to be a useful method to improve the properties of GQDs. A recent study showed that N-doped GQD could generate more ROS than N-free GQD, implying enhanced antibacterial activities [144]. Other than the intrinsic properties of graphene-based nanomaterials, studies also revealed GO killed bacteria in concentration- and time-dependent manners [140].

4.1.2 Antibacterial activities of graphene-based composites

It is well known that silver acts as an effective antibacterial agent for centuries. Ag+ treatment resulted in the detachment of cytoplasm membrane from the cell wall for E. coli and S. aureus and inactivated DNA replication and protein [145]. Gelatinous AgNPs with a diameter less than 10 nm effectively killed different Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria. Unfortunately, AgNPs aggregated when they directly interact with bacteria. To alleviate this issue, Ag-graphene nanocomposites have been synthesized via different reducing agents, like NaBH₄ [146], hydrazine [138], and dopamine [147], etc. As-prepared Ag-rGO nanohybrid displayed surface enhanced Raman scattering (SERS) and high disinfection activities [148, 149]. Ag-rGO nanocomposites also could be prepared without additional reducing agents, which showed enhanced antibacterial ability likely caused by the synergistic effect of “capturing-killing process”, but no tolerable edema and/or erythema in skin irritation test [150]. Tan et al. developed a new method by using DNA as a template to prepare metal NPs and GO composites with controllable size and shape [151, 152]. Among the as-synthesized nanocomposites, 20 ppm Ag(18nm)/dsDNA@GO and 16 ppm Ag(5nm)/dsDNA@GO composites showed optimal antimicrobial capability towards a model plant bacterium Xanthomonas axonopodis due to the synergistic effect between AgNPs and GO [151]. He et al. prepared graphene-AgNPs-Si nanohybrids (G@AgNPs@Si) as a multifunctional SERS platform, allowing for molecular to cellular detection. In particular, it was utilized for capturing, discriminating, and inactivating of E. coli and S. aureus bacteria with strong antibacterial rate of ~ 93% after incubation for 24 h (Fig. 6(f)) [153]. In addition, copper, gold and lanthanum has also been anchored on graphene to kill bacteria [154–156].

Titanium oxide (TiO₂) is an important and inexpensive photocatalytic material. The rGO/TiO₂ thin films as photocatalysts degraded E. coli bacterial under solar light irradiation. The reduction of GO for 4h maximally improved the antibacterial effect of bare TiO₂ films by approximate 7.5-fold [157]. GO-TiO₂ nanorod composites (NRCs) on the gram scale exhibited higher antibacterial activities against E. coli under simulated solar light irradiation than that of TiO₂ NRCs, which was ascribed to the anti-charge recombination and increased (101) facets [158]. The flexible hybrid films comprising of free standing graphene strongly coupled with Ti nanosheets showed almost complete sterilization of E. coli within only 15 min [159].

The poor dispersibility and processability of graphene limit its application in bacteria disinfection. To address these challenges, dispersible polymer-graphene hybrids have been formed via π-π stacking interaction formed between them by embedding graphene into polymer matrix. Rodrigues and co-workers [160] fabricated an antimicrobial film containing PVK polymer and GO on ITO surface. The resulting film was 90% more effective in inactivating E. coli bacterial colonization, in which the inclusion of PVK led to the enhanced bacterial toxicity. PLL as a polycationic homopolymer facilitates the attachment and immobilization cells on solid substrate. Lee et al. [161] prepared various graphene-PLL composites through electrostatic interactions and covalent bonding between PLL and GO/rGO sheets. Among the as-prepared composites, graphene-DS-PLL composed of 4-carboxylic acid benzene diazonium salt (DS) showed the most effective antibacterial behavior given the production of carboxylic acid groups, while improving the growth of human cell.

4.1.3 Mechanisms of antibacterial activities of graphene-based nanomaterials

Despite increasing number of experimental results, however, there is no identical mechanism on how graphene-based nanomaterials cause bacterial inactivation, which may be related to the inconsistent physicochemical properties of graphene-based nanomaterials and experimental surroundings. According to recent achievements, several predominant mechanisms have been proposed to explain the graphene-based nanomaterial’s antimicrobial behavior, that is, the membrane damage hypothesis, the oxidative stress hypothesis, the wrapping or trapping hypothesis, and other mechanisms.

The membrane damage hypothesis. Several studies have demonstrated that the sharp edges of graphene-based nanomaterials, also called “nano-knives”, “cutters”, or “blades” could penetrate into and physically damage the cell membrane of bacteria, resulting in the leakage of intracellular materials and eventual cell death. The mechanism is sometimes mentioned as insertion or penetration mode, which could induce membrane stress and thus inactive microorganisms documented in experimental studies and theoretical simulations.

Akhavan and Ghaderi [137] first proposed that the bacterial cell membrane was effectively damaged by direct contact interaction with extremely sharp edges of the NWs, and subsequently leading to leakage of RNA and losing of cell vitality. Tu et al. [141] experimentally and theoretically studied how graphene and GO nanosheets cause the damage of E. coli within the outer and inner membranes. In the TEM experiments and MD simulations, it was both clearly observed two kinds of molecular mechanism: direct insertion/cutting mode and destructive lipid extraction mode (Fig. 7). The vigorous extraction of phospholipids from the lipid bilayers was first discovered in MD simulations, which was further verified by typical TEM images. The strong attraction between graphene and lipid molecules was mostly generated from unique 2D carbons with sp²-bonded structures, promoting unexpected strong dispersion interactions between them. Both insertion and extraction could cause severe membrane stress, leading to the degradation of the bacterial membrane and then the reduction of bacterial viability.

Similarly, the two basic modes of insertion/cutting and lipid
The availability of GO basal planes in the cytotoxicity against occupation could cause GO's deactivation against bacteria, suggesting molecules were noncovalently adsorbed on GO basal planes, the between the number of LB layers and bacterial inactivation. In another retained the antibacterial activity, exhibiting positive correlation sheets entirely deposited by Langmuir-Blodgett (LB) film still its bacterial disinfection. Advincula et al. [166] found that GO antibacterial mechanism that the basal planes of GO may determine upturned phospholipids with their tails direct contact with the were more freely to pierce through transmembrane, while larger Dallavelle et al. [165]. They reported that smaller graphene sheets driving force. The inconsistent modes, however, were proposed by graphene and cell membrane. Yi and Gao [164] found that graphene sheets in a size-dependent manner would adopt a near-perpendicular configuration or a parallel attachment onto a membrane surface, where the membrane splay and tension energies acted as the main driving force. The inconsistent modes, however, were proposed by graphene sheets were more freely to pierce through transmembrane, while larger ones lay mainly flat on the surface of bilayers where wreak havoc was created with lipophilic membranes and formed a patch of upturned phospholipids with their tails direct contact with the graphene sheet. However, some other findings [166, 167] proposed different antibacterial mechanism that the basal planes of GO may determine its bacterial disinfection. Advincula et al. [166] found that GO sheets entirely deposited by Langmuir-Blodgett (LB) film still retained the antibacterial activity, exhibiting positive correlation between the number of LB layers and bacterial inactivation. In another study [167], when bovine serum albumin (BSA) or tryptophan (Trp) molecules were noncovalently adsorbed on GO basal planes, the occupation could cause GO's deactivation against bacteria, suggesting the availability of GO basal planes in the cytotoxicity against bacteria. Recently, Haag et al. [168] confirmed that the antimicrobial property of graphene was very relevant to both its sharp edges, basal planes and tight agglomeration by studying the interactions between functionalized graphene derivatives and bacteria.

The oxidative stress hypothesis. Graphene-induced oxidative stress has been proposed as another widely recognized mechanism for antimicrobial activities of graphene-based nanomaterials, which is comparable to that of other carbon-based materials, such as CNTs and fullerene with similar structural and physiochemical properties [103, 169, 170]. Generally, there are two pathways for the production of oxidative stress: ROS-dependent and ROS-independent mechanism. The former arises from the elevated intracellular ROS levels, while the latter brings about damage or oxidation of cellular structure through electron transfer. Oxidative stress can disturb microbial metabolism and destroy cellular functions, resulting in the loss of cell integrity and eventually leading to cell death.

ROS-dependent pathway occurs via the excess accumulation of ROS, including hydrogen peroxide(H2O2), hydroxyl radicals (OH'), superoxide anions (O2•−), or singlet molecular oxygen ('O2). The elevated ROS level makes cell reach an oxidative state, and further lead to the damage or inactivation to cellular substrates, e.g., proteins, DNA, and lipids, followed by dysfunction of the mitochondria, disintegration of cell membrane, and ultimate cell death by apoptosis or necrosis [171]. In the ROS-dependent pathway, antioxidant compounds, like glutathione (GSH), N-acetylcysteine (NAC) [172], α-tocopherol [173], and dichlorodihydrofluorescein diacetate [103, 174] can be oxidized in the presence of ROS and act as intracellular redox state indicator, whose depletion suggests the antibacterial effect of oxidative stress against bacteria. Kim's group [172] measured the levels of ROS in P. aeruginosa cells treated by GO and rGO, which were 3.8- and 2.7-fold higher than that in untreated cells, respectively. It was demonstrated that pretreated cells with the antioxidant GSH or NAC reduced the levels of ROS derived from GO or rGO, implying that cell death is mediated with ROS generation. They further observed a remarkable higher production of O2•− by GO or rGO, directly verifying the toxicity of ROS against E. coli [175].

Lipid peroxidation is an important oxidative pathway initiated by ROS-mediated oxidation of lipid molecules, which proceeds by a free radical chain reaction mechanism. In lipid peroxidation, lipid peroxide radicals are further formed to propagate the oxidative damage through the membrane. Kim and co-workers [176] found the ultrasound-induced lipid peroxidation was enhanced by 117% and 109% after treatment with 10 and 5 μg·mL−1 of graphene, respectively. Elimelech et al. [142] reported that preincubated bacterial cells with a lipid-soluble antioxidant α-tocopherol, reduced the antimicrobial effect of GO sheets, indicating that oxidative stress served as a crucial factor in GO-induced cell inactivation. Moreover, the cytotoxicity of graphene was proven to be effected by mitochondrial membrane depolarization. Chen et al. [111] evaluated the cytotoxicity and the related signaling pathways of graphene in murine RAW 264.7 macrophages. After exposure of cells to graphene, the inactivation of bacteria is generated by the loss of MMP and the accumulation of ROS, followed by triggering apoptosis through activation of the mitochondrial pathway.

Besides ROS-mediated damage, the other possible pathway is ROS-independent oxidative stress against bacteria, in which antimicrobial behaviors stem from graphene by disruption or oxidation of cell architecture or component without ROS production. This behavior was previously observed in fullerene (C60)-exposed bacteria, where C60 acted as an oxidant and exerted ROS-independent oxidative stress against bacteria [169, 177]. Liu et al. [138] observed no detectable levels of O2•− in antibacterial activity, indicating that graphene-based nanomaterials mediated little ROS production. They later used Ellman's assay to evaluate the oxidation of GSH and indirectly verified that graphene-based nanomaterials possessed the capacity of mediating ROS-independent oxidative stress against...
bacteria.

Li et al. [178] represented a controversial view that the antibacterial activity of graphene does not arise from ROS-dependent damage but through electron transfer interaction between cell membrane and graphene. They found that graphene films deposited on Cu and Ge could inhibit the bacterial growth, whereas no obvious membrane damage was observed by graphene on SiO2. An electron transfer theory was proposed to explain the phenomena. A circuit for electron transfer was formed, where the electrons were easily transferred from bacterial membrane to graphene film and then to the conductor Cu or semiconductor Ge substrate, while the electrons could not be transferred to insulator SiO2 substrate. Consequently, the graphene-on-substrate junctions could serve as an electron pump for both Cu and Ge substrates, in which the electrons are quickly and potently extracted away from the bacterial membrane under the negative membrane potential, eventually leading to the destroy of membrane integrity and the loss of cell viability.

The wrapping or trapping hypothesis. Owing to its unique flexible 2D lateral nanostructure and the thinnest film, wrapping or trapping bacterial membranes has been regarded as the third mechanism of the antibacterial action. Rodrigues's group [179] found PVK-GO nanocomposite displayed excellent antibacterial behaviors through encapsulating the bacterial cells, resulting in reduced metabolic activity and inhibited bacterial growth. With slight difference, some researchers found that wrapping of bacteria could partly cause bacterial structural damage. Han's group [180] demonstrated that GO interwound or enveloped pathogens using an intact and relatively smooth cell wall or membrane. They further observed MMP changes and thus confirmed that GO could induce partly structural damages of pathogens via membrane depolarization, finally causing the bacterial death. Similarly, another study [181] found that 3D porous GO membrane could kill S. aureus through mechanical wrapping, disrupting and damaging cell membranes, and ultimate cell lysis. Akhavan et al. [182] proposed E. coli chemically reduced GO sheet could trap within the aggregated sheets, which biologically disconnected the bacteria from suspension and inactivated their proliferation.

Other mechanisms. Besides the mechanisms described above, there are some other viewpoints have been established, including extraction of lipid bilayers, interference of protein-protein interactions, etc. Recent experiments and simulations [141] showed that graphene's sp² hybridized 2D carbon architecture has strong interaction with membrane lipids. As a consequence, graphene nanosheets could vigorously extract large amounts of phospholipids from the lipid bilayers, causing a deformation of the membrane and thus leading to the loss of membrane integrity. Luan et al. used large-scale all-atom MD simulations [183] to study the potential toxicity of graphene to cell functions. They found the insertion of graphene into the protein-protein interface could destabilize hydrophobic protein-protein interaction. The separated protein complexes destroyed cell's function and induced ultimate cell death, which agreed well with previous findings of the genotoxicity of CNTs to DNA [103].

4.2 Other applications

4.2.1 Wound addressing

If skins are damaged, microbes are liable to invade easily and formed severe wound infection. Commercially available wound dressing, like cotton wool, natural or synthetic bandages and gauzes, is important for an early stage of wound healing; however, they easily adhere onto wound surfaces and cause trauma to the healing wound. To overcome this issue, graphene-based nanocomposites in the form of fiber or hydrogel have recently emerged as promising candidates for wound dressing applications.

Fan's group [184] prepared GO-based antibacterial cotton fabrics via three ways, including direct adsorption, radiation-induced crosslinking, and chemical crosslinking. These GO-containing fabrics exhibited strong antibacterial behaviors and could kill 98% of bacteria (Fig. 8(a)). Also importantly, these Cotton-GO fabrics could keep a high inactivation efficiency of more than 90% even after being washed 100 times, as well as cause no irritation to wounded skin. The flexible, foldable and reusable cotton-GO fabrics provided a good prospect for potential antibacterial applications. Karimi et al. [185] developed electroconductive and self-cleaning graphene/TiO₂ nanocomposite-coated fabrics. Those fabrics exhibited excellent antimicrobial action toward S. aureus and E. coli and antifungal activity toward Candida albicans (C. albicans) with no cytotoxicity. Wang and co-workers [186] prepared a series of Ag/graphene composites with acrylic acid and N,N'-methylene bisacrylamide with different mass ratios. The Ag/graphene composite hydrogel with an optimal mass ratio at 5:1 (Ag5G1) possessed highest swelling ratio. Most significantly, it could accelerate the healing rate of skin wounds of rats and successfully reconstruct complete and thickened epidermis on the wounds after 15-day treatment. Yang and Lin et al. [187] developed a Ag-based bactericide by anchoring sunlight-driven ultrafine Ag/AgCl NPs on rGO (Ag/AgCl/rGO), which could promote the regeneration of epidermis in burn wound healing. Lu et al. [188] used electrospinning to fabricate chitosan-PVA nanofibers for wound healing.

4.2.2 Drug delivery

Graphene is an ideal candidate for drug delivery because of its large surface area, abundant surface chemistry, specific geometry with double side and high-efficiency loading capacity. Dai's group [189] developed pegylated nGO (NGO-PEG) sheets with intrinsic photoluminescence (PL) by conjugating anti-CD20 antibody Rituxan. Chemotherapy drug doxorubicin (DOX) was loaded onto NGO-PEG-Rituxan via π-stacking interaction for in vitro selective killing of cancer cells. Himanshu et al. [190] studied the loading and releasing behavior of bactericidal aminoglycoside antibiotic, gentamicin sulfate from a nanohybrid aggregates for controlled released of DOX [196]. In further studies, they reported a GQD-based therapeutic agent with DOX loading and Cy dye conjugation via a cathepsin D-responsive peptide (DOX@GQD-P-Cy) for drug delivery, release and response both in vitro and in vivo. After treatment by DOX@GQD-P-Cy, tumor size was reduced to about 1/3 that of free DOX. In addition, the agents were used as fluorescent probes for tracking of cell apoptosis induction and real-time evaluation (Fig. 8(b)). Gu et al. developed a cellular protease-mediated graphene-based co-delivery nanosystem incorporating a cell-membrane-targeted anticancer protein and a chemotherapeutic agent for cancer treatment [195]. In further studies, they reported an ATP-responsive anticancer drug delivery system using DNA-graphene nanohybrid aggregates for controlled released of DOX [196].
4.2.3 Water disinfection

Nearly 750 million people around the world have little or zero access to safe drinking water, especially, after natural disasters or in poor urban areas where water disinfection infrastructure is in scarcity. Thus, pathogen-contaminated water leads to millions of deaths every year. Therefore, effective and nontoxic water disinfection nanomaterials is in great demand to kill a broad spectrum of pathogenic microbes. GO-based nanomaterials provide an effective solution for the development of new technologies of water disinfection.

Zhang’s group [197] synthesized a 3D Ag/rGO hydrogel through a hydrothermal method, in which the porous rGO network acted as a support for dispersed AgNPs. When the water flowed through Ag/rGO hydrogel, more than 97% of viable E. coli cells were killed owing to membrane damage caused by both AgNPs and rGO nanosheets. For real lake and creek water, the Ag/rGO hydrogel could efficiently inactivate more than 94% E. coli cells as well as around 99% of coliforms (Fig. 8(c)), which implies its usage for point-of-use water disinfection application. Recently, the same group co-decorated highly dispersed TiO2 and carbon dots (C-dots) [198] or WO3 nanorods [199] on rGO, and the two ternary nanocomposites showed enhanced photocatalytic activity for inactivation of E. coli via electron transfer mechanism. Ray’s group [200] developed a PGLa antimicrobial peptide and glutathione conjugated CNT bridged 3D porous GO membrane, which could capture and inactive E. coli bacteria via synergistic mechanism. Moreover, such membrane has the capability to simultaneously remove E. coli, As(III), As(V), and Pb(II) from river water sample. Srikanth et al. [201] fabricated Ag/Ag2O core/shell and Ag/Ag2O decorated multi-layered graphene (MLG) nanostructures with excellent adsorption capabilities to remove As(III) from water, as well as high antimicrobial ability against E. coli and S. aureus. Wang et al. [202] reported an activated carbon (AC) electrode coated with graphene oxide-graft-quantemrized chitosan (GO-QC) through capacitive deionization disinfection (CDID). It was found that GO-QC/AC CDID electrode could kill at least 99.9999% of E. coli and be easily regenerated in continuous water through the CDID cell, but showed no observable contamination to the water.
5 Perspectives and conclusions

This report summarized various intriguing properties of graphene-based nanomaterials in biosystems. It highlighted the recent research advances in the preparation and exploration of graphene and its derivatives, the extracellular interactions between graphene and biomacromolecules, the cytotoxicity of graphene, in vivo toxicological effects of graphene, as well as their biological applications in antibacterial activities, wound addressing, water purification and drug delivery.

Despite the achievements, there still remains some challenges and difficulties in studies on graphene-based nanomaterials in biosystems. One of the major challenges is understanding the mechanism about the antibacterial activity of graphene and its derivatives. Several studies claimed that GO had little antimicrobial properties; however, most findings gave a controversial view in supporting antibacterial behavior of graphene and its derivatives. In addition, the mechanism and influencing factor of the antibacterial activities of graphene-based nanomaterials have not been fully understood so far. It is still under debate that whether the lateral size, or basal planes, or oxygen content of graphene-based nanomaterials supports its antibacterial activity. Although many findings claimed that graphene-based nanomaterials produced oxidative damage in the antimicrobial activities, unfortunately, it is still questionable whether graphene-based nanomaterials act as direct oxidants or charge transfer mediators, or generate ROS-mediated oxidative stress. Thus, it is worthy of a further investigation to obtain a thorough understanding of the related mechanisms and influencing factors of its antimicrobial activities.

As graphene-based nanomaterials are applied in a wide range of fields, the directly or indirectly cytotoxicity of graphene has drawn great attention about human health and ecosystem risks. Although a great many studies of graphene toxicity have been reported, it is still unclear whether graphene-based nanomaterials affect normal mammalian cells when they kill microorganisms. Due to lack of certain inconsistencies in detailed results and hypotheses of the mechanisms, establishing universal acceptance criteria for toxicity tests is necessary but has not yet been set up. Additionally, a better understanding of the mechanism of graphene toxicity needs further elaboration in future, which might circumvent the problems and find appropriate ways to realize the biocompatibility of graphene.
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