Imaging of Bacteria

PET Imaging of Bacterial Infections with Fluorine-18-Labeled Maltohexaose**

Xinghai Ning, Wonewoo Seo, Seungjun Lee, Kiyoko Takemiya, Mohammad Rafi, Xuli Feng, Daiana Weiss, Xiaojian Wang, Larry Williams, Vernon M. Camp, Malveaux Eugene, W. Robert Taylor,* Mark Goodman,* and Niren Murthy*

Abstract: A positron emission tomography (PET) tracer composed of ¹⁸F-labeled maltohexaose ($MH^{18}F$) can image bacteria in vivo with a sensitivity and specificity that are orders of magnitude higher than those of fluorodeoxyglucose (¹⁸FDG). $MH^{18}F$ can detect early-stage infections composed of as few as 10⁵ E. coli colony-forming units (CFUs), and can identify drug resistance in bacteria in vivo. $MH^{18}F$ has the potential to improve the diagnosis of bacterial infections given its unique combination of high specificity and sensitivity for bacteria.

The diagnosis of bacterial infections remains a central challenge in medicine. Infections are currently diagnosed by culturing of tissue biopsies or blood samples.^[1] However, these methods can only detect late-stage infections, which are challenging to treat. Bacterial infections therefore cause an enormous medical burden, for example, the mortality caused by bacterial infections was greater than the mortality caused by AIDS, breast cancer, and prostate cancer combined.^[2] Bacterial infections can be treated effectively, if diagnosed and treated at an early stage, and if the presence of drug

[*] Dr. X. Ning, ^[+] Dr. S. Lee, Dr. M. Rafi, Prof. N. Murthy Department of Bioengineering, UC Be 284 Hearst Memorial Mining Building UC Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720 (USA	Dr. X. Feng, Dr. X. Wang, erkeley g) M. Eugene, z Sciences
Department of Bioengineering, UC Be 284 Hearst Memorial Mining Building UC Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720 (USA	rkeley 3 M. Eugene, 2 Sciences
UC Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720 (USA	, M. Eugene,
	M. Eugene,
E-mail: nmurthy@berkeley.edu	, M. Eugene,
Dr. W. Seo, ^[+] L. Williams, V. M. Camp Prof. M. Goodman	z Sciences
Department of Radiology and Imaging Emory University (USA)	5 Sciences
E-mail: mgoodma@emory.edu	
Dr. K. Takemiya, Dr. D. Weiss	
Division of Cardiology, Department of	Medicine
Emory University School of Medicine	(USA)
Prof. W. R. Taylor	
Division of Cardiology, Department of ment of Biomedical Engineering, Emo	^F Medicine and the Depart- ory University School of Contor (USA)
E-mail: w.robert.taylor@emory.edu	Center (USA)
[⁺] These authors contributed equally to	this work.
[**] This project has been funded in part National Heart, Lung, and Blood Inst Health Department of Health and Luc	with Federal funds from the itute, National Institutes of

Health, Department of Health and Human Services, under Contract No. NIH R01 1R01HL096796-02 (N.M.), NIH U01 268201000043C-0-0-1, NIH R211R21AI098799-01 (N.M.), NIH 7UM1AI068636-07, and NIH R01 AI088023-03.

Supporting information for this article is available on the WWW under http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/anie.201408533.

resistance is also established. However, this task is challenging at present because the symptoms of infections look identical to a variety of other illnesses, such as cancer and inflammation.^[3] An imaging technology that can identify and localize bacterial infections with high sensitivity and specificity thus has the potential to have a significant impact on medicine in this clinical environment.

Positron emission tomography (PET) imaging has the potential to significantly improve the diagnosis of bacterial infections because of its unparalleled sensitivity.^[4] However, ¹⁸FDG is currently the only PET contrast agent available for clinical imaging of infections, and is problematic because it lacks specificity for bacteria and has a high uptake in mammalian cells.^{[5] 18}FDG therefore cannot distinguish bacterial infections from other pathologies such as cancer and inflammation, and cannot diagnose bacterial infections at an early stage.^[5a,6] Although numerous experimental PET contrast agents have been developed for imaging bacterial infections, such as radiolabeled antibiotics,^[7] antimicrobial peptides,^[1a] antibodies,^[8] or white blood cells,^[9] these agents have had minimal clinical impact. Several factors have contributed to the lack of success of bacteria imaging agents, such as poor clearance as a result of nonspecific adsorption, low target-receptor expression on bacteria, or complicated radiochemical synthesis, which are challenging to perform in clinical radiochemistry labs.^[10] Therefore, there is a great need for the development of new PET contrast agents that can image small numbers of bacteria with high specificity in vivo.^[11]

Herein, we present a new PET tracer, composed of ¹⁸Flabeled maltohexaose (MH18F), that can image bacterial infections in vivo with unprecedented sensitivity and specificity (see Scheme 1). MH18F targets the bacteria-specific maltodextrin transporter, which internalizes α -1,4-linked glucose oligomers (maltodextrins) as a source of glucose.^[12] The maltodextrin transport system is an ideal target for imaging bacteria because of its high uptake of maltodextrins $(K_{\rm m} \text{ of } 130 \,\mu\text{M})$,^[13] great specificity for bacteria, and the rapid clearance of maltodextrins from uninfected tissues.^[14] In addition, the maltodextrin transporter is only functional in metabolically active bacteria and MH18F uptake is therefore an indicator of bacterial viability,^[14b, 15] and potentially antibiotic efficacy. Finally, MH18F should have minimal toxicity in humans because maltodextrins are a commonly used food additive.[16]

A synthetic strategy was devised to synthesize $MH^{18}F$ through nucleophilic fluorination of the maltohexaose–brosylate precursor (3) with $K^{18}F$ in the presence of kryptofix



Scheme 1. Synthesis of MH¹⁸F. MH¹⁸F is composed of ¹⁸F-fluorideconjugated to maltohexaose and was synthesized by a one-step nucleophilic ¹⁸F fluorination of brosylate–maltohexaose (**3**).

k222 (see Scheme 1). The reducing end of maltohexaose was selected for the fluorination because the maltodextrin transporter recognizes the nonreducing end of maltodextrins and should therefore tolerate substitutions at the reducing end.^[13a,17] Azide-functionalized maltohexaose 1 was synthesized from maltohexaose in four steps following established methods,^[14b] and was conjugated with pent-4-yn-1-yl 4bromobenzenesulfonate (2) using the Cu^I-catalyzed Huisgen cycloaddition to afford the brosylate-maltohexaose precursor (3).^[18] Radiochemical synthesis of MH¹⁸F was carried out by cryptate-mediated nucleophilic substitution of the brosylate precursor **3** with potassium $[^{18}F]$ fluoride (K¹⁸F), followed by basic hydrolysis with NaOH and acid neutralization. A decaycorrected yield of 4.2% was obtained for this synthetic procedure, starting from ¹⁸F-fluoride, with an 87% radiochemical purity based on radiometric HPLC (see Figure S5 in the Supporting Information).^[19] The protocol for the preparation of MH18F had a synthesis time of 100 minutes and follows the same procedures used to prepare ¹⁸FDG,^[20] and should therefore be achievable in clinical radiochemistry laboratories. In addition, we anticipate that the radiochemical yield of MH¹⁸F can be increased using new ¹⁸F-fluorination methodologies.[19]

MH18F is designed to selectively target bacteria because of the presence of maltodextrin transporters in bacteria, and their absence in mammalian cells. We therefore investigated if MH¹⁹F has specificity for bacteria over mammalian cells, and if it is internalized by the maltodextrin transporter LamB, using ¹⁹F NMR spectroscopy. Bacteria (E. coli) and mammalian cells (hepatocytes) were incubated for one hour with MH¹⁹F at a concentration of 500 μM, washed with PBS, lysed, and the cellular supernatant was analyzed using ¹⁹F NMR spectroscopy. Figure 1 a and 1 b demonstrate that MH¹⁹F has high specificity for bacteria over mammalian cells and is robustly internalized. For example, under these conditions, E. coli had accumulated two times more MH19F than hepatocytes, and reached intracellular concentrations in the millimolar range. In addition, we performed maltohexaose competition experiments and experiments with LamB mutant E. coli to determine if $MH^{19}F$ was internalized through the



Figure 1. High specificity of MH¹⁹F for bacteria and robust internalization by bacteria. a) Specificity of MH¹⁹F for bacteria over hepatocytes. *E. coli* (EC), EC with LamB mutation (LamB), and mammalian cells were incubated with MH¹⁹F (500 μ M) for 1 hour in the presence or absence of maltohexaose (MH; 50 mM). The intracellular MH¹⁹F concentration was determined and normalized to the protein content. Bacteria robustly accumulate MH¹⁹F, whereas hepatocytes have negligible uptake. The uptake of MH¹⁹F in EC is inhibited by a large excess of maltohexaose, and the uptake of MH¹⁹F in LamB mutants is significantly reduced. The results are expressed as mean micromoles per gram of protein \pm s.e.m. for n=3 per group. b) Accumulation of MH¹⁹F (500 μ M), and the intracellular concentration of MH¹⁹F was determined at different time points, n=3 per group. s.e.m.=standard error of the mean.

maltodextrin transport pathway. Figure 1 a demonstrates that the uptake of MH¹⁹F in *E. coli* could be inhibited by an excess of maltohexaose, and that there is minimal uptake of MH¹⁹F in LamB mutants, demonstrating that MH¹⁹F enters *E. coli* through the maltodextrin transport pathway.

We investigated the ability of $MH^{18}F$ to image bacterial infections in rats. *E. coli* (10⁷ colony-forming units, CFUs) were injected into the left triceps muscle of rats, and the right triceps muscle was injected with PBS as a control. Two hours later, the rats were injected with 250 µCi of $MH^{18}F$ through the tail vein, and dynamic PET scans were performed using an Inveon micro PET/CT preclinical scanner (Siemens). Figure 2a and b demonstrates that $MH^{18}F$ clears well from healthy tissue but is retained in infected muscle. For example, bacterial infections were clearly visible as early as 10 minutes after the injection with $MH^{18}F$ and had a high target-tocontrol contrast of 8.5 after 70 minutes, allowing bacterial infections to be easily visualized in vivo.

A key challenge in imaging bacteria is the development of probes that have high sensitivity for bacteria.^[21] Current PET tracers for imaging bacteria, such as ¹⁸FDG and radiolabeled antibiotics and antibodies, can only image 10⁷–10⁹ bacterial CFUs in vivo, and cannot detect infections at an early stage.^[22] MH¹⁸F has the potential to detect small numbers of bacteria because of its fast transport into bacteria and its rapid clearance from uninfected tissues. We investigated the ability of MH¹⁸F to image early-stage bacterial infections. *E. coli* (10⁵ CFUs) were injected into the left triceps muscle of rats and





Figure 2. In vivo PET imaging of rats infected with *E. coli* (10^7 CFUs). a) Rats were infected in the left triceps muscle with 10^7 *E. coli*, administered with MH¹⁸F, and dynamic PET scans were performed for 90 min using a microPET/CT. Infected muscles can be easily visualized after 90 min. b) Time activity curves of decay-corrected MH¹⁸F activity in the infected rat, generated from Figure 2a. Infected muscle has an 8.5-fold increase in radioactivity over PBS-injected muscle. Arrows indicate the location of infected muscle (EC), PBS-injected muscle (PBS), and healthy tissue (HT). ID/g=% of injected dose/gram of tissue.

imaged with MH¹⁸F as described above. Figure 3b demonstrates that MH¹⁸F is capable of detecting as few as 10⁵ bacterial CFUs in vivo, for example, rat triceps muscles infected with 10⁵ bacterial CFUs had a 2.7-fold

increase in radioactivity over uninfected controls. Thus, the unique combination of robust transport into bacteria and clearance from healthy tissues allows MH¹⁸F to image bacteria with high sensitivity.

¹⁸FDG is currently the only PET radiopharmaceutical available for imaging bacterial infections; however, ¹⁸FDG has significant limitations as a result of its high uptake in mammalian cells.^[23] To determine the translational potential of MH¹⁸F, a biodistribution study was performed with MH¹⁸F and ¹⁸FDG to compare their specificity for bacteria and nonspecific adsorption in healthy tissues. Rats were infected with 10⁹ CFUs of *E. coli* and intravenously injected with either MH¹⁸F or ¹⁸FDG. One hour after the administration, various organs were harvested and their radioactivity was measured. Figure 4 demonstrates that MH¹⁸F is specific for bacteria



Figure 3. MH¹⁸F can detect as few as 10⁵ CFUs of E. coli (EC) in muscle infections. a1) MH¹⁸F can detect 10⁷ E. coli CFUs in rats. Rats were infected with 107 E. coli and imaged with MH18F using a micro-PET/CT. The image of the rat is representative of four experiments, and identifies the infection site. a2) MH¹⁸F generates a 6-fold increase in radioactivity in infected muscles. b1) MH¹⁸F can detect as few as 105 E. coli in rats. Rats were infected with 105 E. coli CFUs and imaged with MH¹⁸F using a microPET/CT. The image of the rat is representative of four experiments, and identifies the infection site. b2) MH¹⁸F generates a 2.7-fold increase in radioactivity in infected muscles. Regions of interest (ROIs), including the infected muscles (target) or PBS injection areas (control) and healthy tissues (background), were identified and integrated using the ASI Pro VM micro PET analysis software. The results in a2 and b2 are expressed as the target or control to background ratio (ROI ratio) \pm s.e.m. for n = 4 per group. The ROI ratio is defined as the mean radioactivity in the target/mean radioactivity in the background. The statistical significances in a2 and b2 were determined using a two-sample Student's *t*-test (* $p \le 0.05$ and ****p* < 0.001).

and has excellent clearance from healthy tissues. For example, MH¹⁸F generated a 30-fold difference in accumulation between infected versus healthy muscles, and in contrast, ¹⁸FDG generated only a 1.5-fold difference. The improved biodistribution pattern of MH¹⁸F over ¹⁸FDG is due to the



Figure 4. MH¹⁸F is more effective than ¹⁸FDG at imaging bacterial infections. A biodistribution study was performed with either MH¹⁸F or ¹⁸FDG in rats infected with 10⁹ *E. coli* CFUs. MH¹⁸F is efficiently cleared from uninfected tissues, whereas ¹⁸FDG has significant accumulation within the major organs. The results are expressed as (% of injected dose)/(gram of tissue) \pm s.e.m. for *n*=4 per group. Statistical significance was determined using a two-sample Student's *t*-test (* $p \le 0.05$ and *** $p \le 0.001$).

exclusive expression of maltohexaose transporters in bacteria in contrast to the high expression of glucose transporters in mammalian cells.^[12c,24] This allowed MH¹⁸F to clear from all of the major organs including heart, lung, brain, liver, bone, and muscle, whereas ¹⁸FDG had significant accumulation within these tissues. For example, in infected rats, the ratio of accumulation of MH¹⁸F in infected muscle versus liver was 5:1, whereas for ¹⁸FDG, this ratio was only 0.3:1, and for other reported PET contrast agents the infected muscle to liver ratio is also generally less than 1:1.^[1a,7–8] The excellent clearance of MH¹⁸F allowed it to target bacteria much better than ¹⁸FDG, and MH¹⁸F therefore has the potential to image bacterial infections in a variety of anatomical areas.

At present, there is no direct method available to monitor the efficacy of antibiotic treatment, and doctors therefore have to rely on nonspecific and imprecise clinical indicators to guide antibiotic therapy.^[25] MH¹⁸F has the potential to image bacterial drug resistance because it targets ATP-binding cassette (ABC) transporters,^[26] which require ATP for internalizing their substrates, connecting the uptake of MH¹⁸F with cellular metabolism and bacterial viability. We therefore investigated if MH¹⁸F could distinguish between live versus dead bacteria and identify resistance to therapy.

We first performed PET imaging with MH18F and 18FDG, and compared their ability to monitor bacterial metabolic activity in vivo. Rats were injected with 10^9 CFUs of live *E. coli* in their left triceps and 10⁹ CFUs of metabolically inactive E. coli (sodium azide treated) in their right triceps. Two hours later, the rats were injected with 250 µCi of either MH¹⁸F or ¹⁸FDG through the tail vein, and imaged using an Inveon micro PET/CT scanner. Figure 5a shows that MH¹⁸F can distinguish between live versus metabolically inactive bacteria, for example metabolically active E. coli showed a 7-fold increase in relative radioactivity over metabolically inactive bacteria treated with sodium azide, demonstrating that MH¹⁸F is actively transported by bacteria in vivo. In contrast, Figure 5b shows that ¹⁸FDG could not distinguish between live versus dead bacteria because of its high uptake by inflammatory cells.

Based on these results, we investigated if $MH^{18}F$ could identify bacterial drug resistance in vivo and measure antibiotic efficacy. Rats were infected with ampicillin-resistant *E. coli* (10⁹ CFUs) and wild-type *E. coli* (10⁹ CFUs), treated with ampicillin and imaged with $MH^{18}F$. Figure 6a demonstrates that $MH^{18}F$ can measure the efficacy of antibiotics in vivo and rapidly identify drug resistance. For example,



Figure 5. MH¹⁸F can distinguish between live versus dead bacteria and can discriminate infections from inflammation. a1) MH¹⁸F can distinguish between live versus dead bacteria in vivo. Rats were infected with 10° live and dead E. coli and imaged with MH¹⁸F using a micro-PET/CT. The image of the rat is a representative result of four experiments and demonstrates that MH¹⁸F does not accumulate in dead bacteria. a2) E. coli infected tissues had a 7-fold increase in radioactivity over muscles treated with dead bacteria. b1) ¹⁸FDG cannot distinguish between live and dead E. coli infected tissues. Rats were infected with 109 live and dead E. coli CFUs and imaged with ¹⁸FDG using a microPET/CT. The image is a representative result of four experiments and demonstrates that ¹⁸FDG cannot discriminate live bacteria from dead bacteria. b2) ¹⁸FDG accumulates in tissues infected with both live and dead bacteria. ROIs including the infected muscles (target) and healthy tissues (background) from a1 and b1 were identified and integrated using ASI Pro VM™ micro PET analysis software. The results in a2 and b2 are expressed as ROI ratio $\pm\,s.e.m.$ for n = 4 per group. The ROI ratio is defined as the mean radioactivity in the target/the mean radioactivity in the background. The statistical significance in a2 was determined using a two-sample Student's t-test (***p < 0.001).



Figure 6. MH¹⁸F can measure drug resistance and monitor the therapeutic effect of antibiotics in vivo. a1) MH¹⁸F can identify drug resistance in bacteria in vivo. Rats were infected with 109 CFUs of ampicillin-resistant E. coli (DREC) and wild-type E. coli (EC), treated with ampicillin and imaged with MH¹⁸F using a microPET/CT. The image of the rat is representative of four experiments, and demonstrates that MH¹⁸F only accumulates in DREC infected muscles. a2) DREC generated a 10-fold increase in radioactivity over EC. b1) MH¹⁸F can monitor the therapeutic effect of antibiotics. Rats were infected with DREC and EC, treated with ciprofloxacin and imaged with MH¹⁸F using a microPET/CT. The image of the rat is representative of four experiments, and demonstrates that both DREC and EC infected muscles have weak accumulation of MH18F. a2) Both infected tissues have weak radioactivity. ROIs including the infected muscles (target) and healthy tissues (background) from a1 and b1 were identified and integrated using ASI Pro VM™ micro PET analysis software. The results in a2 and b2 are expressed as ROI ratio \pm s.e.m. for n = 4 per group. The ROI ratio is defined as the mean radioactivity in the target/the mean radioactivity in the background. The statistical significance in a2 was determined using a two-sample Student's t-test (****p*≤0.001).

Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2014, 53, 14096-14101

© 2014 Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, Weinheim

ampicillin-resistant *E. coli* generated an 8.2-fold increase in PET signal intensity over susceptible *E. coli* because of their increased survival under antibiotic treatment. In addition, we investigated if MH¹⁸F could monitor the treatment of ampicillin-resistant bacteria with ciprofloxacin, and be used as a real-time methodology to assess antibiotic efficacy. Figure 6b demonstrates that in rats treated with ciprofloxacin, both tissues infected with ampicillin-resistant *E. coli* (10⁹ CFUs) and wild-type *E. coli* (10⁹ CFUs) have very low accumulation of MH¹⁸F, indicating that MH¹⁸F can quantify the effects of antibiotics, and can be used to guide the selection of antibiotics.

In conclusion, we have presented a bacteria-targeted PET tracer, termed MH¹⁸F, which can image bacteria in vivo with a sensitivity and specificity that are orders of magnitude higher than those of previously reported PET tracers. MH¹⁸F can also identify drug resistance and can therefore potentially assist physicians in prescribing the effective antibiotics. Finally, MH¹⁸F can be synthesized in one radiochemical step from clinically available K¹⁸F, and therefore has the potential to rapidly enter into clinical trials.

Received: August 25, 2014 Published online: October 21, 2014

Keywords: bacterial infections · maltodextrin transporters · maltohexaose · positron emission tomography · radiochemistry

- a) A. Lupetti, M. M. Welling, E. K. Pauwels, P. H. Nibbering, Lancet Infect. Dis. 2003, 3, 223–229; b) L. J. van Doorn, Y. Henskens, N. Nouhan, A. Verschuuren, R. Vreede, P. Herbink, G. Ponjee, K. van Krimpen, R. Blankenburg, J. Scherpenisse, W. Quint, J. Clin. Microbiol. 2000, 38, 13–17.
- [2] Sepsis fact sheet, http://www.nigms.nih.gov/Education/Pages/ factsheet_sepsis.aspx (2014).
- [3] a) A. Gillissen, M. Paparoupa, *Clin. Respir. J.* 2014, DOI: 10.1111/crj.12135; b) K. S. Sfanos, W. B. Isaacs, A. M. De Marzo, *Am. J. Clin. Exp. Urol.* 2013, *1*, 3–11.
- [4] a) M. E. Phelps, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 2000, *97*, 9226–9233;
 b) S. M. Ametamey, M. Honer, P. A. Schubiger, *Chem. Rev.* 2008, *108*, 1501–1516.
- [5] a) A. W. Glaudemans, A. Signore, *Eur. J. Nucl. Med. Mol. Imaging* 2010, *37*, 1986–1991; b) P. A. Erba, F. Bandera, M. Sollini, C. Tascini, *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* 2012, *60*, 1435–1436; author reply 1437; c) Z. Keidar, S. Nitecki, *Semin. Nucl. Med.* 2013, *43*, 396–402; d) T. del Rosal, W. A. Goycochea, A. Mendez-Echevarria, M. Garcia-Fernandez de Villalta, F. Baquero-Artigao, M. Coronado, M. D. Marin, L. Albajara, *Eur. J. Pediatr.* 2013, *172*, 1111–1115.
- [6] a) F. H. M. Corstens, J. W. M. van der Meer, Lancet 1999, 354, 765–770; b) F. Gemmel, N. Dumarey, M. Welling, Semin. Nucl. Med. 2009, 39, 11–26; c) M. van Oosten, T. Schäfer, J. A. C. Gazendam, K. Ohlsen, E. Tsompanidou, M. C. de Goffau, H. J. M. Harmsen, L. M. A. Crane, E. Lim, K. P. Francis, L. Cheung, M. Olive, V. Ntziachristos, J. M. van Dijl, G. M. van Dam, Nat. Commun. 2013, 4, 2584.
- [7] O. Langer, U. Muller, M. Brunner, M. Zeitlinger, C. Joukhadar, M. Mitterhauser, W. Wadsak, K. Kletter, M. Muller, *Eur. J. Nucl. Med. Mol. Imaging* 2004, *31*, S447–S447.
- [8] a) M. Rusckowski, S. Gupta, G. Liu, S. Dou, D. J. Hnatowich, J. Nucl. Med. 2004, 45, 1201–1208; b) H. J. Rennen, J. Makar-

ewicz, W. J. Oyen, P. Laverman, F. H. Corstens, O. C. Boerman, *Nucl. Med. Biol.* **2001**, *28*, 401–408.

- [9] a) A. Bhattacharya, R. Kochhar, S. Sharma, P. Ray, N. Kalra, N. Khandelwal, B. R. Mittal, *J. Nucl. Med.* **2014**, *55*, 1267–1272;
 b) H. A. Jones, A. M. Peters, J. C. Clark, *Nucl. Med. Commun.* **2001**, *22*, 601–602.
- [10] a) M. Petrik, H. Haas, M. Schrettl, A. Helbok, M. Blatzer, C. Decristoforo, *Nucl. Med. Biol.* 2012, *39*, 361–369; b) O. Langer, M. Brunner, M. Zeitlinger, S. Ziegler, U. Müller, G. Dobrozemsky, E. Lackner, C. Joukhadar, M. Mitterhauser, W. Wadsak, E. Minar, R. Dudczak, K. Kletter, M. Müller, *Eur. J. Nucl. Med. Mol. Imaging* 2005, *32*, 143–150; c) N. Petruzzi, N. Shanthly, M. Thakur, *Semin. Nucl. Med.* 2009, *39*, 115–123; d) C. Lu, Q. Jiang, C. Tan, J. Tang, J. Zhang, *Molecules* 2012, *17*, 8518–8532.
- [11] A. Signore, S. J. Mather, G. Piaggio, G. Malviya, R. A. Dierckx, *Chem. Rev.* 2010, *110*, 3112–3145.
- [12] a) H. A. Shuman, Ann. Microbiol. 1982, 133A, 153-159; b) P. E. Klebba, Res. Microbiol. 2002, 153, 417-424; c) A. Charbit, Front. Biosci. 2003, 8, s265-274; d) S. Gopal, D. Berg, N. Hagen, E. M. Schriefer, R. Stoll, W. Goebel, J. Kreft, PLoS One 2010, 5, e10349; e) W. Boos, H. Shuman, Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev. 1998, 62, 204-229.
- [13] a) R. Dippel, W. Boos, J. Bacteriol. 2005, 187, 8322-8331; b) S. Freundlieb, U. Ehmann, W. Boos, J. Biol. Chem. 1988, 263, 314-320.
- [14] a) R. Reuss, J. Ludwig, R. Shirakashi, F. Ehrhart, H. Zimmermann, S. Schneider, M. M. Weber, U. Zimmermann, H. Schneider, V. L. Sukhorukov, *J. Membr. Biol.* 2004, 200, 67–81;
 b) X. Ning, S. Lee, Z. Wang, D. Kim, B. Stubblefield, E. Gilbert, N. Murthy, *Nat. Mater.* 2011, 10, 602–607.
- [15] A. J. Sharff, L. E. Rodseth, J. C. Spurlino, F. A. Quiocho, *Biochemistry* 1992, 31, 10657–10663.
- [16] R. Shepherd, A. Robertson, D. Ofman, *Food Hydrocolloids* 2000, 14, 281–286.
- [17] S. Freundlieb, U. Ehmann, W. Boos, J. Biol. Chem. 1988, 263, 314-320.
- [18] a) Q. Wang, T. R. Chan, R. Hilgraf, V. V. Fokin, K. B. Sharpless, M. G. Finn, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2003, 125, 3192–3193; b) H. C. Kolb, M. G. Finn, K. B. Sharpless, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2001, 40, 2004–2021; Angew. Chem. 2001, 113, 2056–2075.
- [19] a) D. O'Hagan, C. Schaffrath, S. L. Cobb, J. T. Hamilton, C. D. Murphy, Nature 2002, 416, 279; b) D. W. Kim, Y. S. Choe, D. Y. Chi, Nucl. Med. Biol. 2003, 30, 345-350; c) D. W. Kim, D. Y. Chi, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2004, 43, 483-485; Angew. Chem. 2004, 116, 489-491; d) D. W. Kim, D. S. Ahn, Y. H. Oh, S. Lee, H. S. Kil, S. J. Oh, S. J. Lee, J. S. Kim, J. S. Ryu, D. H. Moon, D. Y. Chi, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2006, 128, 16394-16397; e) M. Glaser, E. Arstad, Bioconjugate Chem. 2007, 18, 989-993; f) G. Vaidyanathan, M. R. Zalutsky, Nucl. Med. Biol. 1992, 19, 275-281; g) R. Iwata, C. Pascali, A. Bogni, G. Horvath, Z. Kovacs, K. Yanai, T. Ido, Appl. Radiat. Isot. 2000, 52, 87-92; h) O. Prante, J. Einsiedel, R. Haubner, P. Gmeiner, H. J. Wester, T. Kuwert, S. Maschauer, Bioconjugate Chem. 2007, 18, 254-262; i) R. Ting, M. J. Adam, T. J. Ruth, D. M. Perrin, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2005, 127, 13094-13095; j) E. Lee, A. S. Kamlet, D. C. Powers, C. N. Neumann, G. B. Boursalian, T. Furuya, D. C. Choi, J. M. Hooker, T. Ritter, Science 2011, 334, 639-642; k) E. Lee, J. M. Hooker, T. Ritter, J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2012, 134, 17456-17458; l) M. Huiban, M. Tredwell, S. Mizuta, Z. Wan, X. Zhang, T. L. Collier, V. Gouverneur, J. Passchier, Nat. Chem. 2013, 5, 941-944.
- [20] a) D. S. Surasi, P. Bhambhvani, J. A. Baldwin, S. E. Almodovar, J. P. O'Malley, J. Nucl. Med. Technol. 2014, 42, 5–13; b) R. Nakao, T. Ito, M. Yamaguchi, K. Suzuki, Nucl. Med. Biol. 2008, 35, 239–244.
- [21] a) C. Bettegowda, C. A. Foss, I. Cheong, Y. Wang, L. Diaz, N. Agrawal, J. Fox, J. Dick, L. H. Dang, S. Zhou, K. W. Kinzler, B. Vogelstein, M. G. Pomper, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **2005**, *102*,

1145–1150; b) B. A. Smith, W. J. Akers, W. M. Leevy, A. J. Lampkins, S. Xiao, W. Wolter, M. A. Suckow, S. Achilefu, B. D. Smith, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 67–69.

- [22] a) D. Pellegrino, A. A. Bonab, S. C. Dragotakes, J. T. Pitman, G. Mariani, E. A. Carter, J. Nucl. Med. 2005, 46, 1522–1530;
 b) A. J. Fischman, E. Livni, J. Babich, N. M. Alpert, Y. Y. Liu, E. Thom, R. Cleeland, B. L. Prosser, R. J. Callahan, J. A. Correia, Antimicrob. Agents Chemother. 1992, 36, 2286–2292.
- [23] a) L. Varagnolo, M. P. M. Stokkel, U. Mazzi, E. K. J. Pauwels, *Nucl. Med. Biol.* 2000, 27, 103–112; b) M. M. Hanasono, L. D. Kunda, G. M. Segall, G. H. Ku, D. J. Terris, *Laryngoscope* 1999, *109*, 880–885; c) P. Lind, I. Igerc, T. Beyer, P. Reinprecht, K. Hausegger, *Eur. J. Nucl. Med. Mol. Imaging* 2004, *31*, S125–

S134; d) N. Lubezky, U. Metser, R. Geva, R. Nakache, E. Shmueli, J. M. Klausner, E. Even-Sapir, A. Figer, M. Ben-Haim, *J. Gastrointest. Surg.* **2007**, *11*, 472–478.

- [24] a) L. G. Strauss, D. Koczan, S. Klippel, L. Pan, S. Willis, C. Sachpekidis, A. Dimitrakopoulou-Strauss, Am. J. Nucl. Med. Mol. Imaging 2013, 3, 417–424; b) P. Deron, C. Vangestel, I. Goethals, A. De Potter, M. Peeters, H. Vermeersch, C. Van de Wiele, Nuklearmedizin 2011, 50, 15–21; c) C. Wandersman, Ann. Microbiol. 1982, 133A, 161–163.
- [25] J. A. Roberts, R. Norris, D. L. Paterson, J. H. Martin, Br. J. Clin. Pharmacol. 2012, 73, 27–36.
- [26] S. Morbach, S. Tebbe, E. Schneider, J. Biol. Chem. 1993, 268, 18617–18621.