Published in final edited form as:

Dalton Trans. 2018 October 30; 47(42): 15024–15030. doi:10.1039/c8dt03780a.

Copper(II) Complexes for Cysteine Detection using ^{19}F Magnetic Resonance

José S. Enriquez^a, Meng Yu^a, Bailey S. Bouley^a, Da Xie^a, and Emily L. Que^a

^aDepartment of Chemistry, The University of Texas at Austin, 105 E. 24th St Stop A5300, Austin, Texas 78712, United States

Abstract

Cysteine plays an essential role in maintaining cellular redox homeostasis and perturbations in cysteine concentration are associated with cardiovascular disease, liver disease, and cancer. ^{19}F MRI is a promising modality for detecting cysteine in biology due to its high tissue penetration and negligible biological background signal. Herein we report fluorinated macrocyclic copper complexes that display a ^{19}F NMR/MRI turn-on response following reduction of the Cu(II) complexes by cysteine. The reactivity with cysteine was studied by monitoring the appearance of a robust diamagnetic ^{19}F signal following addition of cysteine in addition to UV-vis and EPR spectroscopies. Importantly, complexes with $-\text{CH}_2\text{CF}_3$ tags display excellent water solubility. Studies with this complex in HeLa cells demonstrate the applicability of these probes to detect cysteine in complex biological environments.

Graphical Abstract

Introduction

Cysteine is an essential amino acid that plays an important role in the regulation of a range of cellular processes related to redox homeostasis.^{1, 2} It is involved in the synthesis of glutathione (GSH)³, an important tripeptide that is an abundant intracellular redox buffer, and is a well-known bio-reductant alongside GSH, NADH, and HNO.⁴ The intracellular

[†]Footnotes relating to the title and/or authors should appear here.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts to declare.

concentration of cysteine varies from 30 to 200 μM depending on the cell type.^{5–7} Perturbations in the concentration of cysteine are associated with pathologies including cardiovascular disease, liver disease, and cancer.^{8, 9}

The important role of cysteine in both health and disease has led to the development of probes to detect and monitor its intracellular levels.^{10–12} Many of these probes rely on fluorescence to track cysteine at the cellular level.^{6, 13–19} However, translating these studies into animal models is limited by the poor penetration depth of fluorescence microscopy. Other common strategies for detecting cysteine include colorimetric and electrochemical methods,^{14, 20–27} however, these methods are difficult to translate into cellular and animal models.

In this study, we developed two novel probes to track cysteine using Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI), a non-invasive diagnostic imaging modality with high penetration depth. Currently, clinical MRI is used to detect protons (^1H), but due to the abundance of protons in biological systems, ^1H MR images have high and heterogeneous background signal that complicate the use of sensors in this modality.^{28–30} A promising alternative is ^{19}F MRI as there is a negligible amount of detectable fluorine in the body, resulting in zero biological background signal. Further, ^{19}F has favorable NMR characteristics including a similar gyromagnetic ratio to ^1H , a nuclear spin of $1/2$, and a comparable sensitivity: 83% relative to that of proton.^{30, 31} Paramagnetic metal centers can be used to modulate ^{19}F signal, which has been exploited in a number of transition metal and lanthanide complexes.^{32–44}

Our ^{19}F MR sensor platforms contain Cu(II) owing to its ability to be reduced by bioreductants and act as an “off-on” switch for ^{19}F signals. Copper has two common oxidation states that have distinct magnetic properties; Cu(II) is paramagnetic while Cu(I) is diamagnetic, and both oxidation states are accessible in biological systems. In the Cu(II) oxidation state, the paramagnetic center will silence the fluorine signal *via* paramagnetic relaxation enhancement (PRE).^{35, 45} The long electronic relaxation time of Cu(II) results in drastic reduction in T_1 and T_2 relaxation times. Lowering T_2 can cause severe line broadening, effectively quenching the ^{19}F signal.⁴⁶ By careful tuning of the ligand environment, the Cu(II) can be reduced to Cu(I) by a bioreductant of choice, in this case cysteine. This reduction will be accompanied by an increase in ^{19}F T_1 and T_2 and a reappearance of the ^{19}F signal, which can be detected by both NMR and MRI. We have been able to exploit a similar mechanism to develop Cu(II) based ^{19}F MRI probes for hypoxia.^{33, 34}

To make a cysteine-responsive Cu(II) complex, cyclam (1,4,8,11-tetraazacyclotetradecane) was chosen as a favorable ligand scaffold owing to its high binding affinity towards Cu(II) ($\text{p}K_{\text{d}} \approx 25$).⁴⁷ Addition of aromatic or alkyl substituents on the macrocyclic ring can shift the $E_{1/2}$ of Cu(II)/Cu(I) cathodically which renders the Cu(II) complex more prone to reduction by weaker reductants like cysteine; an idea that has been demonstrated by some reported NO or HNO fluorescence sensors.^{48, 49} Based on this strategy, four different ligands and their corresponding Cu(II) complexes were synthesized containing either fluorinated benzyl (**1**, **2**) or alkyl substituents (**3**, **4**) (Scheme 1). 1,8-disubstituted cyclam complexes **2** and **4** displayed robust turn-on responses in the presence of 3 equivalents of

cysteine. Improved water solubility was observed for alkyl-substituted **4**, consistent with previously reported Ni(II) analogues.^{50, 51} Response of these probes to cysteine in solution is described along with the application of water-soluble **4** for the detection of cysteine in mammalian cell lines.

Results and Discussion

Synthesis

Ligand **L1** was readily synthesized in 60% yield by a one-step reaction between cyclam and 2-trifluoromethylbenzyl bromide. Di-substituted ligand **L2** was obtained by reaction between bisformyl cyclam and two equivalents of 2-trifluoromethylbenzyl bromide, followed by base-mediated hydrolysis to yield the desired product in 40% overall yield over three steps. Ligand **L3** was synthesized by protecting cyclam with benzyl bromide to form the tris alkylated species and reacting with trifluoroacetic anhydride. Following reduction of the carbonyl to a methylene and removal of the benzyl protecting group, ligand **L3** was furnished. Ligand **L4** was synthesized using a modified literature procedure.⁵¹ Copper complexes **1**, **2**, **3**, and **4** were synthesized by combining ligand and Cu(ClO₄)₂ in methanol, and purified by washing the resulting purple precipitate with diethyl ether or by the use of reverse-phase chromatography. Complete synthetic schemes are shown in the supporting information.

Solid State Structural Characterization

Single crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction were obtained by slow evaporation of CH₃CN/H₂O (3:7) solutions of **1**, **2**, and **4** (Figure 1). No x-ray quality crystals of **3** could be obtained. All crystal structures reveal distorted octahedral geometries at the Cu centers with four nitrogen atoms occupying the equatorial plane and two oxygen atoms from perchlorate counter ions in the axial positions. All three structures display a *trans*-III configuration with two adjacent N-R groups of the macrocycle (R = H or the alkyl group) pointing towards one side of the cyclam plane while the other two pointing to the opposite side.⁵² As expected, the introduction of trifluorobenzyl or trifluoromethyl groups on the nitrogen atoms results in Cu-N bond elongation (0.1 Å) compared to the other Cu-N bonds. The Cu-F average distances were 5–6 Å for complexes **1**, **2**, and **4**, well within the range for the PRE effect.⁴⁵

Solution State Characterization

UV-Vis Spectroscopy.—The UV-vis spectrum of **1** displays a d-d transition band at 530 nm ($\epsilon = 220 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$, Figure S1) in HEPES/CH₃CN solution (HEPES: 50 mM, pH 7.2, NaCl 0.1 M; HEPES:CH₃CN = 6:4 v/v). Complex **2** exhibits an analogous absorption feature at 563 nm ($\epsilon = 384 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$, Figure S1). Complex **3** in HEPES buffer displays a d-d transition at 537 nm ($\epsilon = 124 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$) and complex **4** displays an absorption feature at 548 nm ($\epsilon = 212 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$). (Figure S1) These values are comparable to those reported for tetracoordinate cyclam copper(II) complexes with square-planar geometry.⁵³

Cyclic Voltammetry.—In DMF solution, complex **1** gave a quasi-reversible feature with $E_{1/2} = -1.04 \text{ V}$ (vs ferrocene, $E = 226 \text{ mV}$) which was assigned to the Cu(I)/Cu(II) redox couple (Figure S2). A similar feature was observed in complex **2** with a more positive redox

potential $E_{1/2} = -0.74$ V ($E = 117$ mV). Introduction of a second trifluoromethylbenzyl ring shifts the redox potential positively by 300 mV. For reference, we synthesized the Cu(II) complex of 1,8-dibenzyl cyclam (**5**) and found that the redox potential is more negative ($E_{1/2} = -0.93$ V), indicating that the incorporation of CF₃ groups plays a role in positively shifting the redox potential in our system. In addition, the position of the CF₃ group is important. When the CF₃ is placed at the *para*- position instead of the *ortho*- position (**6**), a redox potential of -0.88 V was observed. Compared to complex **2**, a 140 mV negative shift was observed, most likely due to weakened inductive effect of the *para* vs *ortho* CF₃ groups. Under the same conditions, complex **3** gives a feature at $E_{1/2} = -0.96$ V ($E = 400$ mV) and complex **4** gives a quasi-reversible feature at $E_{1/2} = -0.74$ V ($E = 127$ mV), which are comparable with the benzyl systems. Moreover, an irreversible oxidation peak was observed in all complexes **1-4** with $E^0 = -0.24$ V, -0.38 V, -0.12 V, and -0.23 V, respectively. This feature is reminiscent of the redox behavior in the Cu(II) complex of tetramethylcyclam (TMC) and has been attributed to the rapid structural reorganization or isomerization of the Cu(I) *trans*-III intermediate in the TMC system.⁵⁴

Cysteine Reactivity

In order to investigate the reactivity of complexes **1-4** towards cysteine, we monitored the disappearance of the Cu(II) d-d absorbance band using UV-Vis. Complexes **1** and **3** show limited reactivity towards cysteine. For complex **1**, only 43% reduction in the d-d band was observed after 40 min in the presence of 12 equivalents of cysteine. For complex **3**, only 55% reduction was observed after 10 minutes in the presence of 9 equivalents of cysteine (Figure S3). Conversely, reaction of complexes **2** and **4** with cysteine was rapid and associated with a color change from purple to colorless (Figure 2). For complex **2**, based on the absorbance at 563 nm, about 39% reduction was achieved upon the addition of 1 equivalent of cysteine and this conversion increased to 74% after a second equivalent of cysteine was added. The reduction process was driven almost to full completion with 3 equivalents cysteine. With complex **4**, 45% reduction was achieved with 1 equivalent of cysteine, 70% with 2 equivalents and finally complete reduction with 3 equivalents of cysteine. We note that *para*-benzyl-CF₃ complex **6** only displayed a 32% reduction when reacted with 3 equivalents of cysteine (Figure S4). Interestingly, the reductions of **2** and **4** by cysteine are partially reversible as the reacted solution gradually changed from colorless back to purple upon exposure to air. The re-oxidation of **2** was accompanied by the reappearance of the d-d transition band at 563 nm. It is noteworthy that for complex **2** only ~75% regeneration was observed according to the absorbance assuming the original Cu(II) complex was reformed (Figure S5). Some white precipitate was observed during the process, which was identified to be free ligand by LC/MS, suggesting partial metal dissociation during reduction. For complex **4**, there was ~85% regeneration, but no precipitate was observed (Figure S6). Given the promising reactivity of **2** and **4**, further studies largely focused on these complexes.

To better understand the reaction between cysteine and complexes **2** and **4**, we used EPR to monitor the presence of paramagnetic species in solution. Consistent with the crystal structure, the room temperature EPR spectra of **2** and **4** in HEPES buffer revealed spectra consistent with square planar or octahedral geometries with elongated axial bonds.⁵³ After

the addition of 3 equivalents of cysteine, full disappearance of the EPR signals was observed for both complexes, consistent with a reduction of Cu(II) to Cu(I) (Figure 2). After exposing the reduced sample to air, the EPR signal for both complexes was partially restored. Double integration of the EPR spectra revealed a 74% signal restoration for **2** and 90% signal restoration for **4**, consistent with the percent recovery observed by UV-Vis. Moreover, the EPR hyperfine features after re-oxidation perfectly matched the EPR spectra of **2** and **4**, indicating the coordination environment was maintained upon reoxidation.

NMR spectroscopy was used to further analyse the reactions between **2** and **4** and cysteine and to determine the expected signal changes for ^{19}F MRI. The ^{19}F NMR spectrum of **2** displays a severely broadened peak at -52.5 ppm whereas the spectrum of **4** contained no ^{19}F peak, consistent with complete signal quenching in this complex. As a result, the T_1 and T_2 relaxation times of the ^{19}F nuclei in **2** and **4** could not be accurately determined and were estimated to be <0.1 ms. This signal broadening was attributed to the long electronic relaxation time (T_{1e}) of Cu(II) (0.1–10 ns) and the close distance between Cu(II) and fluorine atoms in these complexes. After reacting **2** with cysteine, a sharp singlet at -58.2 ppm appeared. A single ^{19}F signal was observed upon reduction, which is critical for higher sensitivity in ^{19}F MRI.⁵⁵ For complex **4** a sharp triplet at -67.5 ppm was generated upon reacting with cysteine, consistent with coupling between the CF_3 moiety and the adjacent methylene group. The signal intensity increased gradually as more equivalents of cysteine were introduced (Figure 2). Moreover, this signal vanished over time upon exposure to air due to re-oxidation to Cu(II). The T_1 and T_2 relaxation times for complexes **2** and **4** after reduction were measured. For complex **2**, a T_1 of 1 s and a T_2 of 0.8 s were observed. For complex **4**, a T_1 of 0.83 s and a T_2 of 0.25 s were observed. The relatively long T_1 and T_2 relaxation times therefore allow robust ^{19}F signals to be observed after reduction.

Mechanism of Action

To determine a plausible cysteine sensing mechanism for our system, we used both NMR and UV-vis spectroscopy. The ^1H and ^{19}F NMR spectra of both ligand **L4** and reduced complex **4** showed excellent signal alignment, suggesting that reaction of **4** with 3 equivalents of cysteine results in formation of free ligand **L4**. Thus, we propose a reductive chelation mechanism for sensing cysteine in our system.⁵⁶ First, Cu(II) reacts with cysteine to form Cu(I) and cysteine radical. This is followed by formation of the cysteine disulfide and binding of Cu(I) by 2 equivalents of cysteine and removal from the cyclam scaffold (Scheme S7). Formation of the Cu(I)-cysteine complex is accompanied by appearance of a characteristic absorbance band at 260 nm and a shoulder at 300 nm.⁵⁶ These bands were observed following the reaction of **2** and **4** with cysteine (Figure S7), consistent with the proposed mechanism. When the Cu(I) is re-oxidized in air, the cyclam ligand re-chelates the Cu(II) and the starting complex is formed. This recovery of the starting complex is seen in UV-vis, EPR, and NMR.

Selectivity

Selectivity of **2** and **4** towards other amino acids and reductants was further explored. Introduction of glycine, histidine, methionine, threonine, and serine resulted in no change in the Cu(II) complexes based on UV-vis spectroscopy. To further interrogate if the presence of

other amino acids could affect the interaction between cysteine and water soluble **4**, an amino acid competition study was conducted. Complex **4** was incubated with 5 equivalents of various amino acids (glycine, histidine, threonine, serine, glutamic acid, aspartic acid, glutamine, asparagine, and the hydrophobic amino acids) and no reduction was observed by UV-vis. Remarkably, 3 equivalents of cysteine were still able to reduce **4** within 5 minutes even in the presence of the other amino acids (Figure S8). This indicates the strong binding affinity of cysteine towards **4**, which represents a valuable feature for selective cysteine detection in the complex biological environment.

As an abundant biological reductant, glutathione (GSH) plays an important role in maintaining cellular redox potential. For complex **2**, no reaction with 5 equivalents of glutathione was observed by UV-vis after 1 h. For complex **4**, only a 35% reduction was observed with 5 equivalents of glutathione after 1 h. We also tested homocysteine, another bio-reductant and biothiol, due to its structural similarity to cysteine. Partial reduction of both **2** and **4** (20% and 40% respectively) was observed with 5 equivalents of homocysteine. Nitrogen containing species NO, NaNO₂ and NaNO₃ did not reduce **2** and **4** according to UV-vis (Figure 3). HNO, generated by using Angeli's salt, resulted in ~40% reduction of **2** and **4** after reaction of the complexes with 5 equivalents of Angeli's salt for 30 minutes. EPR revealed that the UV-vis absorbance change was probably due to ligand modification and metal displacement as strong, distinct EPR Cu(II) signals were still present after reacting **2** with 20 equivalents of Angeli's salt. Overall, complexes **2** and **4** displayed the highest reactivity with cysteine over biological reductants.

¹⁹F Magnetic Resonance Imaging

The capability of **2** and **4** to detect cysteine in solution by ¹⁹F MRI was explored using a 7 T MRI scanner. Three samples of each complex were prepared: 4 mM of Cu complex, 4 mM of Cu complex with 3 equivalents of cysteine, and 4 mM of Cu complex with 3 equivalents of cysteine exposed to air for 1 hr. ¹⁹F MR images were acquired for the three samples using RARE pulse sequence. As expected, complexes **2** and **4** exhibit no detectable MRI signal. Conversely, when complexes **2** and **4** were reacted with cysteine, bright MRI signals were observed, with signal-to-noise ratios (SNRs) of 23 and 44, respectively. After the samples was exposed to air, the SNRs decreased to 10 and 13, respectively, which corresponds to partial re-oxidation of the complexes (Figure 4). In order to transition into either cellular or animal studies, lower concentrations of probe are desired. A limit of detection (LOD) experiment was thus conducted to investigate the lowest concentration that can be imaged. Four different concentrations of **4** (1mM, 0.75mM, 0.5mM, and 0.25mM) were reduced by cysteine in HEPES buffer and ¹⁹F MR images were acquired using the same pulse sequence. A LOD of 0.3mM was obtained by linearly fitting the SNRs versus concentration and assuming a lowest detectable SNR of 3.5 (Figure S9). To further corroborate the LOD experiment, a 0.5 mM solution of **4** was prepared in PBS buffer and 3 equivalents of cysteine (1.5 mM) were added and then exposed to air. After 20 minutes, an image was successfully acquired with an SNR of 13 for the fully reduced sample and upon exposure to air, the SNR decreased to 2 (Figure S10). This nicely demonstrates the capability of **4** to detect cysteine at lower probe concentration.

Complex Stability.

After determining that both **2** and **4** have an efficient reactivity and selectivity toward cysteine, application in a biological system was studied. Since the solubility of **2** in water was limited, biological studies were carried out with complex **4** as it was soluble up to 1 mM in aqueous buffer. Stability studies were conducted for **4** over the biological pH range and with different bio-available metals. With complex **4**, no change was observed over 4 days in the ^{19}F NMR spectra when it was incubated with 2 equivalents of Ca(II) and Zn(II) (Figure S11). From pH 6–8, no change was observed in the ^{19}F NMR spectrum of complex **4**. At pH 5 and 4, a ^{19}F peak was observed, corresponding to less than 5% demetallation and ~20% demetallation of the complex, respectively (Figure S12).

In vitro ^{19}F NMR studies

Cell studies were carried out with HeLa cells, as they are known to contain a high concentration of biothiols.³⁴ First, cytotoxicity studies were conducted (MTT assay). Cells maintained high viability in the presence of **4** at high micromolar concentrations (Figure S13). HeLa cells were incubated with 0.5 mM **4** for 2 hours and cell uptake of our copper complex was determined using ICP-OES. The ICP-OES data indicated that the cells contained 3.6 fmol of **4** per cell. We then looked at cells incubated under similar conditions using ^{19}F NMR. We observed no peak in the ^{19}F NMR spectrum of HeLa cell lysates, suggesting that cysteine levels were too low to reduce complex **4** (Figure 4). To increase the levels of cysteine, HeLa cells were incubated with 1 mM N-Acetylcysteine (NAC), an external cysteine source for cells^{6, 57}, for 2 hours. After 2 hours with NAC, the media was removed and cells were then incubated with **4**. In this case, a peak corresponding to the reduced complex appeared, indicating that the excess cysteine inside the cells was able to reduce complex **4** in this complex biological environment (Figure 4). These results indicate that complex **4** is not toxic towards cells and can detect millimolar amounts of cysteine in biological systems.

Conclusion

In summary, we report two Cu(II) complexes (**2** and **4**) as potential MRI probes for cysteine. Through incorporation of trifluoromethyl-benzyl or fluororoalkyl moieties on a cyclam scaffold, appropriate Cu(II/I) redox potentials can be achieved that allow their reactivities towards cysteine. The ^{19}F NMR signals are effectively quenched due to the presence of Cu(II) through PRE. In solution, the Cu(II) complex reacts rapidly with cysteine and converts to a diamagnetic Cu(I) complex with a sharp ^{19}F NMR signal that was further demonstrated through ^{19}F MRI. The reduction process can be conveniently reversed through exposure to air, which regenerates the Cu(II) complex. Additionally, selectivity towards other amino acids and other thiols or nitrogen containing reductants was observed. Importantly, we are able to detect excess levels of cysteine in a cellular environment using water-soluble **4**, opening up future avenues for biothiol detection using ^{19}F MRI. Future work includes tuning these scaffolds to react with other bioreductants including biologically abundant glutathione, as well as increasing fluorine density and complex stability to enable *in vivo* studies.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by start-up funds from UT-Austin (EQ), a grant from the Welch Foundation (F-1883) (EQ). We thank Dr. Vincent Lynch for X-ray crystallography support, Dr. Michael Rose and Dr. Jonathan Sessler for providing chemicals. We also acknowledge the Imaging Research Center and Center for Electrochemistry at UT-Austin for access to their facilities. A special thanks goes to Sonya Xu and Daniel Han from the Welch Summer Scholar Program (WSSP), who helped with a portion of the synthesis and characterization. Some NMR spectra were obtained on a Bruker AVIII HD 500 that was funded by an NIH grant (Sessler PI, 1 S10 OD021508-01).

Notes and references

1. Poole LB, *Free Radic Biol Med*, 2015, 80, 148–157. [PubMed: 25433365]
2. Paulsen CE and Carroll KS, *Chem Rev*, 2013, 113, 4633–4679. [PubMed: 23514336]
3. Lu SC, *FASEB J*, 1999, 13, 1169–1183. [PubMed: 10385608]
4. Munday R, Munday CM and Winterbourn CC, *Free Radic Biol Med*, 2004, 36, 757–764. [PubMed: 14990354]
5. Tian M, Guo F, Sun Y, Zhang W, Miao F, Liu Y, Song G, Ho CL, Yu X, Sun JZ and Wong WY, *Org Biomol Chem*, 2014, 12, 6128–6133. [PubMed: 24991968]
6. Jung HS, Han JH, Pradhan T, Kim S, Lee SW, Sessler JL, Kim TW, Kang C and Kim JS, *Biomaterials*, 2012, 33, 945–953. [PubMed: 22048010]
7. Bannai S, *Biochim Biophys Acta*, 1984, 779, 289–306. [PubMed: 6383474]
8. Go YM and Jones DP, *Free Radic Biol Med*, 2011, 50, 495–509. [PubMed: 21130865]
9. Jiang Y, Cao Y, Wang Y, Li W, Liu X, Lv Y, Li X and Mi J, *Theranostics*, 2017, 7, 1036–1046. [PubMed: 28382174]
10. Liu G, Liu D, Han X, Sheng X, Xu Z, Liu SH, Zeng L and Yin J, *Talanta*, 2017, 170, 406–412. [PubMed: 28501188]
11. Peng H, Chen W, Cheng Y, Hakuna L, Strongin R and Wang B, *Sensors (Basel)*, 2012, 12, 15907–15946. [PubMed: 23202239]
12. Wang K, Peng H and Wang B, *J Cell Biochem*, 2014, 115, 1007–1022. [PubMed: 24415273]
13. Yang Z, Zhao N, Sun Y, Miao F, Liu Y, Liu X, Zhang Y, Ai W, Song G, Shen X, Yu X, Sun J and Wong WY, *Chem Commun (Camb)*, 2012, 48, 3442–3444. [PubMed: 22366729]
14. Chen X, Zhou Y, Peng X and Yoon J, *Chem Soc Rev*, 2010, 39, 2120–2135. [PubMed: 20502801]
15. Zhao C, Qu K, Song Y, Xu C, Ren J and Qu X, *Chemistry*, 2010, 16, 8147–8154. [PubMed: 20512822]
16. Niu LY, Guan YS, Chen YZ, Wu LZ, Tung CH and Yang QZ, *J Am Chem Soc*, 2012, 134, 18928–18931. [PubMed: 23121092]
17. Zhang M, Yu M, Li F, Zhu M, Li M, Gao Y, Li L, Liu Z, Zhang J, Zhang D, Yi T and Huang C, *J Am Chem Soc*, 2007, 129, 10322–10323. [PubMed: 17672463]
18. Li G, Chen Y, Wu J, Ji L and Chao H, *Chem Commun (Camb)*, 2013, 49, 2040–2042. [PubMed: 23381732]
19. Liu B, Wang J, Zhang G, Bai R and Pang Y, *ACS Appl Mater Interfaces*, 2014, 6, 4402–4407. [PubMed: 24571859]
20. Li L and Li B, *Analyst*, 2009, 134, 1361–1365. [PubMed: 19562202]
21. Lee JS, Ulmann PA, Han MS and Mirkin CA, *Nano Lett*, 2008, 8, 529–533. [PubMed: 18205426]
22. Zen J-M, Kumar AS and Chen J-C, *Anal. Chem*, 2001, 73, 1169–1175.
23. Tseng K-S, Chen L-C and Ho K-C, *Electroanalysis*, 2006, 18, 1306–1312.
24. Ivanov AR, Nazimov IV and Baratova LA, *J Chromatogr A*, 2000, 895, 167–171. [PubMed: 11105858]
25. Shahrokhian S, *Anal Chem*, 2001, 73, 5972–5978. [PubMed: 11791568]

26. Kim YS, Park GJ, Lee SA and Kim C, RSC Adv, 2015, 5, 31179–31188.
27. Lee SA, Lee JJ, Shin JW, Min KS and Kim C, Dyes and Pigments, 2015, 116, 131–138.
28. Heffern MC, Matosziuk LM and Meade TJ, Chem Rev, 2014, 114, 4496–4539. [PubMed: 24328202]
29. Lux J and Sherry AD, Current opinion in chemical biology, 2018, 45, 121–130. [PubMed: 29751253]
30. Tirotta I, Dichiarante V, Pigliacelli C, Cavallo G, Terraneo G, Bombelli FB, Metrangolo P and Resnati G, Chem Rev, 2015, 115, 1106–1129. [PubMed: 25329814]
31. Knight JC, Edwards PG and Paisey SJ, RSC Advances, 2011, 1, 1415–1425.
32. Yu M, Xie D, Phan KP, Enriquez JS, Luci JJ and Que EL, Chem Commun (Camb), 2016, 52, 13885–13888. [PubMed: 27841393]
33. Xie D, King TL, Banerjee A, Kohli V and Que EL, J Am Chem Soc, 2016, 138, 2937–2940. [PubMed: 26906216]
34. Xie D, Kim S, Kohli V, Banerjee A, Yu M, Enriquez JS, Luci JJ and Que EL, Inorg Chem, 2017, 56, 6429–6437. [PubMed: 28537705]
35. Mizukami S, Takikawa R, Sugihara F, Hori Y, Tochio H, Wälchli M, Shirakawa M and Kikuchi K, J Am Chem Soc, 2008, 130, 794–795. [PubMed: 18154336]
36. Neubauer AM, Myerson J, Caruthers SD, Hockett FD, Winter PM, Chen J, Gaffney PJ, Robertson JD, Lanza GM and Wickline SA, Magn Reson Med, 2008, 60, 1066–1072. [PubMed: 18956457]
37. Peterson KL, Srivastava K and Pierre VC, Front Chem, 2018, 6, 160. [PubMed: 29876342]
38. Srivastava K, Weitz EA, Peterson KL, Marja ska M and Pierre VC, Inorg Chem, 2017, 56, 1546–1557. [PubMed: 28094930]
39. Basal LA, Bailey MD, Romero J, Ali MM, Kurenbekova L, Yustein J, Pautler RG and Allen MJ, Chem. Sci, 2017, 8, 8345–8350. [PubMed: 29780447]
40. Kislukhin AA, Xu H, Adams SR, Narsinh KH, Tsien RY and Ahrens ET, Nat Mater, 2016, 15, 662–668. [PubMed: 26974409]
41. Chalmers KH, Kenwright AM, Parker D and Blamire AM, Magn Reson Med, 2011, 66, 931–936. [PubMed: 21381109]
42. Kenwright AM, Kuprov I, Luca ED, Parker D, Pandya SU, Senanayake PK and Smith DG, Chem. Commun, 2008, 2514–2516.
43. Jiang ZX, Feng Y and Yu YB, Chem Commun (Camb), 2011, 47, 7233–7235. [PubMed: 21617807]
44. Yu M, Bouley BS, Xie D, Enriquez JS and Que EL, J Am Chem Soc, 2018, 140, 10546–10552. [PubMed: 30052043]
45. Harvey P, Kuprov I and Parker D, Eur. J. Inorg. Chem, 2012, 2012, 2015–2022.
46. Bertini I, Luchinat C, Parigi G and Pierattelli R, Chembiochem, 2005, 6, 1536–1549. [PubMed: 16094696]
47. Wadas TJ, Wong EH, Weisman GR and Anderson CJ, Chem Rev, 2010, 110, 2858–2902. [PubMed: 20415480]
48. McQuade LE and Lippard SJ, Inorg Chem, 2010, 49, 7464–7471. [PubMed: 20690755]
49. Kim S, Minier MA, Loas A, Becker S, Wang F and Lippard SJ, J Am Chem Soc, 2016, 138, 1804–1807. [PubMed: 26836121]
50. Blahut J, Bernásek K, Gálisová A, Herynek V, Císa ová I, Kotek J, Lang J, Mat jková S and Hermann P, Inorg Chem, 2017, 56, 13337–13348. [PubMed: 29048157]
51. Blahut J, Hermann P, Gálisová A, Herynek V, Císa ová I, Tošner Z and Kotek J, Dalton Trans, 2016, 45, 474–478. [PubMed: 26646503]
52. Hart SL, Haines RI, Decken A and Wagner BD, Inorganica Chimica Acta, 2009, 362, 4145–4151.
53. Goeta AE, Howard JA, Maffeo D, Puschmann H, Williams JAG and Yufit DS, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans, 2000, 0, 1873–1880.
54. Amatore C, Barbe J-M, Bucher C, Duval E, Guillard R and Verpeaux J-N, Inorganica Chimica Acta, 2003, 356, 267–278.

55. Jacoby C, Temme S, Mayenfels F, Benoit N, Krafft MP, Schubert R, Schrader J and Flögel U, NMR Biomed, 2014, 27, 261–271. [PubMed: 24353148]
56. Pecci L, Montefoschi G, Musci G and Cavallini D, Amino Acids, 1997, 13, 355–367.
57. Mayer M and Noble M, Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 1994, 91, 7496–7500. [PubMed: 7914368]

Figure 1. ORTEP drawing of **1**, **2**, and **4**; the thermal ellipsoids are at the 50% probability level. Blue: carbon, purple: nitrogen, light green: fluorine, orange: copper, red: oxygen and dark green: chlorine.

Figure 2.

Reaction of cysteine with **2** (top row) and **4** (bottom row). A,B) UV-vis spectra. C,D) EPR spectra. E,F) ^{19}F NMR spectra utilizing 5-fluorocytosine as an internal reference (pink), reduced complexes (blue). All data for **2** were obtained in 40% CH_3CN in 50 mM HEPES buffer. All data for **4** were obtained in 50 mM HEPES buffer.

Figure 3. Selectivity of **2** (black) and **4** (grey) with different amino acids and bioreductants. 3 equivalents of cysteine and excess NO were used. For all other reagents, 5 equivalents were used.

Figure. 4.

A) ^{19}F MR phantom images using RARE pulse sequence: 4 mM **2** and **4** (top), after reacting with 3 equivalents of cysteine (middle), after exposure to air for 1h after reduction (bottom). Scanning parameters: echo time: 14.99 ms, repetition time: 1200 ms, number of acquisition: 256, rare factor: 16, matrix size: 64×64 , field of view: 40×40 , slice thickness: 50 mm. B) ^{19}F NMR after 6000 scans, top is HeLa cells with 0.5 mM of **4** and bottom is HeLa incubated with 1 mM of NAC for 2 hours and then incubated with 0.5 mM of **4**.

Scheme 1.
Structures of Cu(II) complexes **1–4**.