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# ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION 

Design and Synthesis of Novel Luciferin Architectures

By

Rachel Catherine Steinhardt

Doctor of Philosophy in Chemistry
University of California, Irvine, 2015
Professor Jennifer Prescher, Chair

Bioluminescence imaging using luciferase is a widely used technology. However, its scope is hampered by several limitations, most notably the lack of distinct luciferin-luciferase pairs suitable for multicomponent imaging. I addressed this problem by synthesizing novel luciferins which may be used by luciferase. Furthermore, I developed new techniques to evaluate whether a novel luciferin is intrinsically capable of emitting light.

## Chapter 1: Optical imaging of biological processes

### 1.1 Introduction

Technologies have emerged within the imaging community that enable the nondestructive, real-time observation of dynamic cellular movements in vivo. Among the most popular of these approaches involve optical reporters. Optical imaging tools are uniquely suited to visualize cellular communication in living organisms [1-5]. These tools produce visible light that can report on cell motions and other behaviors [6-8]. Visible light is desirable for many in vivo applications owing to its non-toxicity (and thus biocompatability). Wavelengths in the 380750 nm realm (UV-vis) have been used for decades in cell microscopy experiments and in vitrosame here, etc. assays to measure gene expression levels (Figure 1-1A). For imaging in live animals, though, more red-shifted light ( $>650 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) is desirable. These wavelengths are less prone to absorption and scatter by endogenous chromophores and light, and can pass through tissues to be detected by sensitive cameras [9,10]. Mammalian tissues themselves emit few endogenous photons. Thus, optical probes can selectively report on a variety of cellular features. These probes-and how they have been used to understand biological functions-are the focus of this chapter.
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Figure 1-1. Considerations for fluorescence imaging. (A) The electromagnetic spectrum, with the desired window for in vivo optical imaging highlighted. (B) Fluorescent probes require excitation energy to emit light. Upon irradiation, the probes are electronically excited; relaxation to the ground state results in photon emission. (C) Examples of common fluorescent probes used for biological imaging.

For imaging cell-cell communication in vivo, most optical agents can be categorized as fluorescent or bioluminescent probes. Fluorescent probes emit light following absorption of incident photons (Figure 1-1B), and can be further sub-divided into two classes: small molecules (fluorophores) and fluorescent proteins (FPs) (Figure 1-1C). The bulk of FPs contain an internal chromophore produced from native amino acids upon protein folding [11]. For some FPs, the emission spectra are broad enough to include wavelengths that can escape tissue. Pushing these emission wavelengths farther into the red region is important for improved sensitivity and biocompatability. Over the years, both targeted and random mutagenesis have been used to diversify the palette of florescent proteins [4,11-14]. Some fluorescent proteins now excite and emit light in the red/near-infrared regime and are broadly useful for noninvasive imaging in whole organisms.

A complementary set of optical imaging probes comprises bioluminescent enzymesubstrate pairs. Like fluorescence imaging, bioluminescence imaging (BLI) has been useful for examining cellular and biological features in live organisms. BLI relies on a class of enzymes (luciferases) that catalyze light emission using small molecules substrates (Figure 1-2). Several luciferase-luciferin pairs have been identified in nature. The most popular for in vivo imaging derive from the North American firefly, Photinus pyralis (Fluc) [3,15]. Fluc catalyzes the oxidation of the small molecule D-luciferin, and emits yellow-green light. Other well-known luciferases derive from marine organisms, including Renilla reniformis (Rluc) and Gaussia princeps (Gluc). These enzymes catalyze the release of blue-green light using the small molecule coelenterazine $[3,15]$. Continued efforts to identify new luciferase-luciferin pairs in nature, and engineer non-natural ones, will expand the bioluminescent palette. However, the variations in
wavelength are not as dramatic as those for fluorescent molecules and dyes. This has somewhat limited the applicability of BLI for multi-component imaging [2,3].


Figure 1-2. Common optical probes used in tracking cell communication and function. These include small molecule fluorophores, fluorescent proteins, and bioluminescent proteins (luciferases). Signature features of these probes are also listed.

### 1.2 Considerations for selecting an optical imaging modality

The photons produced by either fluorescent or bioluminescent probes must ultimately must be registered by a detector. Modern instrumentation offers a large linear range of photon detection, allowing very faint events to be visualized in concert with relatively bright ones [ 9,16$]$. In whole animal models, the number of photons reaching detector is influenced by overlying tissue and blood. Endogenous chromophores in these tissues and blood can both absorb and scatter light from the reporters. In general, the light reaching the detector falls off on a logarithmic scale with depth [9,10]. Transparent organisms avoid this problem; however, light penetration can be be limiting in studies that require mammalian tissues/organisms. In these latter cases, mathematical models can begin to deconvolute the diffusion of light within tissue. Based on these considerations, the ideal range for light transmission through tissue is in the near infrared range ( $650-\sim 950 \mathrm{~nm}$ ). Shorter wavelengths are absorbed by endogenous chromophores (melanin, hemoglobin, etc.) Longer wavelengths are absorbed by water.

Fluorescence microscopy can be reliably used to visualize cells over hundreds of micrometers, enabling studies of cell-to-cell contact in explanted tissues and small distances in live animals [17]. Fluorescence imaging over longer distances or depths remains difficult, though, owing to autofluorescence issues. Fluorescence microscopy also requires that investigators know where to look, that is, where and when to shine the excitation light [18]. The continued development of far-red emitting FPs is easing this requirement [19].

Imaging with bioluminescent probes, by contrast, does not rely on excitation light and can often be a better choice for imaging in thick tissues and animals. BLI has a very high signal-
to-noise ratio, due to virtually no photons being produced in mammalian tissue. The most commonly used luciferases (from the insect family) release light in the $600-650 \mathrm{~nm}$ range. While not absorbed well by hemoglobin, the wavelengths emitted are still subject to the diffusive effect of scattering that occurs as light descends deeper into tissue. The deeper the imaging source, the poorer the resolution. Thus BLI and noninvasive macroscopic imaging, in general, is a tradeoff between sensitivity and resolution.

The current depth limit of bioluminescence imaging (BLI) using firefly luciferaseluciferin is $\sim 1-2 \mathrm{~cm}$, and it is possible to use this technology without knowing the location of the imaging target a priori. BLI also requires an exogenous substrate and this can be limiting, based on cost and accessibility, as well as the bioavailability of the substrate. Bioluminescent probes are typically used for macroscale imaging in whole animals (due to low background signals), but are weak emitters. By contrast, fluorescent probes are more suitable for microscopic imaging owing to their requirement for excitation light. In fact, fluorescent and bioluminescent tools are often used in tandem to gain information across all length scales.

Optical reporters must often track with the cells of interest, requiring chemical or genetic "attachment" to the imaging target. Historically, small molecule fluorophores have been used to track cells for short-term imaging. These tools span a large spectrum of excitation and emission wavelength combinations [20]. For reasons mentioned above, those fluorophores whose excitation and emission wavelengths occur in the NIR tissue transmission window are particularly useful for in vivo imaging [21-23]. In addition to the traditional small organic molecules, fluorescent nanoparticles [24-26] and quantum dots [26,27] may also be used for in vivo imaging applications. Collectively, these tools can be appended covalently or non-
covalently (DiI, DiR, etc.) to cell surfaces. For cell-targeting probes, the dyes are often attached to antibodies via bioconjugation chemistries [28,29].

When the reporter probe needs to be used for long-term, serial tracking, genetic "attachment" is often more desirable. Genes encoding fluorescent or bioluminescent proteins can be incorporated into cells and animals, and the optical signatures of their encoded proteins can can "report" on desired biological process. Such genetic strategies can be used to mark cells or proteins for long-term visualization and monitor molecular events. Importantly, genetic tags propagate with cell division, providing stable sources of signal for longitudinal studies [30,31]. Genetic reporters can also be cloned into promoter regions of genes [32]. In these cases, the level of reporter produced parallels the transcription of the native gene. Several transgenic mice expressing these reporters are also readily available from commercial vendors.

### 1.3 Examples of cell communication with microscopic optical imaging tools

Cells exchange information via direct cell contacts and secreted small molecules. One of the most complex systems of cellular information exchange comprises immune function. Cellcell contacts are required for basic immune function, including pathogen clearance mechanisms. Breakdowns in cellular communication also potentiate autoimmunity and other disease states. These phenomena are difficult to examine outside of living tissues or organisms. Capturing cellcell communication in living systems is a paramount goal, and advances in imaging technologies and probes are bolstering efforts to examine such events. Fluorescence imaging tools, in particular, have been widely used to capture cell behaviors at microscopic scales. The bulk of examples described in this section focus on immunology.

Among immune cell types, T cells have been arguably the most well studied in vivo. These cells play central roles in both adaptive and innate immunity and T-cell based therapies are gaining traction in the clinic. T cells can be engineered to express fluorescent proteins and tracked in tissues and live organisms using fluorescence microscopy [33]. Their communication with other immune cells (including different T cell subtypes and B cells), in addition to their response to pathogens and malignant cells, are revealing new insights into the roles of immune function in human health and disease. Cahalan, Krummel, and others have shown that $\mathrm{CD} 4^{+} \mathrm{T}$ cells form stable complexes with B cells in lymph tissue. The motile conjugates moved according in response to chemokine gradients for CCR7 [34] (Figure 1-3). Such discoveries were made possible using immune cells labeled differentially with fluorescent proteins. Numerous related studies have been performed to understand neutrophil trafficking patterns [35,36] and other immune cell behaviors


Figure 1-3. In vivo visualization of cell contacts. (A) Fluorescently labeled B (red) and T (green) cells were monitored over time. (B) Time-lapse images showing an encounter of a B cell and a T cell to form a conjugate. Image is reproduced with permission from [34].

More refined tracking studies are being enabled through advances in intravital microscopy. In these cases, microscope lenses can be juxtaposed next to tissues of interest to facilitate cell visualization in deeper locales [37]. Recent examples include imaging leukocytes to deconstruct the roles of selectins, integrins, and other endothelial markers involved in immune cell homing [38,39], and "serial killings" by single NK cells [40]. Fluorescent probes have also enabled detailed studies of antigen presentation by MHC molecules, a process central to the immune clearance of infection, along with lymphocyte proliferation in cell types which have proven difficult to image with traditional immunohistochemical staining [41,42]. In many cases, the same imaging tools can be used in combination with experimental therapies to judge efficacy and mechanistic targeting [43].

Beyond basic tracking of immune cells, imaging tools have enabled immune cell interactions with cancer cells and infectious agents to be readily visualized [44]. For example, intravital microscopy revealed a new role for perivascular macrophages in staph infections. These cells were observed to work closely with neutrophils in skin infected with S. aureus [45]. Such interactions would have gone unnoticed in studies outside of living organisms. Optical imaging tools are also aiding virus-immune cell interactions. In one example, the roles of $\mathrm{CD} 8^{+}$ T cells and dendritic cells in H1N1 influenza infection were examined using GFP labeled T cells and YFP labeled dendritic cells [43]. In related work, fluorescently labeled murine leukemia virus enabled researchers the observation of a viral synapse in vivo [46]. In another striking example, fluorescently labeled HIV particles were imaged in humanized mice to determine that infected T cells migrated readily and formed stable synapses [47]. These studies showcase the obvious strengths of genetically encoded imaging tags to visualize detailed biological processes.

Beyond cell tracking, optical reporters (especially FP's) can be co-opted for readouts on gene expression relevant to signal transduction and cell-cell communication. For example, Alves et al. were able to use intravital microscopy to follow YFP expression driven by the interleukin-7 (IL-7) promoter in the murine thymus [41]. IL-7 is difficult to visualize with conventional immunohistochemistry due to its low level of expression [42]. The imaging results provided a new level of insight into the spatiotemporal dynamics of IL-7 expression, which has implications both for T-cell development, as well as thymic morphology. The reporter gene construct also revealed IL-7 expression in several tissue types, as well as colocalization of IL-7 expressing cells and $\mathrm{CD}^{+} \mathrm{T}$ cells, which require IL-7 in order to home to bone marrow. Optical tools have also been used to report on cascades of gene expression relevant to inflammation [48,49]. Multicomponent tracking experiments related to inflammation have also been performed. In one example, Matheu et al. labeled both H1N1 influenza specific $\mathrm{CD}^{+} \mathrm{T}$ cells and dendritic cells [43]. The researchers were then able to observe the dynamics of the "cytokine storm" implicated in the increased virulence for this strain of flu.

In addition to monitoring cells and gene expression, optical reporters can be co-opted for direct visualization of the biomolecules involved in communication. Dynamic fluctuations in chemokines and other immune signaling molecules can dramatically influence immune cell behavior [50]. Visualizing levels of these probes can therefore provide direct insight into immune function. Most approaches to imaging and quantifying signaling molecules rely on antibody conjugates. Cleverly designed sensors can also report on biomolecule abundance. Several of these tools rely on fluorescence resonance energy transfer (FRET) for signal generation (Figure 1-4A). FRET involves the transfer of energy from one excited state molecule (donor) to a second molecule (the acceptor), with the released photon matching the emission
spectrum of the acceptor (Figure 1-4A). When the donor chromophore (i.e., small molecule dye or FP) and acceptor chromophore are far apart, excitation of the donor results in the characteristic emission wavelength of the donor. When the donor and acceptor are in close contact (i.e., 10-100 angstroms), excitation of the donor results in emission of the acceptor due to FRET. Thus, the ratio of acceptor to donor emissions (FRET ratio) directly reports on the distance between the two chromophores.

FRET imaging has been extensively applied to unravel protein-protein interactions relevant to signal transduction and receptor dimerization [51,52]. In these cases, the donor and acceptor fluorophores are appended to the candidate interacting proteins. FRET principles have also been used to design unique sensors to report on small molecule metabolites [53,54]. In one example, Mues et al. used a FRET-based genetically encoded calcium reporter gene to report on calcium levels in activated T cells. This genetically encoded reporter was used to monitor the cytosolic calcium levels of T cells in various situations and milieus in vivo, which enabled greater understanding of the activation patterns of T cells in a multiple sclerosis model (Figure 14) $[55]$.


Figure 1-4. FRET sensors can be used to probe immune cell function in vivo. (A) A calciumbased FRET sensor comprising two fluorescent proteins joined by a calcium-responsive linker. When calcium ions bind, a conformational change re-positions the fluorescent proteins and FRET is observed. (B) The genetically encoded calcium sensor was used to image calcium concentrations in extravasated T cell clusters. Images were collected in inflamed spinal cords during onset of EAE (top panel) and peak EAE (bottom panel). EAE: mouse experimental autoimmune encephalitis, a murine multiple sclerosis model. $\Delta \mathrm{R} / \mathrm{R}$ : fractional fluorescence changes in the emission ratio. Both images are reproduced with permission from [55].

### 1.4 Macroscale visualization of cellular function with bioluminescent tools

Despite numerous advances in optical imaging over the past fifty years, our ability to resolve molecular and microscopic events in tissues and whole organisms remains limited. This is primarily due to the scattering of visible light by lipids and other biomolecules in opaque tissues, a phenomenon that broadens the area of signal perceived by the detector. Scattering can be partially ameliorated with physical methods, including mechanical disruption and dissolution [56], but these procedures are typically not compatible with serial imaging experiments requiring intact, living tissues. Intravital microscopy circumvents the need for disrupting tissue structures by placing the optical source and detector near the tissue of interest. Surgically implanted windows can further reduce interference from overlying tissues and resolve issues due to autofluorescence [17]. While providing unrivaled insight into microscopic cell interactions in living tissues, these techniques are invasive and not readily accessible to all researchers. Furthermore, these techniques require a priori knowledge of when and where to image.

Bioluminescence imaging (BLI) with luciferase-luciferin pairs, by contrast, is more suited to monitor biological processes in intact animals. Indeed, luciferase-labeled cells have been used to monitor cell trafficking patterns in diverse fields. Similar to microscopic imaging with FPs, several facets of immunology and methods for disease treatment have been monitored in vivo using BLI [57,58]. Improved luciferase reporters are enabling even more sensitive imaging in mouse models. Rabinovich and coworkers recently reported that as few as ten T-cells expressing an optimized luciferase can be imaged in some mouse models post-implantation [59]. This exquisite sensitivity has been capitalized on to track other immune cell classes, including NK cell homing to tumor stroma BLI [60]. Recently, the Negrin group examined the roles of
regulatory T cells (Tregs) and natural killer T (NKT) in immune function (Figure 1-5A). Using adoptive transfer of luciferase-labeled CD4 $(+)$ NKT cells in a murine model of allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation (HCT) the authors monitored the migration of the cells first to lymphoid tissues then to graft-versus-host disease (GVHD) target tissues. GVHD entails donor cells attack host tissue following transplantation. The study found that adoptively transferred NKT cells survive over 100 days and unlike conventional T cells do not cause significant GVHD-related morbidity or mortality. Furthermore, mixing in just 10,000 NKT cells to large boluses of T cells suppressed GVHD, demonstrating clinical potential in reducing GVHD in HCT [61]. While macroscale views of these cells could be readily gleaned, dissection and ex vivo analyses (with conventional fluorescent probes) were necessary to capture microscopic information.

The ability to sensitively visualize immune cell homing has similarly proved to be a tremendous boon to adoptive cell transfer studies in preclinical cancer models [61]. These therapies involve isolating a patient's white blood cells and engineering the cells ex vivo to improve their tumor-killing and homing efficacies. The modified cells are then re-introduced into the patient [57]. In a recent example, Tsukahara et al. utilized BLI to examine chimeric T cell engineering and its relevance to adoptive cell transfer. Human T cells were engineered to express CD19 receptors. CD19 is a cell surface protein that assembles with the B cell antigen receptor in order to decrease the threshold for antigen receptor-dependent stimulation. When these cells reinfused into mice bearing $\mathrm{CD} 19^{+} \mathrm{Fluc}^{+}$tumors, tumor proliferation was markedly reduced as judged by bioluminescence imaging [62].


Figure 1-5. Luciferase probes can be used to track cell populations and gene expression patterns in vivo. (A) In graft-versus-host disease (GVHD) models, NKT (luc ${ }^{+}$) cells were observed in the spleen and lymph nodes, then the skin and other organs. The total photons emitted from the luc + cells peaked at day 25, and then declined steadily. Imaging of excised organs indicated NKT cells trafficked to the spleen and mesenteric lymph nodes on day 11. (B) Bioluminescence imaging was used to monitor T cell effector function in response to tumor antigens in vivo. T cell activation was monitored using a luc2 reporter gene, driven by a granzyme B promoter. Mice were implanted with two cancer cell lines, EL4 (thyroma cell line) and its derivative EG7 (EL4 cells stably express chicken OVA cDNA). An adoptive T cell transfer was performed on the tumor bearing mice, with $\mathrm{CD}^{+} \mathrm{T}$ cells responsive to OVA. Bioluminescent signal in the EG7 tumor was more robust than in the non-targeted EL4 tumor. Peak signal intensity from the target tumor coincided with tumor regression. OVA: ovalbumin. Image (A) is reproduced with permission from [61]. Image (B) reproduced with permission from [72].

Unlike fluorescence technologies, bioluminescence has been largely limited to monitoring one cell type or biological feature at a time. Only a handful of distinct luciferaseluciferin pairs have been optimized for use in heterologous organisms. While these bioluminescent probes often emit different colors of light, they remain difficult to distinguish in living organisms, where the depth of the source and various tissue properties influence the
"color" of light observed by the detector. Luciferases that catalyze light emission with chemically distinct molecules can be more readily discerned, and some have been used in tandem. In one example, $T$ cells expressing Gluc could be readily visualized accumulating within Fluc-expressing tumor cells [63]. Sequential application of coelenterazine and luciferin (the Gluc and Fluc substrates, respectively) enabled both populations of cells to be imaged simultaneously. Similar bioluminescent pairs have been used to track Treg and effector T cell functions [64], differential tumor growth [65], mesenchymal stem cell interactions with tumor stroma, and interaction of the immune system with fungal infections such as Aspergillis and Candida [66-70]. While fruitful, these studies still remain arduous, as substrates must often be supplied sequentially and given ample time to clear.

Similar to fluorescence imaging, BLI has been applied to studies of gene expression patterns [71]. Various promoters have been used to drive luciferase expression, including those involved in T cell activation [72] and B cell proliferation [73], in addition to tumor progression [74], and other pathologies [75]. In a recent example, T cell activation was monitored by transfecting T cells with a granzyme B promoter-luciferase reporter construct (Figure 1-5B). Granzyme B was used because of its known correlation with T cell activation. It should be noted that the researchers subsequently had to apply two rounds of signal amplification in order to detect the luciferase signal in a BLI platform. Researchers were then able to observe T cell activation in response to an antigenic tumor, the peak of which correlated with tumor regression [72]. In all cases, BLI provided a facile readout of gene expression levels across entire organisms.

While less common, BLI can also be used to track individual proteins and other biomolecules relevant to immune function. In one example, the Serganova lab monitored the
abundance of HIF-1 $\alpha$, a transcription factor that is overexpressed in many human cancers, using an Fluc fusion. The chimeric protein enabled sensitive imaging of the abundance and stability of HIF-1a in cellulo and in xenograft models [76]. Luciferase fusions have also been used to interrogate the canonical Wnt signaling pathway. The Wnt pathway regulates various aspects of development, including immune cell differentiation and becomes dysregulated in a variety of cancers [77]. In this network, $\beta$-catenin ( $\beta$-cat) acts as a transcriptional activator of numerous host transcription factors. Usually marked for degradation, $\beta$-cat stabilization enables propagation of Wnt signaling. To study the posttranslational stabilization of $\beta$-cat, Naik et al. developed two bioluminescent fusion reporters, a $\beta$-cat click beetle luciferase ( $\beta$-cat-CBG) and $\beta$-cat firefly luciferase ( $\beta$-cat-FLuc). The researchers were able to observe modulators of $\beta$-cat activity and global $\beta$-cat levels, as well as processing, and downstream transcriptional activity by using further reporters [78].

Beyond direct detection, biomolecules can be visualized using bioluminescent sensors. Many of these exploit BRET in which bioluminescent emission excites a longer-wavelength fluorophore (Figure 1-6A). Analogous to FRET, the emission spectrum of the luciferase must overlap with the excitation of the fluorophore or FP. When the two light emitting molecules are in close proximity, the emission of the longer wavelength fluorophore is observed. Using an optimized version of Rluc (Rluc8) and a yellow-fluorescent protein (Venus) linked by pro-IL-1 $\beta$, the Pelegrin group developed a BRET sensor for caspase-1 activity (Figure 1-6B). Caspase-1 modulates several inflammatory signaling molecules, including the proapopotic chemokine IL$1 \beta$ in macrophages and other immune cells. IL- $1 \beta$ becomes activated upon caspase- 1 cleavage of the proprotein form (pro-IL-1 $\beta$ ). When the BRET sensor was expressed in cells with low levels of active caspase, the BRET pair remained in close proximity, evidenced by the emission
of yellow light. The blue photons emitted by Rluc8 acting upon coelentrazine are absorbed by Venus which emits lower-energy yellow light. When the BRET sensor is cleaved by caspase-1, Rluc is free to diffuse away from Venus and blue light is observed upon coelentrazine administration. The ratio of blue to yellow light in each case is a measure of caspase-1 activity and IL-1 $\beta$ activation, which indicates changes in the inflammatory response [79].


Figure 1-6. BRET probes can report on immune cell function. (A) A BRET sensor for IL-1 $\beta$ formation (mediated by caspase activity) was devised. Before pro IL-1 $\beta$ is cleaved, the two parts of the pro protein, labeled with Rluc and Venus fluorescent protein, are in close proximity. In this scenario, Rluc serves as the excitation source for Venus fluorescence. Once the pro protein is cleaved to mature IL-1 $\beta$, Rluc is no longer in close enough proximity to Venus fluorescent protein, and Rluc light emission is observed. (B) The BRET sensor was used to image IL-1 $\beta$ processing in primary bone marrow-derived macrophages (BMDM). Macrophages were monitored at 480 nm (Rluc emission) and 535 nm (Venus emission), after being administered the Rluc substrate, coelenterazine. The bottom row is a pseudo colored for the $480 / 535$ BRET ratio. Image (B) is reproduced with permission from [79].

### 1.5 Next-generation tools for imaging immune cell communication

The need to monitor cells at all length scales to capture chemical communication is driving the development of new tools and technologies. Work in the fluorescence realm is already well under way. As noted above, brighter, more photostable, and red-shifted FPs are being produced [80-82], along with metabolite-responsive FP's [54,83]. New chemistries to efficiently produce dyes and attach them to cells and other imaging targets are also being developed $[20,84]$. New fluorescence imaging technologies based on reconstitution of split GFP or enzymatic tagging of intracellular interactions have enabled rapid identification of direct cell contact in synapses [84-86].

In the bioluminescence realm, new luciferins and luciferases are also being engineered to track multiple cell types and for more sensitive imaging. The majority of this work to date has focused on identifying new luciferases, although many remain poorly characterized. Continued optimization of these luciferases for expression and stability is also increasing their sensitivity for use in vivo. Within well-characterized luciferase families, standard molecular biology techniques are being used to optimize reaction kinetics and, in some cases, provide altered colors or other desirable characteristics such as prolonged light emission [87-90].

More recently, the focus has turned to the luciferin itself. The luciferin small molecule is the bioluminescent light-emitter, thus efforts to modify its structure and enzyme utilization are attractive. Urano and coworkers developed several new luciferin derivatives by appending fluorophores to the aromatic core [91]. Upon luciferase utilization, BRET to the pendant fluorophore red shifts the light emission. The Miller and Prescher labs have similarly explored nitrogenous luciferins [92,93]. Moerner and Urano have also developed heterocyclic variants (Figure 1-7) [94]. Most have altered emission spectra, and are on par with D-luciferin in terms
of enzyme utilization. Additionally, one of the cyclic amino luciferin derivatives exhibits enhanced bioavailability in mouse models [95]. Studies on novel luciferins rely on efficient syntheses of these new compounds. To this end, the Prescher lab has developed method to quickly access several novel luciferins [93].




Coelenterazine


Figure 1-7. Collection of luciferin analogs for bioluminescence imaging.

Despite these efforts to identify improved luciferins, multispectral imaging with BLI remains difficult. As mentioned above, light emission in rodent models is skewed by tissue depth, complicating the interpretation of wavelength. Thus, multi-component bioluminescence imaging and efforts to map cell-cell contacts with distinct luciferase and luciferin pairs are complicated. In recent years, alternative methods to capture these events have been reported. For example, "split" versions of luciferase have been used to map cell interactions and detect chemokine receptor-ligand interactions [96]. The Prescher group extended this technology to probing direct cell-cell contacts in living systems [97].

In a related strategy, we crafted bioluminescent tools that produce light only when two cells interact (Figure 1-8). These tools comprise "caged" probes-luciferins outfitted with appendages (i.e., "cages") that preclude binding to luciferase [98]. In the presence of "activator" cells capable of removing the cage (e.g., via selective enzymatic activity), active luciferin is liberated and available for use by luciferase-expressing ("reporter") cells. Reporter cells nearest the activator cells consume the most substrate; thus, light intensity correlates with the proximity of the two populations (Figure 1-8). For example, a galactose-caged luciferin (Lugal) was synthesized to monitor the proximity between $\beta$-galactosidase ( $\beta$-gal)-expressing activator cells and luciferase-expressing reporter cells in tumor models [99]. When activator cells were localized to sites of metastases, Lugal administration signaled the invasion of luciferaseexpressing tumor cells in mice (Figure 1-8B) fix [100]. This study enabled sensitive imaging of cell-cell interactions not possible with traditional toolsets. Further extensions of "caged" luciferin technology and other methods to visualize cellular interactions promise to refine our views of organismal biology and disease.


Figure 1-8. Immune cell interactions can be visualized with proximity reporters. (A) A proximity probe ("caged" luciferin) enters an activator cell, where it is liberated by an uncaging enzyme. Free luciferin can diffuse out of the cell. If a luc ${ }^{+}$reporter cell is nearby, the uncaged substrate can be used to produce light. Robust light production is only observed when the activator and reporter cells are in close proximity. (B) An in vitro assay of the uncaging process. Activator or control cells in matrigel were plated in the center of a Petri dish. Luciferase reporter cells were plated in a monolayer surrounding the activator or control cells. The plates were incubated with a reporter substrate that shows location of uncaging enzyme activity (center). The caged luciferin was administered, and BLI was performed on the plates. Light emission was shown to correlate with the proximity of reporter cells to activator cells. Images were reproduced with permission from [100]

### 1.6 Objectives of this study

Optical imaging technologies have revolutionized our understanding of immunity and living systems by enabling researchers to visualize biological features in real time. As highlighted above, there is shortage of tools for imaging in vivo and, in particular, cellular communication networks in vivo. To address these issue I sought to develop new luciferins toward enabling multi-target tracking and detection.

The objectives of my thesis work included the following:

1. Develop novel syntheses of richly functionalized luciferins, towards the creation of compound libraries.
2. Characterize the biochemical and physical chemical properties of these new compounds.
3. Develop methods to predict robust, light-emitting luciferins for the development of unique bioluminescent enzyme-substrate pairs.
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# Chapter 2: Design and synthesis of an alkynyl luciferin analog for bioluminescence imaging 

### 2.1 Introduction

Bioluminescence is a versatile imaging platform with applications ranging from metabolite biosensing to whole animal imaging [1,2]. At the heart of this technology are enzymes (luciferases) that catalyze the oxidation of small molecule substrates (luciferins) [3,4]. During each enzymatic transformation, an electronically excited oxyluciferin is generated that emits a photon of light upon relaxation to the ground state [5]. Since mammalian cells and tissues do not produce large numbers of photons in the absence of incident light, bioluminescence can provide an exquisitely sensitive readout on biological processes in these environments [6]. Indeed, luciferase-luciferin pairs have been widely used to report on enzyme activities and gene expression patterns in live cells and tissue lysates [1,2]. Additionally, since bioluminescence does not require an excitation source, this technology is well suited for noninvasive imaging in whole animals, where delivery of excitation light is often inefficient or impractical [1,7-10].

The most widely used luciferases for cell and animal imaging originate from the insect family [2]. These enzymes, including firefly luciferase (Fluc), catalyze the oxidation of Dluciferin (1) and release $\sim 500-600 \mathrm{~nm}$ light (Figure 2-1a) [4,5]. Wavelengths of this sort can penetrate the skin of small rodents and be detected by sensitive cameras, making insect luciferases attractive for imaging in vivo. Indeed, Fluc and related enzymes have been expressed in a variety of tissue and cell types, and when exposed to D-luciferin, light is produced [1,2]. D-
luciferin is also sufficiently bioavailable in rodents [11] and has been used extensively in preclinical models [12,13].

a)



Figure 2-1. a) The luciferase-catalyzed oxidation of D-luciferin (1) produces visible light. b) Retrosynthetic analysis of alkynyl luciferin ( $\mathrm{PG}=$ protecting group).

### 2.2 Results and discussion

Because of the sensitivity and user-friendly features of bioluminescence, there has been much interest in expanding the scope of the technology [10,14]. Several efforts have been directed toward identifying other naturally occuring luciferase-luciferin pairs for multicomponent imaging [1]. The instability and poor tissue penetrance of many luciferins has been prohibitive in many cases. Other attempts have focused on generating luciferases that provide altered emission spectra. For example, several insect luciferases have been engineered to emit different colors of light (ranging from $\sim 500-650 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) with D-luciferin [15-22]. While these wavelengths can be adequately resolved in vitro, they cannot be easily discriminated in vivo, where tissue absorption and scatter modulate the color of light that ultimately reaches the detector.

Compared to luciferase engineering efforts, there has been less work invested in crafting new luciferins. Substrate engineering is an obvious strategy to broaden the scope of bioluminescence technology, though, as the luciferin molecules can be modified to emit different colors of light or be selectively utilized by unique luciferases [23-27]. In some cases, the substrates have proven remarkably cell and tissue permeant and, thus, well suited for in vivo work [28]. In the majority of cases, though, the engineered substrates remain poor substrates for the enzyme. Mutant luciferases can be developed to more efficiently process unnatural substrates [29], but these studies typically require access to large quantities of molecules that are difficult to synthesize.

Continued efforts to develop unique bioluminescent tools would benefit from rapid access to diverse collections of light-emitting luciferins. These scaffolds have been notoriously difficult to synthesize owing to their electron-rich and highly substituted cores. Late-stage modifications to luciferin molecules are also complicated. For example, most attempts to dervitize D-luciferin (1) have focused on altering the $6^{\prime}$-position via alkylation or acylation chemistries [11, 30, 31]. While facile, these strategies have produced scaffolds that are somewhat limited in scope. Electron donation is required for robust emission and, thus, the 6 '-position is particularly sensitive to modification. Indeed, many $6^{\prime}$-substituted luciferins comprise electronwithdrawing substituents that dampen light output [30].

We aimed to develop a bioluminescent probe modified at an alternative ring position. We were initially drawn to the $5^{\prime}$-alkyne derivative (2) shown in Figure 2-1b. In previous work, 5'-fluoro and other small substituents were shown to be well tolerated by Fluc and minimally perturbing to the bioluminescent reaction [24]. Our initial modeling analyses also suggested that the alkyne would be sterically accommodated in the luciferase active site (Figure 2-2a).

Similarly, computational data [32] suggested that the installation of the alkynyl functional group in conjugation with the benzothiazole could permit the alkyne to extend the pi system of the luciferin chromophore, resulting in red shifted light (Figure 2-2b).
a)

b)
 20\%


Figure 2-2. In silico analyses of D-luciferin. a) Overlay of 2 with firefly luciferase structure (PDB ID: 4G36) suggests that the alkyne motif will be tolerated. b) DFT predictions of (B3LYP/6-311**) of the HOMO (middle) and LUMO (bottom) of a possible structure of oxyluciferin (top) suggest the participation of the alkyne in these molecular orbitals, which may contribute to the red shift in the light emssion observed (for computational details please see the Materials and Methods).

We were further attracted to alkyne $\mathbf{2}$ as its benzothiazole core could be accessed using $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ activation chemistry, as previously reported by our group [33-37]. The functionalized luciferin still presented some synthetic challenges, though. Electron-rich heterocycles like 2 are susceptible to non-specific oxidation and are thus difficult to handle and prepare on scale. Methods to produce highly substituted benzothiazoles are also rare. To access the desired heterocycle, we began with tri-substituted phenol 3. The hydroxy substituent was first protected with a mesyl group (Scheme 2-1) [38]. Other classic phenol protecting groups (e.g., silyl and methyl) were explored, but most proved either incompatible with subsequent transformations (in the case of bulky silyl groups) or difficult to remove later on in the synthesis (in the case of methyl groups). Mesylate 4 was ultimately subjected to Sonogashira conditions for alkyne installation. Notably, this reaction was readily scalable and provided decagram quantities of $\mathbf{5}$ (Scheme 2-2). The nitro group of $\mathbf{5}$ was reduced using iron filings and glacial acetic acid [39] to reveal aniline 6 in good yield and purity.

## Scheme 2-1. Installation of the alkyne substituent.



## Scheme 2-2. Gram-scale synthesis of mesylate 5.



Compound 6 was then treated with Appel's salt 7, and the resulting adduct was fragmented with resin-linked $\mathrm{PPh}_{3}$ to yield thioamide 9 (Scheme 2-3) [40]. It should be noted that while other bulky nucleophiles (e.g, DBU and DBA) [41] can be used for such fragmentations, they resulted in premature deprotection of the mesyl group and reduced overall yields in this case. Subsequent cyclization of thioamide 9 via palladium- and copper-catalyzed C-H activation [42] provided $\mathbf{1 0}$ in $61 \%$ yield. Attempts to isolate $\mathbf{1 0}$ directly from $\mathbf{8}$ via thermal cyclization resulted in product decomposition and were not pursued further. The desired alkyne luciferin 2 was ultimately isolated following mesyl group removal [43] and cysteine condensation. Importantly, luciferin 2 was stable for weeks as a solid material and in aqueous solution.

Scheme 2-3. Synthesis of alkyne luciferin 2 using $\mathbf{C}-\mathbf{H}$ activation chemistry.


Luciferin 2 was also found to be a viable substrate for firefly luciferase (Fluc). When 2 was incubated with Fluc in the presence of ATP, bioluminescent light was observed. Light emission was both concentration-dependent and sustained. The overall photon output from $\mathbf{2}$ is weaker than that observed with D-luciferin (the native substrate), but on par with other luciferin analogs used in biological assays (Figures 2-3) [24]. Interestingly, the bioluminescence emission spectrum of 2 is substantially red-shifted compared to D-luciferin $\left(\lambda_{\max }=610 \mathrm{~nm}\right.$ at $25{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, Figure 2-4). In fact, the emission wavelengths are on par with some of the most red-shifted luciferins used in BLI: aminoluciferin $[27,31]$ and CycLuc2 [27, 28, 31].


Figure 2-3. Alkynyl luciferin 2 is a weaker light emitter than D-luciferin. A) Total photon flux for the bioluminescent reactions of alkynyl luciferin 2 (light blue bars) or D-luciferin (dark blue bars) with firefly luciferase (Fluc). Assays were performed in triplicate using black 96-well plates (BD Bioscience). Each well contained purified Fluc ( 2 mg ), luciferin substrate ( $0-100$ mM ), ATP ( 1 mM , Sigma Aldrich), coenzyme A ( 0.5 mM , Calbiochem), and reaction buffer ( 20 mM Tris- $\mathrm{HCl} \mathrm{pH} 7.6,0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ BSA, 0.1 mM EDTA, 1 mM TCEP, 2 mM MgSO 4 ), totaling 100 mL . All reaction components were pre-mixed prior to Fluc addition. B) Total photon flux for the bioluminescent reactions of alkynyl luciferin $2(100 \mathrm{mM}$, light blue bars) or an equimolar amount of D-luciferin (dark blue bars) monitored over time. Assays were conducted as in A).


Figure 2-4. Normalized bioluminescence spectra for alkynyl luciferin 2 ( $\lambda_{\max } 610 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) and Dluciferin $1\left(\lambda_{\max } 565 \mathrm{~nm}\right)$. Samples $(100 \mu \mathrm{M})$ were combined with Photinus pyralis luciferase ( 10 $\mu \mathrm{g}$ ) in bioluminescence buffer and monitored at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

Based on the ease of synthesis and favorable spectral properties of 2, we anticipated that the probe would be useful for biological imaging applications both in vitro and in vivo. To test this hypothesis, we first evaluated the probe with recombinant Fluc. We found that $\mathbf{2}$ was a light emitting substrate (Figure 2-5a), and able sustain photon production over time (Figure 2-5b). The alkynyl probe also appeared to be reasonably tolerated by the enzyme, with an apparent $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{m}}$ of $8.5 \pm 1 \mu \mathrm{M}$, and an apparent $\mathrm{V}_{\max }$ of $130 \pm 5 \times 10^{6}$ photons s ${ }^{-1}$ (Figure 2-6).


Figure 2-5. a) Alkynyl luciferin 2 produces light upon incubation with Fluc. Samples of analog 2 $(0.5-100 \mu \mathrm{M})$ were mixed with Fluc, ATP, and CoA in pH 8 buffer in 96 -well plates. Light emission was measured using a cooled CCD camera. Sample images are shown in the inset. b) Analog 2 exhibits sustained light emission. Photon production from samples of $2(100 \mu \mathrm{M})$, Fluc, ATP, and CoA (in black-walled 96-well plates) were monitored over time. Light emission was quantified over time, and sample images are shown. For a-b, error bars represent the standard deviation of the mean for three replicate experiments.


Figure 2-6. Alkynyl luciferin 2 is a viable substrate for Fluc. Luciferin $2(0-150 \mathrm{mM})$ was incubated with purified Fluc $(2 \mu \mathrm{~g})$, ATP $(1 \mathrm{mM})$, coenzyme A $(0.5 \mathrm{mM})$, and light emission was monitored. For further details see materials and methods. Reactions were performed in triplicate. Error bars represent the standard deviation of the mean for $\mathrm{n}>3$ experiments.

The luciferin analog also performed well in cell assays. Luciferase-expressing HEK293 cells were incubated with various doses of $\mathbf{2}$, a similar trend was observed to the in vitro experiment (Figure 2-7a), indicating that alkynyl luciferin was cell permeable. The light emission was sustained over 2 h (Figure 2-7b), which is a desirable characteristic for BLI applications.


Figure 2-7. a) Alkynyl luciferin 2 produces light when incubated with HEK293 cells. Doses of analog 2 ( 25 to $250 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) in PBS were added to the cells (100,000 cells per well in 96 well plates). Sample images are shown (inset). b) Analog 2 exhibits sustained light emssion with HEK293 cells. Photon production from a dose of $2(250 \mu \mathrm{M})$ in HEK293 cells (100,00 cells per well in 96 well plates) was monitored over time. For a, error bars represent the standard deviation of the mean for 6 replicate experiments. For b, error bars represent the standard deviation of the mean for 3 replicate experiments.

We also recognized that the alkyne provided a convenient handle for late-stage diversification and potential access to diverse pools of light-emitting luciferins. Alkynes can be "clicked" with various azido appendages via copper-catalyzed azide-alkyne cycloaddition (i.e., CuAAC). Azides and alkynes are well-behaved in complex settings and "click" chemistry conditions are mild enough to be performed in the presence of numerous functional groups [4446]. Indeed, preliminary evidence suggested compound 2 was readily modified with azido appendages via CuAAC (Figures 2-8-2-11, Scheme 2-4). We found that azide-alkyne cycloaddition proceeds in aqueous solvents and in the absence of copper ligands. However, excess copper was necessary in most cases, likely due to metal chelation with the ring nitrogen atoms. When alkyne 2 was "clicked" with a fluorogenic azide [47], robust fluorescence was observed (Figures 2-8-2-10). The excitation and emission spectra of the ligated product also differed from those of the starting alkyne 2 (Figures 2-9 and 2-10), indicating successful ligation. Other model azides were also successfully ligated to the alkynyl core via CuAAC (Scheme 2-4, Figure 2-11).

Collectively, these data indicate that alkynyl luciferin 2 can be modified with appendages at the $5^{\prime}$-position. We envision using this approach to produce libraries of analogs that can be screened for altered wavelengths of emission or selective processing by mutant luciferases. Recent crystallographic analyses have also revealed Fluc amino acids in close proximity to the $5^{\prime}$ carbon of a bound luciferin intermediate [22,48]. These amino acids could potentially be mutated to complement more bulky, steric appendages on the luciferin ring, thereby facilitating the development of new substrate-specific (i.e., orthogonal) bioluminescent tools.
A)


B)


Figure 2-8: A) Modification of luciferin 2 via "click" chemistry. Azide 11 was reacted with 2 to generate fluorescent adduct 12. B) Fluorescence emission spectra of alkyne $\mathbf{2}$ with sodium ascorbate and copper sulfate only (gray line), azide 11 with sodium ascorbate and copper sulfate only (dark blue line) and the reaction mixture of $\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1 1}$, sodium ascorbate and copper sulfate to provide 12 (light blue line). All spectra were acquired using an excitation wavelength of $\mathrm{l}=444$ nm .
A)
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Figure 2-9. Unique fluorescence spectra observed for "click" reaction control samples. A) Excitation and emission spectra for the reaction mixture containing azide $\mathbf{1 1}$ ( 10 mM in DMSO). B) Excitation and emission spectra for the reaction mixture containing alkynyl luciferin 2 (10 $\mathrm{mM}), \mathrm{CuSO}_{4}(160 \mathrm{mM})$, and sodium ascorbate ( 160 mM ), but no azide 11, in DMSO. For (A)(B), cps is defined as counts per second.


Figure 2-10. Unique fluorescence spectra observed for "click" reaction control samples. A) Excitation and emission spectra for azide $\mathbf{1 1}(10 \mathrm{mM})$ in DMSO containing $\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}(160 \mathrm{mM})$ and sodium ascorbate ( 160 mM ), but no alkyne 2. B) Excitation and emission spectra for alkyne $2(10 \mathrm{mM})$ in DMSO, without the addition of copper or ascorbate. For (A)-(B), cps is defined as counts per second.

Scheme 2-4. Additional "click" reactions performed with luciferin 2 and various azides.


B)


Figure 2-11. HPLC analysis of CuAAC reactions with alkyne 2 and model azides. A)
Reaction mixture of $\mathbf{2}$ and benzyl azide at $t=8 \mathrm{~h}$. B) Reaction mixture of $\mathbf{2}$ and azidohexanoic $\operatorname{acid}$ at $\mathrm{t}=8 \mathrm{~h} . \mathrm{S} . \mathrm{M} .=$ copper complexes of starting material.

### 2.3 Conclusions

In conclusion, we identified an alkyne-modified luciferin for use in bioluminescence assays. The alkyne scaffold is isolable in reasonable yields and quantities and is a functional light emitter with luciferase. The alkynyl probe can also be selectively modified with azido appendages via CuAAC. Such luciferins could eventually be used for multi-component in vivo imaging. Strategies to produce luciferins to date have generally been quite tedious owing to the non-divergent nature of their syntheses and the difficulties in accessing the highly substituted benzothiazole cores. Thus, the installation of a readily modifiable chemical handle (e.g., an alkyne) at the $5^{\prime}$ position addresses these difficulties and provides a platform for both late-stage diversification and rapid expansion of the luciferin toolkit. The alkynyl luciferin will also bolster efforts to generate "activatable" forms of luciferin for biosensing applications in cells and live organisms [49, 50]. Such designer luciferin analogs will further expand the scope of bioluminescence imaging.

### 2.4 Materials and methods

## General experimental procedures

All reactions were performed in flame- or oven-dried glassware under positive pressure of nitrogen or argon unless otherwise noted. Dichloromethane, dimethylacetamide, N,Ndimethylformamide, triethylamine, and toluene were dried by columns packed with activated alumina on a solvent purification system. Anhydrous pyridine and DMSO were purchased from Acros Organics in AcroSeal ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ bottles. All reagents were used as purchased without further
purification. 4,5-Dichloro-1,2,3-dithiazol-1-ium chloride (Appel's salt) [33], benzyl azide [51], azidohexanoic acid [52], and 3-azido-7-hydroxy-2H-chromen-2-one [47] were synthesized according to a published procedures. Thin layer chromatography (TLC) was performed on Merck $60 \mathrm{~F}_{254}$ pre-coated silica gel plates, and plates were visualized with UV light and ninhydrin stain when appropriate. Flash-column chromatography was performed using silica gel ( $60 \AA$ Å, 230-240 mesh, Merck KGA). HPLC runs were conducted on a Varian ProStar equipped with UV-Vis Detector. Analytical runs were performed using an Agilent Polaris 5 C18-A column ( $4.6 \times 150 \mathrm{~mm}, 5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) with a $1 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ flow rate, eluting with $10-90 \%$ acetonitrile (with $0.1 \%$ TFA) over 28 min . Separations were monitored at 254 nm . NMR spectra were recorded with Bruker Advanced spectrometers using deuterated solvents. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra were recorded at 400 or 500 MHz as indicated. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ spectra were recorded at $125 \mathrm{MHz} .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR data are reported in the following order: chemical shift ( $\delta \mathrm{ppm}$ ), multiplicity, coupling constant ( Hz ), and integration. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR data are reported in terms of chemical shift. Infrared spectra were recorded using a Thermo Scientific iD5 ATR infrared spectrophotometer. High-resolution mass spectra were obtained from the UC Irvine Mass Spectrometry Facility. The abbreviations used can be found in the document JOC Standard Abbreviations and Acronyms.

## General bioluminescence imaging

All images were acquired using an IVIS Lumina (Xenogen) system equipped with a cooled CCD camera. Exposure times ranged from 1-5 s. The captured images were analyzed using Living Image software (Xenogen) and Microsoft Excel.

## Light emission assays with recombinant luciferase

Assays were performed in triplicate using black 96-well plates (BD Bioscience). Each well contained purified Fluc ( 2 mg ), luciferin substrate $(0-100 \mathrm{mM})$, ATP ( 1 mM , Sigma Aldrich), coenzyme A ( 0.5 mM , Calbiochem), and reaction buffer ( 20 mM Tris- $\mathrm{HCl} \mathrm{pH} 7.6,0.5$ $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ BSA, 0.1 mM EDTA, 1 mM TCEP, 2 mM MgSO 4 ) to a final volume of $100 \mu \mathrm{~L}$. All reaction components were pre-mixed prior to Fluc addition. Light emission was monitored using an IVIS Lumina as described above. For kinetic assays, non-linear regression to a MichaelisMenten model was performed using robust outlier determination (GraphPad Prism program, www.graphpad.com).

## Bioluminescence emission spectra

Emission spectra were recorded on a Horiba Jobin-Yvon FluoroMax®-4 spectrometer. The excitation and emission slits were adjusted to 0 and 29.4 nm , respectively. Emission data were collected at 5 nm intervals from $500-750 \mathrm{~nm}$ at room temperature. Light emission was measured in counts per second (cps), and the acquisition time for each sample was 15 s per wavelength. The luciferin $(100 \mu \mathrm{M})$ was incubated in a cuvette ( 10 mm path length) with ATP (1 mM ), LiCoA ( 0.5 mM ) and reaction buffer (see above) totaling $900 \mu \mathrm{~L}$. Purified Fluc ( $10 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ ) was added immediately prior to data acquisition.

## Fluorescence imaging

Fluorescence spectra for all luciferin analogs were recorded on a Horbia Jobin-Yvon FluoroMax®-4 spectrometer. Pure compounds were diluted to 0.01 mM with DMSO, and reaction mixtures were diluted with DMSO to 0.01 mM product, assuming the reaction had gone to completion. Excitation and emission slit widths were both 1 nm .

## Synthetic Experimental Procedures



Chemical Formula: $\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{BrNO}_{5} \mathrm{~S}$
Molecular Weight: 296.10 over 15 min . After 1 h , the reaction was quenched ( $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaHSO}_{4}$ ) and washed with $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaHSO}_{4}(3 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$, saturated ammonium chloride ( $1 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and brine (3 x 50 mL ). The organic layers were dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude residue was purified via flash-column chromatography (eluting with 7:3 hexanes:ethyl acetate) to yield 4 as a light yellow solid ( $5.89 \mathrm{~g}, 84 \%$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{DMSO}$ ) $\delta 8.64$ (d, $J$ $=2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.36(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.0,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.82(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.66(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, DMSO) $\delta 151.3,146.6,129.5,125.3,125.0,117.4,39.8$; IR (thin film) 3108.8, $3012.0,1511.7,1371.8,1335.0,1174.9,1280.2,972.9,884.8,851.6,735.0 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$.


Chemical Formula: $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{NO}_{5} \mathrm{SSi}$
Molecular Weight: 313.40

4-Nitro-2-((trimethylsilyl)ethynyl)phenyl methanesulfonate
(5)

Following the general method of Cappelli and coworkers [53], a flame-dried round-bottom flask was flushed with argon and charged with 2-bromo-1-methanesufonyl-4-nitrobenzene 4 ( $1.02 \mathrm{~g}, 3.46 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), bis(triphenylphosphine) palladium(II) dichloride ( $0.25 \mathrm{~g}, 350 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), and copper(I) iodide ( $67 \mathrm{mg}, 350 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ). The flask was again flushed with argon and capped with a rubber septum. Dry triethylamine ( 40 mL ) and ethynyltrimethylsilane ( $0.490 \mathrm{~mL}, 3.47 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were then added by syringe. The flask was heated in a $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ oil bath under positive argon pressure for 3 h , and the reaction was monitored by TLC. Upon completion, the reaction mixture was filtered through a pad of Celite and diluted with ethyl acetate $(100 \mathrm{~mL})$. The solution was then washed with a saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}$ solution ( $2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), brine ( $1 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo to give 5 as a grey solid. $(0.38 \mathrm{~g}, 35 \%){ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.41(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.25(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.2,2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.55(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1H), $3.30(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.30(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 153.7,146.0,129.3,125.0,124.3$, 118.9, 104.1, 96.0, 39.5, -0.3 ; HRMS (CI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{SSi}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+}$331.0784, found 331.0788 .


Chemical Formula: $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \mathrm{SSi}$

## 4-Amino-2-((trimethylsilyl)ethynyl)phenyl methanesulfonate (6)

Following the general method of Shen and Driver [39], a solution of 5 $(0.22 \mathrm{~g}, 0.70 \mathrm{mmol})$ in acetone $(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added to a solution of iron
powder $(0.250 \mathrm{~g}, 4.50 \mathrm{mmol})$ and glacial acetic acid $(4 \mathrm{~mL})$ in water $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The mixture was heated at reflux for 2 h , then filtered hot through a pad of Celite. The reaction mixture was neutralized with a saturated $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ solution and extracted with EtOAc $(50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was washed with saturated EDTA ( $2 \times 50 \mathrm{ml}$ ) to remove any additional iron species, followed by water $(1 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and brine $(1 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic layer was dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo to give 6 as a brown oil ( $0.121 \mathrm{~g}, 63 \%$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 400 MHz , DMSO) $\delta 6.99(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.63(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.57(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.8,2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.37$ (br s, 2 H ), $3.25(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.20(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{DMSO}\right) \delta 148.3,140.0,124.0,117.4$, 117.2, 115.7, 101.2, 98.9, 38.6, 0.22; HRMS (CI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{SSi}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+}$ 301.1042, found 301.1039.

## (Z)-4-(4-Chloro-5H-1,2,3-dithiazol-5-ylideneamino)-2-



Chemical Formula: $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{ClN}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~S}_{3} \mathrm{Si}$ Molecular Weight: 419.01

## ((trimethylsilyl)ethynyl)phenyl methanesulfonate (8)

Following the general procedure of Micaelidou and Koutentis [41], to a flask of $\mathbf{6}(58.1 \mathrm{mg}, 0.205 \mathrm{mmol})$, was added Appel's salt 7 (4,5-dichloro-1,2,3-dithiazol-1-ium chloride, $51.0 \mathrm{mg}, 0.245 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), quickly followed by an argon flush. Anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ was immediately added and the reaction was stirred at room temperature for 5 min under positive argon pressure. Upon consumption of starting material, anhydrous pyridine ( $36 \mathrm{mg}, 0.45 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was slowly added. The reaction mixture was allowed to stir overnight and then loaded onto a silica gel column. The crude material was purified using flash-column chromatography (eluting with 8:2 hexanes:EtOAc) to afford $\mathbf{8}$ as a
dark brown oil ( $52 \mathrm{mg}, 61 \%$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.47(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.37(\mathrm{~d}, J$ $=2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.22(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.26(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.29(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz, DMSO) $\delta 162.2,150.6,147.2,147.2,125.3,124.1,122.5,119.0,101.7,99.5,39.3,0.1 ;$ HRMS (ESI+) $m / z$ calcd for fragment $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{Si}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+}$343.0606, found 343.0603.

## 4-(Cyanocarbonothioylamino)-2-



Chemical Formula: $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{Si}$ Molecular Weight: 352.50

## ((trimethylsilyl)ethynyl)phenyl methanesulfonate (9)

Note: This compound degrades quickly. Following the general procedure of Besson et al. [40], a flask containing 8 ( 0.104 g ,
0.248 mmol ) was flushed with argon. Resin-linked triphenylphosphine $(0.42 \mathrm{~g}, 0.51 \mathrm{mmol}$ assuming an average loading of $1.2 \mathrm{mmol} / \mathrm{g}$ resin) and anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added. The reaction mixture was agitated for 2.5 h under argon at room temperature. The crude mixture was purified via flash-column chromatography (eluting with 7:3 hexanes:EtOAc) to afford $\mathbf{9}$ as a dark yellow oil $(0.062 \mathrm{~g}, 0.18 \mathrm{mmol}, 71 \%)$ The product was used immediately in next reaction.

## 2-Cyano-5-((trimethylsilyl)ethynyl)benzo[d]thiazol-6-yl



Chemical Formula: $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{Si}$ Molecular Weight: 350.49

## methanesulfonate (10)

Following the general procedure of Inamoto and coworkers [42], a flask containing 9 ( $16.4 \mathrm{mg}, 46.5 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ was charged with palladium(II) chloride ( $1 \mathrm{mg}, 6 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), copper(I) iodide ( $5.0 \mathrm{mg}, 26 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), and tetrabutylammonium bromide ( 0.031 $\mathrm{g}, 98 \mu \mathrm{~mol})$, followed by an argon flush. Anhydrous DMF ( 0.22 mL ) and DMSO ( 0.22 mL )
were then added. The reaction was heated at $120^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 h . The crude mixture was filtered over a pad of Celite and extracted with $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic phase was then washed with $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(1$ x 15 mL ), water ( $1 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and brine ( $1 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried by $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The concentrated mixture was purified by flash-column chromatography (eluting with 8:2 hexanes:EtOAc) to afford $\mathbf{1 0}$ as a brown solid ( $10.0 \mathrm{mg}, 61 \%$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$ $\delta 8.43(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.07(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.36(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.37(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $\left.125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 150.4$, $148.8,138.8,136.1,130.2,118.4,116.5,112.3,103.0,98.0,39.1,-0.3$; HRMS (ESI+) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{15} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{SiNa}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}+\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{OH}\right]^{+}$405.0375, found 405.0374.


Chemical Formula: $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~S}_{2}$ Molecular Weight: 304.34

## (S)-2-(5-Ethynyl-6-hydroxybenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)-4,5-

 dihydrothiazole-4-carboxylic acid (2)To a flask of $\mathbf{1 0}(58 \mathrm{mg}, 0.16 \mathrm{mmol})$ in dry THF ( 2 mL ) under argon at $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was added a 1.0 M solution of LiHMDS in THF ( 0.26 mL ), followed immediately by TMS chloride ( $29 \mathrm{mg}, 0.26 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The reaction was allowed to warm to room temperature, and then quenched ( 1 M NaHSO 4 ). The mixture was extracted with EtOAc ( 20 mL ) and then washed with $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaHSO}_{4}(2 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and brine $(1 \times 20$ mL ), dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The concentrated mixture was then purified via flash-column chromatography (eluting with 8:2 hexanes:EtOAc) to yield 6-hydroxy-5-((trimethylsilyl)ethynyl)benzo[d]thiazole-2-carbonitrile as a brown solid which was used immediately in the next step. To a solution of 6-hydroxy-5-((trimethylsilyl)ethynyl)benzo[d]thiazole-2-carbonitrile ( $0.02 \mathrm{~g}, 0.08 \mathrm{mmol})$ in degassed methanol was added a solution of D-cysteine ( $0.015 \mathrm{~g}, 0.097 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in degassed 0.05 M
phosphate buffer ( pH 8.0 ). The reaction was stirred under $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ overnight. The mixture was then concentrated in vacuo, dissolved in a solution of sodium carbonate ( pH 9 ), and filtered through cotton wool. The filtrate was then cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and HCl was added until a precipitate formed. The resultant brown precipitate was collected to provide 2 as a brown solid ( $4.4 \mathrm{mg}, 20 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$, $18 \%){ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\left.500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 8.09(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.44(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.43(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.78(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (125 MHz, CD $\left.{ }_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 177.7,165.6,158.2,144.3,138.3,127.6,111.6,107.4,82.9,80.1$, 67.9, 36.5, 30.3; IR (thin film) 3371.7, 3283.7, 2918.3, 2850.3, 2359.6, 1593.5, 1489.0, 1435.8, 1280.4, 1205.5, 1027.7, 880.7, 857.8, $668.0 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (ESI-) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~S}_{2}[\mathrm{M}-$ $\mathrm{H}]^{-} 302.9898$, found 302.9905 .

HPLC trace:


dichlorobis(triphenylphosphine) palladium $(0.31 \mathrm{~g}, 0.43 \mathrm{mmol})$, and copper( I ) iodide $(0.085 \mathrm{~g}$, 0.45 mmol ). The flask was again flushed with argon and sealed with a rubber septum. Dry triethylamine $(250 \mathrm{~mL})$ and ethynyltrimethylsilane $(6.10 \mathrm{~mL}, 43.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ were then added via syringe. The flask was heated in a $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ oil bath under positive argon pressure for 3 h , and the reaction was monitored by TLC. Upon completion, the reaction mixture was filtered through a pad of Celite and diluted with EtOAc (200 mL). The filtrate was washed with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(2$ x 100 mL ) and brine ( $1 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), then dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo to provide $\mathbf{S 1}$ as a grey solid. $(13.0 \mathrm{~g}, 90 \%) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{HNMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.33(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $8.19(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.2,2.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.93(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.99(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 0.29(\mathrm{~s}, 9 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 $\left.\mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 164.9,140.9,129.8,125.8,113.5,110.3,101.5,98.5,56.7,-0.09$; IR (thin film) 2987, 2161, 1579, $1521 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$; HRMS (CI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \mathrm{Si}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}$249.0821, found 249.0821 .

## Procedure for converting methyl ether 5

To a flame dried round bottom flask containing the 2-bromo-4-nitroaniline (7.47 g, 30.0 mmol) under argon, was added 200 mL of dry $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The temperature was reduced to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. To this mixture was slowly added $90 \mathrm{~mL}(90 \mathrm{mmol})$ of $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{BBr}_{3}$ solution in dry $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. The reaction was allowed to warm and stir at room temperature for 12 h . The reaction was then
quenched with $1.0 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaHSO}_{4}$, washed with $1.0 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaHSO}_{4}(2 \times 250 \mathrm{~mL})$, saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(1 \times$ 250 mL ) and brine ( $1 \times 250 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). Filtered through a pad of Celite and diluted with EtOAc (200 $\mathrm{mL})$. The filtrate was washed with saturated $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and brine $(1 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$, then dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude material was purfied by flashcolumn chromatography (eluting with 1:1 EtOAc:hexanes) to afford the crude phenol as a brown solid, which was carried on immediately. A flask containing the crude phenol ( 4.40 g , 27.0 mmol ) was flushed with argon, and 30 mL dry THF was added. The flask was then cooled to $-78{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. A solution of KHMDS ( 1.0 M in THF 59.0 mL ) was added, followed by trimethylsilyl chloride $(7.53 \mathrm{~mL}, 59.0 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction was allowed to warm to room temperature, then quenched ( 1 M NaHSO 4 ). The mixture was extracted with EtOAc ( 40 mL ), and the organic fractions were combined, washed with $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaHSO}_{4}(2 \times 60 \mathrm{~mL})$ and brine ( 1 x 60 mL ), then dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The concentrated material was purified via flash-column chromatography (eluting with 7:3 hexanes:EtOAc) to yield the protected alkynyl compound as a brown solid. This solid was taken on directly to the next step. To a flask of the protected alkynyl compound $(2.62 \mathrm{~g}, 11.0 \mathrm{mmol})$, was added dry $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(25$ mL ), followed by anhydrous diisopropylethylamine ( $2.97 \mathrm{~g}, 23.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). Methanesulfonyl chloride ( $1.80 \mathrm{~mL}, 23.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was then added slowly over the course of 10 min , and the reaction was allowed to stir for an additional 15 min . The reaction was then washed with 1 M $\mathrm{NaHSO}_{4}(2 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL})$, saturated ammonium $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(1 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL})$ and brine ( $1 \times 25 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic layers were combined and dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, then filtered and concentrated to yield a yellow-orange oil. This material was purified via flash-column chromatography (eluting with 8:2 hexanes:ethyl acetate) to give $5(2.5 \mathrm{~g}, 27 \%$ over 3 steps $)$.


Chemical Formula: $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{~N}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{~S}_{2}$ Molecular Weight: 491.50
(S)-2-(6-hydroxy-5-(1-(2-oxo-2H-chromen-3-yl)-1H-

## 1,2,3-triazol-5-yl)benzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)-4,5-

 dihydrothiazole-4-carboxylic acid (12)Following the general method of Sivakumar, et al.[47], $10 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of a solution comprising coumarin azide ( 1 mM ) 11, alkyne $2(1 \mathrm{mM}), \mathrm{CuSO}_{4}(16 \mathrm{mM})$ and sodium ascorbate $(16 \mathrm{mM})$ in $1: 1$ DMSO: $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was prepared. The mixture was allowed to incubate at room temperature for 24 h prior to dilution with DMSO (final concentration of 0.01 mM in DMSO) and fluorescence measurement.


Chemical Formula: $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~S}_{2}$ Molecular Weight: 437.49
(S)-2-(5-(1-benzyl-1H-1,2,3-triazol-4-yl)-6-hydroxybenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)-4,5-dihydrothiazole-4carboxylic acid (S7)

Following the general procedure of Himo, et al. [54], alkyne $2(2.0 \mathrm{mg}, 5.8 \mu \mathrm{~mol})$ was added to a vial containing benzyl azide ( $2.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 8.8 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), copper ribbon ( 20 mg ), and anhydrous DMSO. The vial was then sealed and allowed to stir at room temperature for 8 h . The reaction mixture was diluted with ethyl acetate ( 5 mL ), then washed with 1 M NaHSO 4 ( $1 \times 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and ammonium chloride ( $1 \times 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic layer was concentrated in vacuo. The crude material was dissolved in a minimal volume of acetonitrile and analyzed by HPLC. HPLC analysis showed12\% conversion. HRMS (ESI+) m/z calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{~N}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~S}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$438.0695, found 438.0690.


Chemical Formula: $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{~N}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{~S}_{2}$ Molecular Weight: 461.51
(S)-2-(5-(1-(5-carboxypentyl)-1H-1,2,3-triazol-4-yl)-6-hydroxybenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)-4,5-dihydrothiazole-4carboxylic acid (S8)

Following the general procedure of Himo et al. [54], alkyne $2(2.0 \mathrm{mg}, 5.8 \mu \mathrm{~mol})$ was added to a vial containing azidohexanoic acid ( $6.0 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 8.8 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), copper ribbon ( 30 mg ), and anhydrous DMSO. The vial was then sealed and allowed to stir at room temperature for 8 h . The reaction mixture was diluted with ethyl acetate ( 5 mL ), washed with $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaHSO} 4(1 \times 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and ammonium chloride ( $1 \times 5 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic layer was concentrated in vacuo. The crude material was dissolved in a minimal volume of acetonitrile and analyzed by HPLC, showing $40 \%$ conversion. Nominal mass (ESI + ) $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ found for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{~S}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 462.1$, and $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{~N}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$484.0.
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# Chapter 3: Building better bioluminescent reporters through ab initio calculations 

### 3.1 Introduction

Recent years have seen a surge of interest in accessing novel luciferin scaffolds for bioluminescence imaging (BLI) [1-5]. BLI relies on the enzyme-catalyzed production of light via luciferase enzymes and luciferin small molecules [6]. This reaction has been routinely used in vitro and in vivo for monitoring diverse biological processes [7]. However, a limited supply of robust, light-emitting luciferins has stymied efforts to visualize multicellular networks and other interactions.

We and others are attempting to fill this void with new luciferin architectures for both multi-spectral and multi-component imaging [7,8]. Our efforts have been focused on developing analogs of D-luciferin, the native light-emitting substrate for firefly luciferase (Fluc) [1]. Fluc catalyzes the activation and subsequent oxidation of D-luciferin, releasing photons of yellowgreen light (Figure 3-1) [6]. While the mechanism of photon release remains controversial and the subject of intense investigation, the most accepted version involves initial activation of the luciferin substrate (as a luciferyl-AMP anhydride) [6,9-13]. Subsequent oxidation of this intermediate, followed by $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ release results in a singlet excited-state $\left(\mathrm{S}_{1}\right)$ oxyluciferin; this compound then emits light as it relaxes to a singlet ground state $\left(\mathrm{S}_{0}\right)$. Fluc can also catalyze light emission with a range of D-luciferin analogs [7], and a similar mechanism is believed to be operative.

The most robust, light-emitting analogs harbor common features: strong electrondonating groups at the 6 ' position, extended pi systems, and rigid cores [14,15]. However, plenty
of analogs exist that meet these criteria, yet remain poor light emitters [4,14,16]. Some notable examples include heterocyclic luciferins (including benzimidazole and benxoxazole variants). Most of these molecules emit less light than D-luciferin when incubated with Fluc $[1,17,18]$. Whether the reduced bioluminescent intensities are due to inefficient processing by Fluc, or the inability of the luciferin to access an appropriate electronic excited state $\left(\mathrm{S}_{1}\right)$ remains difficult to deconvolute. These uncertainties have confounded the development of new useful luciferin analogs; there is no guarantee that a desired scaffold will be able to reach the appropriate electronic excited state or emit light efficiently from that state. Thus, an important long-term goal involves predicting viable light-emitting scaffolds prior to chemical synthesis. Accurate predictions would avoid time-consuming syntheses, streamlining the production of new bioluminescent tools.

There are several challenges involved in predicting robust luciferin emitters. Bioluminescent light production is a complex, multi-step process that involves chemical activation (versus the light-based excitation of fluorescence), thus, traditional fluorescence parameters do not apply. In this particular case, the light-emitting species is an oxyluciferin, the unstable-and difficult to access-product of the chemical activation [19]. For these reasons, we turned to computational tools to aid in the design of desirable luciferin architectures. We employed time-dependent density functional theory [20] (TDDFT) to compute the adiabatic emission of oxyluciferin from the first singlet excited state $\left(\mathrm{S}_{1}\right)$ to the ground state $\left(\mathrm{S}_{0}\right)$. The predicted oscillator strength of this de-excitation served as an indirect measure for the chemiluminscence intensity. These data identified scaffolds that were likely to be robust light emitters, and upon synthesizing compounds of interest, we confirmed the predictions using
standard biochemical and BLI assays, even in live cells. This method will aid in the design of new synthetic targets with desired optical properties.


Figure 3-1. Mechanism of luciferase-mediated light production. Fluc catalyzes the adenylation/activation and oxidation of D-luciferin to oxyluciferin, releasing light in the process. The reaction proceeds through an excited state $\left(\mathrm{S}_{1}\right)$ oxyluciferin intermediate. Relaxation of this molecule to the ground state $\left(\mathrm{S}_{0}\right)$ is accompanied by photon release.

### 3.2 Results and discussion

## 3.2a Oscillator strengths correlate with known robust bioluminescent emitters.

We first calibrated our computational results by calculating the emission intensity of known luciferin analogs (Table 3-1). The predicted values correlated with the known bioluminescent emission intensities in most cases. For example, D-luciferin analogs lacking an electron-donating group at the $6^{\prime}$ position were predicted to have low oscillator strengths. Such compounds are known to be poor bioluminescent emitters [14,21,22]. By contrast, D-luciferin analogs with 6'-amino substituents-known robust light emitters-were predicted to have oscillator strengths on par with (or in some cases better than) the native Fluc substrate. In the case of 6'-dimethylaminoLuc, the steric bulk of the methyl groups can force an out-of-plane twisting, thereby breaking the conjugation across the molecule and drastically lowering its emission strength [23-28]. Similar decreased light emission has been observed for $6^{\prime}$-alkylated luciferins, including $\mathbf{6}^{\prime}$-methoxyLuc, in addition to some fluorophores [28-30].

Table 3-1. Comparison of calculated oscillator strengths and bioluminescence emission intensities for known luciferins.

| Compound | Name | Oscillator Strength ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Rel. BLI ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | D-Luc | 100 | 100 |
|  | 6'-deoxyLuc | 1.4 | $<0.01^{\circ}$ |
|  | 6'-methoxyLuc | 57.2 | <0.01 |
|  | 6'-aminoLuc <br> 6'-MeNHLH ${ }_{2}$ <br> $6{ }^{\prime}-\mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{NLH}_{2}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 91.9 \\ 94.9 \\ 102.9 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 61 \\ 101 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | CycLuc1 | 127.6 | 38 |
|  | NMeBenzLuc | 0.282 | 0.01 |

${ }^{a}$ Calculated as a theoretical maximum. ${ }^{b}$ Bioluminescence was measured using 100 $\mu \mathrm{M}$ luciferin and $1 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ recombinant luciferase. ${ }^{\text {C }}$ no signal exceeding background was observed.

## 3.2b Oscillator strengths predict novel bioluminescent emitters.

Encouraged by these results, we used the same methodology to predict the emission strengths for novel luciferin architectures. These compounds included various electronically and sterically modified luciferins (Table 3-2). This latter category included scaffolds with substituents at the $4^{\prime}, 5^{\prime}$, and $7^{\prime}$ positions on the D -luciferin core.

Table 3-2. Calculated oscillator strengths and measured bioluminescent photon production for novel luciferin analogs.

| Compound Name | Oscillator Strength ${ }^{a}$ | Rel. BLI ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Rel. $\mathrm{CLI}^{\text {c }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D-Luc | 100 | 100 | $100 \pm 11$ |
|   6'-deoxyLuc | $57.2$ $1.4$ | $\begin{aligned} & <0.01^{d} \\ & <0.01 \end{aligned}$ | $0.157 \pm 0.029$ $0.99 \pm 0.11$ |
|  <br> 4'-BrLuc | 86.1 | 3.1 | $5.31 \pm 0.45$ |
|  <br> 5'-BrLuc | 104 | 46.0 | $15.1 \pm 2.4$ |
|  <br> 7'-BrLuc | 79.3 | 3.4 | $15.8 \pm 2.0$ |
|  | 25.8 | 0.5 | 0.47 to $0.06{ }^{\text {e }}$ |
|  | 93.3 | 34.3 | $46.5 \pm 10.4$ |

${ }^{a}$ Calculated as a theoretical maximum. ${ }^{b}$ Bioluminescence was measured using 100 $\mu \mathrm{M}$ luciferin and $1 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ recombinant luciferase. ${ }^{\circ}$ Chemiluminescence was measured at approximately $25 \mu \mathrm{M}$ luciferin and 0.05 M KOPh in DMSO (see SI for further details). ${ }^{d}$ no signal exceeding background was observed. ${ }^{e}$ A range of measured values is given due to compound instability.

As expected, the calculated oscillator strengths for the $6^{\prime}$-deoxy compound ( $6^{\prime}-$ deoxyLuc) and nitro-substituted scaffold $\mathbf{4}^{\prime}-\mathbf{N O}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{L u c}$ were substantially lower than D-luc. Both $\mathbf{6}^{\prime}-\mathbf{d e o x y L u c}$ and $\mathbf{4}^{\prime}-\mathbf{N O}_{\mathbf{2}}$ Luc reduce the amount of electron density at the $6^{\prime}$ position of the luciferin ring; this type of modification is known to reduce luciferin light output [31,32]. Since the bioluminescent properties of these analogs are unknown, the reduction in light emission predicted by DFT could imply an inherent reduction in the light-emitting potential of the compound (as noted above). To avoid this confounding issue, we utilized a traditional chemiluminescent assay to measure their intrinsic abilities to produce light (Figure 3-2) [33-35]. This non-enzymatic process mimics the enzymatic reaction itself, involving formation of an activated ester intermediate, followed by oxidation [36]. Indeed, White and others have previously shown that the luciferin excited state can be attained by treating activated luciferin esters (as AMP surrogates) with base (e.g., KOPh), in the absence of enzyme [33]. We were able to recapitulate these results, observing strong emission from the activated ester of D-luciferin. Control compounds (e.g., 6'-methoxyLuc and $\mathbf{6}^{\prime}$-deoxyLuc) with weaker electron donation into the aromatic ring (a key feature of luciferins) did not produce this level of emission.


Figure 3-2. Chemiluminescent light production from luciferin analogs. Luciferin acids can be chemically activated to labile esters. Subsequent H -atom abstraction/oxidation generates lightemitting species. This procedure mimics the bioluminescent reaction mediated by Fluc.

## 3.2c DFT model, chemiluminescence and biochemical analyses reveal sites for orthogonal probe development.

More interesting patterns emerged with the sterically modified compounds. DFT analyses were performed on a series of luciferins comprising modifications at the $4^{\prime}, 5^{\prime}$, and $7^{\prime}$ positions. In initial surveys, the site of substitution was predicted to minimally impact emission for a given substituent. However, the electron-withdrawing/donating character of the substituent itself was predicted to greatly impact the strength of the emission (i.e., the more electron-withdrawing substituents correlated with the weakest oscillator strengths). We decided to move forward with the bromo-substituted compounds (4'-BrLuc, 5'-BrLuc, and $\left.\mathbf{7}^{\prime}-\mathbf{B r L u c}\right)$ for experimental validation. Bromo substituents are inductive electron-withdrawing groups, yet ortho/paradirectors in classic organic transformations. Thus, they fall in the "middle-of-the-road" considering their electronic impact. Methyl groups are classified solely as inductive donors, while nitro groups are classified as resonance acceptors. Bromo substituents are also suffi sufficiently large to present a steric barrier for enzyme utilization and thus help us deconvolute the role of electronics vs. enzymatic processing. Last, these substituents offer unique opportunities for further analog development - as chemical handles for important classes of cross-coupling reactions.


Figure 3-3. Bromo-substituted luciferins are capable of chemiluminescent photon production. Measured counts were normalized to concentration. Error bars represent the standard error in the mean of at least 18 measurements over three days ${ }^{* * *} p<0.001$ ( $t$-test)

When the bromo luciferins were subjected to the chemiluminescence assay pictured in Figure 3-2, light emission was observed for all compounds. The intensity of photon production was lower than that of D-luciferin, which was predicted by the DFT calculations (Figure 3-3). Within the analog series, the $\mathbf{5}^{\prime}-$ BrLuc and $7^{\prime}-$ BrLuc compounds exhibited nearly the same levels of chemiluminescence. The photon emission values for the $4^{\prime}$-substituted luciferin (4'BrLuc) were somewhat lower, but on par with the other two isomers ( $\mathbf{5}^{\prime}$, and $\mathbf{7}^{\prime}$ ). The reduction in chemiluminescence relative to D-Luc can be attributed to electronic effects due to the presence of bromine. DFT calculations revealed two low-lying states that may play a major role in the deactivation of luciferin emission: (1) a triplet ground state and (2) a singlet twisted intramolecular charge-transfer (TICT) excited state (Figure 3-4).

Figure 3-4. Ordering of relevant spin and geometric states. In order to reconcile the differences in experimental and computational results for the BromoLuc series, $\mathbf{4}^{\prime}-\mathbf{N O}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{L u c}$, and $\mathbf{6}^{\prime}$-methoxyLuc, the ground and excited electronic states were studied in both the planar and twisted geometric states of the neutral and anionic species; both singlet and triplet states were included to help rationalize possible intruder states that may be responsible for the quenching of the chemiluminescence. Electronic states were computed at the geometry of the first singlet excited state, which was confirmed to be a minimum by numerical frequency analysis. In the case of neutral $\mathbf{4}^{\prime}$-BrLuc, no twisted $S_{1}$ minimum was found. This picture gives relative energetics of the different electronic states at the assumed emissive nuclear configuration.

For the native D-Luciferin, both the twisted and the planar $S_{1}$ state are relatively isolated from other states. Given that our model can reasonably predict the emission strength of native luciferin, the isolated nature of the $S_{1}$ state helps to establish a baseline by demonstrating that it is less probable that there is some other electronic state lower in energy that can be accessed. In the case of the anionic 7'-BrLuc, one observes a very small separation between the planar $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ state and the twisted triplet ground state, which could account for the considerable decrease in experimentally measured emission. The planar $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ state for the other bromo-substiuted luciferin molecules seems to be modestly isolated, but there could be a distribution of protonated and deprotonated luciferin whose different accessible electronic states could cause interference. For both protonation states of $\mathbf{4}^{\prime}-\mathbf{N O}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{L u c}$, the $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ planar state is very near in energy to the twisted $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ state. Considering finally $\mathbf{6}^{\prime}$-methoxyLuc, there seem to be no nearby electronic states, but there is a low-lying planar triplet state that could act as a channel for nonradiative decay. The overall environment in solution is complex compared to our model and many factors besides those described here could be in effect; however, electronic states in both the planar and twisted configurations are definitely accessible under photoexcitation and provide a reasonable explanation for the quenching of chemiluminescence.

## D-Luciferin

| Total Energy <br> (Hartree) | anionic | neutral | Total Energy (Hartree) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -1438.75 | [ s 1 pl | $\rightleftharpoons \begin{aligned} & \mathrm{s} 1 \mathrm{tw} \\ & \mathrm{t} 0 \mathrm{tw} \end{aligned}$ | -1439.22 |
| -1438.76 | to tw |  | -1439.24 |
| -1438.77 |  | ¢ 1 pl |  |
| -1438.78 | $\square \mathrm{s} 1 \mathrm{tw}$ | to pl | -1439.26 |
| -1438.79 | $\longrightarrow \mathrm{t} 0 \mathrm{pl}$ |  | -1439.28 |
|  | $\square \mathrm{s} 0 \mathrm{tw}$ |  |  |
| -1438.81 |  |  | -1439.3 |
| -1438.82 |  |  |  |
| -1438.83 |  | $\square \mathrm{s} 0 \mathrm{tw}$ | -1439.32 |
| -1438.84 |  | ¢ 0 pl |  |
| -1438.85 |  |  | -1439.34 |

Neutral BromoLuciferin



Total Energy
(Hartree) $-1478.429$
$-1478.449$
-1478.449
-1478.469



It is well known that in the case of (1) intersystem crossing leads to non-radiative relaxation and (2) that TICT states display near-zero oscillator strength ("dark") due to the broken conjugation of the pi-system [25]. Luciferins with groups that can twist out of plane may have a lower-lying energetically twisted excited state responsible for the observed 'dark' behavior. In chemiluminescence experiments, one would expect the emission profile to derive from a Boltzmann-like distribution of torsional angles, only some of which are light-emitting, while the computational results represent a single excitation from a discrete nuclear configuration (either planar or twisted). TICT states may be underappreciated in luciferin emission and have important ramifications for orthogonal probe development (Figure 3-4).

From a chemiluminscence perspective, both the experimental and computational data suggest that an increase in emission intensity can be achieved by chemical modification at many positions on the luciferin core, as long as the electronic requisites are met by the appendage. However, if this extra steric bulk yields poor bioluminscence, the reduction in light emission must be attributed to poor enzyme utilization rather than an inherent inability to reach the necessary excited state. When the three bromo analogs were analyzed with recombinant Fluc, a significant reduction in bioluminescent light emission was observed for both 7'-BrLuc and 4'BrLuc. $\mathbf{5}^{\prime}-$ BrLuc retained robust light emission. This suggests that the $\mathbf{5}^{\prime}$-BrLuc analog is more efficiently processed by Fluc than the $\mathbf{4}^{\prime}$ or $7^{\prime}$ isomers (since chemiluminescent data suggest that the compounds are roughly capable of producing the same numbers of photons). Other luciferin analogs with rather bulky groups at the $5^{\prime}$ position are also known to be processed efficiently by Fluc [37]. Indeed, recent crystal structure analyses of Fluc suggest that its active site has sufficient room to accommodate steric appendages at the $5^{\prime}$ and $6^{\prime}$ positions, but tends to be too crowded to fit large modifications at the $4^{\prime}$ and $7^{\prime}$ positions [38-40]. Our results establish a
crucial precedence that luciferin scaffolds may be poor substrates for the native enzyme, but still capable of emission from a chemically-accessed excited state.

## 3.2d Experimental characterization of bromoluciferins

Crystal structure analyses also suggest that backbone/steric clashes prevent the utilization of $4^{\prime}-$ BrLuc and $7^{\prime}-$ BrLuc. To elucidate which aspect of the enzymatic process (binding vs. catalytic turnover) might be precluding use of the analogs, we measured the $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{m}}$ and relative $\mathrm{k}_{\text {cat }}$ parameters for each of the transformations (Table 3-3). Interestingly, the $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{m}}$ for $\mathbf{4}^{\prime}$-BrLuc was on par with D -luciferin, but the relative $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{cat}}$ for this analog was 50 -fold reduced compared to the native substrate. This finding is corroborated by crystal structure data, indicating room for a halogen atom to dock - the modification likely interferes with subsequent motion of the enzyme required for catalysis. The relative $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{cat}}$ for $\mathbf{7}^{\prime}-\mathbf{B r L u c}$ was similarly low compared to $\mathbf{D}-\mathbf{L u c}$. The $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{m}}$ for 7'-BrLuc was also higher than $\mathbf{D}-\mathbf{L u c}$, suggesting that the 7' substituted analog does not bind the active site as efficiently. Gratifyingly, the enzymatic parameters measured for $\mathbf{5}^{\prime}-$ BrLuc were on par with those for $\mathbf{D}-$ Luc.

The bioluminescence spectra for all bromo luciferins were red-shifted from that of $\mathbf{D}$ Luc, while the fluorescence spectra were virtually identical (Figure 3-5). These data further suggest that the luciferin analogs can access alternate excited state geometries and relaxation pathways.


Figure 3-5. A) Differential bioluminescent photon production is observed with the series of bromoluciferins and recombinant luciferase (conc. nM) Sample images are included. Error bars represent the standard deviation of three replicates. B-D) Statistical analysis of the data given in A). B) $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ concentration. C) $100 \mu \mathrm{M}$ concentration. D) 1 mM concentration. ${ }^{*} p<0.1$ (ANOVA), ${ }^{* *} p<0.01$ (ANOVA), ${ }^{* * * *} p<0.0001$ (ANOVA)

Table 3-3. Enzymatic parameters for Fluc-catalyzed oxidation of bromo analogs.

| Compound | $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{m}}(\mu \mathrm{M})$ | Rel $_{\text {cat }}{ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D-Luc | $3.07 \pm 0.80$ | $100 \pm 0.3$ |
| 4'-BrLuc | $2.47 \pm 0.92$ | $1.8 \pm 0.4$ |
| 5'-BrLuc | $6.72 \pm 0.31$ | $104 \pm 2.2$ |
| 7'-BrLuc | $17.3 \pm 8.8$ | $1.9 \pm 0.4$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Expressed as the ratio of the corresponding compound with $\mathbf{D}$-Luc.


Figure 3-6. Optical analyses of luciferin analogs. A) Fluorescence spectra of D-luciferin and bromo analogs using $365-\mathrm{nm}$ excitation light ( pH 7.6 ). B) Bioluminescence spectra of D-Luc and the bromo analogs at pH 7.6 .

Collectively, DFT calculations and in vitro assays suggested that the $\mathbf{5}^{\prime}$-brominated analog would be suitable for BLI, while the $4^{\prime}$ and $7^{\prime}$ isomers were good starting points for orthogonal probe development. These compounds were further analyzed in cells. When the brominated compounds were incubated with Fluc-expressing HEK293 cells, robust light emission was observed from cultures treated with 5'-BrLuc. Minimal light was produced with 4'-BrLuc and 7'-BrLuc, consistent with the in vitro data. Interestingly, the light emission observed with $\mathbf{5}^{\prime}$-BrLuc was similar to D-Luc. These data suggest that $\mathbf{5}^{\prime}$-BrLuc may have superior cell permeability compared to the native probe. Though it performed worse than D-Luc in vitro, it performs better in cellulo at lower concentrations, implying superior cell permeability.


Figure 3-7. Differential bioluminescent photon production is similarly observed with Flucexpressing cells treated with series of bromoluciferins. Compounds were administered to HEK293 sells stably expressing Fluc with a concentration of 100,000 cells per well. Imaging was performed at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Compounds were diluted to the indicated concentration in PBS pH 7.4. For further details see supporting information. Sample images are included. (A) Peak emission for all analogs at $100 \mu \mathrm{M}$ concentration. (B) Dose response comparison between 5'-BrLuc (black) and D-Luc (grey). Error bars represent the standard deviation of three runs. ${ }^{*} p<0.1, * * p<0.01(t-$ test).

### 3.3 Conclusions

Limitations in multi-spectral and multi-component emission have spurred the development of luciferins with altered emission wavelengths, conjugation, caged probe development, and orthogonal pairs. The efficient development of such probes has been confounded by a lack of accurate models to predict robust light-emitting luciferins. Here, we report a direct link between density functional calculations and experimental results that allows for the a priori assessment of the light-emitting efficacy of new luciferin analogs with moderate reliability. Our simulations predict that a variety of sterically and electronically modified luciferins should be good bioluminescent emitters. Enzymatic assays confirmed that the molecules retained their ability to bind the enzyme, but were poorly turned over by luciferase itself. It has also not escaped our attention that these groups can be further sterically modified using traditional cross-coupling reactions. These experiments are ongoing in our laboratory and will be reported in due course. Collectively, these studies provide a rational basis for new luciferin design.

### 3.4 Materials and methods

## 3.4a Expression and purification of Fluc

Firefly luciferase was expressed and purified as previously described [1].

## 3.4b Bioluminescence kinetic measurements

Measurements were acquired on a Tecan F200 Pro injection port luminometer with a neutral density filter. Reactions were performed in black 96-well flat-bottom plates (Grenier). Bioluminescence buffer [41] ( $93.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of 20 mM Tris- $\mathrm{HCl} \mathrm{pH} 7.6,2 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{MgSO} 4,2 \mathrm{mM}$ ATP,
0.1 mM EDTA, 1 mM TCEP, $0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ BSA) was added to each well, followed by conenzyme A $(0.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of a 100 mM solution) and luciferin substrate $(1 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of a $0.01-100 \mathrm{mM}$ solution in DMSO). The luminescence from each well was measured for 30 s prior to the addition of Fluc ( $5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of a $1 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mu \mathrm{L}$ solution in bioluminescence buffer). Following the addition of Fluc, luminescence was recorded every 0.1 s over a 1-min period. Samples were analyzed in triplicate and multiple runs were performed. The emission maxima were determined by averaging the largest photon outputs from five independent runs. $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{m}}$ and relative $\mathrm{k}_{\text {cat }}$ values were determined using nonlinear regression analyses and robust fit outlier removal in GraphPad Prism (version 6.0f for Macintosh, GraphPad Software).

## 3.4c Bioluminescence imaging (in vitro)

Imaging was performed using an IVIS Lumina (Xenogen) system equipped with a cooled CCD camera. Reactions were performed in black 96-well flat-bottom plates (Grenier). Bioluminescence buffer ( $93.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) was added to each well, along with coenzyme A ( $0.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of a 100 mM solution) and luciferin substrate ( $1 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of a $0.5-100 \mathrm{mM}$ solution in DMSO). To initiate photon production, Fluc ( $5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of a $1 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ solution in bioluminescence buffer) was added to each well. The plate was then briefly agitated and placed in the IVIS instrument. The bioluminescent output was recorded every 5-30 s over a $45-75 \mathrm{~min}$ time period. Measurements were performed in triplicate.

## 3.4d Bioluminescence imaging (in cellulo)

HEK-293 cells stably expressing Fluc (provided by the Contag Lab, Stanford) were grown in DMEM media supplemented with fetal bovine serum (FBS, 10\%) penicillin (10
units $/ \mathrm{mL}$ ), and streptomycin $(10 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL})$. The cells were cultured in a $\mathrm{CO}_{2}(5 \%)$ incubator at 37 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Imaging was performed using an IVIS Lumina (Xenogen) system equipped with a heated stage ( $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) and a cooled CCD camera. Reactions were performed in black 96 -well flat-bottom plates (Grenier) with 100,000 cells per well. Luciferin ( $50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of 2 X stock in PBS, pH 7.4 ) was added to each well and bioluminescence images were acquired as above.

## 3.4e Bioluminescence emission spectra

Emission spectra for D-luciferin and all analogs were recorded on a FluoroMax-4 spectrometer (Horiba Jobin-Yvon). Luciferin (10 $\mu \mathrm{L}$ of a $100 \mu \mathrm{M}$ solution in bioluminescence buffer) and Fluc ( $10 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of a $1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ solution in bioluminescence buffer) along with coenzyme A ( $5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of a 100 mM solution) were placed in a 10 mm path length quartz cuvette ( 1 mL total volume). Emission data were collected from 450-750 nm (1 nm intervals) at room temperature. The acquisition times were $0.1 \mathrm{~s} /$ wavelength. The spectra were then normalized to D-luciferin and plotted.

## 3.4f General chemiluminescence procedure

Phenyl esters of each luciferin analog were prepared following the basic procedure of Kim et al [42]. In brief, the potassium salt of each luciferin ( $6.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ) was added to an ovendried, two-dram vial containing a small stir bar. Deuterated dimethylsulfoxide ( 0.55 mL ) containing a mesitylene internal standard $(0.275 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ was then added and the luciferin was dissolved with stirring ( 5 min ). Phenylchloroformate ( $0.76 \mu \mathrm{~L}, 6.0 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ) was subsequently added and a brief color change was observed in most cases. The solutions were stirred for an additional 5 min . A portion of each solution $(5 \mu \mathrm{~L})$ was reserved, and the remainder was added to
an NMR tube for analysis. The NMR sample was kept at ambient temperature until luminometer measurements were made (see below). At that point, the NMR sample was frozen $\left(-73{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ to preserve the contents of the tube. At a later time, each tube was thawed and a ${ }^{1} \mathrm{HNMR}$ spectrum was immediately acquired ( 2 scans, 20 s relaxation delay). The concentration of each luciferin phenyl ester was determined via comparison to the internal standard (mesitylene, see Figure 3-7).

The reserved portion of each luciferin ester solution was diluted to 0.5 mL with anhydrous dimethylsulfoxide, and $50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of this solution was added to six wells of a black 96well flat-bottom plate (Greiner). Chemiluminescence values were acquired on a Tecan Infinite F200 PRO plate-reading luminometer. Data were acquired for 1.5 s prior to injection of potassium phenoxide solution ( $50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of a of 0.1 M solution). The phenoxide solution was prepared via dissolution of potassium tert-butoxide ( 112 mg ) and phenol ( 94 mg ) in anhydrous dimethylsulfoxide ( 10 mL ) with stirring ( 30 min ). The total volume in each well was $100 \mu \mathrm{~L}$. After the addition of base, luminescence data were collected for an additional $50 \mathrm{~s}(100 \mathrm{~ms}$ integration times were used). Relative luminescence yields were determined via trapezoidal integration of the data (Figure 3-8).


Figure 3-8. Representative ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum of a luciferin phenyl ester prepared as described.


Figure 3-9. Representative luminescence data following the addition of base to the phenyl ester of D-luciferin. The shaded area denotes the region used for trapezoidal integration.

## 3.4g General experimental procedures

All reactions were performed in flame- or oven-dried glassware under positive pressure of nitrogen or argon unless otherwise noted. Dichloromethane, dimethylacetamide, $N, N-$ dimethylformamide, triethylamine, and toluene were dried by columns packed with activated alumina on a solvent purification system. Anhydrous pyridine and DMSO were purchased from Acros Organics in AcroSeal ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ bottles. All reagents were used as purchased without further purification. 4,5-Dichloro-1,2,3-dithiazol-1-ium chloride (Appel's salt) was synthesized according to a published procedure[43] and stored in a desiccator. Thin layer chromatography (TLC) was performed on Merck $60 \mathrm{~F}_{254}$ pre-coated silica gel plates, and TLC plates were visualized with UV light and ninhydrin stain when appropriate. Flash-column chromatography was performed using silica gel ( $60 \AA$, 230-240 mesh, Merck KGA). NMR spectra were recorded with Bruker Advanced spectrometers using deuterated solvents. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra were recorded at 400 or 500 MHz as indicated. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were recorded at $125 \mathrm{MHz} .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR data are reported in the following order: chemical shift ( $\delta \mathrm{ppm}$ ), multiplicity, coupling constant $(\mathrm{Hz})$, and integration. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR data are reported in terms of chemical shift. Infrared spectra were recorded using a Thermo Scientific iD5 ATR infrared spectrophotometer. High-resolution mass spectra were obtained from the UC Irvine Mass Spectrometry Facility. The abbreviations used can be found in the document JOC Standard Abbreviations and Acronyms.

## 3.4h Synthetic Procedures

Scheme 3-1: Synthesis of brominated luciferins.


## 3-Bromo-4-isopropoxyaniline



Following the general method of Shen and Driver [44], to a flask of 2-bromo-1-isopropoxy-4-nitrobenzene [45] was added iron filings ( $0.15 \mathrm{~g}, 0.56$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ followed by acetone ( 3 mL ) and water ( 10 mL ). Glacial acetic acid ( 1 mL ) was then added, and the mixture was heated at reflux for 3 h . The mixture was then $\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{BrNO}$
230.10 diluted with ethyl acetate $(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with saturated sodium carbonate (2 x 20 mL ), ammonium chloride ( 2 x 20 mL ), and brine. The organic layer was then dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The residue was purified via flash-column chromatography (eluting with 8:2 hexanes:ethyl acetate) to yield 3-bromo-4-isopropoxyaniline ( $72 \mathrm{mg}, 57 \%$ ) as a brown oil. The spectra matched those reported [46].

## 2,6-Dibromo-4-isopropoxyaniline



Following the procedure of Popney and Guan, to a solution of 4isopropoxy aniline ( $1.20 \mathrm{~g}, 7.90 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(66 \mathrm{~mL})$ and methanol (22 mL ) was added calcium carbonate ( $3.03 \mathrm{~g}, 30.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), followed by benzyltrimethylammonium tribromide $(6.53 \mathrm{~g}, 16.0 \mathrm{mmol})$. The reaction
$\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{Br}_{2} \mathrm{NO}$
Mol. Wt.: 309.00 proceeded at room temperature for 2 h . The reaction was quenched with a 1 M solution of $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$, water ( $2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine ( $1 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and concentrated in vacuo. The concentrated mixture was then purified by flash-column chromatography (eluting with $8: 2$ hexanes:ethyl acetate) to afford the title compound (1.02 g, $3.30 \mathrm{mmol}, 43 \%)$ as an orange oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.03(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.34$ (septet, $J=$ 6.1 Hz, 1H), $1.29(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 150.2,136.4,120.9,109.0$, 72.0, 22.0; HRMS (CI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{Br}_{2} \mathrm{NO}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 309.9265$, found 309.9274.

## 3.4i Representative procedure for the synthesis of Appel's salt adducts.

## (Z)-2,6-Dibromo-N-(4-chloro-5H-1,2,3-dithiazol-5-ylidene)-4-isopropoxyaniline



Following the general method of Michaelidou and Koutentis [47], to a flask of the dibromoaniline $(0.94 \mathrm{~g}, 3.3 \mathrm{mmol})$ under argon was added Appel's salt (4,5 dichloro-1,2,3-dithiazol-1-ium chloride) ( $0.83 \mathrm{~g}, 4.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) followed by anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$ and anhydrous pyridine $(0.59 \mathrm{~mL}$, 7.30 mmol ). The reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature for 2 h , $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{9} \mathrm{Br}_{2} \mathrm{ClN}_{2} \mathrm{OS}_{2}$ then loaded onto silica gel and purified via flash-column chromatography Mol. Wt. 444.59 (eluting with 8:2 hexanes:ethyl acetate) to yield the title compound ( $1.28 \mathrm{~g}, 91 \%$ ) as a brown oil. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}\right.$, DMSO- $\left.d_{6}\right) \delta 7.33(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.66$ (septet, $\left.J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right), 1.23(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 164.8,155.8,146.7,142.8,120.3,113.6,71.3,22.0$; HRMS (ESI-TOF) ${ }^{+} m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{Br}_{2} \mathrm{ClN}_{2} \mathrm{OS}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 442.8290$, found 442.8295 .

## (Z)-3-Bromo-N-(4-chloro-5H-1,2,3-dithiazol-5-ylidene)-4-isopropoxyaniline



Isolated as a brown oil ( $0.92 \mathrm{~g}, 87 \%$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 400 MHz, DMSO- $d_{6}$ ) $\delta$ 7.52, (s, 1H), $7.28(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.72$ (septet, $J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.34(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (500 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 159.2,152.5,147.5,144.5,125.2$, 121.0, 116.6, 113.3, 72.1, 22,3; HRMS (CI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{BrClN}_{2} \mathrm{OS}_{2}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 364.9185$, found 364.9189 .

[^0]
## (Z)-N-(4-Chloro-5H-1,2,3-dithiazol-5-ylidene)-4-isopropoxyaniline



Isolated as a brown oil ( $2.84 \mathrm{~g}, 99 \%$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 400 MHz, DMSO- $d_{6}$ ) $\delta 7.20$ (d, $J=8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.61$ (septet, $J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), $1.25(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 500 MHz, DMSO- $d_{6}$ ) $\delta$ 156.6, 156.4, 147.8, 142.9, 122.3, 116.9, 70.0, 22.3; HRMS (ESI-TOF) ${ }^{+} m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{ClN}_{2} \mathrm{OS}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$287.0080, found 287.0084.

$\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{ClN}_{2} \mathrm{OS}_{2}$

Mol. Wt. 286.80

## 3.4j Representative procedure for the fragmentation and cyclization of Appel's salt adducts.

## 4-bromo-6-isopropoxybenzo[d]thiazole-2-carbonitrile



Following the general procedure of Micaelidou and Koutentis
[47], a flask containing the dibrominated Appel adduct ( $0.28 \mathrm{~g}, 0.6$ mmol ) was flushed with dry nitrogen and charged with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$. $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{9} \mathrm{Br} \mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{OS}$
Mol. Wt. 297.17
The flask was cooled to $0{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice bath and DBU $(0.29 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.9$
mmol ) was added. The reaction mixture was allowed to stir for 5 min , then adsorbed to silica gel. The crude mixture was purified by plug-style flash-column chromatography: the plug with the adsorbed reaction mixture was washed with hexanes and was then eluted with 7:3 hexanes:ethyl acetate to afford the thioamide which was immediately used in the next reaction. (Note: this compound degrades quickly and best yields are realized by moving the compound immediately on to the cyclization protocol that follows).

Following the general procdure of Inamoto and cowerkers [48], to a flask containing (2,6-dibromo-4-isopropoxyphenyl)carbamothioyl cyanide ( $0.24 \mathrm{~g}, 0.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) (based on crude
yield from fragmentation procedure), was added palladium(II) chloride ( $11 \mathrm{mg}, 64 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), copper(I) iodide ( $60 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and tetrabutyl ammonium bromide ( $0.43 \mathrm{~g}, 1.3 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). The flask was flushed with dry nitrogen, and then DMF ( 8 mL ) and DMSO ( 8 mL ) were added. The reaction was heated at $125^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h . The mixture was then diluted with ethyl acetate ( 40 mL ) and washed with $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaHSO}_{4}(1 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL})$, water ( $3 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), ammonium chloride ( $1 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine. The organic layer was then dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and concentrated in vacuo. The concentrate was then purified with flash-column chromatography (eluting with 9:1 hexanes:ethyl acetate) to yield the title compound ( $33 \mathrm{mg}, 6.7 \%$ over two steps) as a brown solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (400 MHz, $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.45$, (d, $\left.J=2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right), 7.29(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.64$ (septet, $J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 1.40(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 159.0,145.2,137.7,133.6,122.9$, $119.2,112.8,104.3,71.7,21.9$; HRMS (ESI-TOF) ${ }^{+} m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{9} \mathrm{BrN}_{2} \mathrm{OS}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$ 350.9779, found 350.9783 .

## 5-Bromo-6-isopropoxybenzo[d]thiazole-2-carbonitrile

 $146.9,136.1,134.4,129.3,115.9,113.0,104.4,73.0,21.8 ;$ HRMS (CI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{9} \mathrm{BrN}_{2} \mathrm{OS}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$296.9697, found 296.9694.

## 6-Isopropoxybenzo[d]thiazole-2-carbonitrile



Isolated as a brown solid ( $48 \mathrm{mg}, 3 \%$ over two steps). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.07(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.34(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1$ $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{OS}$
Mol. Wt. 218.27
H), $7.20(\mathrm{dd}, J=9.1,2.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.66$ (septet, $J=5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), 1.41 $(\mathrm{d}, J=5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 158.9,146.7,137.5,126.0,119.6,113.3$, 104.9, 71.1, 21.9; HRMS (CI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{OS}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$236.0858, found 236.0864.

## 7-Bromo-6-isopropoxybenzo[d]thiazole-2-carbonitrile



To a flask of 6-isopropoxybenzo[d]thiazole-2-carbonitrile (0.13 $\mathrm{g}, 0.6 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added N -bromosuccinimide $(0.16 \mathrm{~g}, 0.9 \mathrm{mmol})$ followed by $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. The reaction mixture was stirred for 12
$\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{9} \mathrm{BrN}_{2} \mathrm{OS}$
Mol. Wt. 297.17
h. The mixture was then extracted with ethyl acetate ( 30 mL ), and washed with water ( $3 \times 60 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine ( $1 \times 60 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo to yield the title compound ( $0.14 \mathrm{~g}, 75 \%$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{DMSO}-d_{6}$ ) $\delta 8.22(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.60(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.88($ septet, $J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 1.31(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ 6.0 Hz, 6H); ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 155.3,145.7,134.2,124.7,116.4,113.0,103.3$, 73.7, 22.2; HRMS (CI) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{9} \mathrm{BrN}_{2} \mathrm{OS}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$296.9697, found 296.9696.

## 3.4k Representative procedure for the deprotection of the 6-isopropoxybenzothiazole-2carbonitriles and condensation of the 6 '-hydroxybenzothiazole-2-carbonitrle compounds with D-cysteine (7'-BrLuc, 4'-BrLuc, 5'-BrLuc).

## (S)-2-(7-Bromo-6-hydroxybenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)-4,5-dihydrothiazole-4-carboxylic acid (7'-

 BrLuc)

7'-BrLuc $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{BrN}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~S}_{2}$
Mol. Wt. 359.22

To a flask of 7-bromo-6-isopropoxybenzo[d]thiazole-2carbonitrile ( $52 \mathrm{mg}, 18 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ) was added anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ ( 5 $\mathrm{mL})$ and a 1.0 M solution of $\mathrm{BCl}_{3}$ in hexanes ( $1.00 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.06$ mL ) was added slowly. The mixture was stirred at room temperature under nitrogen for 24 h . The reaction was then quenched with a saturated solution of ammonium chloride $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, extracted into ethyl acetate $(30 \mathrm{~mL})$, washed with saturated ammonium chloride ( $2 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine ( $1 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic layer was dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The concentrate was then purified with flashcolumn chromatography (eluting with $1: 1$ hexanes:ethyl acetate) to yield the title compound which was used immediately in the following step.

To a flask of 7-bromo-6-hydroxybenzo[d]thiazole-2-carbonitrile (33 mg, $13 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ) (based on crude yield isolated according to the procedure above) in degassed methanol ( 2 mL ) under nitrogen was added D-cysteine ( $24 \mathrm{mg}, 14 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ) in degassed 0.05 M phosphate buffer, pH 8.0 . The mixture was allowed to stir at room temperature, under nitrogen, overnight. The mixture was then acidified with $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaHSO}_{4}(10 \mathrm{~mL})$. The mixture was then extracted with ethyl acetate ( 20 mL ), washed with saturated ammonium chloride $(2 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$ and brine $(1 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL})$, dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, and concentrated in vacuo to yield the title compound ( $41.0 \mathrm{mg}, 65 \%$ over two steps) as
a yellow solid. Note: this compound was treated with 1.0 equiv. of anhydrous $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ in water and lyophilized if the compound was to be further esterified in the chemiluminescence assay. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR (500 MHz, D 2 O) $\delta 7.56(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.89(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.17(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.76$ (m, 1 H$), 3.55(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right) \delta 180.6,168.4,164.4,157.0,144.6,142.9$, 125.7, 123.4, 103.7, 82.7, 39.1. Note: it is extremely difficult to obtain high resolution mass spectrometry for this compound due to its multiple fragmentation pathways [49].

## (S)-2-(4-Bromo-6-hydroxybenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)-4,5-dihydrothiazole-4-carboxylic acid


( $14 \mathrm{mg}, 17 \%$ over two steps) as a yellow solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right) \delta 7.01(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 5.21(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.84(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.64(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) $\delta$ 180.4, 168.3, 169.8, 4'-BrLuc $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{BrN}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~S}_{2}$ $159.3,146.7,139.9,123.3,119.2,109.0,82.8,39.3$. Note: it is Mol. Wt.: 359.22
extremely difficult to obtain high resolution mass spectrometry
for this compound due to its multiple fragmentation pathways [49].

## (S)-2-(5-Bromo-6-hydroxybenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)-4,5-dihydrothiazole-4-carboxylic acid


( $16 \mathrm{mg}, 36 \%$ over two steps) as a yellow solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR

5'-BrLuc $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{BrN}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~S}_{2}$
Mol. Wt.: 359.22
$\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right) \delta 7.81(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.12(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.20$ (apparent $\mathrm{t}, J$ $=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.81(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.60(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $(500 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\left.\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right) \delta 180.0,168.2,160.4,158.8,147.4,139.0,129.1,116.2$, $110.1,82.8,39.1$. Note: it is extremely difficult to obtain high resolution mass spectrometry for this compound due to its multiple fragmentation pathways [49].

Scheme 3-2: Synthesis of (S)-2-(benzothiazol-2-yl)-4,5-dihydrothiazole-4-carboxylic acid (6'deoxyLuc)


## Phenylcarbamothioyl cyanide.



A dry, nitrogen-purged round bottom flask containing a stir bar and anhydrous tetrahydrofuran ( 30 mL ) was charged with aniline $(0.91 \mathrm{~mL}, 10$ $\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~S} \quad \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and 4,5-dichloro-1,2,3-dithiazol-1-ium chloride (Appel's salt, 2.19 g , Mol. Wt. 162.21
$10.5 \mathrm{mmol})$. The resulting solution was stirred at room temperature for 40 min and pyridine (1.66
$\mathrm{mL}, 20.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was subsequently added. When complete starting material consumption was observed by TLC analysis, a solution of sodium thiosulfate pentahydrate ( $3.2 \mathrm{~g}, 20 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 15 mL water and $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added. The solution was stirred, and when complete consumption of the intermediate was observed by TLC, the reaction mixture was diluted with ethyl acetate, washed with saturated $\mathrm{NaHSO}_{4}$, and dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$. The mixture was filtered, concentrated by rotary evaporation and purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with $10 \%$ ethyl acetate in hexanes) to yield the title compound ( $0.75 \mathrm{~g}, 46 \%$ ) as a brown solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$, mixture of tautomers) $\delta 9.51(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.78(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.57-$ $7.28(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.75(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 165.8,162.0,137.0,136.9,130.2$, $129.5,129.0,128.5,122.9,122.6,113.7,112.1$.

|  | (S)-2-(Benzothiazol-2-yl)-4,5-dihydrothiazole-4-carboxylic acid |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | (6'-deoxyLuc) |
|  | Benzothiazole-2-carbonitrile ( $222 \mathrm{mg}, 1.38 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was |
| 6'-deoxyLuc $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2}$ | dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(6 \mathrm{~mL})$ and a solution of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(228 \mathrm{mg}, 1.65$ |
| Mol. Wt.: 264.32 | mmol ), D-cysteine hydrochloride monohydrate ( $252 \mathrm{mg}, 1.45$ | and water ( 3 mL ) was added dropwise with stirring. After 45 min , the $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ was removed via rotary evaporation and hydrochloric acid $(1 \mathrm{M})$ was added until the solution was acidic. Upon addition of acid, a cream colored precipitate was observed. The solid was collected by filtration, washed with water, and dried under high vacuum to isolate $\mathbf{6}^{\prime}$-deoxyLuc ( $319 \mathrm{mg}, 88 \%$ ) as an off white solid. Note: this compound was treated with 1.0 equiv. of anhydrous $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ in water and lyophilized if the compound was to be further esterified in the chemiluminescence assay. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$

NMR (500 MHz, DMSO- $d_{6}$ ) $\delta 8.16(\mathrm{ddd}, J=28.6,7.7,0.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.57(\mathrm{dtd}, J=19.7,7.4,1.2$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.94(\mathrm{at}, J=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.77(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.4,8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.51(\mathrm{t}, J=10.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR (126 MHz, DMSO- $d_{6}$ ) $\delta 169.88,162.15,159.35,152.67,135.05,126.87,126.85,123.76$, 122.71, 83.98, 36.27; HRMS (ESI ${ }^{+}$) calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$324.9484, found 324.9479 .

Scheme 3-3: Synthesis of (S)-2-(6-hydroxy-4-methylbenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)-4,5-dihydrothiazole-4-carboxylic acid (4'-MeLuc)


## 4-[(4-Chlorodithiazol-5-ylidene)amino]phenyl acetate

3-Methyl-4-nitrophenyl acetate $(9.76 \mathrm{~g}, 50.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in
 EtOAc ( 500 mL ) and the vessel purged with $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ before $10 \% \mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}(974 \mathrm{mg})$ was added. The solution was then sparged with $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ then stirred under an atmosphere of $\mathrm{H}_{2}$. Upon consumption of starting material, the heterogeneous $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{9} \mathrm{ClN}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2}$ catalyst was removed by celite filtration and the solvent removed in vacuo. Mol. Wt. 300.77

The residual colorless oil was taken up in dry $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and Appel's salt (10.8 g, 52.5 mmol ) was added. The mixture was stirred initially for 1 h before dry pyridine was added
then stirred for an additional 2 h at r.t. Upon completion the solvent was removed in vacuo and the crude residue purified over a plug of silica using gradient elution ( $100 \%$ hexanes to $2: 1$ hexanes:EtOAc). The dithiazole ( 14.5 g ) was isolated as a bright yellow solid in $96 \%$ yield over two steps. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.12(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.5,1 \mathrm{H}), 7.05(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.5,1 \mathrm{H}), 7.01(\mathrm{dd}, J$ $=8.5,2.5,1 \mathrm{H}), 2.30(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.27(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 169.6, 158.3, 148.7, 148.1, 147.6, 132.6, 124.3, 120.2, 116.8, 21.3, 18.0; $\mathrm{HRMS}\left(\mathrm{ESI}^{+}\right)$calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{9} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{ClNa}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+} 322.9692$, found 322.9682 .

## 4-(1-Cyanomethanethioamide-N-(3-methylphenyl acetate)

| The dithiazole (14.5 g, 48.2 mmol) was dissolved in $(1: 1$ |
| :--- |
| $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~S}$ <br> Mol. Wt. 234.27 |
| MeCN:THF, 386 mL$)$ and stirred rapidly as a solution of $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}(23.0 \mathrm{~g}$, |
| Amol $)$ in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(96.0 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added. The mixture was vigorously | stirred at rt for 3 h when TLC (hexanes:EtOAc, 3:1) showed consumption of starting material. The biphasic solution was quickly filtered to remove sulfur then the organics were evaporated in vacuo. The residual aqueous phase was acidified with $1 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaHSO}_{4}$ and the resultant precipitate vacuum filtered. The solids were washed with chilled $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and once dry provided the thioamide $(10.7 \mathrm{~g}, 95 \%)$ as a bright yellow solid. The compound was characterized as a mixture of tautomers. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta$ 7.49-7.37 $(\mathrm{m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 7..06-6.96 (m, 2H), $7.02(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.35-2.20(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 170.5$, 169.7, 167.6, 164.7, 151.0, 150.3, 135.6, 134.9, 133.6, 132.2, 127.1, 127.0, 124.7, 124.5, 120.8, 120.1, 113.5, 112.0, 21.3, 18.2, 18.0; HRMS (ESI ${ }^{-}$) calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{9} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}]^{-}$233.0385, found 233.0388.

## (2-Cyano-4-methyl-1,3-benzothiazol-6-yl) acetate.


Compound was prepared according to our previously published method [50].
$\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~S}$
Mol. Wt. 232.26 $\quad{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 400 MHz , acetone- $d_{6}$ ) $\delta 7.88(\mathrm{dd}, J=2.2,0.6,1 \mathrm{H}), 7.32(\mathrm{dd}, J$ $=2.2,0.9,2 \mathrm{H}), 2.75(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.32(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}),{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz , acetone$\left.d_{6}\right) \delta 170.1,152.5,150.9,137.6,137.5,137.2,124.6,114.4,114.1,21.5,18.7 ;$ HRMS (ESI $\left.^{-}\right)$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{9} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}]^{-}$233.0385, found 233.0388.

## 4'-MeLuc



The nitrile ( $232 \mathrm{mg}, 1.00 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was taken up in MeCN $(4 \mathrm{ml})$ and a solution of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}(209 \mathrm{mg}, 1.51 \mathrm{mmol})$ in MeOH $(80.8 \mu \mathrm{l}, 2.00 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}(1 \mathrm{ml})$ was added. The mixture was stirred at rt until TLC (hexanes:EtOAc, 2:1) showed consumption of starting material. D-Cysteine $\cdot \mathrm{HCl} \cdot \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added to the reaction and the mixture stirred for an additional 15 min . The reaction was acidified with 1 M NaHSO 4 and the precipitate collection by vacuum filtration. The precipitate was washed with chilled $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and once dried gave 4'-MeLuc (268 mg, 91\%) as an off-white solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 500 MHz , acetone$\left.d_{6}\right) \delta 12.1(\mathrm{br} \mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.92(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.1,1.5 \mathrm{H}), 7.48(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.9,0.4 \mathrm{H}), 7.02(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.84(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) ;$ ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz , acetone- $d_{6}$ ) $\delta 162.4,160.0,132.1,125.4,115.2,114.9,56.2$.

## 3.4k Computational Details

Density functional theory (DFT) structural optimizations of the singlet ground state S 0 and the first singlet excited state (S1) were performed using the hybrid-GGA functional, PBE0 [51] in the gas phase. Basis sets of double-zeta quality with polarization and diffuse functions [52] (def2SVPD) were necessary to bind the additional electron of the anionic structures. Analytical force constant calculations [20] for the ground state and numerical force constant calculations were performed to verify minima by the absence of imaginary vibrational modes. Constrained excited state geometry optimizations were performed by fixing the out-of-plane bending angle of the carboncarbon single bond connecting the two thiazoline rings to $0^{\circ}$ and adjusting the torsional angle between the nitrogens in each ring. All calculations were performed with the quantum chemistry package TURBOMOLE $[53,54]$.

### 3.41 Molecular orbitals involved in the emission of luciferin analogs.

For each luciferin analogue, we report the molecular orbitals involved in the emission "de-excitation" from the $S_{1}$ excited state geometry. All orbitals are plotted with a contour value of 0.05 au . The primary contribution to the excitation is a HOMO to LUMO transition that tends to have pi-pi character originating on the anionic oxygen attached to the benzothiazoline with the transition dipole moment pointing towards the thiazoline motif. In the case of luciferin that are electron poor at the $6^{\prime}$ position of the benzothiazoline, e.g. 6'-deoxyLuc, no such character is observed and corroborates the notion that an electron rich moiety is necessary for strong emission.
Compound
NmeBenzLuc
PhLuc

Note: for further computational details, please see Appendix D.
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# Chapter 4: Diversifying the luciferin scaffold with metal- 

## based cross-coupling reactions

### 4.1 Introduction

Expanding the bioluminescent toolkit requires access to diverse luciferin architectures. As noted in earlier chapters, these scaffolds have been notoriously difficult to synthesize from a common route. We thus aimed to identify more expedient methods to prepare libraries of functional luciferins. We hypothesized that cross coupling reactions could enable streamlined syntheses. These reactions have broad utility in organic synthesis, the Suzuki and Stille reactions were the specific transformations which best fit our requirements. We sought to examine whether cross-coupling methodologies could be used to readily prepare luciferins with extended pi system to provide rapid access to luciferins with novel properties. For these studies, we examined methodologies to build off the $2^{\prime}$-position of the benzothiazole ring based on computational data.

Many cross coupling reactions have also been used in catalytic transformations. Catalytic reactions with the luciferin scaffold could be problematic due to multiple sites for competitive metal binding. Nontheless, we pursued attempts to synthesize $4^{\prime}$ and $7^{\prime}$ substituted luciferins through Stille chemistry (Figure 4-1). Collectively, the resulting luciferins showed promising physical characteristics, and are good starting points for future luciferin library development.


Figure 4-1.Benzothiazole numbering scheme to indicate sites of desired modification. A sample extended chromophore is also shown.

### 4.1 Extending the lucifeirn pi system with $\mathbf{2}^{\prime}$-substitutents

Extending the luciferin pi system was a natural step to build brighter and multi-color luciferins. Indeed, some extended pi scaffolds were predicted to be approximately 2 -fold brighter than D-lucfierns (Figure 4-1). This prediction is based on the consensus in the field that the light emitting oxyluciferin accesses the singlet excited state. The electronic structure change in the excited state is analogus to many fluorophores, and therefore we can apply the extensive knowledge about them to our (considerably less studied) system. Furthermore, luciferin itself is fluorescent (see Chapter 3). Although the identity of the light-emitting oxyluciferin species is still debated, most groups believe it is the keto form oxyluciferin (Figure 4-2). This is the structure on which we have based our predictions.


Figure 4-2. Structure of the putative light-emitting species used in our calculations.

Native oxyluciferin has a dipole, similar to most fluorophores, with the donor (D) and acceptor (A) separated by a conjugated system (Figure 4-3) Calculations suggested that by increasing the distance of the D and A in a conjugated molecule, you could, up to a limit, increase the oscillator strength of the molecule and thus the intensity of the emission. Based on this fact, we proposed oxyluciferins from parent luciferins 2 and $\mathbf{3}$. As mentioned above, the calculations predicted the oxyluciferins would be approximately fold more than D-luc, respectively. Armed with these data we set about synthesizing the intervening phenyl and intervening alkenyl luciferins.
A)


B)


Figure 4-3. A) Oxyluciferin dipole and the separated D and A concept. B) Structures of possible hyperemissive luciferins.

Armed with the computational insights, we set about synthesizing the intervening phenyl and intervening alkenyl luciferins. The challenge posed by the intervening alkenyl luciferin was that we could not proceed with our customary route of thiazole installation by condensing Dcysteine with a nitrile. This is due to the fact that the heteroaryl acrylonitrile (Figure 4-4) is a Michael-type system susceptible to attack by sulfur nucleophiles. Attempts to lithiate the 2'position of the benzothaizole ring were also complicated due to a possible ring opening mechanism as shown by Hilf et al, [1].


B)


Figure 4-4. Design considerations for intervening alkenyl luciferin.

Inspired by work on the total synthesis of thiangazole [2], we attempted to install the intervening alkene via a Horner-Wadsworth-Emmons reaction with a thiazole unit (Figure 4-5 A). Toward this end, we began studies toward forming the required phosphonate (Figure 4-5 B). While promising, we halted this synthesis when the desired luciferin was reported by another
group [3]. Interestingly, the spectral properties mentioned in the report seem to support those predicted in our computational data.

A)



Figure 4-5. Efforts toward alkenyl luciferin. A) Disconnection of alkenyl luciferin. B) Possible synthetic route.

We next focused on an alternative extended chromophore: intervening phenyl luciferin 2. The key step in the synthesis of this molecule was a Suzuki-Miayaura coupling a known bromobenzothiazole and boronic ester (Scheme 4-1). Traditional Suzuki-Miayaura couplings rely on boronic acids; interestingly, these molecules did not couple well in our hands. Aryl thiazoline synthesis is not as facile as the synthesis of thiazolines by the condensation of D-
cysteine with 2-cyanobenzothiazoles. In fact, that condensation has even been proposed as a new class of "click" reactions [4]. After a screening various conditions, we ultimately settled on a condensation performed over 12 h in refluxing ethanol. Progress has been made toward an amino-substituted variant as well (Scheme 4-1).

Scheme 4-1. Synthesis of phenyl-substituted luciferins.




With the luciferin 2 in hand we could test its biochemical properties. The compound 2 does not emit light with Fluc, but rather is a potent inhibitor (Figure 4-6C). This molecule is capable of emitting light, though. The chemilumienscence assay described in Chapter 3 indicated that 2 emitted light at $4 \%$ of that reported for $D$-luc. We were able to further
investigate the fluorescence properties of the molecule. The excitation and emission spectra are shown in Figure 4-6A. Interestingly, the Stokes shift of the molecule was quite large and showed a fairly strong dependance on solvent dielectric (Figure 4-6B) This indicates that the light emitted by $\mathbf{2}$ is environment dependent, suggesting that the color of light emission of $\mathbf{2}$ could be modulated by a mutant enzyme.


Figure 4-6. Characterization of properties of luciferin 2. A) Fluorescence intensity of $\mathbf{2}$ in solvents of varied dielectrics. The excitation wavelength was optimized for each solvent. B) Lippert plot of 2. C) Concentrations of $\mathbf{2}$ were varied in reaction mixtures containing $10 \mu \mathrm{M} \mathrm{D}$ luciferin and $1 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ of Fluc, $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{pH}$ 8.0.

To further test this hypothesis, we added protein to the luciferin solution and re-analzyed the fluorescence data. As shown in Figure 4-7, the fluorescence intensity increased with increasing concentration of protein. These data suggested that phenyl luciferin is capable of robust emission when "bound" in a conformation that prevents non-radiative relaxation or twisting movements. Indeed, we are currently screening for a mutant enzyme that emits light with $\mathbf{2}$, likely enforcing a planar conformation.


Figure 4-7. Fluorescence of 2 in the presence of protein. A) Fluorescence of $\mathbf{2}$ in the presence of Fluc. B) Fluorescence of 2 in the presence of the relatively nonpolar protein, BSA, and the relatively polar protein, lysozyme.

One logical extension from these data is that unique luciferases could be identified based to discriminate among luciferins with distinct rotational states. These lucifeirns would be analogous to molecular rotors [5]. Such systems comprise two units with a non-trivial rotational energy barrier to relative rotation. The molecules display many interesting properties, such as high polarity and viscosity sensitivity [6,7].

Applying these ideas to the lucifeirn system, we performed rotational energy barrier calculations on substituted phenyl luciferins. We modeled known molecular rotor fluorophores via semi-emperical PM3 calculations [8], and found the predicted rotational barrier to be 4-6 $\mathrm{kcal} / \mathrm{mol}$ (Figure 4-8). When we modeled methylated phenyl luciferins 3 and 4 we found the energy barrier to be similar (Figure 4-9), suggesting these molecules are good candidates for molecular rotor luciferins.
A)


C)


E)


B)


D)


F)



Figure 4-8. Rotational energy barrier calculations for known and novel molecular rotors. All calculations are semi-empirical PM3. A) Known molecular rotor DMABN. B) Known molecular rotor DCVJ. C) Phenyl luciferin 2. D) Phenyl luciferin 2. E) Methylated phenyl luciferin 3. F) Methylated phenyl luciferin 4.
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Figure 4-9. Structures of two methyl-substituted luciferins.

Initial attempts to synthesize luciferin $\mathbf{3}$ using analogous conditions to access $\mathbf{2}$ were unsuccessful. Thus, a second route was devised and is pictured in Scheme 4-2. In this route, the bromobenzonitrile was lithiated and then quenched with solid $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ to provide known carboxylic acid. This molecule was then converted to the acid chloride and reacted with 4-isopropoxyanline to afford the amide in $20 \%$ yield over two steps. The amide was treated with Lawesson's reagent [9] to provide the thioamide, which was then cyclized to the benzothiazole using the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ activation chemistry previously mentioned. The aryl benzothiazole phenol was deprotected using boron trichloride, and the thiazoline installed via the same general method used to install the thiazoline on phenyl luciferin (Scheme 4-2A).

By contrast, methyluciferin 4 could be accessed using Suzuki-Miyaura methodology. The requisite boronic ester was installed with a Miyaura reaction in modest yield. The boronic ester was then coupled to the bromobenzothiazole via a Suzuki-Miyaura reaction. This material was then condensed with cysteine to access the desired molecule (Scheme 4-2B). This compound was assayed as described for $\mathbf{2}$ above. Luciferin $\mathbf{4}$ was also found to inhibit Fluc, with an approximate $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ in the high micromolar range. Studies of the fluorescence properties of $\mathbf{3}$ and $\mathbf{4}$ are ongoing.

Applying the same procedure mentioned earlier, luciferin 4 is an inhibitor of the native luciferase enzyme, with an approximate $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ in the high micromolar range. Studies of the fluorescence properties of $\mathbf{3}$ and $\mathbf{4}$ are ongoing.

In conclusion, intervening phenyl luciferins have been synthesized, and their biochemical and fluorescence behavior characterized. Phenylluciferin 2 shows some promise as an orthogonal luciferin candidate, and methylluciferins $\mathbf{3}$ and $\mathbf{4}$ establish groundwork for future work on molecular rotor luciferins.

Scheme 4-2. Synthesis of methyl-substituted phenyl luciferins 3 and 4.
A)

$\mathrm{PdCl}_{2}$ (0.2 equiv.)


B)



### 4.2 Building sterically modified luciferins via $4^{\prime}$ and $7^{\prime}$ substitution

In parallel with the work above, we examined cross coupling to add steric substitutions on the luciferin benzothiazole ring. Broadly, we utilized the bromo luciferins described in chapter 3 as the cross coupling partner, and then surveyed a number of cross coupling methodologies. The 4'- and $7^{\prime}$ 'bromo scaffolds were particularly attractive for derivatization based on their measured $\mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{cat}}$ and $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{m}}$ values with Fluc (Chapter 3). These data suggested that the 4' and 7' positions were "hot spots" for orthogonal probe development and could serve as foci for steric disruptions of luciferin-luciferase binding (Figure 4-1).

Our "holy grail" remained a luciferin synthesis that would allow late-stage diversification to a library of modified luciferins. Cross-coupling was chosen as the best candidate methodology to create such a library. This is because it allows the additional installation of diverse functional groups. Additionally, data from the bromo derivatives and others indicated that the extra "grease" added by the all carbon functionalization may likely increase cell permeability, as opposed to dervitization methodologies adding additional H -bond donors and acceptors. A further goal was to connect any functional group to the luciferin molecule through an $\mathrm{sp}^{3}$ carbon as opposed to an $\mathrm{sp}^{2}$ or sp carbon. This is due to the fact that extending the conjugation of the luciferin chromophores would likely alter the frontier molecule orbitals, and possibly quench light emission.

The main challenges with cross-coupling reactions on luciferin substrates are twofold: 1 . Late-stage luciferin intermediates are densely functionalized with sensitive moieties, notably the highly reactive nitrile and electrophilic $\mathrm{C}^{\prime}$ ' carbon of the benzothiazole (Figure 4-1). 2. These
molecules contain a number of motifs which are known metal ligands, potentially leading to catalytically unproductive interactions with a metal catalyst.

We chose to focus our studies on the $4^{\prime}$ and $7^{\prime}$ positions of the luciferin benzothiazole based on preliminary work described in Chapters 2 and 3. Additionally, we analyzed crystal structure data suggesting that the $4^{\prime}$ and $7^{\prime}$ positions were closely juxtaposed to the luciferase backbone. We therefore selected brominated benzothiazoles $\mathbf{5}$ and $\mathbf{6}$ as ideal starting points for our cross-coupling studies.


5


6

Figure 4-10. Brominated benzothiazoles used as starting points for our cross-coupling study.

Our initial forays into metal-based coupling focused on Negishi methodologies with zinc [10]. These reactions with $\mathbf{5}$ were unsuccessful, resulting in complex mixtures of products. Mild indium-catalyzed resulted in degradation as well [11]. Fortunately, exploration of Stille protocols [12] showed promise, and we found evidence for the successful coupling of vinyl and phenyl stannanes.

As mentioned above, we had been concerned that conjugated substitions would further complicate the electronic structure of the luciferin chromophore, possibly decreasing light emission. Encouraged by reports of facile allylation using Stille chemistry, we envisioned crafting allylated late-stage intermediates which could then be further derivatized by Suzuki chemistry to create a library of alkyl lucferins. These sterically modified luciferins could provide good starting points for orthogonal luciferin development.

### 4.3 Synthesis of allylated luciferin intermediates

As mentioned above, we had been concerned that conjugated substitutions would further complicate the electronic structure of the luciferin chromophore, possibly decreasing light emission. Encouraged by reports of facile allylation using Stille chemistry, we envisioned crafting allylated late-stage intermediates which could then be further derivatized sp by Suzuki chemistry to create a library of alkyl luciferins. These sterically modified luciferins could provide good starting points for orthogonal luciferin development.

We decided to focus on synthesizing the $4^{\prime}$ and $7^{\prime}$ allyl luciferins since our previous data indicated that Fluc was most sensitive to modifications in these areas. The bromo cyanobenzothiazole intermediates were also selected due to their ease of synthesis. The $7^{\prime \prime}$ bromobenzothiazole was synthesized according to the method mentioned to Chapter 3, with the exception of increasing catalyst loading on the cyclization reaction from $10 \mathrm{~mol} \%$ to $20 \mathrm{~mol} \%$. The 4'-bromobenzothiazole cyclization protocol was improved by using one equivalent copper iodide and one equivalent pyridine, replacing the low-yielding and capricious cyclization procedure previously used.

With the brominated benzothiazoles in hand, we began screening allylation protocols. The highest yielding in our hands was one reported by Fu et al. [13]. This method employed both palladium(0) tri-t-butylphosphine and palladium(0) dibenzylidineacetone. Our experiments suggested, though, that this protocol was not catalytic. One explanation could be that the substrate is not interacting with the palladium in a catalytically productive fashion. We further screened conditions, including attempting to pre-coordinate chelating sites, but no improvements in yield were made (Table 4-1).

Table 4-1. Screen of allylation conditions for 4' bromobenzothiazole.

|  |  |  |  | $-\mathrm{CN}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Entry | [Pd] | ligand | additive | solvent | \% conversion ${ }^{1}$ |
| 1 | $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}(5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ |  | Cul (8 mol\%) | dioxane | 0\% |
| 2 | $\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}(10 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ |  | $\mathrm{LiCl}(120 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ | dioxane | 10\% |
| 3 | $\mathrm{Pd}_{2}(\mathrm{dba})_{3}(1.5 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ | $\mathrm{HP}(t-\mathrm{bu})_{3} \mathrm{BF}_{4}(6 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ | CsF (200 mol\%) | dioxane | 2\% |
| 4 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Pd}_{2}(\mathrm{dba})_{3}(15 \mathrm{~mol} \%), \\ & \mathrm{Pd}_{2}\left(\mathrm{PtBu}_{3}\right)_{6}(15 \mathrm{~mol} \%) \end{aligned}$ |  | CsF (200 mol\%) | dioxane | 20\% |
| 5 | $\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{OAc})_{2}(10 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ | $\mathrm{P}(2-\mathrm{furyl})_{3}(10 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ | CsF (200 mol\%) | dioxane | 9\% |
| 6 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Pd}_{2}(\mathrm{dba})_{3}(50 \mathrm{~mol} \%), \\ & \mathrm{Pd}_{2}\left(\mathrm{PtBu}_{3}\right)_{6}(50 \mathrm{~mol} \%) \end{aligned}$ |  | CsF (200 mol\%) | dioxane | 44\% |
| 7 | $\mathrm{Pd}_{2}(\mathrm{dba})_{3}(2 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ | $\mathrm{AsPh}_{3}$ | CsF (200 mol \%) | dioxane | 0\% |
| 8 | $\mathrm{Pd}_{2}(\mathrm{dba})_{3}(2 \mathrm{~mol} \%)$ | $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{Cy})_{3}$ | CsF (200 mol \%) | dioxane | redo |

1: \% conversion determined by NMR

In order to benchmark the disruption of binding with the wild-type enzyme by the addition of steric bulk, we deprotected and condensed the 4 ' allylated benzothiazole with D cysteine to provide $4^{\prime}$ AllylLuciferin (Scheme 4-3). In an assay with recombinant enzyme, 4' AllylLuciferin emitted light at approximately $1 \%$ of D-luc, further supporting our hypothesis that further steric perturbations could quickly disrupt the binding of the alkylated substrate with the native enzyme, providing leads for orthogonal luciferase-luciferin pairs (Figure 4-11)

Scheme 4-3. Synthesis of 4' AllylLuciferin.



Figure 4-11. Peak light emission for $100 \mu \mathrm{M}$ concentrations of D-lucferin vs. 4' AllylLuciferin vs. D-lucferin.

### 4.4 Future directions

## 4.4a Grubbs metathesis to functionalize allylated intermediates

We hypothesized the terminal alkene present on the allylated benzothiazoles could participate in metathesis reactions to install a variety of functional groups on the late-stage luciferin intermediate. We envisioned two separate modalities for the metathesis reaction: 1. A ring closing metathesis ( RCM ) route, and 2. A cross metathesis ( CM ) route.

The RCM route was based on esterifying the metathesis partner to the benzothiazole phenol, performing RCM, and ultimately hydrolyzing the ester to unveil the phenol needed for luciferin light emission (Figure 4-12). To assay this route, we deprotected the allylbenzothiazole and esterified it with two different acid chlorides- the commercially available 4-pentenoyl chloride and the readily synthesized 6-heptenoyl chloride (Figure 4-12). We then attempted to cyclize the pendant alkenes using Hoveyda-Grubbs catalyst II, with or without the inclusion of titanium (IV) isopropoxide (an additive known to assist with macrocylization of esters as well as prevent the chelation of the ruthenium catalyst by the substrate [14]). TLC and NMR evidence indicated the cyclization of the alkenes, as showed that the omission of titanium (IV) isopropoxide resulted in a cleaner reaction. Experiments towards further optimization of this reaction are ongoing.

A CM route has also been investigated. CM can be more complicated than RCM due to the necessity of biasing the reaction towards a productive CM product. One way this can be accomplished is to use an alkene coupling partner that is known to be highly reactive toward CM [15]. TLC and NMR evidence indicates that CM was successful with 1-hexene. Experiments towards further optimization of this exiting result are ongoing.

Another promising avenue may be to borylate the alkene with $9-\mathrm{BBN}$ followed by a Suzuki reaction to cross-couple the borylated intermediate. This avenue has yet to be explored.

### 4.5 Conclusion

Cross-coupling is a powerful transformation for the rapid diversification of molecules, as well as the formation of carbon-carbon bonds. We have demonstrated the power of this reaction in accessing new luciferins with interesting properties, as well as new steric modifications for luciferin libraries. Overall, this methodology provides possibilities for the study of novel luciferins.

### 4.6 Materials and methods

## 4.6a Expression and purification of Fluc

Firefly luciferase was expressed and purified as previously described[16].

## 4.6b In vitro bioluminescence imaging for peak emission

Imaging was performed using an IVIS Lumina (Xenogen) system equipped with a cooled CCD camera. Reactions were performed in black 96-well flat-bottom plates (Grenier). Bioluminescence buffer [17] ( $93.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of 20 mM Tris- $\mathrm{HCl} \mathrm{pH} 7.6,2 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{MgSO} 4,2 \mathrm{mM}$ ATP, 0.1 mM EDTA, 1 mM TCEP, $0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ BSA) was added to each well, along with coenzyme A ( $0.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of a 100 mM solution) and luciferin substrate ( $1 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of a 100 mM solution in DMSO). To initiate photon production, Fluc ( $5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of a $1 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ solution in bioluminescence buffer) was added to each well. The plate was then briefly agitated and placed in the IVIS instrument. The bioluminescent output was recorded every 10 s over a 45 min time period. The time point of
peak light emission for each luciferin was determined. Measurements were performed in triplicate.

## 4.6c In vitro bioluminescence imaging for $\mathrm{IC}_{50}$ determination

Imaging was performed using an IVIS Lumina (Xenogen) system equipped with a cooled CCD camera. Reactions were performed in black 96-well flat-bottom plates (Grenier). Bioluminescence buffer ( $93.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ ) was added to each well, along with coenzyme A ( $0.5 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of a 100 mM solution), D-luciferin ( $1 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of a 100 mM solution in DMSO), and varying concentration of inhibitor luciferin. To initiate photon production, Fluc (5 $\mu \mathrm{L}$ of a $1 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$ solution in bioluminescence buffer) was added to each well. The plate was then briefly agitated and placed in the IVIS instrument. The bioluminescent output was recorded every 10 s over a 45 min time period. The time point of peak light emission for each luciferin was determined. Measurements were performed in triplicate.

## 4.6d Fluorescence imaging for Lippert plot

Emission spectra for luciferins were recorded on a FluoroMax-4 spectrometer (Horiba Jobin-Yvon). To 1 mL of each solvent, $2 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of an 100 mM solution of the luciferin analog in DMSO was added. The solution was then mixed, and added to a 10 mm path length quartz fluorimetry cuvette. Excitation was optimized, and emission was then measured from 450-650 nm ( 1 nm intervals) at room temperature. The acquisition time was 0.1 s per wavelength.

## 4.6e Fluorescence imaging for protein binding

Emission spectra for luciferins were recorded on a FluoroMax-4 spectrometer (Horiba Jobin-Yvon).

## 4.6f General experimental procedures

All reactions were performed in flame- or oven-dried glassware under positive pressure of nitrogen or argon unless otherwise noted. Dichloromethane, dimethylacetamide, N,Ndimethylformamide, triethylamine, and toluene were dried by columns packed with activated alumina on a solvent purification system. Anhydrous pyridine and DMSO were purchased from Acros Organics in AcroSeal ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ bottles. All reagents were used as purchased without further purification. 4,5-Dichloro-1,2,3-dithiazol-1-ium chloride (Appel's salt) was synthesized according to a published procedure[18] and stored in a desiccator. Thin layer chromatography (TLC) was performed on Merck $60 \mathrm{~F}_{254}$ pre-coated silica gel plates, and TLC plates were visualized with UV light and ninhydrin stain when appropriate. Flash-column chromatography was performed using silica gel ( $60 \AA$, 230-240 mesh, Merck KGA). NMR spectra were recorded with Bruker Advanced spectrometers using deuterated solvents. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra were recorded at 400 or 500 MHz as indicated. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were recorded at $125 \mathrm{MHz} .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR data are reported in the following order: chemical shift ( $\delta \mathrm{ppm}$ ), multiplicity, coupling constant $(\mathrm{Hz})$, and integration. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR data are reported in terms of chemical shift. Infrared spectra were recorded using a Thermo Scientific iD5 ATR infrared spectrophotometer. High-resolution mass spectra were obtained from the UC Irvine Mass Spectrometry Facility. The abbreviations used can be found in the document JOC Standard Abbreviations and Acronyms.


2-Methyl-4-(4,4,5,5-tetramethyl-1,3,2-dioxaborolan-2-yl)benzonitrile
To an oven-dried round bottomed flask was added 4-bromo-2methylbenzonitrile $\quad(0.22 \quad \mathrm{~g}, \quad 1.1 \quad \mathrm{mmol}), \quad 1,1^{\prime}-$ bis(diphenylphosphino)ferrocene]palladium(II) dichloride dichloromethane $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{BNO}_{2}$ 243.11 complex ( $28 \mathrm{mg}, 33 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), bis(pinocolato)diboron ( $0.31 \mathrm{~g}, 1.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), and potassium acetate $(0.33 \mathrm{~g}, 3.3 \mathrm{mmol})$. The flask was then flushed with argon, and anhydrous dioxane ( 30 mL ) was added. The flask was sealed and heated to $70{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 16 h . The flask was then diluted with ethyl acetate $(100 \mathrm{~mL})$, and washed with water $(2 \mathrm{x} 100 \mathrm{~mL})$, sat. $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(1 \mathrm{x}$ 100 mL ) and brine ( $1 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic layer was then dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered and concentrated in vacuo. The residue was purified via flash-column chromatography (eluting with 1:9 $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ :pet. ether) to yield 2-methyl-4-(4,4,5,5-tetramethyl-1,3,2-dioxaborolan-2yl)benzonitrile as a colorless solid ( $68 \mathrm{mg}, 0.28 \mathrm{mmol}, 25 \%$ ). Spectra matched those reported in [19].

## 4.6h General protocol for Suzuki coupling


$\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{8} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{OS}$
Mol.Wt.: 252.29

## 4-(6-Hydroxybenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)benzonitrile

To an oven-dried sealed tube was added 2-bromobenzo[d]thiazol-6-ol (117 mg, 0.5 mmol$), 4-(4,4,5,5-$ tetramethyl-1,3,2-dioxaborolan-2-yl)benzonitrile ( $116 \mathrm{mg}, \quad 0.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 1,1'bis(diphenylphosphino)ferrocene]palladium(II) dichloride dichlormethane complex (12 mg, 15 $\mu \mathrm{mol}$ ), and tripotassium phosphate ( $322 \mathrm{mg}, 1.5 \mathrm{mmol}$ ). Dry dioxane ( 15 mL ) was then added and the reaction was heated to $70{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h . The mixture was then diluted with ethyl acetate
$(60 \mathrm{~mL})$ and washed with water ( 2 x 60 mL ), saturated ammonium chloride ( $1 \times 60 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and brine ( $1 \times 60 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic phase was dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The mixture was then purified with flash column chromatography (eluting with 7:3 $\rightarrow$ 6:4 hexanes:ethyl acetate) to provide 4-(6-hydroxybenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)benzonitrile as a colorless solid ( $63 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}, 49 \%$ ).

$\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{~S}$
Mol. Wt. 281.29

## 4-(6-Nitrobenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)benzonitrile

Synthesized according to the general procedure to provide $0.18 \mathrm{~g}, 0.6 \mathrm{mmol}, 81 \%$. This product was used in the reduction reaction to synthesize 4-(6-aminobenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)benzonitrile. Characterization of this product is ongoing.


## 4-(6-Hydroxybenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)-2-methylbenzonitrile

Synthesized according to the general procedure to provide $0.14 \mathrm{~g}, 51 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 19 \%$. Characterization of this product is ongoing.


Mol. Wt. 251.31

## 4-(6-Aminobenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)benzonitrile

To a flask of 4-(6-nitrobenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)benzonitrile $(0.18 \mathrm{~g}, 0.6 \mathrm{mmol})$, was added iron shavings $(0.10 \mathrm{~g}, 1.9$
mmol ), ammonium chloride ( $0.20 \mathrm{~g}, 3.7 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), acetone ( 10 mL ), and water ( 10 mL ). The mixture was then heated to reflux for one hour. The reaction mixture was neutralized with a saturated sodium carbonate solution and extracted with EtOAc ( 50 mL ). The organic layer was washed with saturated sodium carbonate $(2 \times 50 \mathrm{ml})$, followed by water $(1 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$ and brine ( 1 x 50 mL ). The organic layer was dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The mixture was then purified with flash column chromatography (eluting with 7:3 6:4 hexanes:ethyl acetate) to provide 4-(6-aminobenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)benzonitrile ( $18 \mathrm{mg}, 70 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$, $11 \%$ ). Diagnostic peaks: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.10(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.32 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.85(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.73(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.12(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.86(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 145.44,134.3,133.0,132.7,128.4,127.4,124.1,122.3,118.5$, 116.4, 113.2, 106.4.

## 4.6i General procedure for the synthesis of aryl thiazolines


(R)-2-(4-(6-Hydroxybenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)phenyl)-4,5-dihydrothiazole-5-carboxylic acid

Following the general procedure of [20]. To a flask of 4-(6-hydroxybenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)benzonitrile ( $28 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), was added Dcysteine ( $58 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), sodium bicarbonate ( $28 \mathrm{mg}, 0.3 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and absolute ethanol ( 10 mL ). The mixture was heated at reflux for 30 min , and then piperidine (approximately 4 drops) was added until the pH was $\sim 9$. The mixture was then heated at reflux for a further 12 h . The mixture was then acidified to $\mathrm{pH} \sim 4$ with 1 M sodium hydrogen sulfate, diluted with ethyl acetate ( 50 mL ), washed with 1 M sodium hydrogen sulfate ( $2 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and brine ( $1 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ).

The organics were dried with magnesium sulfate, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo to provide (R)-2-(4-(6-hydroxybenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)phenyl)-4,5-dihydrothiazole-5-carboxylic acid (7 mg, 2 $\mu \mathrm{mol}, 18 \%)$. Characterization of this product is ongoing.

Mol. Wt.: 370.44
(R)-2-(4-(6-Hydroxybenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)-2-methylphenyl)-4,5-dihydrothiazole-5-carboxylic acid

Synthesized according to the general method to
provide $0.11 \mathrm{~g}, 30 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 58 \%$. Characterization of this compound is ongoing.
 $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$
Mol. Wt 294.35

4-Cyano- $N$-(4-isopropoxyphenyl)-2-methylbenzamide
To a flask of 4-cyano-2-methylbenzoic acid $(0.29 \mathrm{~g}, 1.8$ mmol) was added an argon flush followed by anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(15$ $\mathrm{mL})$. To this was added $\mathrm{SOCl}_{2}(0.65 \mathrm{~mL}, 2.7 \mathrm{mmol})$ followed by approximately $200 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ of anhydrous DMF. The reaction proceeded for 3 h at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and then was concentrated in vacuo to provide a light yellow oil which was used immediately in the following reaction. To a flask containing the crude 4-cyano-2-methylbenzoyl chloride was added an argon flush, 4-isopropoxyaniline ( $0.29 \mathrm{~mL}, 1.9 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(15 \mathrm{~mL})$. Anhydrous Hünig's base ( $0.52 \mathrm{~mL}, 3.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise, and the reaction was allowed to proceed for 18 h . The mixture was then diluted with ethyl acetate (50 $\mathrm{mL})$ and washed with water ( 50 mL ), saturated ammonium chloride ( $2 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and brine ( 50 mL ). The organics were then dried with magnesium sulfate, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo.

The mixture was then purified with flash column chromatography (eluting with 8:2 $\rightarrow$ 7:3 hexanes:ethyl acetate) to provide 4-cyano- $N$-(4-isopropoxyphenyl)-2-methylbenzamide ( 0.53 g , $0.4 \mathrm{mmol}, 20 \%$ over two steps $).{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 7.50(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 6.90(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.9$ $\mathrm{Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.54($ septet, $J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.53(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.35(\mathrm{~d}, 6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 125 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 166.1,155.3,140.7,137.8,134.6,130.2,129.8,127.4,122.0,118.2,116.5,113.8,70.4$, 22.0, 19.6. HRMS (ESI+) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$317.1267, found 317.1266.

$\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{OS}$
Mol. Wt. 308.40

## 4-(6-Isopropoxybenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)-3-

## methylbenzonitrile

To a flask of 4-cyano- $N$-(4-isopropoxyphenyl)-2-
methylbenzamide ( $85 \mathrm{mg}, 0.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added Lawesson's reagent ( $46 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and anhydrous toluene ( 5 mL ). The mixture was then heated to reflux for 3 h under argon. The mixture was then diluted with ethyl acetate ( 20 mL ) and washed with water ( 2 x 20 mL ), saturated ammonium chloride ( $2 \times 20 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and brine $(20 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organics were dried with magnesium sulfate, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The residue was then purified with flash column chromatography (eluting with 8:2 hexanes:ethyl acetate), however, some of the Lawesson's reagent remained. This mixture was then taken on to be used in the next step (approximate yield: $58 \mathrm{mg}, 190 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 81 \%$ ).

To the mixture of 4-cyano- N -(4-isopropoxyphenyl)-2-methylbenzothioamide and residual Lawesson's reagent was added palladium(II) chloride ( $7 \mathrm{mg}, 37 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ), copper(I) iodide ( 18 mg , $93 \mu \mathrm{~mol})$, and tetrabutylammonium bromide $(0.13 \mathrm{~g}, 04 \mathrm{mmol})$, followed by an argon flush. Anhydrous DMF ( 10 mL ) and DMSO $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ were then added. The reaction was heated at 120 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 h . The mixture was diluted with ethyl acetate ( 50 mL ) washed with $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Cl}(2 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL})$,
water ( $1 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and brine ( $1 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), dried by $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The concentrated mixture was purified by flash column chromatography (eluting with 8:2 hexanes:EtOAc) to afford 4-(6-isopropoxybenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)-3-methylbenzonitrile ( $26 \mathrm{mg}, 83$ $\mu \mathrm{mol} 36 \%$ over two steps). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 8.04(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.91(\mathrm{~d}, J=$ $8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.66(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.45(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.18(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.70($ septet, $J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.77(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, $1.46(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 162.8,156.5,148.2,138.5,137.4$, 137.0, 135.0, 130.9, 129.7, 124.4, 118.6, 117.7, 113.0, 106.2, 70.9, 22.0, 21.5. HRMS (ESI+) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{OSNa}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 331.0881$, found 331.0876.

$\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~S}_{2}$
Mol. Wt. 370.44 acid
(R)-2-(4-(6-Hydroxybenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)-3-methylphenyl)-4,5-dihydrothiazole-5-carboxylic

To a flask of 4-(6-isopropoxybenzo[d]thiazol-

2-yl)-3-methylbenzonitrile ( $31 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added anhydrous $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and a 1.0 M solution of $\mathrm{BCl}_{3}$ in hexanes ( $0.6 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.62 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) was added slowly. The mixture was stirred at room temperature under nitrogen for 24 h . The reaction was then quenched with a saturated solution of ammonium chloride ( 10 mL ), extracted into ethyl acetate ( 30 mL ), washed with saturated ammonium chloride ( $2 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine ( $1 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic layer was dried with $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The concentrate was then purified with flashcolumn chromatography (eluting with 1:1 hexanes:ethyl acetate) to yield the title compound which was immediately subjected to the method for aryl thiazoline synthesis mentioned above to provide $\quad(R)$-2-(4-(6-hydroxybenzo[d]thiazol-2-yl)-3-methylphenyl)-4,5-dihydrothiazole-5carboxylic acid ( $69 \%$ crude yield over two steps). Note: attempts at isolating an analytical
standard of this compound are ongoing. Diagnostic peaks: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ ) $\delta 8.8$ $(\mathrm{m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 7.0(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.8(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.1(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.3(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) 2.6(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H})$.

## 4.6j General procedure for Stille allylation



## 4-Allyl-6-isopropoxybenzo[d]thiazole-2-carbonitrile

Synthesized following the procedure of Fu et al. [13]. To a flask of 4-bromo-6-isopropoxybenzo[d]thiazole-2-carbonitrile (75 mg, 250 $\mu \mathrm{mol})$ was added palladium(0) tri- $t$-butylphosphine (20 mg), $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{OS}$
Mol. Wt. 258.34 palladium(0) dibenzylidineacetone ( 30 mg ), cesium fluoride ( 75 mg ), and allyltributylstannane $(75 \mu \mathrm{l})$. The flask was then flushed with argon, and anhydrous dioxane was added. The mixture was then heated to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h . The mixture was then filtered over a pad of celite, which was rinsed with $2 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ of diethyl ether. The combined organics were washed with water ( 100 mL ), saturated ammonium chloride ( $2 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), and brine ( 100 mL ). The organics were dried with magnesium sulfate, filtered, and concentrated via rotary evaporated. The crude mixture was purified via flash column chromatography (eluting with 9.5:0.5 $\rightarrow$ 9:1 pet. ether:diethyl ether) to provide 4-allyl-6-isopropoxybenzo[d]thiazole-2carbonitrile ( $26 \mathrm{mg}, 0.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 40 \%$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 7.19(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $7.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 6.09(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.16(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.64(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.88(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.40$ $(\mathrm{d}, J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 6 \mathrm{H}) ;{ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \operatorname{NMR}\left(125 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 158.9,145.9,138.6,137.7,135.6,132.0$,
119.0, 117.1, 113.6, 102.6, 70.8, 36.3, 21.9; HRMS (ESI+) $m / z$ calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{14} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{OSNa}$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+} 281.0724$, found 281.0734 .


## 4-Allyl-6-isopropoxybenzo[d]thiazole-2-carbonitrile

Synthesized according to the general method 4.6j. Diagnostic peaks: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 8.04(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.29(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 5.88(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.12(\mathrm{~m}, 0.5 \mathrm{H}), 4.70($ septet, $J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.60(\mathrm{~d}$, $6.45 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.40(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 8 \mathrm{H})$.
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## Appendix A: NMR spectra for Chapter 2















$$
\begin{aligned}
& 28986 \cdot 0 \\
& \\
& 0982 \cdot \square
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { T0LE } \varepsilon \cdot \varepsilon \\
& \\
& \hline
\end{aligned}
$$




## Appendix B: NMR spectra for Chapter 3

































## Appendix C: NMR spectra for Chapter 4





13C spectrum with 1 H decoupling



Z-restored spin-echo 13C spectrum with 1H decoupling









Appendix D: Additional computational data for Chapter 3

| D-Luc |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S0 Energy $=-1438.843074343$ |  |  |  |
| C | -1.2813373 | 4.2620165 | 0.9672691 |
| C | -0.5639216 | 3.0090061 | 1.0785824 |
| C | 0.8064982 | 3.0073406 | 1.1731258 |
| C | 1.5866350 | 4.2210546 | 1.1679940 |
| C | 0.8995049 | 5.4641204 | 1.0601380 |
| C | -0.4599930 | 5.4801449 | 0.9650070 |
| S | 1.9038716 | 1.6557876 | 1.3136942 |
| C | 3.2596334 | 2.7958787 | 1.3508706 |
| N | 2.9068526 | 4.0653135 | 1.2658870 |
| C | 4.5972422 | 2.3599630 | 1.4611518 |
| S | 5.8813591 | 3.5980542 | 1.4854097 |
| N | 4.9702370 | 1.1080088 | 1.5469792 |
| C | 6.3234754 | 0.9454358 | 1.6461948 |
| C | 7.1002788 | 2.2773794 | 1.6302748 |
| O | 6.9126056 | -0.1140081 | 1.7399920 |
| O | -2.5220026 | 4.3248825 | 0.8775392 |
| H | -1.0078312 | 6.4213743 | 0.8805400 |
| H | 1.4886068 | 6.3838958 | 1.0560990 |
| H | -1.1523024 | 2.0906698 | 1.0827860 |
| H | 7.7967781 | 2.2782298 | 0.7806943 |
| H | 7.6821334 | 2.3670627 | 2.5575835 |
| S1 Energy = -1438.837364170 |  |  |  |
| C | -1.3077364 | 4.2411522 | 0.9742593 |
| C | -0.5251260 | 3.0144489 | 1.0853816 |
| C | 0.8732071 | 3.0787400 | 1.1717981 |
| C | 1.5811853 | 4.2982977 | 1.1571969 |
| C | 0.8343348 | 5.4909973 | 1.0477456 |
| C | -0.5449927 | 5.4702381 | 0.9599381 |
| S | 1.9763984 | 1.7519350 | 1.3077014 |
| C | 3.3014484 | 2.9069091 | 1.3384698 |
| N | 2.9533467 | 4.1697306 | 1.2536181 |
| C | 4.6384353 | 2.4025237 | 1.4553801 |
| S | 5.9626301 | 3.5791753 | 1.4991833 |
| N | 4.9516785 | 1.1310834 | 1.5337424 |
| C | 6.2915119 | 0.9031962 | 1.6420835 |
| C | 7.1250283 | 2.2021387 | 1.6445183 |
| O | 6.8391147 | -0.1862002 | 1.7311552 |
| O | -2.5568109 | 4.1882638 | 0.8988577 |
| H | -1.1121422 | 6.3987922 | 0.8751294 |
| H | 1.3781167 | 6.4389700 | 1.0335322 |
| H | -1.0664676 | 2.0675599 | 1.0986238 |
| H | 7.8317080 | 2.1872338 | 0.8022538 |
| H | 7.7034552 | 2.26642 | 2.5772437 |


| 6'-aminoLuc |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| S0 | Energy $=-1419.531486458$ |  |  |
| C | -4.4714246 | 0.6994008 | -0.0531430 |
| C | -3.3692188 | 1.5614488 | -0.0974595 |
| C | -4.2658215 | -0.7069461 | 0.0061684 |
| C | -3.0009735 | -1.2492622 | 0.0244840 |
| C | -2.0921667 | 1.0063512 | -0.0803884 |
| C | 0.2163665 | 0.2382510 | -0.0579573 |
| S | -0.5584490 | 1.8136621 | -0.1235692 |
| C | 1.6607835 | 0.1366511 | -0.0622214 |
| C | 3.7786309 | 0.8331079 | -0.1041887 |
| C | 4.0076765 | -0.6855881 | -0.0437758 |
| S | 2.3821488 | -1.4681121 | -0.0009116 |
| H | 4.5888990 | -0.9326787 | 0.8545634 |
| H | 4.5767526 | -1.0051463 | -0.9269342 |
| N | 2.4274703 | 1.1729047 | -0.1094693 |
| N | -0.5788406 | -0.7855947 | -0.0088251 |
| C | -1.8823847 | -0.3974068 | -0.0192836 |
| H | -3.5184629 | 2.6409029 | -0.1456867 |
| H | -2.8488274 | -2.3279379 | 0.0711795 |
| H | -5.1385883 | -1.3622747 | 0.0351306 |
| O | 4.6868831 | 1.6208778 | -0.1420452 |
| N | -5.7511204 | 1.1900916 | -0.1014747 |
| H | -5.9101560 | 2.1741553 | 0.0461581 |
| H | -6.5173909 | 0.5846211 | 0.1462701 |
|  |  |  |  |
| S 1 | Energy | $=-1419.527675377$ |  |
| C | -4.4803789 | 0.6851627 | -0.0178088 |
| C | -3.326056 | 1.5285508 | -0.0610676 |
| C | -4.3249978 | -0.7152743 | 0.0290246 |
| C | -3.0598503 | -1.2789556 | 0.0336751 |
| C | -2.0683707 | 0.9377477 | -0.0550975 |
| C | 0.2198206 | 0.1264484 | -0.0523619 |
| S | -0.5154815 | 1.7232744 | -0.1001641 |
| C | 1.6501356 | 0.0722123 | -0.0638300 |
| C | 3.7302659 | 0.8922127 | -0.1104362 |
| C | 4.0432301 | -0.6194627 | -0.0588742 |
| S | 2.4601755 | -1.4950325 | -0.0164827 |
| H | 4.6396163 | -0.8437868 | 0.8364763 |
| H | 4.6276427 | -0.9073218 | -0.9438741 |
| N | 2.3864681 | 1.1573965 | -0.1079582 |
| N | -0.6099309 | -0.9016371 | -0.0076986 |
| C | -1.9050211 | -0.4652489 | -0.0080012 |
| H | -3.4498270 | 2.6122753 | -0.0984732 |
| H | -2.9332101 | -2.3617129 | 0.0698932 |
| H | -5.2111955 | -1.3504931 | 0.0610567 |
|  |  |  |  |


| O | 4.6238033 | 1.7152787 | -0.1476353 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| N | -5.7079766 | 1.2648930 | -0.0238185 |
| H | -5.8180548 | 2.2669642 | -0.055780 |
| H | -6.5484712 | 0.7079876 | 0.0058242 |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{6} \mathbf{6}-\mathbf{M e N H L H 2}$ |  |  |  |
| S 0 | Energy | $=-1458.761653271$ |  |
| C | -4.4872976 | 0.6696379 | -0.0489409 |
| C | -3.3824353 | 1.5327374 | -0.1473878 |
| C | -4.2720884 | -0.7304882 | 0.0981780 |
| C | -2.9995231 | -1.2591416 | 0.1461942 |
| C | -2.1052672 | 0.9900004 | -0.0985360 |
| C | 0.2091789 | 0.2348838 | -0.0417864 |
| S | -0.5742369 | 1.8011763 | -0.1969441 |
| C | 1.6531610 | 0.1391059 | -0.0510849 |
| C | 3.7681740 | 0.8399187 | -0.1370161 |
| C | 4.0035162 | -0.6744100 | -0.0183228 |
| S | 2.3812831 | -1.4597322 | 0.0727991 |
| H | 4.5957110 | -0.8835664 | 0.8824064 |
| H | 4.5639884 | -1.0267934 | -0.8945450 |
| N | 2.4162632 | 1.1749752 | -0.1482248 |
| N | -0.5804386 | -0.7877926 | 0.0730776 |
| C | -1.8861072 | -0.4084055 | 0.0475822 |
| H | -3.5376057 | 2.6067408 | -0.2618215 |
| H | -2.8411273 | -2.3321072 | 0.2603661 |
| H | -5.1294213 | -1.3979398 | 0.1745117 |
| O | 4.6738481 | 1.6285687 | -0.2099286 |
| N | -5.7542279 | 1.1765487 | -0.0942315 |
| C | -6.9503067 | 0.3858882 | -0.0248385 |
| H | -5.8519107 | 2.1722670 | -0.2066495 |
| H | -7.0154443 | -0.3411765 | -0.8521188 |
| H | -7.8189738 | 1.0492230 | -0.0928716 |
| H | -7.0241598 | -0.1697600 | 0.9249636 |
|  |  |  |  |
| S 1 | Energy | $=-1458.758090104$ |  |
| C | -4.4940452 | 0.6138937 | -0.0458721 |
| C | -3.3500759 | 1.4627083 | -0.1364094 |
| C | -4.3265676 | -0.7776759 | 0.0912730 |
| C | -3.0503608 | -1.3241779 | 0.1393935 |
| C | -2.0836445 | 0.8894190 | -0.0874074 |
| C | 0.2132737 | 0.1040229 | -0.0300020 |
| S | -0.5432916 | 1.6872872 | -0.1817513 |
| C | 1.6443727 | 0.0696163 | -0.0445610 |
| C | 3.7108312 | 0.9173472 | -0.1637966 |
| C | 4.0492132 | -0.5815949 | -0.0108331 |
| S | 2.4807752 | -1.4770004 | 0.1024370 |
|  |  |  |  |


| H | 4.6543218 | -0.7338128 | 0.8936643 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| H | 4.6333114 | -0.9197773 | -0.8779575 |
| N | 2.3633530 | 1.1606597 | -0.1676050 |
| N | -0.6032185 | -0.9254865 | 0.0826763 |
| C | -1.9065876 | -0.5057360 | 0.0515846 |
| H | -3.4831241 | 2.5410358 | -0.2431797 |
| H | -2.9132055 | -2.4009690 | 0.2454444 |
| H | -5.1955703 | -1.4295292 | 0.1595461 |
| O | 4.5903845 | 1.7502028 | -0.2662265 |
| N | -5.7219068 | 1.2035500 | -0.0986606 |
| C | -6.9633152 | 0.4926620 | -0.0284835 |
| H | -5.7527764 | 2.2078640 | -0.1987465 |
| H | -7.0532381 | -0.2347449 | -0.8530727 |
| H | -7.7923929 | 1.2032438 | -0.0971100 |
| H | -7.0519632 | -0.0626493 | 0.9204859 |

## 6'-Me2NLH2

S0 Energy $=-1497.990421989$
C $\quad-4.4861974 \quad 0.7491604-0.0910281$
C $\quad-3.3611606 \quad 1.5968276 \quad-0.1029254$
C $\quad-4.2810704-0.6653136-0.0660703$
C $\quad-3.0199584-1.2164225-0.0494197$
C $\quad-2.0926843-1.0261819-0.0865954$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 0.2120281 & 0.2425126 & -0.0606940\end{array}$
S $\quad-0.5521773 \quad 1.8244503-0.0965605$
C $\quad 1.6546717 \quad 0.1319701 \quad-0.0515171$
C $\quad 3.7772472 \quad 0.8162629 \quad-0.0572887$
C $\quad 3.9971041-0.7046679-0.0201194$
S $2.3667505-1.4782345-0.0106258$
H $\quad 4.5657277-0.9700488 \quad 0.8810927$
H $4.5755926-1.0121816-0.9014106$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{N} & 2.4291049 & 1.1640647 & -0.0717082\end{array}$
N $\quad-0.5910980-0.7771687-0.0435917$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { C } & -1.8908190 & -0.3788969 & -0.0578753\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -3.4715258 & 2.6777862 & -0.1257107\end{array}$
H $\quad-2.8823335-2.2979416 \quad-0.0301953$
H $\quad-5.1408846-1.3315481 \quad-0.0599715$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { O } & 4.6912395 & 1.5987041 & -0.0718205\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{N} & -5.7553110 & 1.2633106 & -0.1035751\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -6.9004261 & 0.3869323 & -0.1106124\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { H } & -6.9294967 & -0.2594303 & 0.7820583\end{array}$
H $\quad-6.9190932-0.2614487-1.0026626$
H $\quad-7.8138926$ 0.9887326 -0.1156257
C $\quad-5.9470514 \quad 2.6908924-0.1349602$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -5.5047395 & 3.1446984 & -1.0383141\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{H} & -5.4994370 & 3.1821005 & 0.7455521\end{array}$

| H | -7.0177921 | 2.9136213 | -0.1359343 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| S 1 | Energy $=$ | -1497.987259200 |  |
| C | -4.4966845 | 0.7060184 | -0.0951344 |
| C | -3.3379064 | 1.5324563 | -0.1030681 |
| C | -4.3377266 | -0.7006779 | -0.0714968 |
| C | -3.0750048 | -1.2718974 | -0.0554425 |
| C | -2.0812256 | 0.9327865 | -0.0856622 |
| C | 0.2064057 | 0.1197652 | -0.0591166 |
| S | -0.5299475 | 1.7200821 | -0.0907584 |
| C | 1.6380950 | 0.0676805 | -0.0498289 |
| C | 3.7165129 | 0.8948966 | -0.0549151 |
| C | 4.0342412 | -0.6157478 | -0.0211218 |
| S | 2.4534342 | -1.4965669 | -0.0141354 |
| H | 4.6189543 | -0.8505449 | 0.8791625 |
| H | 4.6322186 | -0.8879359 | -0.9019022 |
| N | 2.3720938 | 1.1552380 | -0.0672201 |
| N | -0.6200908 | -0.9069333 | -0.0462647 |
| C | -1.9188294 | -0.4680740 | -0.0610814 |
| H | -3.4222004 | 2.6165555 | -0.1228028 |
| H | -2.9600356 | -2.3561791 | -0.0384609 |
| H | -5.2079783 | -1.3521217 | -0.0662337 |
| O | 4.6074021 | 1.7221357 | -0.0680827 |
| N | -5.7431889 | 1.2882624 | -0.1110534 |
| C | -6.9170887 | 0.4558623 | -0.1048516 |
| H | -6.9465014 | -0.1815247 | 0.7945456 |
| H | -6.9379717 | -0.2073221 | -0.9857761 |
| H | -7.8124491 | 1.0821284 | -0.1182652 |
| C | -5.8948431 | 2.7218790 | -0.1370610 |
| H | -5.4332203 | 3.1604881 | -1.0369026 |
| H | -5.4356909 | 3.1923887 | 0.7476793 |
| H | -6.9584563 | 2.9718076 | -0.1428581 |

## CycloLuc-1

| S0 | Energy $=$ |  | -1496.809364595 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| C | -4.5332049 | 0.8700070 | 0.1884754 |
| C | -3.4533613 | 1.7437545 | 0.1266118 |
| C | -4.3651522 | -0.5455850 | 0.2133999 |
| C | -3.1167863 | -1.1115332 | 0.1776570 |
| C | -2.1843145 | 1.1564577 | 0.0896171 |
| C | 0.1120877 | 0.3549146 | 0.0035415 |
| S | -0.6418683 | 1.9392121 | 0.0022762 |
| C | 1.5514649 | 0.2322211 | -0.0585663 |
| C | 3.6773770 | 0.8961032 | -0.1735707 |
| C | 3.8849595 | -0.6267986 | -0.1410293 |
| S | 2.2501354 | -1.3848422 | -0.0472983 |


|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| H | 4.4949910 | -0.8940398 | 0.7320955 |
| H | 4.4162729 | -0.9430566 | -1.0485217 |
| N | 2.3340119 | 1.2567174 | -0.1214294 |
| N | -0.6993542 | -0.6578692 | 0.0621271 |
| C | -1.9952502 | -0.2539636 | 0.1118390 |
| H | -3.5905528 | 2.8247393 | 0.1037956 |
| H | -2.9647913 | -2.1914208 | 0.1969222 |
| O | 4.5971562 | 1.6694522 | -0.2374958 |
| N | -5.8720096 | 1.1721768 | 0.2532084 |
| C | -6.6725631 | -0.0121654 | -0.0344857 |
| H | -6.2017164 | 2.0817157 | -0.0338749 |
| C | -5.7307858 | -1.1718301 | 0.3314280 |
| H | -6.9422776 | -0.0552014 | -1.1051920 |
| H | -7.6014056 | -0.0146429 | 0.5505426 |
| H | -5.8687522 | -2.0462145 | -0.3170772 |
| H | -5.9041856 | -1.4993389 | 1.3695036 |
|  |  |  |  |
| S 1 | Energy | $=-1496.805965042$ |  |
| C | -4.5188303 | 0.8448987 | 0.0649123 |
| C | -3.4057626 | 1.7038943 | -0.0120338 |
| C | -4.3933374 | -0.5645303 | 0.1453505 |
| C | -3.1441156 | -1.1508470 | 0.1515579 |
| C | -2.1554606 | 1.0885034 | -0.0049445 |
| C | 0.1249134 | 0.2489555 | -0.0108181 |
| S | -0.5914225 | 1.8572849 | -0.0896190 |
| C | 1.5596392 | 0.1717704 | -0.0422211 |
| C | 3.6502853 | 0.9576060 | -0.1443735 |
| C | 3.9407244 | -0.5561388 | -0.0564846 |
| S | 2.3452184 | -1.4049256 | 0.0351680 |
| H | 4.5484552 | -0.7654240 | 0.8349124 |
| H | 4.5062645 | -0.8768773 | -0.9425104 |
| N | 2.3087500 | 1.2431367 | -0.1275050 |
| N | -0.7045317 | -0.7689543 | 0.0710004 |
| C | -2.0034705 | -0.3225669 | 0.0759388 |
| H | -3.5234551 | 2.7860514 | -0.0737316 |
| H | -3.0096882 | -2.2313761 | 0.2125619 |
| O | 4.5534279 | 1.7670832 | -0.2187222 |
| N | -5.8340155 | 1.1946670 | 0.0757037 |
| C | -6.7191482 | 0.0498699 | 0.1600770 |
| H | -6.1648151 | 2.1465673 | 0.0261097 |
| C | -5.7705014 | -1.1687788 | 0.2125729 |
| H | -7.3916321 | 0.0217248 | -0.7129199 |
| H | -7.3574459 | 0.1257051 | 1.0554184 |
| H | -5.9546457 | -1.8571504 | -0.6255961 |
| H | -5.9152757 | -1.7511800 | 1.1346954 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |


| CycloLuc-2 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S0 | $0 \quad$ Energy $=-1536.043936818$ |  |  |
| C | -4.5177037 | 0.8825209 | 0.22 |
| C | -3.4339598 | 1.7519734 | 0.1364294 |
| C | -4.3507512 | -0.5346255 | 0.2477281 |
| C | -3.1064844 | -1.1051381 | 0.2004083 |
| C | -2.1669125 | 1.1588914 | 0.0932334 |
| C | 0.1268617 | 0.3503597 | -0.0067657 |
| S | -0.6231183 | 1.9365082 | -0.0107615 |
| C | 1.5647602 | 0.2224707 | -0.077 |
| C | 3.6933664 | 0.8773770 | -0.1950317 |
| C | 3.8939476 | -0.6468396 | -0.1793518 |
| S | 2.2563345 | -1.3979752 | -0.0803654 |
| H | 4.5101054 | -0.9258714 | 0.6856685 |
| H | 4.4161248 | -0.9561856 | -1.0945647 |
| N | 2.3521888 | 1.2437481 | -0.1368690 |
| N | -0.6880078 | -0.6596411 | 0.0640315 |
| C | -1.9813369 | -0.2512773 | 0.1234451 |
| H | -3.5607052 | 2.8327060 | . 0962407 |
| H | -2.9588448 | -2.1855981 | 0.2200439 |
| O | 4.6171515 | 1.6467845 | -0.2510712 |
| N | -5.8518777 | 1.1947327 | 0.3023929 |
| C | -6.6485020 | 0.0088926 | 0.0171091 |
| C | -5.7166292 | -1.1573484 | 0.3722052 |
| H | -6.9228079 | -0.0181674 | -1.0557101 |
| H | -7.5794186 | 0.0173775 | 0.6002205 |
| H | -5.8611150 | -2.0270291 | -0.2809260 |
| H | -5.8872431 | -1.4891083 | 1.4092008 |
| C | -6.3644971 | 2.4939682 | -0.0182548 |
| H | -5.8029838 | 3.2695056 | 0.5186751 |
| H | -7.4126624 | 2.5630680 | 0.2996060 |
| H | -6.3145398 | 2.7136773 | -1.1018496 |
| S1 Energy $=-1536.040963107$ |  |  |  |
| C | -4.5096600 | 0.8542040 | 0.1497455 |
| C | -3.3959787 | 1.7067676 | 0.0687325 |
| C | -4.3833063 | -0.5567709 | 0.2088052 |
| C | -3.1369889 | -1.1493234 | 0.1908217 |
| C | -2.1462485 | 1.0860860 | 0.0494318 |
| C | 0.1319822 | 0.2400044 | -0.0070415 |
| S | -0.5826276 | 1.8524619 | -0.0552789 |
| C | 1.5658464 | 0.1595740 | -0.0649257 |
| C | 3.6562055 | 0.9426315 | -0.1939619 |
| C | 3.9451256 | -0.5726231 | -0.1355150 |
| S | 2.3496750 | -1.4194086 | -0.0268745 |
| H | 4.5691531 | -0.7966795 | 0.7408769 |


| H | 4.4932948 | -0.8801285 | -1.0369966 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| N | 2.3158528 | 1.2304861 | -0.1474074 |
| N | -0.6976121 | -0.7754734 | 0.0767525 |
| C | -1.9962040 | -0.3247174 | 0.1097975 |
| H | -3.4995787 | 2.7898275 | 0.0147012 |
| H | -3.0080556 | -2.2311926 | 0.2376484 |
| O | 4.5593568 | 1.7517801 | -0.2726379 |
| N | -5.8321243 | 1.2122105 | 0.1885602 |
| C | -6.6848755 | 0.0439584 | 0.0684711 |
| C | -5.7582083 | -1.1528831 | 0.3347588 |
| H | -7.1099440 | 0.0065919 | -0.9532229 |
| H | -7.5318000 | 0.1168724 | 0.7668801 |
| H | -5.9361312 | -1.9759780 | -0.3701055 |
| H | -5.9174814 | -1.5574133 | 1.3477642 |
| C | -6.3383710 | 2.5335888 | -0.0053534 |
| H | -5.6983115 | 3.2686290 | 0.4987506 |
| H | -7.3487701 | 2.6066709 | 0.4168807 |
| H | -6.3934748 | 2.8000035 | -1.0781078 |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{~N} M e B e n z L u c$ |  |  |  |
| S 0 | $\mathrm{Energy}=-1135.399753938$ |  |  |
| C | -1.2375449 | 4.3192697 | 0.9962674 |
| C | -0.4291839 | 3.1348193 | 1.1216527 |
| C | 0.9443563 | 3.2706318 | 1.2010201 |
| C | 1.6150501 | 4.5430098 | 1.1635154 |
| C | 0.8378917 | 5.7288952 | 1.0400824 |
| C | -0.5179048 | 5.6093513 | 0.9611894 |
| N | 1.9576406 | 2.3551952 | 1.3231419 |
| C | 3.1544686 | 3.0707689 | 1.3539433 |
| N | 2.9375752 | 4.3880752 | 1.2571934 |
| C | 4.4438684 | 2.5185508 | 1.4699009 |
| S | 5.8229820 | 3.6547542 | 1.4821962 |
| N | 4.7301631 | 1.2386532 | 1.5699342 |
| C | 6.0642714 | 0.9785272 | 1.6692306 |
| C | 6.9386156 | 2.2469089 | 1.6391193 |
| O | 6.5736526 | -0.1233549 | 1.7732947 |
| O | -2.4841720 | 4.2994069 | 0.9184069 |
| H | -1.1548781 | 6.4917420 | 0.8650602 |
| H | 1.3375206 | 6.6997692 | 1.011411 |
| H | -0.9352195 | 2.1688883 | 1.1502326 |
| H | 7.6327425 | 2.1853652 | 0.7896568 |
| H | 7.5282210 | 2.3002674 | 2.5645180 |
| C | 1.7922907 | 0.9278022 | 1.3994518 |
| H | 0.7219850 | 0.7032482 | 1.3445312 |
| H | 2.2034190 | 0.5317288 | 2.3366408 |
| H | 2.3157012 | 0.4246350 | 0.5764295 |
|  |  |  |  |


| S1 Energy $=-1135.392767424$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| C | -1.2697770 | 4.3170913 | 0.9924328 |
| C | -0.4065855 | 3.1465368 | 1.1205726 |
| C | 0.9918151 | 3.3271635 | 1.2005843 |
| C | 1.6018254 | 4.5962767 | 1.1619881 |
| C | 0.7781299 | 5.7292504 | 1.0391205 |
| C | -0.6017663 | 5.5991948 | 0.9571558 |
| N | 1.9941187 | 2.4141495 | 1.3226699 |
| C | 3.1821287 | 3.1413153 | 1.3550917 |
| N | 2.9700840 | 4.4493477 | 1.2607930 |
| C | 4.4658335 | 2.5246643 | 1.4740042 |
| S | 5.8668476 | 3.6162170 | 1.4850740 |
| N | 4.7105919 | 1.2333453 | 1.5753908 |
| C | 6.0328826 | 0.9289858 | 1.6731358 |
| C | 6.9437794 | 2.1723608 | 1.6407074 |
| O | 6.5140263 | -0.1932310 | 1.7774979 |
| O | -2.5124690 | 4.1635050 | 0.9200294 |
| H | -1.2392930 | 6.4792365 | 0.8609364 |
| H | 1.2413250 | 6.7190183 | 1.0086065 |
| H | -0.8846781 | 2.1666191 | 1.1494226 |
| H | 7.6369856 | 2.0968506 | 0.7903603 |
| H | 7.5396985 | 2.2154232 | 2.5637056 |
| C | 1.8352167 | 0.9832688 | 1.3974546 |
| H | 0.7677426 | 0.7475944 | 1.3387873 |
| H | 2.2581147 | 0.5986480 | 2.3327155 |
| H | 2.3769349 | 0.4940774 | 0.5795138 |

## 4-BrLuc

| S0 Energy $=-4011.790393777$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| O | -6.8448625 | 3.5066263 | 0.0000277 |
| C | -5.7550987 | 2.8962422 | -0.0001237 |
| C | -4.4743511 | 3.5689170 | -0.0003715 |
| C | -3.3128202 | 2.8399157 | -0.0005227 |
| C | -3.2717813 | 1.3958513 | -0.0004524 |
| C | -4.5269237 | 0.7361945 | -0.0002101 |
| C | -5.7085744 | 1.4350660 | -0.0000525 |
| S | -1.6680617 | 3.4417652 | -0.0008231 |
| C | -1.0904728 | 1.7475828 | -0.0008238 |
| N | -2.0679365 | 0.8190991 | -0.0006187 |
| C | 0.2372386 | 1.4631867 | -0.0010187 |
| S | 0.7687657 | -0.3190377 | -0.0010166 |
| N | 1.2835062 | 2.2978614 | -0.0012224 |
| C | 2.4933628 | 1.7402297 | -0.0013884 |
| C | 2.4823412 | 0.1899125 | -0.0013115 |
| H | 3.0104887 | -0.1843149 | 0.8905541 |
| H | 3.0102020 | -0.1844092 | -0.8933036 |


| O | 3.5877124 | 2.3056246 | -0.0015908 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| H | -4.4739261 | 4.6604285 | -0.0004295 |
| H | -6.6651359 | 0.9136911 | 0.0001339 |
| Br | -4.5378820 | -1.1629725 | -0.0001056 |
|  |  |  |  |
| S 1 | Energy $=-4011.710603849723$ |  |  |
| O | -6.7829107 | 3.6274877 | -0.0000102 |
| C | -5.7500840 | 2.9238810 | -0.0001261 |
| C | -4.4317689 | 3.5471242 | -0.0003866 |
| C | -3.2788420 | 2.7497812 | -0.0005274 |
| C | -3.3110194 | 1.3393784 | -0.0004453 |
| C | -4.5919987 | 0.7416342 | -0.0001902 |
| C | -5.7608189 | 1.4779501 | -0.0000238 |
| S | -1.6406106 | 3.3008724 | -0.0008041 |
| C | -1.1150913 | 1.6245661 | -0.0007993 |
| N | -2.0771422 | 0.7305339 | -0.0006072 |
| C | 0.2923759 | 1.3577569 | -0.0010236 |
| S | 0.8186614 | -0.3320233 | -0.0011378 |
| N | 1.2191917 | 2.2868683 | -0.0011642 |
| C | 2.4891504 | 1.7898465 | -0.0013885 |
| C | 2.5314880 | 0.2469192 | -0.0013424 |
| H | 3.0703789 | -0.1065825 | 0.8892589 |
| H | 3.0702231 | -0.1066770 | -0.8920082 |
| O | 3.5235144 | 2.4402342 | -0.0015856 |
| H | -4.3849815 | 4.6365284 | -0.0004720 |
| H | -6.7312604 | 0.9838975 | 0.0001866 |
| Br | -4.6826752 | -1.1525073 | -0.0000731 |

5- BrLuc
S0 $\quad$ Energy $=-4011.801518284$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { O } & -6.7891639 & 3.5566622 & -0.0032265\end{array}$
C $\quad-5.7123659 \quad 2.9455578-0.0020496$
C $\quad-4.4263046 \quad 3.6087163-0.0048395$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -3.2568236 & 2.8885796 & -0.0034073\end{array}$
C $\quad-3.23981641 .4495888 \quad 0.0009261$
C $\quad-4.4786221 \quad 0.7552349 \quad 0.0037855$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -5.6411938 & 1.4692353 & 0.0023466\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { S } & -1.6061438 & 3.4546740 & -0.0061729\end{array}$
C $\quad-1.0610640 \quad 1.7704864-0.0014388$
$\begin{array}{llll}\mathrm{N} & -2.0314378 & 0.8797553 & 0.0018765\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 0.3135098 & 1.4331837 & -0.0013169\end{array}$
S $\quad 0.7500242-0.2931721 \quad 0.0036376$
N $\quad 1.2894669 \quad 2.3021346-0.0046127$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 2.5322110 & 1.7265635 & -0.0037090\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 2.4881321 & 0.1859963 & 0.0010092\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { H } & 3.0086956 & -0.1874802 & 0.8932456\end{array}$

| H | 3.0074937 | -0.1929026 | -0.8896401 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| O | 3.5923193 | 2.3188898 | -0.0062399 |
| H | -4.4424913 | 4.6989112 | -0.0081132 |
| Br | -7.2975886 | 0.5503267 | 0.0061108 |
| H | -4.4737861 | -0.3346915 | 0.0070588 |
| S |  |  |  |
| S 1 | Energy | $=-4011.796387194$ |  |
| O | -6.7437212 | 3.6772546 | -0.0031658 |
| C | -5.7186254 | 2.9697383 | -0.0018696 |
| C | -4.3954213 | 3.5818131 | -0.0044834 |
| C | -3.2377910 | 2.7950392 | -0.0030318 |
| C | -3.2846579 | 1.3868124 | 0.0009242 |
| C | -4.5476541 | 0.7623570 | 0.0035154 |
| C | -5.7058689 | 1.5174540 | 0.0022117 |
| S | -1.5935900 | 3.3370327 | -0.0058902 |
| C | -1.0840590 | 1.6554509 | -0.0015344 |
| N | -2.0491522 | 0.7671677 | 0.0016384 |
| C | 0.3244271 | 1.3753295 | -0.0014447 |
| S | 0.8310340 | -0.3204403 | 0.0041211 |
| N | 1.2604039 | 2.2930692 | -0.0052328 |
| C | 2.5258156 | 1.7815085 | -0.0041678 |
| C | 2.5505003 | 0.2384339 | 0.0013366 |
| H | 3.0856052 | -0.1180970 | 0.8930933 |
| H | 3.0847145 | -0.1245141 | -0.8883520 |
| O | 3.5668260 | 2.4206560 | -0.0070476 |
| H | -4.3611156 | 4.6716393 | -0.0076101 |
| Br | -7.3876280 | 0.6456411 | 0.0056586 |
| H | -4.5949914 | -0.3270960 | 0.0065609 |

## 7-BrLuc

| S0 | Energy | $=-4011.759897560$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| O | -6.8117381 | 3.4595796 | 0.0029335 |
| C | -5.7216478 | 2.8707448 | 0.0013385 |
| C | -4.4348731 | 3.5452103 | 0.0045764 |
| C | -3.2531015 | 2.8403188 | 0.0026474 |
| C | -3.2340551 | 1.4008789 | -0.0027133 |
| C | -4.4737326 | 0.7034700 | -0.0060358 |
| C | -5.6422345 | 1.4048733 | -0.0040951 |
| S | -1.6157756 | 3.4241695 | 0.0058077 |
| C | -1.0583751 | 1.7446135 | -0.0001276 |
| N | -2.0207710 | 0.8437951 | -0.0040662 |
| C | 0.3182677 | 1.4165633 | -0.0005116 |
| S | 0.7643403 | -0.3082045 | -0.0066373 |
| N | 1.2897944 | 2.2900858 | 0.0033428 |
| C | 2.5355001 | 1.7211731 | 0.0020153 |
| C | 2.4996733 | 0.1802397 | -0.0037318 |


| H | 3.0212415 | -0.1961605 | 0.8866843 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| H | 3.0223923 | -0.1895294 | -0.8962514 |
| O | 3.5926833 | 2.3185410 | 0.0048960 |
| Br | -4.4145662 | 5.4330358 | 0.0116693 |
| H | -4.4573940 | -0.3881333 | -0.0100862 |
| H | -6.6069278 | 0.8930852 | -0.0065650 |
|  |  |  |  |
| S 1 | Energy $=-4011.795056788$ |  |  |
| O | -6.7843515 | 3.5880324 | 0.0033296 |
| C | -5.7447304 | 2.9044070 | 0.0014106 |
| C | -4.4133815 | 3.5294764 | 0.0045355 |
| C | -3.2306306 | 2.7536740 | 0.0023402 |
| C | -3.2794805 | 1.3475690 | -0.0029263 |
| C | -4.5444281 | 0.7235825 | -0.0060107 |
| C | -5.7124689 | 1.4607122 | -0.0039673 |
| S | -1.5979460 | 3.3016099 | 0.0053605 |
| C | -1.0783132 | 1.6198572 | -0.0006018 |
| N | -2.0425238 | 0.7318175 | -0.0044872 |
| C | 0.3286271 | 1.3500736 | -0.0007245 |
| S | 0.8529965 | -0.3429053 | -0.0066833 |
| N | 1.2604692 | 2.2750099 | 0.0033161 |
| C | 2.5278859 | 1.7751634 | 0.0022345 |
| C | 2.5671773 | 0.2317636 | -0.0034626 |
| H | 3.1050927 | -0.1254000 | 0.8863331 |
| H | 3.1061519 | -0.1188499 | -0.8952208 |
| O | 3.5658623 | 2.4214073 | 0.0053212 |
| Br | -4.3248798 | 5.3856081 | 0.0115190 |
| H | -4.5783246 | -0.3683564 | -0.0101170 |
| H | -6.6841035 | 0.9640973 | -0.0064089 |

## 4- MeLuc

S0 Energy $=-1478.088011145$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { O } & -6.7289911 & 3.6696745 & 0.1913071\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -5.6462956 & 3.0556790 & 0.1448748\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -4.3628723 & 3.7243125 & 0.1703403\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -3.2120188 & 2.9786822 & 0.1159915\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & -3.2188915 & 1.5384587 & 0.0332927\end{array}$
C $\quad-4.4734377 \quad 0.84425140 .0057794$
C $\quad-5.6163495 \quad 1.5904697 \quad 0.0601384$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { S } & -1.5496031 & 3.5138645 & 0.1303052\end{array}$
C $\quad-1.0300675 \quad 1.82371170 .0282129$
N $\quad-2.0236779 \quad 0.9534131-0.0120204$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { C } & 0.3317961 & 1.4617994 & -0.0055679\end{array}$
S $0.7361893-0.2737558 \quad-0.1086860$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\mathrm{N} & 1.3317126 & 2.3070498 & 0.0332729\end{array}$
C $\quad 2.5582984 \quad 1.7081919 \quad-0.0125856$

| C | 2.4835405 | 0.1702327 | -0.0997177 | S | -1.5016991 | 3.5322032 | 0.1925347 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| H | 3.0048742 | -0.2654432 | 0.7634767 | C | -0.9882898 | 1.8467572 | 0.0781756 |
| H | 2.9882448 | -0.1637733 | -1.0164602 | N | -1.9672870 | 0.9748159 | 0.0095526 |
| O | 3.6344090 | 2.2745939 | 0.0095662 | C | 0.3863382 | 1.4875774 | 0.0579656 |
| H | -4.3577533 | 4.8128363 | 0.2329169 | S | 0.7974883 | -0.2345817 | -0.0702303 |
| H | -6.5944928 | 1.1028612 | 0.0418039 | N | 1.3663416 | 2.3458318 | 0.1260171 |
| C | -4.4736565 | -0.6513604 | -0.0804322 | C | 2.6056996 | 1.7562443 | 0.0850187 |
| H | -3.9323021 | -1.0920052 | 0.7700719 | C | 2.5415623 | 0.2221378 | -0.0325558 |
| H | -3.9493620 | -0.9907338 | -0.9862696 | H | 3.0544466 | -0.2286100 | 0.8278206 |
|  | -5.4982936 | -1.0444203 | -0.0931215 | H | 3.0577689 | -0.0925329 | -0.9496267 |
| H |  |  |  | O | 3.6691426 | 2.3375659 | 0.1327893 |
| S1 | Energy $=-1478.082134380$ |  |  | H | -4.2684630 | 4.8547504 | 0.2170523 |
| O | -6.6779253 | 3.7824044 | 0.1953789 | H | -6.5607791 | 1.1823507 | -0.1478717 |
| C | -5.6490293 | 3.0707318 | 0.1448208 | N | -4.5671021 | -0.5134866 | -0.0856172 |
| C | -4.3262277 | 3.6881794 | 0.1673760 | O | -5.4529445 | -0.9869424 | -0.7741445 |
| C | -3.1826178 | 2.8786365 | 0.1099713 | O | -3.7948987 | -1.1644147 | 0.5844472 |
| C | -3.2464733 | 1.4742763 | 0.0302688 |  |  |  |  |
| C | -4.5205391 | 0.8479191 | 0.0068018 | S1 | Energy $=-1642.996545840$ |  |  |
| C | -5.6650538 | 1.6286263 | 0.0625463 | O | -6.6112305 | 3.7849343 | 0.0756080 |
| S | -1.5324555 | 3.3972284 | 0.1236619 | C | -5.5533597 | 3.1251624 | 0.0551514 |
| C | -1.0390233 | 1.7134407 | 0.0225788 | C | -4.2708721 | 3.7845577 | 0.1141690 |
| N | -2.0221457 | 0.8405881 | -0.0178082 | C | -3.1456507 | 2.9991767 | 0.0878316 |
| C | 0.3593483 | 1.4138128 | -0.0081401 | C | -3.1733807 | 1.5530182 | 0.0044345 |
| S | 0.8339124 | -0.2913576 | -0.1105285 | C | -4.4634897 | 0.8915421 | -0.0550061 |
| N | 1.3180212 | 2.3095386 | 0.0338866 | C | -5.5885375 | 1.6660192 | -0.0291869 |
| C | 2.5701496 | 1.7738355 | -0.0090095 | S | -1.4918092 | 3.5435405 | 0.1467973 |
| C | 2.5640177 | 0.2324909 | -0.0974541 | C | -0.9898621 | 1.8685851 | 0.0591965 |
| H | 3.1006792 | -0.1871462 | 0.7654081 | N | -1.9613612 | 0.9884769 | -0.0076009 |
| H | 3.0831631 | -0.0848006 | -1.0131317 | C | 0.3929918 | 1.5039038 | 0.0617680 |
| O | 3.6265641 | 2.3888358 | 0.0160158 | S | 0.7853808 | -0.2144043 | -0.0301058 |
| H | -4.2707046 | 4.7754887 | 0.2290530 | N | 1.3664039 | 2.3662261 | 0.1278657 |
| H | -6.6489219 | 1.1548158 | 0.0449379 | C | 2.6078416 | 1.7682956 | 0.1148656 |
| C | -4.5722930 | -0.6454579 | -0.0781855 | C | 2.5326992 | 0.2341911 | 0.0255132 |
| H | -4.0387859 | -1.1020709 | 0.7704853 | H | 3.0286337 | -0.2063583 | 0.9010951 |
| H | -4.0551937 | $-1.0016460$ | -0.9832228 | H | 3.0590472 | -0.1042995 | -0.8772949 |
| H | -5.6074663 | -1.0097794 | -0.0892209 | O | 3.6693112 | 2.3495825 | 0.1665100 |
|  |  |  |  | H | -4.2487547 | 4.8716956 | 0.1769733 |
| 4- NO2Luc |  |  |  | H | -6.5579811 | 1.1741717 | -0.0734083 |
| S0 | Energy $=-1643.004485500$ |  |  | N | -4.6069636 | -0.5289665 | -0.1388763 |
| O | -6.6716535 | 3.7795938 | 0.0392606 | O | -5.7797432 | -0.9839310 | -0.1839657 |
| C | -5.6022913 | 3.1447406 | 0.0425758 | O | -3.5740852 | -1.2366398 | -0.1628346 |
| C | -4.3034886 | 3.7672875 | 0.1458032 |  |  |  |  |
| C | -3.1622209 | 2.9986553 | 0.1343024 |  |  |  |  |
| C | -3.1663606 | 1.5611215 | 0.0506429 |  |  |  |  |
| C | -4.4494033 | 0.9444739 | -0.0401944 |  |  |  |  |
| C | -5.5966781 | 1.6829409 | -0.0642181 |  |  |  |  |


| Lu |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S0 | Energy $=-1669.912412725$ |  |  |
| C | -4.1280261 | 1.5123750 | -0.92 |
| C | -2.8911687 | 2.0724997 | -1. |
| C | -1.7259689 | 1.3986597 | -0.7678764 |
| C | -1.8531346 | 0.1541857 | -0.1046469 |
| C | -3.0992199 | -0.4196775 | 0.1557670 |
| C | -4.2379135 | 0.2703006 | -0.2 |
| H | -5.0506768 | 2.0126871 | -1.2243315 |
| H | -2.7989722 | 3.0331965 | -1.6860730 |
| H | -3.1855810 | -1.3823779 | 0.6694253 |
| N | -0.4425174 | 1.8313777 | -0.9522469 |
| S | -0.2753623 | -0.4471026 | 0.2773263 |
| C | 0.4221124 | 0.9963512 | -0.4719817 |
| C | 6.0909405 | 1.8401647 | -0.7401270 |
| S | 6.7339756 | 3.3128693 | $-1.4901904$ |
| N | 6.9286838 | 0.9832402 | -0.2700457 |
| C | 8.3985643 | 2.7311018 | -1.1412883 |
| C | 8.2584533 | 1.3665460 | -0.4361113 |
| H | 8.9348041 | 3.4353938 | -0.4846741 |
| H | . 9798682 | 2.6118148 | -2.0699706 |
| O | 9.2106609 | 0.7284437 | -0.0819067 |
| O | -5.4854805 | -0.1999840 | -0.0541927 |
| H | -5.4483588 | -1.0534333 | 0.4041399 |
| C | 1.8704091 | 1.1956671 | -0.5278513 |
| C | 2.3718137 | 2.3602593 | -1.1329548 |
| C | 2.7744053 | . 2606057 | . 0014840 |
| C | 4.1416482 | 0.4790868 | -0.0717551 |
| C | 4.6412507 | . 6425490 | -0.6773547 |
| C | 3.7384483 | 2.5786060 | -1.2053584 |
| H | 4.1099944 | . 4916067 | -1.6817698 |
| H | 1.6614130 | 3.0819078 | -1.5419557 |
| H | 2.4039707 | -0.6529602 | 0.4775347 |
| H | 4.8540286 | -0.2420019 | 0.3356333 |
| S1 | Energy $=-1669.907790024$ |  |  |
| C | -4.1345190 | 1.5161512 | -0.9225135 |
| C | -2.9056126 | 2.0808504 | -1.1739263 |
| C | -1.7199988 | 1.4094482 | -0.7693635 |
| C | -1.8365674 | 0.1457184 | -0.1006712 |
| C | -3.0668178 | -0.4284533 | 0.1560677 |
| C | -4.2258457 | 0.2651143 | -0.2601670 |
| H | -5.0640460 | 2.0061963 | -1.2209080 |
| H | -2.8130449 | 3.0428679 | -1.6828595 |
| H | -3.1549091 | -1.3928214 | 0.6665925 |
| N | -0.4653621 | 1.8581378 | -0.9596429 |


| S | -0.2495288 | -0.4477775 | 0. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | 0.4334037 | 1.0134422 | -0.4757310 |
| C | 6.0692092 | 1.8457007 | -0.7436104 |
| S | 6.7409010 | 3.3130397 | $-1.5032677$ |
| N | 6.9206078 | 0.9798131 | -0.2621570 |
| C | 8.3966950 | 2.7092964 | -1.1395569 |
| C | 8.2346135 | 1. | -0.4232917 |
| H | 8.9413729 | 3.4102003 | -0.4850867 |
| H | 8.9842315 | 2.5763588 | -2.0633095 |
| O | 9 | 0 | -0.0653842 |
| O | -5.4499490 | -0.2186282 | -0.0523532 |
| H | -5.4162954 | -1.0762703 | 0.4049800 |
| C | 1.8531169 | 1.2069677 | -0.5288917 |
| C | 2.3642311 | 2.3821573 | -1.1401224 |
| C | 2.7 | 0 | 2 |
| C | 4.1274268 | 0.4801816 | -0.0685724 |
| C | 4.6413433 | 1.6564704 | -0.6821865 |
| C | 3.7242670 | 2.59882 | $-1.2132300$ |
| H | 4.0999268 | 3.5098186 | -1.6889918 |
| H | 1.6564200 | 3.1064 | -1.5499651 |
| H | 2.4012647 | -0.6504480 | 0.4828250 |
| H | 4.8451151 | -0.2362891 | 0.3365216 |
| 6' - deoxyLuc |  |  |  |
| S0 | Energy $=-1364.262556246$ |  |  |
| C | -3.8887853 | 0.5411853 | 0.01 |
| C | -3.9813083 | -0.8641396 | 0.0333510 |
| C | -2.8472751 | $-1.6632313$ | 0.0353918 |
| H | -4.9657325 | -1.3351363 | 0.0428777 |
| C | -2.6586667 | 1.1731746 | 0.0050638 |
| H | -4.8026377 | 1.1368910 | 0.0154811 |
| C | -1.4949478 | 0.3864087 | 4 |
| H | -2.5681963 | 2.2595490 | -0.0081928 |
| C | -1.6014809 | $-1.0284963$ | 0.0224105 |
| H | -2.9301269 | $-2.7502593$ | 0.0459045 |
| N | -0.2139126 | 0.8614673 | -0.0042680 |
| S | -0.0171715 | -1.7323308 | 0.0190287 |
| C | 0.6414379 | -0.1116984 | -0.0006608 |
| C | 2.0829149 | 0.0893377 | -0.0129804 |
| S | 2.6897696 | 1.7383480 | -0.0324891 |
| N | 2.9128232 | -0.8948249 | -0.0102107 |
| C | 4.3652767 | 1.0675144 | -0.0392240 |
| C | 4.2416239 | -0.4637484 | -0.0226020 |
| H | 4.9265511 | 1.3996161 | 0.8443366 |
| H | 4.9118806 | 1.3813354 | -0.9385757 |
| O | 5.1979637 | -1.1909620 | -0.0204063 |


| S1 | Energy $=-1364.230020612$ |  |  | C | -4.4987251 | 2.3008076 | 0.0942555 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C | -3.8559532 | 0.5712146 | 0.0087144 | H | -5.5301848 | 2.3930159 | 0.4477822 |
| C | -3.9801107 | -0.8276326 | -0.0767330 | H | -4.0472212 | 1.3953547 | 0.5305478 |
| C | -2.8552328 | -1.6466446 | $-0.0950343$ | H | -4.4999112 | 2.2162513 | -1.0043316 |
| H | -4.9723293 | -1.2785667 | -0.1279337 |  |  |  |  |
| C | -2.6136292 | 1.1765583 | 0.0796964 | S1 | Energy | 1478.5800 | 5938 |
| H | -4.7565146 | 1.1873864 | 0.0202942 | C | -1.8830714 | 4.7861949 | 0.6530733 |
| C | -1.4550570 | 0.3728865 | 0.0672685 | C | -0.5388785 | 4.9784218 | 0.3602200 |
| H | -2.5053782 | 2.2595641 | 0.1460202 | C | -2.5226898 | 3.5843639 | 0.1975980 |
| C | -1.6012735 | -1.0435992 | -0.0229363 | C | -1.8064591 | 2.6305781 | -0.5233447 |
| H | -2.9574920 | -2.7302281 | -0.1616933 | C | -0.4547536 | 2.8521572 | -0.8025455 |
| N | -0.1826011 | 0.8234438 | 0.1372677 | C | 0.2029577 | 4.0230497 | -0.3696471 |
| S | -0.0334010 | -1.7961254 | -0.0189254 | H | -2.2836720 | 1.7170192 | -0.8717882 |
| C | 0.6835525 | -0.1825684 | 0.0994154 | S | 0.4740507 | 6.3254358 | 0.7825550 |
| C | 2.0575145 | 0.0104766 | 0.1765614 | N | 1.5078183 | 4.3379954 | -0.5857000 |
| S | 2.7004163 | 1.6696698 | 0.3979463 | C | 1.8023033 | 5.5113490 | -0.0448518 |
| N | 3.0050565 | -0.9447297 | 0.1866544 | C | 3.0585498 | 6.1795059 | -0.0584263 |
| C | 4.2720697 | 1.0967426 | -0.1928708 | N | 3.2276935 | 7.3498519 | 0.5172052 |
| C | 4.2224603 | -0.4725259 | 0.1487035 | S | 4.4434269 | 5.4342124 | -0.8657924 |
| H | 5.1188655 | 1.6225679 | 0.2616548 | C | 5.4314980 | 6.8726580 | -0.3890814 |
| H | 4.3679470 | 1.0850764 | -1.2904330 | C | 4.5033062 | 7.8273186 | 0.3954081 |
| O | 5.3410903 | -0.9529663 | 0.2563626 | H | 5.8282793 | 7.3874346 | -1.2750250 |
|  |  |  |  | H | 6.2774763 | 6.5748132 | 0.2457066 |
| 6'-MethoxyLuc |  |  |  | O | 4.9219653 | 8.8806493 | 0.8346122 |
| S0 | Energy $=-1478.585905861$ |  |  | H | 0.1181310 | 2.1142760 | -1.3659913 |
| C | -1.9457970 | 4.8111594 | 0.6845139 | H | -2.4780628 | 5.5069822 | 1.2143548 |
| C | -0.6014930 | 5.0305282 | 0.4054565 | O | -3.8099637 | 3.4991991 | 0.5308661 |
| C | -2.5278098 | 3.6288309 | 0.2233707 | C | -4.5550478 | 2.3653572 | 0.1431859 |
| C | -1.7700652 | 2.6829162 | -0.5062453 | H | -5.5683465 | 2.5186056 | 0.5234362 |
| C | -0.4334305 | 2.9108234 | -0.7785140 | H | -4.1262099 | 1.4509222 | 0.5814733 |
| C | 0.1743274 | 4.0905754 | -0.3264205 | H | -4.5780176 | 2.2726754 | -0.9536606 |
| H | -2.2352423 | 1.7647298 | -0.8604312 |  |  |  |  |
| S | 0.3912284 | 6.3856428 | 0.8378426 |  |  |  |  |
| N | 1.4763897 | 4.4471802 | -0.5197342 |  |  |  |  |
| C | 1.7296041 | 5.5970213 | 0.0209326 |  |  |  |  |
| C | 3.0327088 | 6.2358887 | -0.0217056 |  |  |  |  |
| N | 3.2560264 | 7.3808234 | 0.5256109 |  |  |  |  |
| S | 4.3402938 | 5.4041219 | $-0.8533971$ |  |  |  |  |
| C | 5.4209665 | 6.7867227 | -0.4324256 |  |  |  |  |
| C | 4.5770564 | 7.7980662 | 0.3590192 |  |  |  |  |
| H | 5.8164506 | 7.2677286 | -1.3369697 |  |  |  |  |
| H | 6.2664107 | 6.4530192 | 0.1838765 |  |  |  |  |
| O | 5.0296732 | 8.8297438 | 0.7783827 |  |  |  |  |
| H | 0.1572773 | 2.1868500 | -1.3402255 |  |  |  |  |
| H | -2.5554427 | 5.5199750 | 1.2436690 |  |  |  |  |
| O | -3.8308072 | 3.4632503 | 0.5189803 |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{BrClN}_{2} \mathrm{OS}_{2}$
    Mol. Wt. 365.70

