# Amino Acid Based Gallium-68 Chelators Capable of Radiolabeling at Neutral pH

Thomas W. Price,<sup>a,b</sup> Juan Gallo,<sup>c</sup> Vojtěch Kubíček,<sup>d</sup> Zuzana Böhmová,<sup>d</sup> Timothy J. Prior,<sup>e</sup> John Greenman,<sup>a</sup> Petr Hermann,<sup>d</sup> and Graeme J. Stasiuk<sup>ab\*</sup>

- <sup>a</sup> School of Life Sciences, Department of Biomedical Sciences, University of Hull, Cottingham Road, Hull, UK, HU6 7RX
- <sup>b</sup> Positron Emission Tomography Research Centre, University of Hull, Cottingham Road, Hull, UK, HU6 7RX
- Advanced (magnetic) Theranostic Nanostructures Lab, International Iberian
   Nanotechnology Laboratory, Av. Mestre José Veiga s/n 4715-330 Braga, Portugal
- <sup>d</sup> Faculty of Science, Charles University, Hlavova 2030, 12840, Prague 2, Czech Republic
- <sup>e</sup> Chemistry, School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, University of Hull, Cottingham Road, Hull, UK, HU6 7RX
- \* E-mail: g.stasiuk@hull.ac.uk

1.1	Ligands	3
1.2	Complexes	5
1.3	Radio-HPLC	12
1.4	Radio-TLC	13
1.5	Specific Activity	14
1.6	Radiolabelling of standard ch	elates
	16	

1.7	Stability to transferrin	17
2. NM	R Data	21
3. Cry	stal Data	24
3.1	H <sub>4</sub> Dpaa.ga crystals structure	24
3.2	GaDpaa crystal structure	26
3.3	GaDpaa.ga crystal structure	28





## 1.1 Ligands

**Table S 1**: Overall protonation constants ( $\beta_{hlm}$ ) for ligands (T = 25 °C, I = 0.1 M (NMe<sub>4</sub>)Cl)

 $H_3$ Dpaa  $H_3$ Dpaa.dab  $H_4$ Dpaa.ga

HL	7.38(2)	11.35(1)	7.17(1)
$H_2L$	11.11(2)	16.74(2)	11.84(2)
$H_3L$	13.93(2)	20.51(3)	15.76(2)
$H_4L$	-	23.20(3)	18.51(2)



**Figure S 2**: Speciation diagrams of ligands A) H<sub>3</sub>Dpaa B) H<sub>3</sub>Dpaa.dab C) H<sub>4</sub>Dpaa.ga. ( $T = 25 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ , I = 0.1 M (NMe<sub>4</sub>)Cl, [L] = 0.004 M).

#### 1.2 Complexes

Equilibrium (Charges are omitted)	H₃Dpaa			H₃Dpaa.dab			H₄Dpaa.ga		
	Ga(III) <sup>[a,b]</sup>	Cu(II) <sup>[a]</sup>	Zn(II) <sup>[a]</sup>	Ga(III) <sup>[a]</sup>	Cu(II) <sup>[a, c]</sup>	Zn(II) <sup>[a,c]</sup>	Ga(III) <sup>[a]</sup>	Cu(II) <sup>[a,c]</sup>	Zn(II) <sup>[a,c]</sup>
M + L ⇔[M(L)]	18.53	10.85	11.93	22.08	19.1	15.8	18.36	14.52	13.38
[M(HL)] ↔ [M(L)] + H	1.0	3.38	2.33	5.40	5.0	6.8	4.04	4.54	4.65
$[M(H_2L)] \leftrightarrow$ [M(HL)] + H	-	-	-		2.8	1.8	-	3.10	1.77
$[M(L)] + H_2O$ $\Leftrightarrow$ [M(L)(OH)] + H	4.41	9.86	11.27	[C]	12.5	12.2	5.27	10.52	12.24
$\begin{array}{l} [M(L)(OH)] \ + \\ H_2O & \longleftrightarrow \\ [M(L)(OH)_2] \ + \\ H \end{array}$	9.63	12.00	-	[c]	-	-	-	-	-

Table S 2: Equilibrium constants (*logK*) obtained for complexes

<sup>[a]</sup> Determined by potentiometric titration ([L] = [M] = 0.004 M, T = 25 °C, I = 0.1 M (NMe<sub>4</sub>)Cl), <sup>[b]</sup> Determined by UV-VIS titration ([L] = [M] = 0.1 mM, T = 25 °C, pH = 2-7)<sup>c]</sup> Determined by UV-VIS titration [L] = [M] = 0.01 mM, T = 25 °C, pH = 0-2)

**Table S 3**: Overall stability constants,  $log\beta_{hlm_1}$  of the complexes. (T = 25 eC, I = 0.1 M (NMe<sub>4</sub>)Cl). Charges are omitted.

Ligand		H₃Dpaa			H₃Dpaa.dab			H₄Dpaa.ga	
Metal	Ga(III) <sup>[a,b]</sup>	Cu(II) <sup>[a]</sup>	Zn(II) <sup>[a]</sup>	Ga(III) <sup>[a]</sup>	Cu(II) <sup>[a,c]</sup>	Zn(II) <sup>[a,c]</sup>	Ga(III)	Cu(II) <sup>[a, c]</sup>	Zn(II) <sup>[a, c]</sup>
[M(L)]	18.53(5)	10.85(1)	11.93(3)	22.08(1)	19.1(1)	15.8(1)	18.36(3)	14.52(7)	13.38(7)
[M(HL)]	19.5(2)	14.23(1)	14.26(4)	27.48(2)	24.1(1)	22.6(1)	22.40(3)	19.06(7)	18.03(7)
[M(H <sub>2</sub> L)]	-	-	-		26.9(1)	24.3(1)	-	22.16(7)	19.80(8)
[M(L)(OH)]	14.12(2)	0.99(2)	0.66(3)		6.6(1)	3.6(1)	13.09(1)	4.00(7)	1.14(7)
[M(L)(OH) <sub>2</sub> ]	4.49(8)	-11.01(2)	-	а	-	-			

<sup>[a]</sup> Determined by potentiometric titration ([L] = [M] = 0.004 M, T = 25 °C, I = 0.1 M (NMe<sub>4</sub>)Cl), <sup>[b]</sup> Determined by UV-VIS titration ([L] = [M] = 0.1 mM, T = 25 °C, pH = 2-7) <sup>[c]</sup> Determined by UV-VIS titration ([L] = [M] = 0.01 mM, T = 25 °C, pH = 0-2)



Figure S 3: Speciation diagram for Metal –  $H_3Dpaa$  systems. A) Ga(III), B) Cu(II), C) Zn(II) ( $T = 25 \text{ }^{\circ}C$ ,  $I = 0.1 \text{ }^{\circ}M$  (NMe<sub>4</sub>)Cl, [L] = [M] =0.004 M)



**Figure S 4** : UV-Vis titration of GaDpaa: UV-VIS titration (A) of Ga(III)-H<sub>3</sub>Dpaa, difference of absorbance  $\Delta A = A_{216 nm} - A_{270}$ <sub>nm</sub> was used to evaluate results, the line corresponds to the best fits. The corresponding UV-VIS spectra (B) of Ga(III)-H<sub>3</sub>Dpaa system.(T = 25 °C, [L] = [M] =0.1 mM.)



Figure S 5: Speciation diagram for Metal –  $H_3Dpaa.dab$  systems. C) Ga(III) A) Cu(II), B) Zn(II) ( $T = 25 \text{ }^{\circ}C$ , I = 0.1 M (NMe<sub>4</sub>)Cl, [L] = [M] =0.1 mM.)



**Figure S 6**: UV-VIS titration at 220 nm (A) of Cu(II)-H<sub>3</sub>Dpaa.dab (red) and Zn(II)- H<sub>3</sub>Dpaa.dab (green), the lines correspond to the best fits. The corresponding UV-VIS spectra (B) of H<sub>3</sub>Dpaa.dab (blue), Cu(II)- H<sub>3</sub>Dpaa.dab (red) and Zn(II)- H<sub>3</sub>Dpaa.dab (green) at pH = 2.



Figure S 7: Speciation diagram for Metal – H<sub>4</sub>Dpaa.ga systems. A) Ga(III), B) Cu(II), C) Zn(II) (T = 25 °C, I = 0.1 M (NMe<sub>4</sub>)Cl, [L] = [M] =0.004 M).



**Figure S 8**: UV-VIS titration at 220 nm (A) of Cu(II)-H<sub>4</sub>Dpaa.ga (red) and Zn(II)- H<sub>4</sub>Dpaa.ga (green), the lines correspond to the best fits. The corresponding UV-VIS spectra (B) of H<sub>4</sub>Dpaa.ga (blue), Cu(II)- H<sub>4</sub>Dpaa.ga (red) and Zn(II)- H<sub>4</sub>Dpaa.ga (green) at pH = 2. ( $T = 25 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ , [L] = [M] =0.01 mM



**Figure S 9**: HPLC traces of A) <sup>68</sup>Ga, B,C,D) radiolabeling mixtures containing <sup>68</sup>Ga and B) H<sub>3</sub>Dpaa C) H<sub>3</sub>Dpaa.dab, D) H<sub>4</sub>Dpaa.ga. ([L] = 100  $\mu$ M, pH = 7.4, *I* = PBS, *T* = 37.7 °C, *t* = 5 minutes)



**Figure S 10**: Radio-TLC of a) <sup>68</sup>GaCl<sub>3</sub>, b) <sup>68</sup>GaCl<sub>3</sub> + H<sub>3</sub>Dpaa, b) <sup>68</sup>GaCl<sub>3</sub> + H<sub>3</sub>Dpaa.dab, D) <sup>68</sup>GaCl<sub>3</sub> + H<sub>4</sub>Dpaa.ga. [L] = 100  $\mu$ M, *I* = PBS, *T* = 37.5 °C, *t* = 15 mins.



Figure S 11: Semi-preparative HPLC chromatogram for the purification of <sup>68</sup>GaDpaa. A) Radio-HPLC trace. B) UV-HPLC trace



Figure S 12: Semi-preparative HPLC chromatogram for the purification of <sup>68</sup>GaDpaa.dab. A) Radio-HPLC trace. B) UV-HPLC trace



Figure S 13: Semi-preparative HPLC chromatogram for the purification of <sup>68</sup>GaDpaa.ga. A) Radio-HPLC trace. B) UV-HPLC trace

#### **1.6 Radiolabelling of standard chelates**

**Table S 4**: Radiochemical yields (RCY) of standard chelators with  ${}^{68}$ Ga. (pH = 7.5, T = 25 °C, [L] = 100 uM, I = 0.1 M phosphate buffer)

Ligand	5 minutes	15 minutes
DOTA	0	0
NOTA	33	48
EDTA	95	95
ТНР	95	95



**Figure S 14**: Stability of GaDpaa to transferrin. A)  ${}^{68}$ GaCl<sub>3</sub> + H<sub>3</sub>Dpaa (I = 0.1 M aq. NaOAc, pH = 4.5, T = RT). B) A after incubation with transferrin for 1 hour, C) A after incubation with transferrin for 2 hours.





**Figure S 15:** Stability of radiolabelled complexes assessed by radio-TLC. A) Radiolabelling mixture containing 100  $\mu$ M H<sub>3</sub>Dpaa in PBS after 15 minutes incubation at 37 °C. B) Solution containing 100  $\mu$ L of radiolabelling mixture A and 1.5 mL FBS after incubation at 37 °C for 30 minutes. C) Radiolabelling mixture containing 100  $\mu$ M H<sub>3</sub>Dpaa.dab in PBS after 15

minutes incubation at 37 °C. D) Solution containing 100  $\mu$ L of radiolabelling mixture C and 1.5 mL FBS after incubation at 37 °C for 30 minutes. E) Radiolabelling mixture containing 100  $\mu$ M H<sub>4</sub>Dpaa.ga in PBS after 15 minutes incubation at 37 °C. F) Solution containing 100  $\mu$ L of radiolabelling mixture E and 1.5 mL FBS after incubation at 37 °C for 30 minutes.

#### 2. NMR Data



Figure S 17: <sup>1</sup>H NMR of [Ga(Dpaa)] in  $D_2O$  (pD = 8.8)



Figure S 19: <sup>1</sup>H NMR of [Ga(Dpaa.dab)] in  $D_2O$  (pD = 1.1)



Figure S 21: <sup>1</sup>H NMR of [Ga(Dpaa.ga)] in  $D_2O$  (pD = 6.0)

## 3. Crystal Data

#### **3.1** H<sub>4</sub>Dpaa.ga crystals structure



**Figure S 22:** ORTEP representation of H4Dpaa with atoms drawn as 50% probability ellipsoids. Small-scale disorder (C16a/C17a & C16b/C17b) was modelled using standard techniques.

Table S 5: Crystal data and structure refinement for  $\rm H_4Dpaa.ga$  .

Identification code	shelx	
Empirical formula	C19 H19 N3 O8	
Formula weight	417.37	
Temperature	150(2) К	
Wavelength	0.71073 Å	
Crystal system	Monoclinic	
Space group	P 2 <sub>1</sub> /n	
Unit cell dimensions	a = 7.0852(6) Å	a= 90°
	b = 32.290(4) Å	b= 94.108(7)°
	c = 7.6786(6) Å	g = 90°
Volume	1752.2(3) Å <sup>3</sup>	
Z	4	
Density (calculated)	1.582 Mg/m <sup>3</sup>	
Absorption coefficient	0.125 mm <sup>-1</sup>	
F(000)	872	
Crystal size	0.275 x 0.130 x 0.056 mm <sup>3</sup>	
Theta range for data collection	1.261 to 25.550°.	
	-8<=h<=8, -38<=k<=38, -	
Index ranges	9<=l<=9	
Reflections collected	9845	
Independent reflections	3229 [R(int) = 0.0571]	
Completeness to theta = 25.242°	99.90%	
Refinement method	Full-matrix least-squares on F2	
Data / restraints / parameters	3229 / 0 / 275	
Goodness-of-fit on F2	0.792	
Final R indices [I>2sigma(I)]	R1 = 0.0440, wR2 = 0.0727	
R indices (all data)	R1 = 0.1003, wR2 = 0.0804	
Extinction coefficient	n/a	
Largest diff. peak and hole	0.400 and -0.220 e.Å <sup>-3</sup>	

# 3.2 GaDpaa crystal structure



Figure S 23: ORTEP diagram of Ga.Dpaa with atoms drawn as 50 % thermal ellipsoids.

Table S 6: Crystal data and structure refinement for Ga.Dpaa

Identification code	Ga.Dpaa		
Empirical formula	C32 H40 Ga2 N6 O20		
Formula weight	968.14		
Temperature	100(2) К		
Wavelength	0.6889 Å		
Crystal system	Triclinic		
Space group	P -1		
Unit cell dimensions	a = 7.06810(10) Å a= 93.6180(10)°		
	b = 8.21920(10) Å b= 93.7920(10)°		
	c = 15.9952(2) Å g = 91.9130(10)°		
Volume	924.69(2) Å <sup>3</sup>		
Z	1		
Density (calculated)	1.739 Mg/m <sup>3</sup>		
Absorption coefficient	1.425 mm <sup>-1</sup>		
F(000)	496		
Crystal size	0.040 × 0.005 × 0.005 mm <sup>3</sup>		
Theta range for data			
collection	1.239 to 36.179°.		
Index ranges	$-11 \le h \le 12, -13 \le k \le 13, -27 \le l \le 27$		
Reflections collected	20701		
Independent reflections	8614 [R(int) = 0.0570]		
Completeness to theta =	22.402/		
24.415	99.40%		
Refinement method	Full-matrix least-squares on F2		
Data / restraints / parameters	8614 / 18 / 304		
Goodness-of-fit on F2	1.01		
Final R indices [I>2sigma(I)]	R1 = 0.0425, wR2 = 0.1063		
R indices (all data)	R1 = 0.0491, wR2 = 0.1099		
Extinction coefficient	none		
Largest diff. peak and hole	1.606 and -0.543 e.Å⁻³		

#### 3.3 GaDpaa.ga crystal structure



Figure S 24: ORTEP diagram of GaDpaa.ga with atoms drawn as 50 % thermal ellipoids.

The compound crystallises in the centric space group Pccn (Z = 8) with discrete complexes and unbound water molecules. Between the complexes there are C–H…O interactions and there is evidence for  $\pi$ … $\pi$  interactions between face-on pyridine rings. The complexes are arranged such that there are broad channels running parallel to the crystallographic –c-axis. Within these channels are located the unbound water molecules.

The structure presented above was determined using synchrotron radiation ( $\lambda = 0.6889$  Å) and a data collection that lasted 12 minutes in total. The structure determination confirms the chemical connectivity and the binding of gallium, although the fit parameters are only moderately good (R1 = 0.1133 for data with I > 2 $\sigma$ I). The crystal examined was found to suffer from damage in the X-ray beam; this causes a loss of intensity in the X-ray scattering and always leads to poor quality of fit of the model to data. Interestingly in this case, a total of 70 minutes X-ray scattering data were collected from one crystal and it is possible to refine the structure using all of the data (70 minutes). This gives a hint as to the mode of decomposition of the compound in the X-ray beam. The structure refined from all data is shown below.



**Figure S 25**: ORTEP representation of decomposed form of GaDpaa.ga. Hydrogen atoms have been omitted for clarity. Atoms are drawn at the 30% probability level.

The major portion of the ligand is unchanged, but two key changes are observed. There is loss of water (O5a/O5b) and the ligand starts to decompose. There is evidence that this decomposition involves loss of the arm containing unbound carboxylate and in particular with loss of  $CO_2$ . In the structure refinement the carboxylate O7-C19-O8 is 34 % occupied and C17&C18 are 58% occupied.

The decomposition of the ligand and loss of water is accompanied by fracture of the crystal and loss of scattered intensity.

 Table S 7: Crystal data and structure refinement for GaDpaa.ga. (12 minutes – limited decomposition)

Identification code	GaDpaa.ga		
Empirical formula	C19 H15 Ga N3 O12.87		
Formula weight	561.02		
Temperature	100(2) K		
Wavelength	0.6889 Å		
Crystal system	Orthorhombic		
Space group	Pccn		
Unit cell dimensions	a = 20.7850(12) Å	a= 90°	
	b = 30.2224(18) Å	b= 90°	
	c = 7.2085(6) Å	g = 90°	
Volume	4528.2(5) ų		
Z	8		
Density (calculated)	1.646 Mg/m <sup>3</sup>		
Absorption coefficient	1.186 mm <sup>-1</sup>		
F(000)	2272		
Crystal size	0.060 × 0.005 × 0.005 m	1m <sup>3</sup>	
Theta range for data			
collection	1.152 to 24.835°.		
Index ranges	$-18 \le h \le 25, -34 \le k \le 30$	6, -5 ≤ l ≤ 8	
Reflections collected	12211		
Independent reflections	4251 [R(int) = 0.2109]		
Completeness to theta =			
24.415°	98.70%		
Refinement method	Full-matrix least-square	s on F2	
Data / restraints / parameters	4251 / 0 / 324		
Goodness-of-fit on F2	1.009		
Final R indices [I>2sigma(I)]	R1 = 0.1133, wR2 = 0.2750		
R indices (all data)	R1 = 0.1749, wR2 = 0.3333		
Extinction coefficient	none		
Largest diff. peak and hole	2.429 and -1.265 e.Ă <sup>−3</sup>		