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#### Abstract

Glycosyl conjugation to drugs is a strategy being used to take advantage of glucose transporters (GLUT) overexpression in cancer cells in comparison with non-cancerous cells. Its extension to the conjugation of drugs to thiosugars tries to exploit their higher biostability when compared to $O$-glycosides. Here, we have synthesized a series of thiosugar naphthalene diimide conjugates as G-quadruplex ligands and have explored modifications of the amino sidechain comparing dimethyl amino and morpholino groups. Then, we studied their antiproliferative activity in colon cancer cells, and their antiparasitic activity in $T$. brucei and $L$. major parasites, together with their ability to bind quadruplexes and their cellular uptake and location. We observed higher toxicity for the sugar-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ derivatives than for the sugar-NDI-morph compounds, both in mammalian cells and in parasites. Our experiments indicate that a less efficient binding to quadruplexes and a worse cellular uptake of the carb-NDI-morph derivatives could be the reasons for these differences. We found small variations in cytotoxicity between $O$-carb-NDIs and $S$-carbNDIs, except against non-cancerous human fibroblasts MRC-5, where thiosugar-NDIs tend to be less toxic. This leads to a notable selectivity for $\beta$-thiomaltosyl-NDI-NMe $2 \mathbf{1 2}$ ( 9.8 fold), with an IC50 of $0.3 \mu \mathrm{M}$ against HT-29 cells. Finally, the antiparasitic activity observed for the carb-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ derivatives against T. brucei was in the nanomolar range with a good selectivity index in the range of 30- to 69-fold. © 2022 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Masson SAS. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).


## 1. Introduction

G-quadruplexes (G4) are nucleic acids secondary structures formed within guanine-rich sequences where the basic motif are guanine tetrads linked through Hoogsteen hydrogen bonds and stacked on top of each other. G4's are located in key regions of the genome such as in promoters, enhancers, and telomeres, playing important roles in cellular and genetic processes [1,2]. In the last

[^0]decade, they have emerged as interesting targets for cancer [3-5], neurological pathologies [6,7], as well as for viral [8] and parasitic infections [9,10].

A wide variety of small molecule ligands have been reported to bind G-quadruplexes [11,12], but only a few based on naphthalene diimide [13], quinazoline [14], quinoxaline [15], among other aromatic scaffolds, have shown efficacy as anticancer agents in animal models. Of those, only Quarfloxin (CX-3543) [16], APTO-253 [17,18], CX-5461 [19], and recently pyrvinium pamoate [20], have managed to enter clinical trials for the treatment of different types of tumors.

Our research groups have described carbohydrate naphthtalene diimide conjugates (carb-NDIs) as potential anticancer [21] and antiparasitic agents [10,22]. Several mono- and disaccharide-NDIs resulted in submicromolar IC50 values against HT-29, MCF-7 and

HeLa cancerous cells, with 1.4 - to 5.4 -fold less toxicity against noncancerous MRC-5 cells. The activity of these carb-NDIs against Trypanosoma brucei, the parasite causing sleeping sickness, showed IC50 values in the nanomolar range with 40 - to 80 -fold selectivity when compared to MRC-5 human cells. The carbohydrate conjugation to potential chemotherapy drugs tries to take advantage of the Warburg effect, since rapidly proliferating cancer cells have a different energy metabolism than that of healthy cells. This process is characterized by the sole use of the glycolytic pathway for the partial catabolism of carbohydrates compared to the complete route through the posterior metabolism of pyruvate in the citric acid cycle. Although this provides benefits for the survival of cancer cells, it ultimately yields less ATP and hence transmembrane glucose transporters (GLUTs) are overexpressed in compensation to ensure that sufficient glucose is internalized to ensure its growth. Thus, sugar conjugation becomes an attractive system for targeted drug delivery directly to cancer cells. In fact, this approach is becoming popular for all types of drugs [23], such as metallodrugs [24-26], peptides [27], oligonucleotides [28] or natural products [29], and glufosfamide, a glucose-ifosfamide conjugate, is in clinical trials Phase III for pancreatic cancer.

In our first work on carb-NDIs [21] we showed that the higher selectivity of the carbohydrate-NDIs for tumoral cells was due to its preferential uptake through the overexpressed glucose transporters, especially through GLUT 1 and GLUT 4 . This has been recently confirmed in a collaborative work where a lactose-C-NDI derivative (Fig. S1) showed a 4 -fold greater entrance into tumoral cells (SW480) in relation to non-tumoral ones as quantified by confocal fluorescence microscopy [30]. At the same time, lactose-C-NDI showed selective inhibition of cell growth by high-affinity binding to G-quadruplexes in ribosomal DNA, hindering RNA polymerase I (Pol I) elongation. Thus, lactose-C-NDI induced inhibition of Pol I transcription, nucleolus disruption, degradation of the proteasomedependent Pol I catalytic subunit A and finally, autophagy.

Conjugation of thioglycosides to drugs instead of $O$-glycosides has also been used due to their higher biochemical stability to glycosidases [31,32], in order to potentially improve their bioavailability under physiological conditions. Moreover, thiosugars may bring differences on GLUT binding which could be interesting to explore with NDI conjugates. In fact, this approach has already been used on thiosugar nanoparticle conjugates [33], thiosugar peptides [34], thiosugar dendrimers [35] and also on thiosugar drugs, such as, auranofin [36], a drug to treat rheumatoid arthritis or GOPI-sugar [37], which is also under development against malignant glioma.

Since a critical point of G4 ligands design is their binding selectivity to G-quadruplex targets in comparison to the abundant duplex DNA, modulation of the basicity of the amine charged residues could be a promising strategy to investigate. Actually, the introduction as NDI side-chains of less basic morpholine groups instead of the strongly basic dimethyl amino groups could be really useful. In fact, the reduced basicity, reduces the positive charge on the ligand, limiting nonspecific interactions, and enhancing its bioavailability [38].

In this work, we decided to explore several chemical modifications in carb-NDIs in order to improve efficacy, cytotoxicity and cellular uptake. Thus, we designed and prepared new carb-NDIs exploring novel glycosides (Carb-NDI-NMe2), modifying the dimethyl amine side-chains with morpholine moieties (Carb-NDImorph), substituting $O$-glycosides with $S$-glycosides (Thiocarb-NDI-NMe2), and finally, NDIs merging both structural modifications (Thiocarb-NDI-morph) (Fig. 1). Then, we measured their antiproliferative and antiparasitic activity, their binding to Gquadruplexes, and their cellular and parasitic uptake.

## 2. Results and discussion

### 2.1. Design, synthesis and rationale

The design of these new carb-NDIs is based on the previously reported $\beta$-glc-O-C2-NDI-NMe2 1 and $\alpha$-man-O-C2-NDI-NMe2 2 (Fig. 2) [21]. In this case, an ethylene glycol spacer was used to connect sugars to the NDI core through a triazole ring because this eight-atom chain length conjugating the NDI to the pyranose ring gave the best results in terms of cellular uptake. At the same time, carb-NDIs containing longer alkyl chains between the sugar and the central aromatic core resulted in less active antiparasitic agents against Trypanosoma brucei and Leishmania major than those found for compounds $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{2}$ [22]. Therefore, we have incorporated other mono- and disaccharides (galactose and maltose) through the ethylene glycol spacer used for $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{2}$, yielding compounds $\mathbf{3}$ and 4. We also synthesized the morpholine derived carb-NDIs version (compounds 5-8). Then, the thioglycoside analogues ( $\mathbf{9}-\mathbf{1 6}$ ) of the carb-NDIs $1-8$ were prepared.

The library of carbohydrates-NDIs conjugates has been obtained following the synthetic protocol reported in our previous work [21]. The key step is the copper(I)-catalyzed azide alkyne cycloaddition, using an azidosugar and an NDI with an alkyne moiety. Alkyne-NDI precursors have been synthesized in three steps, starting with imidation of the dibromo-1,4,5,8-naphthalentetracarboxylic dianhydride, in presence of 3 -(dimethylamino)-1-propylamine or 4-(2-aminoethyl)morpholine to generate the corresponding naphthalene diimides 20a-c and 21a-c, respectively (Scheme 1). The mixture obtained from this reaction was used for the following step without further purification. Nucleophilic aromatic substitution on the NDI core was carried out in the presence of an excess of propargylamine in acetonitrile and refluxed overnight (Scheme 1). Products 18 and 19 were isolated after purification using reverse phase column chromatography.

The 2-azidoethyl 0 -glycoside derivatives $\mathbf{3 0}$ - $\mathbf{3 3}$ were prepared as previously reported starting from the corresponding trichloroacetimidate derivative: $\beta$-glucose-C2 [21,39], $\alpha$-mannose-C2 [21,40], $\beta$-galactose-C2 [39] and $\beta$-maltose-C2 derivatives [40] (Scheme 2). In the case of the 2-azidoethyl S-glycoside derivatives 42-45, they were prepared from the peracetylated carbohydrates by treatment with thiourea and 1-bromo-2-chloroethane, subsequent reaction with sodium azide and final de-O-acetylation [41].

Finally, 2-azidoethyl 0 -glycoside derivatives $\mathbf{3 0 - 3 3}$ and 2azidoethyl $S$-glycoside derivatives 42-45 were conjugated to the alkyne NDIs 18 and 19 through Huisgen cycloaddition reaction, following a standard protocol [21]. Briefly, the reaction was performed in the presence of catalytic $\mathrm{CuSO}_{4} \cdot 5 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and sodium ascorbate, in a $1: 1 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}:{ }^{\text {t }} \mathrm{BuOH}$ solution. After 1 h , the solvents were evaporated and the crude was purified through reverse phase column chromatography yielding the NDIs $\mathbf{1 - 1 6}$ in good yields (Scheme 3).

### 2.2. Antiproliferative and antiparasitic activity

Cytotoxicity of carb NDIs $\mathbf{1} \mathbf{- 1 6}$ was evaluated in two different cell lines, MRC5 (healthy human lung fibroblast) and HT29 (colorectal adenocarcinoma), to investigate potential differences in bioactivity (Table 1). Some general trends can be envisioned from these results. In general, morpholino substituted carb-NDIs 5-8 and $\mathbf{1 3 - 1 6}$ showed lower toxicity compared to dimethyl amino carb-NDI derivatives $\mathbf{1 - 4}$ and $\mathbf{9 - 1 2}$ in both cell lines. The IC50 values obtained for the morpholino NDI derivatives were in the low-mid micromolar range, whereas for the dimethyl amino NDI derivatives were in the submicromolar or low micromolar range. This effect could be due to differences in the ability to enter cells, to




Fig. 1. Structures of carb-NDIs indicating the chemical modifications included in the compounds investigated in this study.

$\beta$-glc-O-C2, X=O or S

$\alpha$-man-O-C2, X=O or $S$

$\beta$-gal-O-C2, X=O or S

$\beta$-malt-O-C2, X=O or $S$
$1 \mathrm{R}_{1}=\beta$-glc-O-C2; $\mathrm{R}_{2}=\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{NMe}_{2}$
$2 \mathrm{R}_{1}=\alpha$-man-O-C2; $\mathrm{R}_{2}=\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{NMe}_{2}$
$3 \mathrm{R}_{1}=\beta$-gal-O-C2; $\mathrm{R}_{2}=\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{NMe}_{2}$
$4 \mathrm{R}_{1}=\beta$-malt-O-C2; $\mathrm{R}_{2}=\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{NMe}_{2}$


$5 \mathrm{R}_{1}=\beta$-glc-O-C2; $\mathrm{R}_{2}=$ morph
$6 \mathrm{R}_{1}=\alpha$-man-O-C2; $\mathrm{R}_{2}=$ morph
$7 \mathrm{R}_{1}=\beta$-gal-O-C2; $\mathrm{R}_{2}=$ morph
$8 R_{1}=\beta$-malt-O-C2; $R_{2}=$ morph
$9 \mathbf{R}_{1}=\beta$-glc-S-C2; $\mathbf{R}_{2}=\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{NMe}_{2}$
$10 \mathrm{R}_{1}=\alpha$-man-S-C2; $\mathrm{R}_{2}=\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{NMe}_{2}$
$11 \mathbf{R}_{1}=\beta$-gal-S-C2; $\mathbf{R}_{2}=\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{NMe}_{2}$
$12 \boldsymbol{R}_{1}=\beta$-malt-S-C2; $\boldsymbol{R}_{2}=\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{NMe}_{2}$
$13 \mathbf{R}_{1}=\beta$-glc-S-C2; $\boldsymbol{R}_{2}=$ morph
$14 \mathbf{R}_{1}=\alpha$-man-S-C2; $\mathbf{R}_{2}=$ morph
$15 \boldsymbol{R}_{1}=\beta$-gal-S-C2; $\boldsymbol{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=$ morph
$16 \mathbf{R}_{1}=\beta$-malt-S-C2; $\mathbf{R}_{2}=$ morph

Fig. 2. Carbohydrate naphthalene diimide conjugates (Carb-NDIs $1-8$ ) and their thiosugar analogues ( $\mathbf{9}-16$ ) prepared in this work.
their binding efficacy to their potential targets (DNA G-quadruplexes) or to other factors.

The selectivity index (SI) was calculated by dividing IC50 values obtained for MRC- 5 cells by those obtained for HT- 29 cancer cells.

We found that all carb-NDIs, except compound 15, were more toxic against cancerous HT-29 cells than against non-cancerous MRC5 cells. At the same time, O-glycoside NDIs tend to be more toxic than their $S$-glycoside NDI analogues against non-cancerous MRC-


Scheme 1. Synthesis of alkyne-modified NDIs 18 and 19. a) amine ( 3 eq.), acetic acid, reflux, 30 min ; b) propargylamine ( 3 eq.), acetonitrile, reflux, 12 h .


Scheme 2. Synthesis of 2-azidoethyl O-glycoside derivatives 30-33 and 2-azidoethyl S-glycoside derivatives 42-45. a) 2-bromoethanol, $\mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{DCM}$; b) $\mathrm{NaN3}, \mathrm{DMF}$; c) NaOMe , MeOH ; d) Thiourea, 1-bromo-2-chloroethane, $\mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{ACN}$.


Scheme 3. Synthesis of carb-NDIs $\mathbf{1 - 1 6}$. a) $\mathrm{CuSO}_{4} \cdot 5 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, sodium ascorbate ( 1 eq .), $t$ - $\mathrm{BuOH} / \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} 1: 1$, r.t., 1 h .

5 cells. In fact, the most selective compound was the thiocarb-NDI derivative 12, $\beta$-malt-S-C2-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$, which resulted in an SI value of 9.8 fold. The rest of carb-NDIs showed SI values between 2 and 4 fold, except compound $\mathbf{1 4}$ with an SI value of 6.7. In the dimethyl amino carb-NDI series, the differences of cytotoxicity due to the carbohydrate moiety were small, with thiogalactosyl and thiomaltosyl derivatives being slightly more toxic than the other sugars against HT-29 cells. In the morpholino carb-NDI series, the
differences of cytotoxicity due to the sugar unit were larger, with 0 glucosyl, $O$-galactosyl and $S$-mannosyl derivatives around one order of magnitude more toxic than the rest of sugar derivatives against HT-29 and with smaller differences against MRC-5 cells.

The antiparasitic activity of carb NDIs $\mathbf{1 - 1 6}$ was measured against Trypanosoma brucei and Leishmania major promastigote parasites, and the SI value calculated by dividing the IC50 values obtained for MRC- 5 cells by those obtained for $T$. brucei or $L$. major

Table 1
IC50 values measured for MRC-5 and HT-29 cells, T. brucei, L. major promastigotes, together with the resulting selectivity indexes, for compounds 1-16. SI stands for selectivity index. Data in bold correspond to the best antiparasitic and antiproliferative activities.

|  | $\underline{\mathrm{IC}_{50} \text { Parasites ( } \mu \mathrm{M} \text { ) }}$ |  | $\underline{\mathrm{IC}_{50} \text { Cells ( } \mu \mathrm{M} \text { ) }}$ |  | L. major | $\frac{\text { SI }}{\text { T brucei }}$ | HT-29 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L. major | T. brucei | HT-29 | MRC-5 |  |  |  |
| $1 \beta$-glc-O-C2-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ | $0.79 \pm 0.15$ | $0.08 \pm 0.06$ | $0.46 \pm 0.09$ | $0.92 \pm 0.04$ | 1.2 | 11.5 | 2.0 |
| $2 \alpha$-man-O-C2-NDI-NMe 2 | $0.30 \pm 0.03$ | $0.05 \pm 0.02$ | $0.43 \pm 0.02$ | $0.95 \pm 0.43$ | 3.2 | 19.0 | 2.2 |
| $3 \beta$-gal-O-C2-NDI-NMe 2 | $13.9 \pm 2.10$ | $0.05 \pm 0.01$ | $0.50 \pm 0.20$ | $1.94 \pm 0.65$ | 1.4 | 38.8 | 3.9 |
| $4 \beta$-malt-O-C2-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ | $0.80 \pm 0.05$ | $0.06 \pm 0.03$ | $0.48 \pm 0.26$ | $1.80 \pm 0.52$ | 2.3 | 30.0 | 3.8 |
| $5 \beta$-glc-O-C2-NDI-morph | $10.5 \pm 1.37$ | $0.31 \pm 0.06$ | $1.75 \pm 0.50$ | $7.86 \pm 0.50$ | 0.7 | 25.3 | 4.5 |
| $6 \alpha$-man-O-C2-NDI-morph | >50 | $2.10 \pm 0.18$ | $8.52 \pm 4.25$ | $30.5 \pm 15.1$ | - | 14.5 | 3.6 |
| $7 \beta$-gal-O-C2-NDI-morph | $27.5 \pm 2.90$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 5} \pm 0.02$ | $3.60 \pm 2.50$ | $10.4 \pm 3.24$ | 1.3 | 69.3 | 2.9 |
| $8 \beta$-malt-O-C2-NDI-morph | >50 | $3.32 \pm 1.82$ | $13.0 \pm 5.18$ | >50 | - | >15 | >3.8 |
| $9 \beta$-glc-S-C2-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ | $1.38 \pm 0.55$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 5} \pm 0.02$ | $0.75 \pm 0.11$ | $2.75 \pm 1.80$ | 2.0 | 55.0 | 3.7 |
| $10 \alpha$-man-S-C2-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ | $1.52 \pm 0.55$ | $0.08 \pm 0.06$ | $0.88 \pm 0.22$ | $2.78 \pm 2.15$ | 1.8 | 34.7 | 3.2 |
| $11 \beta$-gal-S-C2-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ | $0.74 \pm 0.15$ | $0.04 \pm 0.01$ | $0.35 \pm 0.12$ | $1.55 \pm 0.23$ | 2.1 | 38.7 | 4.4 |
| $12 \beta$-malt-S-C2-NDI-NMe 2 | $0.51 \pm 0.10$ | $0.06 \pm 0.04$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 0} \pm \mathbf{0 . 1 0}$ | $2.94 \pm 0.38$ | 5.7 | 49.0 | 9.8 |
| $13 \beta$-glc-S-C2-NDI-morph | $30.2 \pm 2.11$ | $1.18 \pm 0.06$ | $28.9 \pm 0.82$ | $35.7 \pm 11.7$ | 1.2 | 30.3 | 1.2 |
| $14 \alpha$-man-S-C2-NDI-morph | $21.7 \pm 1.28$ | $0.73 \pm 0.23$ | $3.39 \pm 0.62$ | $22.6 \pm 1.96$ | 1.1 | 31.0 | 6.7 |
| 15 3-gal-S-C2-NDI-morph | $30.0 \pm 0.72$ | $0.85 \pm 0.29$ | $26.5 \pm 2.00$ | $23.5 \pm 6.30$ | 0.8 | 27.6 | 0.9 |
| $16 \beta$-malt-S-C2-NDI-morph | >50 | $3.04 \pm 0.16$ | $13.7 \pm 1.08$ | >50 | - | >16 | >3.6 |

parasites. All the compounds showed higher efficacy against T.brucei than against $L$. major parasites, most probably due to the previously observed overall higher drug sensitivity of T.brucei than L. major [42,43]. At the same time, the general trend observed for the toxicity of carb-NDIs in mammalian cells is also observed against parasites. Thus, the morpholino substituted carb-NDIs 5-8 and $13-16$ showed lower toxicity compared to dimethyl amino carb-NDI derivatives $1-4$ and $9-12$ in both parasites. In the case of the dimethyl amino carb-NDI's, the IC50 values found for T.brucei ( $0.04-0.08 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) were all very similar, independently of the $O$ - or $S$ glycoside present in the compound. In the case of $L$. major, the IC50 values were higher $(0.3-1.5 \mu \mathrm{M})$ than those for T.brucei, with compound $\mathbf{3}$ being the least toxic one $(13.9 \mu \mathrm{M})$. In the series of the morpholino carb-NDI's, the IC50 values found for T.brucei showed more variation ( $0.15-3.32 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) depending on the carbohydrate unit, with O-glucosyl and O-galactosyl NDI morph derivatives being the most active ones. The IC50 data for L. major were in the midmicromolar range indicating low toxicity against this parasite.

Concerning the selectivity index calculated for $L$. major over MRC-5 cells, the carb-NDI conjugates showed small SI values of up to 5.7. In contrast, the SI for $T$. brucei were higher (11.5-55), with $\beta$ -gal-O-C2-NDI-morph 7 showing the highest selectivity of series ( 69 -fold). This value is in the same range of that found for $\beta$-malt- $O$ -TEG-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ reported recently by our group [22]. The TEG linker was $-\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)_{3}$-triazole- $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)_{3}-\mathrm{NH}$ - bound to the NDI scaffold modified with two dimethyl amino side chains.

### 2.3. Binding to G4 DNA

One of the potential targets of naphthalene diimides are DNA Gquadruplexes (G4). Thus, we evaluated the binding of several carbNDIs to these relevant secondary DNA structures. Based on their biological activity, we selected compounds 3 and 4 ( $\beta$-gal-O-C2-NDI-NMe 2 and $\beta$-malt-O-C2-NDI-NMe $)_{2}$ ), and their thiosugars equivalents compounds $\mathbf{1 1}$ and 12 ( $\beta$-gal-S-C2-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ and $\beta$ -malt-S-C2-NDI-NMe 2 ), together with gal-NDI morpholino derivatives 7 and 15 ( $\beta$-gal-O-C2-NDI-morph and $\beta$-gal-S-C2-NDImorph), in order to compare the role of the amine group on binding.

First, we measured binding of the selected carb-NDI conjugates to the well known human telomeric sequence F21T [5'$\left.\mathrm{d}\left(\mathrm{G}_{3}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{2} \mathrm{AG}_{3}\right)_{3}\right)-3^{\prime}\right]$, also found in $T$. brucei and numerous mammalian species, using the FRET assay [44] (Fig. 3). We observed $\Delta$ Tm values between 10 and $12{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for the carb-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}(3,4,11$ and 12),
derivatives at $1 \mu \mathrm{M}$ concentration, with few differences among them, whereas the carb-NDI-morph ligands $(\mathbf{7}, 15)$ showed $\Delta T \mathrm{~m}$ 's around $1-2{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. These results seem to indicate that the lower basicity of the morpholine groups with respect to the dimethylamino groups may be the reason of the poor binding of compounds 7 and 15 to the DNA G-quadruplex. In fact, this is the case even at higher ligand concentration of 7 and 15 ( 2 and $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ concentration, respectively), rendering $\Delta \mathrm{Tm}$ values around $4-6^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. These results seem to correlate with the lower toxicity found for carb-NDI-morph derivatives than for carb-NDI-NMe 2 derivatives, both in cells and parasites. At the same time, the small differences in $\Delta \mathrm{Tm}$ found for the carb-NDI's indicate that the carbohydrate does not play a relevant role on binding to the G-quadruplex, as we had observed previously for compounds $\mathbf{1}$ and 2 [21].

We also carried out FRET melting experiments under competing conditions of increasing concentrations of double stranded DNA (ds26, 3 and 10 eq, see Fig. S2) for four selected carb-NDI-NMe 2 ligands (3,4,11 and 12) to study their selectivity of G4 versus duplex DNA binding. We found a small but significant selectivity for G4s against DNA duplex. In the presence of 10 equivalents of ds26 competitor, a decrease of roughly $70-75 \%$ in the induced stabilization was observed for F21T.


Fig. 3. FRET melting assays for compounds $\mathbf{1} \mathbf{- 1 6}$ with F21T G-quadruplex.


Fig. 4. FRET melting assays for compounds carb-NDIs $\mathbf{3}$ and $\mathbf{4}$, and their corresponding thiocarb-NDIs $\mathbf{1 1}$ and $\mathbf{1 2}$ (at $1 \mu \mathrm{M}$ conc.) with different G-quadruplexes.

In order to investigate potential G4 binding selectivity, we measured binding of carb-NDI-NMe 2 ( $\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{4 , 1 1}$ and 12) to several G4 sequences. We selected as DNA G4s: EBR1, a sequence unique to T. brucei [10] with a hybrid topology, four sequences with parallel topology such as, F25CebT, the human mini-satellite G4 sequence, F21rasT, the Kras promoter, FAG3AT, a G4 synthetic construct and FmycT, and a sequence with antiparallel topology, F21ctaT. We also included an RNA G4, the human telomeric RNA F21RT and as control FdXT, a hairpin duplex with a hexaethyleneglycol loop (see Table S1 for sequences). $\Delta \mathrm{Tm}$ values at 1 and $2 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ligand concentration are shown in Fig. 4 and Fig. S3, respectively. We observed F21T, its corresponding RNA G4, F21RT, and FmycT were found to be the sequences most stabilized by the carb-NDI $\mathrm{NMe}_{2}$ ligands, whereas EBR1-FT and F25CebT showed the smallest stabilization of the selected G4's. It is important to mention that no stabilization
was observed for the DNA duplex control FdxT. At the same time, only small differences on binding were found between the four sugar-NDI measured, independently of being O- or S-glycoside, pointing again to a negligible role of the carbohydrates on binding to the G-quadruplexes.

Next, we studied ligand binding to the G4 structures using native electrospray mass spectrometry, which will also provide the resulting stoichiometry [45]. The four selected carb-NDI-NMe 2 ligands were evaluated with several DNA sequences. These include the following ones: the human telomeric 22AG, [5'$\left.\mathrm{d}\left(\mathrm{AG}_{3}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{2} \mathrm{AG}_{3}\right)_{3}\right)-3^{\prime}\right]$, the T.brucei G 4 sequence EBR1, [5'$\mathrm{d}\left(\mathrm{G}_{3} \mathrm{CAG}_{5} \mathrm{TGATG}_{4} \mathrm{AG}_{2} \mathrm{AGC}_{2} \mathrm{AG}_{3}\right)-3$ '], a parallel tetramolecular G 4 , $\left[5^{\prime}-\mathrm{d}\left(\mathrm{TG}_{4} \mathrm{~T}\right)_{4}-3^{\prime}\right]$, a bimolecular antiparallel sequence [5'$\left.\left.\mathrm{d}\left(\mathrm{G}_{4} \mathrm{~T}_{4} \mathrm{G}_{4}\right)_{2}\right)-3^{\prime}\right]$ and two duplex sequences, the Dickerson-Drew dodecamer [46], here noted d66 [5'-d(CGCGA ${ }^{\prime}$ T2CGCG $\left.)_{2}\right)-3^{\prime}$ ], and self-complementary duplex with $100 \%$ CG-content [5'$\left.\mathrm{d}\left(\left(\mathrm{CGCG}_{3} \mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{GCG}\right)_{2}\right)-3^{\prime}\right]$. The corresponding mass spectra are shown in Fig. 5 and Fig. S4.

We found all four carb-NDI $\mathrm{NMe}_{2}$ compounds actually bind to quadruplexes and, in all cases, only 1:1 complexes were detected. It is important to note that the $1: 1$ complex of compound $\mathbf{1 2}, \beta$-D-malt-S-C2-NDI-NMe 2 , with the $\left(\mathrm{TG}_{4} \mathrm{~T}\right)_{4}$ quadruplex is observed with 3 ammonium ions but also with 2 ammonium ions (see insertion on Fig. 3B). This could suggest a putative secondary interaction mode through intercalation with the displacement of one of the coordinated ammonium cations in the G4 structure. Among the quadruplex studied, the four carb-NDIs showed binding preference for parallel tetramolecular $\mathrm{G} 4\left(\mathrm{TG}_{4} \mathrm{~T}\right)_{4}$, except for compound $4, \beta$-D-malt-O-C2-NDI-NMe 2 , with similar binding also to the human telomeric G4 (Fig. S4). Binding of the four sugar-NDIs to DNA duplexes d66 and d100 is also detected and, in some cases, even higher than that found to quadruplexes.

When the equilibrium binding constants were calculated using our previously reported methodology [47,48], all four ligands showed $\mathrm{K}_{1}$ binding constants in the range of $5.9 \times 10^{4} \mathrm{M}^{-1}$ to $4.1 \times 10^{5} \mathrm{M}^{-1}$ with $\left(\mathrm{TG}_{4} \mathrm{~T}\right)_{4}$ quadruplex, and in the range of $0.3-7.2 \times 10^{4} \mathrm{M}^{-1}$ with the other three G4 studied (Table S2).
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Fig. 5. Mass spectra for $\beta$-D-gal-S-C2-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$, compound $\mathbf{1 1}(\mathrm{A})$ and for $\beta$-D-malt-S-C2-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ compound $\mathbf{1 2}$ (B) with different DNA G-quadruplexes and DNA duplexes.

Selectivity with respect to DNA duplex was smaller than expected, with $\mathrm{K}_{1}$ binding constants ranging from $1.9 \times 10^{4} \mathrm{M}^{-1}$ to $1.25 \times 10^{5} \mathrm{M}^{-1}$. This result may be due to a preference on binding to duplex regions rich on CG base pairs, since we did not observe such affinity to FdxT duplex, containing just one CG base pair when measured using the FRET assay. In fact, we carried out further FRET experiments for compounds $\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{4}, \mathbf{1 1}$ and $\mathbf{1 2}$ with control duplexes containing higher CG content (up to $30 \%$ ) and $\Delta \mathrm{Tm}$ values obtained remained low ( $0-2{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) (Fig. S5). It is important to note that a direct comparison between DNA binding studies measured through FRET and mass spectrometry can show biased results. As a matter of fact, studies on mechanism of action of this type of ligands indicate carb-NDIs actually bind G-quadruplexes in ribosomal DNA as demonstrated using fluoresecent intercalator displacement (FID) assay, NMR and a DNA polymerase stop assay on G4 sequences found in the rDNA [30]. At the same time, a fluorescence confocal microscopy displacement experiment run with thioflavin T (ThT), a fluorescent light-up probe of ribosomal G4s in the nucleolus, run on SW480 cells, showed that carb-NDI sharply decreased the ThTstained foci, indicating that carb-NDI displaced ThT from the nucleolar G4s. Thus, carb-NDIs exhibited a G4-binding pattern inside cells mainly targeting G4s in the nucleolar rDNA.

### 2.4. Cellular and parasitic uptake of carb-NDI conjugates

We evaluated cell entrance of several $O$ - and $S$-glycoside-NDI$\mathrm{NMe}_{2}$, and compared it to that of the corresponding carb-NDImorph analogues (Table 2). We took advantage of the red fluorescent emission of NDI derivatives to monitor their cell entry [21]. Fluorescence spectroscopy measurements were made to study their entrance within a cancer cell line (human colon adenocarcinoma HT-29, a noncancerous cell line (human lung fibroblast MRC5 ) and $T$. brucei epimastigotes. They were carried out exciting the

Table 2
Cell uptake of selected carb-NDIs and control NDIs. Percentage of compound entering the cells of total incubated. The symbol $(-)$ means data not measured.

| HT-29 |  | MRC-5 | T. brucei |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 2 \alpha \text {-man-O- } \\ \text { C2-NDI- }^{2} \\ \text { NMe }_{2} \end{gathered}$ | - |  | - | $8.1 \pm 1.1$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 4 \beta \text {-malt-O- } \\ \text { C2-NDI- } \\ \mathrm{NMe}_{2} \end{gathered}$ | $20.9 \pm 9.0$ |  | $25.5 \pm 13.5$ | $7.0 \pm 0.5$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 6 \alpha \text {-man-O- } \\ \text { C2-NDI- } \\ \text { morph } \end{gathered}$ | - |  | - | $4.2 \pm 1.0$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 7 \beta \text {-gal-O- } \\ \text { C2-NDI- } \\ \text { morph } \end{gathered}$ | - |  | - | $5.4 \pm 0.9$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 8 \beta \text {-malt-O- } \\ \text { C2-NDI- } \\ \text { morph } \end{gathered}$ | $3.2 \pm 2.4$ |  | $0.8 \pm 0.2$ | $6.1 \pm 2.0$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 10 \alpha \text {-man-S- } \\ \text { C2-NDI- } \\ \text { NMe }_{2} \end{gathered}$ | $-$ |  | $-$ | $6.1 \pm 1.4$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 12 \beta \text {-malt-S- } \\ & \text { C2-NDI- } \\ & \mathrm{NMe}_{2} \end{aligned}$ | $23.1 \pm 13.9$ |  | $20.7 \pm 18.5$ | $4.3 \pm 0.7$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 14 \alpha \text {-man-S- } \\ & \text { C2-NDI- } \\ & \text { morph } \end{aligned}$ | - |  | - | $3.2 \pm 0.1$ |
| $\begin{gathered} 15 \text { } \beta \text {-gal-S- } \\ \text { C2-NDI- } \\ \text { morph } \end{gathered}$ | - |  | $-$ | $6.8 \pm 0.3$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 16 \beta \text {-malt-S- } \\ & \text { C2-NDI- } \\ & \text { morph } \end{aligned}$ | $3.5 \pm 0.4$ |  | $3.3 \pm 3.4$ | $6.7 \pm 0.6$ |

red dye at $\lambda=485 \mathrm{~nm}$ and recording its emission at $\lambda=535 \mathrm{~nm}$ after incubation with the compounds ( $10 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ) for 2 h .

In the case of $T$. brucei, a small percentage of the carb-NDI entered the parasites ( $3.2-8.1 \%$ ), with small differences between the sugar or the tertiary amine modifying the structure, that, in any case, was higher than two fold. In contrast, compounds 4 and 12 ( $\beta$ -malt-O-C2-NDI-NMe 2 and $\beta$-malt-S-C2-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ ), enter both HT29 and MRC-5 cells in much higher percentage (20.7-25.5\%) than their morpholine-NDI counterparts, compounds 8 and 16 ( $\beta$-malt-O-C2-NDI-morph and $\beta$-malt-S-C2-NDI-morph), with only a $0.8-3.5 \%$ entrance. These results correlate quite well with the cytotoxicity found in mammalian cells where $\mathrm{NMe}_{2}$-NDIs were much more toxic than the morph-NDIs, independently of the sugar substituent.

Next, we used confocal microscopy to study the localization of compounds 4 and 12 ( $\beta$-malt-O-C2-NDI-NMe 2 and $\beta$-malt-S-C2-NDI-NMe 2 ) in HT-29 cells and in T. brucei parasites, exploiting again its intrinsic fluorescence properties. In the case of HT-29 cancer cells, we observed both carb-NDIs mainly co-localized with the DNA probe DAPI highlighting its preferential distribution in the nucleus (Fig. 6), with no differences among them. In the case of T. brucei, compounds $\mathbf{4}$ and $\mathbf{1 2}$ could be localized in the nucleus but also in other areas of the cytoplasm (Fig. S6). This is in contrast with our previous results with other carb-NDIs [21] and could be due to a short incubation time.

## 3. Conclusions

We have explored the influence of different amino side chains such as dimethylamino and morpholino, together with a variety of $O$ - and $S$-glycosides attached to NDIs on their bioactivity and their G-quadruplex binding ability. Carb-NDI-NMe 2 derivatives turned out to be more potent antiproliferative and antiparasitic agents than their carb-NDI-morph analogues. The reasons behind these differences seem to be poorer G4 binding of carb-NDI-morph ligands, besides their low cellular uptake in comparison with that of the carb-NDI-NMe 2 derivatives.

The main observed difference with respect to their bioactivity between O -carb-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ and S -carb-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ is the fact that thiocarb-NDIs were overall less toxic against MRC-5 cells. This leads to a higher selectivity index for these $S$-carb-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ derivatives. For example, compound 12 ( $\beta$-malt-S-C2-NDI-NMe 2 ) displays potent growth inhibition activity against colon cancer cells, at sub$\mu \mathrm{M}$ concentrations, and shows great selectivity against control human fibroblasts ( 9.8 -fold) which is the best reported one for carb-NDI derivatives.

In the case of $T$. brucei parasites, several carb-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ displayed nanomolar activity with a good selectivity index, in the range of 30 - to 55 -fold. However, the best SI ( 69 -fold) was observed for compound 7, $\beta$-gal-O-C2-NDI-morph. Finally, we confirmed binding of carb-NDI's to quadruplexes using different biophysical measurements, although the G4 selectivity vs duplex DNA was smaller than expected. Finally, carb-NDI localization was studied by confocal microscopy, and whereas compounds 4 and 12 ( $\beta$-malt- $O$ -C2-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ and $\beta$-malt-S-C2-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ were located in the HT29 cell nucleus, they were also found in both the cytoplasm and nucleus of $T$. brucei epimastigotes, probably due to short incubation times.

## 4. Experimental section

### 4.1. General materials and methods

Reagents, solvents and chemicals were purchased from Alfa Aesar or Sigma-Aldrich and were used as supplied without further


Fig. 6. Fluorescence microscopy of compounds 4 and 12, $\beta$-malt-O-C2-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ and $\beta$-malt-S-C2-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$, respectively, in HT-29 cancer cells. Left to right columns: fluorescence of the compounds at 25 uM concentration, DAPI staining, merge image and light microscopy image, respectively. A) compound $\mathbf{4}, 30 \mathrm{~min}, \mathrm{~B}$ ) compound $\mathbf{4}, 2 \mathrm{~h}, \mathrm{C}$ ) compound $\mathbf{1 2}$, 30 min, D) compound 12, 2h, E) Negative control.
purification. Oligonucleotides were purchased from Eurogentec and were used without further purification. Oligonucleotide stock solutions (about $5 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{M}$ ) were prepared in MilliQ water and stored at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The exact stock concentrations were determined from the absorbance at 260 nm . The ODNs were annealed by incubation at $95^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min and letting them cool down at r.t to promote the folding. Heating was carried out using a thermoblock (Accublock by Labnet). The folded samples were then stored, at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, if necessary. The compounds were solubilized in water at $1 \times 10^{-2} \mathrm{M}$ concentration and stored at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. TLC analysis was carried out on silica gel (Merck 60F-254) with visualization at 254 and 366 nm or with the appropriate stainers. The solvents used for all the HPLC analyses and purifications were $0.1 \%$ trifluoroacetic acid in water and acetonitrile. HPLC analysis was performed using an Agilent system SERIES 1260. The column was XSelectHSS C18 $(2.5 \mu \mathrm{~m})(4.6 \times 50 \mathrm{~mm})$ (Waters). The following analytical method (method 1) was used, flow: $1.4 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$; gradient: $95 \%$ aqueous solution, gradually to $40 \%$ aqueous solution over 8 min and then
isocratic flow for 4 min ; (method 2) was used, flow: $1.4 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$; gradient: $95 \%$ aqueous solution, gradually to $40 \%$ aqueous solution over 12 min and then isocratic flow for 4 min .

Preparative reverse phase purification of NDI precursors and carb-NDI conjugates was carried out using an Agilent Technologies 1260 Infinity preparative HPLC, provided with a diode array UV-vis detector. The column was a SunFire C18 OBD ( $5 \mu \mathrm{~m}, 150 \times 30 \mathrm{~mm}$ ). The following method was used for the purification of NDIs (method 3): flow: $30 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$; gradient: $95 \%$ of aqueous solvent, then gradually to $70 \%$ aqueous over 5 min , then to $40 \%$ aqueous over 13 min and then isocratic flow for 2 min ( $\lambda$ detection: 620,530 and 256 nm ). The following method was used for the purification of carb-NDI conjugates (method 4): flow: $30 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$; gradient: $85 \%$ of aqueous solvent, then gradually to $70 \%$ aqueous over 12 min , then to $50 \%$ aqueous over 2 min and finally isocratic flow for $3 \mathrm{~min}(\lambda$ detection: 530, 450 and 256 nm$).{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker NMR equipment.

### 4.2. Synthesis

### 4.2.1. Synthesis of NDI intermediates compounds 20a-20c and alkyne-NDI derivatives 18

These compounds were synthesized from compound 17 according to the published synthetic protocol [21].

### 4.2.2. Synthesis of NDI intermediates compounds 21a-21c

In a one-necked flask, 500 mg ( $1.18 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$.$) of dibromo-$ naphthalene diimide 17 , previously synthesized according to a published procedure [21], were suspended into 100 ml of acetic acid. Then, 0.460 ml ( $3.54 \mathrm{mmol}, 3$ eq.) of 4 -(2-aminoethyl)morpholine were added to the mixture. The solution was refluxed for 30 min , under nitrogen atmosphere, and then neutralized through addition of sodium hydrogen carbonate. The crude was extracted three times with dichloromethane ( $3 \times 200 \mathrm{ml}$ ) and used for the next step without further purification.

### 4.2.3. Synthesis of alkyne-NDI derivative $\mathbf{1 9}$

In a round bottomed flask, 300 mg ( $0.46 \mathrm{mmol}, 1 \mathrm{eq}$.$) of$ dibromo-naphthalene diimide 21a were dissolved into 150 ml of acetonitrile, and 0.08 ml propargylamine ( $1.39 \mathrm{mmol}, 3$ eq.) were added. The reaction mixture was refluxed for 12 h , and then the solvent was removed under reduced pressure. The crude was purified using reverse phase column chromatography and 100 mg (Yield $=40 \%$, red solid) of pure product 19 were isolated. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D} 2 \mathrm{O}$ ) $\delta \mathrm{ppm} 8.16$ (d, $J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.98(\mathrm{~d}, J=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 7.9(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.48-4.42(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 4.3(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.02(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})$, $3.69-3.65(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 3.5-3.45(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.22-3,19(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.82(\mathrm{~s}$, 1H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D} 2 \mathrm{O}$ ): $\delta \mathrm{ppm} 168.59 ; 167.27$; 167.05; 166.67 ; 154.70; 134.67; 131.69; 129.94; 128.46; 128.34; 125.74; 123.67; 121.95; 102.97; 82.22; 77.35; 66.99; 58.10; 57.83; 55.62; 38.18; 37.67; 35.86. HRMS (ESI): $m / z$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{29} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{~N}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{6}+\mathrm{H}^{+}$: 546.2347 [M+H] ${ }^{+}$; found: 546.3216.

### 4.2.4. Protocol for step a of Scheme 2

To a solution of peracetylated 1-trichloroacetimidate sugar (1 eq.) in anhydrous DCM, under argon atmosphere, 2-bromo ethanol (1.1 eq.) was added dropwise. Boron trifluoride diethyl etherate was then added ( 1 eq .) and the reaction was stirred at room temperature for 30 min . After TLC verification of total consumption of the initial product, $10 \%$ aqueous solution of $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ was added. The organic phase was washed three times ( $3 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) with the basic solution, concentrated and purified through flash column chromatography, using, as eluent, a mixture of Hexane: Ethyl Acetate 4:1 to 2:1.

Compounds 22 and $\mathbf{2 3}$ were synthesized according to the published synthetic protocol [21].

Compound 24. 2-Bromoethyl 2,3,4,6-tetra-O-acetyl- $\beta$-d-galactopyranose. Yield $=37 \%, R f=0.25$ (Hexane: Ethyl Acetate $-2: 1$ ). The compound characterization coincided with the description found in literature [39].

Compound 25. 2-Bromoethyl $2,3,4,2^{\prime}, 3^{\prime}, 4^{\prime}, 6^{\prime}$-hepta- $O$-acetyl- $\beta$ -D-maltopyranose, Yield $=13 \%, \mathrm{Rf}=0.2$ (Hexane: Ethyl Acetate 2:1), which was fully characterized according to the literature [40].

### 4.2.5. Protocol for step b of Scheme 2

Solution of 2-bromoethyl O-glycoside or 2-chloroethyl S-glycoside ( 1 eq .) and sodium azide ( 10 eq .) in DMF ( 25 mL ) was stirred for $24 \mathrm{~h}-96 \mathrm{~h}$ at room temperature. The reaction mixture was then diluted with DCM and extracted with water ( $6 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) to yield the corresponding 2-azidoethyl glycosides.

Compounds 26 and 27 were synthesized according to the published synthetic protocol [21].

Compound 28. 2-azidoethyl 2,3,4,6-tetra-O-acetyl- $\beta$-d-galactopyranose. Yield $=94 \%$, which was fully characterized according to the literature [39].

Compound 29. 2-azidoethyl $2,3,4,2^{\prime}, 3^{\prime}, 4^{\prime}, 6^{\prime}$-hepta- $O$-acetyl- $\beta$-dmaltopyranose. Yield $=93 \%$, which was fully characterized according to the literature [40].

Compound 38. 2-azidoethyl 2,3,4,6-tetra-O-acetyl- $\beta$-D-1thioglucopyranose. Yield $=50 \%{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(500 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 5.23$ $(\mathrm{t}, J=9.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.06(\mathrm{dt}, J=19.3,9.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.56(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, 1 H ), 4.19 (ddd, $J=14.7,12.4,3.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), 3.73 (ddd, $J=10.1,5.0$, $2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.60-3.43(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.95(\mathrm{dt}, J=13.9,6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.77$ (dt, $J=13.9,6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.09(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.06(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.03(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.01$ $(\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $126 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta$ 170.55, 170.08, 169.40, 169.36, 83.48, 76.05, 73.66, 69.62, 68.19, 62.02, 51.56, 29.43, 20.69, 20.66, 20.57, 20.55. TOF MS ES ${ }^{+}$Calculated mass $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}+$ $\mathrm{Na}]=456.1053$, Found mass $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]=456.1048$.

Compound 39. 2-azidoethyl 2,3,4,6-tetra-O-acetyl- $\alpha$-D-1thiomannopyranose. Yield $=60 \%$, which was fully characterized according to the literature [49].

Compound 40. 2-azidoethyl 2,3,4,6-tetra-O-acetyl- $\beta$-D-1thiogalactopyranose. Yield $=99 \%{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 5.37(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.22-4.93(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.54(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.04(\mathrm{t}, J=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.95(\mathrm{t}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.66(\mathrm{dt}, J=9.6$, $5.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.46$ (ddd, $J=12.3,7.8,4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.14-2.95(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 2.72 (dd, $J=13.9,7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.09$ (s, 3H), 2.00 (s, 3H), 1.98 (s, 3H), 1.91 (s, 3H). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta 170.39,170.22,169.99$, $169.67,83.97,74.70,71.81,67.50,61.77,51.64,43.51,29.60,20.84$, 20.71, 20.63. TOF MS ES ${ }^{+}$Calculated mass for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}+$ $H]=434.1233$, Found mass $[M+H]=434.1239$.

Compound 41. 2-azidoethyl $2,3,4,2^{\prime}, 3^{\prime}, 4^{\prime}, 6^{\prime}$-hepta- $O$-acetyl- $\beta$-D-1-thiomaltopyranose. Yield $=43 \% .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right)$ $\delta 5.44-5.21(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 5.03(\mathrm{t}, J=9.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.90-4.79(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 4.64-4.45 (m, 2H), 4.28-4.13 (m, 2H), 4.13-3.90 (m, 3H), $3.75-3.57$ (m, 2H), 3.48 (dd, $J=10.6,6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.10-2.65(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $2.12(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.08(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.04-1.97(\mathrm{~m}, 15 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 75 MHz , $\left.\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta 170.72,170.67,170.57,170.24,170.08,169.77,169.59,95.85$, 83.37, 72.78, 70.80, 70.19, 69.48, 68.80, 68.21, 62.99, 61.71, 51.75, 43.54, 32.61, 29.81, 21.09, 20.98, 20.96, 20.88, 20.83, 20.78, 20.78. TOF MS ES + Calculated mass for $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{39} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{17} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}+$ $\mathrm{Na}]=744.1898$, Found mass $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]=744.1863$.

### 4.2.6. Protocol for step c of Scheme 2

In a round-bottom flask, the protected 2-azidoethyl glycoside (1 eq.) was dissolved in MeOH . A solution of sodium methoxide ( $2 \mathrm{~mL} /$ 1 mmol of protected sugar, $25 \% \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}$ in MeOH ) was added dropwise and stirred until TLC verification showed complete transformation of the starting material. Solvents were evaporated and the resulting oil was resuspended in MeOH , then Amberlite ${ }^{\circledR} 120 \mathrm{H}$ resin was introduced into the flask. The suspension was stirred until $\mathrm{pH}=7$, then resin was filtered off. Evaporation of the solvents afforded the pure product as a yellow oil or foam.

Compounds 30 and 31 (2-azidoethyl $\beta$-d-glucopyranose and 2azidoethyl $\alpha$-D-mannopyranose) were synthesized according to the published synthetic protocol [21].

Compound 32. 2-azidoethyl $\beta$-d-galactopyranose. Yield $=92 \%$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ ) $\delta 4.31(\mathrm{~d}, J=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.03(\mathrm{dd}, J=$ $10.8,5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.88(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.79-3.73(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.59-3.55(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.54(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.50(\mathrm{t}, J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 101 MHz , $\mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ ) $\delta 103.60,75.24,73.51,71.11,68.88,67.92,61.11,50.78$. TOF MS ES ${ }^{+}$Calculated mass for $\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{6}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]=272.0859$, Found mass $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]=272.0835$.

Compound 33. 2-azidoethyl $\beta$-d-maltopyranose. Yield $=89 \%{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\left.400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 4.98(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.41(\mathrm{dd}, J=11.5,7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 4.02 (dd, $J=10.7,5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.91(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.79(\mathrm{dd}, J=$
$11.5,6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.65(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.62-3.55(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.50(\mathrm{t}$, $J=5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.33(\mathrm{~d}, J=1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ ) $\delta 178.61,103.82,102.77,79.33,75.69,75.16,73.32,71.03,68.96$, 68.02, 61.13, 50.68, 48.55, 22.54. TOF MS ES ${ }^{+}$Calculated mass for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{11}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]=434.1387$, Found mass $[\mathrm{M}+$ $\mathrm{Na}]=434.1363$.

Compound 42. 2-azidoethyl $\beta$-D-1-thioglucopyranose. Yield $=97 \%{ }^{1}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\left.300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 4.46(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $3.89(\mathrm{~d}, J=11.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.68(\mathrm{dd}, J=11.6,3.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.57(\mathrm{dt}, J=$ $9.1,5.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.38(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.34(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.23(\mathrm{t}, J=$ $9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.99(\mathrm{dt}, J=13.9,7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.91-2.78(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ ) $\delta=85.82,80.63,78.14,73.01,70.07,61.50$, 51.52, 29.07. TOF MS ES ${ }^{+}$Calculated mass for $\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}+$ $\mathrm{Na}]=288.0630$, Found mass $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]=288.0605$.

Compound 43. 2-azidoethyl $\alpha$-D-1-thiomannopyranose. Yield $=95 \%{ }^{1}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ ) $\delta 5.34(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.98-3.83$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.83-3.70(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.70-3.65(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.56(\mathrm{ddd}, J=12.9$, 8.7, $4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.45-3.36(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.99-2.77(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta=85.46,73.74,72.16,71.69,67.41,61.34,50.85$, 30.04. TOF MS ES ${ }^{+}$Calculated mass for $\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}+$ $\mathrm{Na}]=288.0630$, Found mass $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]=288.0630$.

Compound 44. 2-azidoethyl $\beta$-D-1-thiogalactopyranose. Yield $=95 \%{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $\left.400 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}\right) \delta 4.41(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 3.93 (d, $J=2.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.74(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.3,6.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.61-3.52(\mathrm{~m}$, 4 H ), 2.98 (dd, $J=13.8,6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.91-2.77(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $101 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CD}_{3} \mathrm{OD}$ ) $\delta 86.30,79.18,74.74,70.02,69.10,61.29,51.58$, 29.12. TOF MS ES ${ }^{+}$Calculated mass for $\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}+$ $\mathrm{Na}]=288.0630$, Found mass $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]=288.0629$.

Compound 45. 2-azidoethyl $\beta$-D-1-thiomaltopyranose. Yield $=43 \% .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( 400 MHz , MeOD) $\delta=5.21(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.48(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.94-3.78(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})$, $3.75-3.54(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H})$, $3.50-3.42(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.34-3.25(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.03-2.92(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.86$ (dt, $J=13.8,6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .13 \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 101 MHz , MeOD) $\delta=101.39,85.76$, 79.21, 77.91, 73.69, 73.35, 72.73, 70.08, 61.34, 60.99, 51.51, 43.48, 32.30, 29.12. TOF MS ES ${ }^{+}$Calculated mass for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{10} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}+$ $\mathrm{Na}]=450.1158$, Found mass $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]=450.1140$.

### 4.2.7. Protocol for step $d$ of Scheme 2

It follows a modification of the procedure described in MoralesSanfrutos et al. [41]. Briefly, to a solution of the peracetylated sugar ( 1 eq .) and thiourea ( 1.1 eq .) in dry acetonitrile ( 10 mL ) was added $\mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ (2 eq.). The reaction mixture was then refluxed for 3 h . After cooling 1-bromo-2-chloroethane ( 2.5 eq .) and $\mathrm{NEt}_{3}$ ( 4 eq .) were added and the reaction mixture was magnetically stirred at r.t. for 12 h . Then, the solvent was evaporated under vacuum to give a crude that was dissolved in DCM ( 100 mL ) and washed with water ( $3 \times 100 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The organic phase was evaporated and purified by flash column chromatography using as eluents Hexane: Ethyl Acetate $-4: 1$ to $2: 1$.

Compound 34. 2-chloroethyl 2,3,4,6-tetra-O-acetyl- $\beta$-D-1thioglucopyranose, which was fully characterized according to the literature [41].

Compound 35. 2-chloroethyl 2,3,4,6-tetra-O-acetyl- $\alpha$-D-1thiomannopyranose. Yield $=49 \%, \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.5$ (Hexane: Ethyl Acetate $-1: 1) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta=5.24(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.22-5.10(\mathrm{~m}$, 2H), 4.38-4.26 (m, 1H), 4.22 (dd, $J=11.9,6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), 4.05 (dd, $J=12.0,1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.80-3.37(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.04-2.83(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.09(\mathrm{~s}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 2.03$ ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ ), 1.99 ( $\mathrm{s}, 3 \mathrm{H}$ ), $1.92(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta=170.68,170.05,169.94,169.88,83.28,70.87,69.46,69.41,66.40$, $62.67,42.85,34.08,21.01,20.85,20.76$. TOF MS ES ${ }^{+}$Calculated mass for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{ClO}_{9} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]=449.0649$, Found mass $[\mathrm{M}+$ $\mathrm{Na}]=449.0666$.

Compound 36. 2-chloroethyl 2,3,4,6-tetra-O-acetyl- $\beta$-D-1thiogalactopyranose. Yield $=18 \%, \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.25$ (Hexane: Ethyl Acetate $-2: 1$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta=5.37(\mathrm{~d}, J=2.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$,
$5.16(\mathrm{t}, J=9.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.00(\mathrm{dd}, J=10.0,3.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.51(\mathrm{~d}$, $J=9.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.13-3.98(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.92(\mathrm{t}, J=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.74-3.55$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.13-2.77(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.10(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.00(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 1.92(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ) $\delta=170.52,170.29,170.10,169.70,84.53$, 74.82, 71.87, 67.50, 67.23, 61.87, 43.53, 32.97, 20.92, 20.81, 20.72. TOF MS ES ${ }^{+}$Calculated mass for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{23} \mathrm{ClO}_{9} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]=427.0830$, Found mass $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]=427.0812$.

Compound 37. 2-chloroethyl 2,3,4,6-tetra-O-acetyl- $\beta$-D-1thiomaltopyranose. Yield $=27 \%, \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}=0.55$ (Hexane: Ethyl Acetate $-1: 1$ ). ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta=5.29$ (ddd, $J=18.6,9.6,6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $3 \mathrm{H}), 4.99(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=9.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.86-4.76(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.63-4.42(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, 4.17 (ddd, $J=16.9,12.3,4.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), $4.07-3.87$ (m, 3H), 3.76-3.50 (m, 3H), 3.38 (dt, $J=31.3,7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.10-2.75(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.08(\mathrm{~d}$, $J=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 2.04(\mathrm{~s}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 1.97(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.8,3.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 15 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $\left(75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) \delta=170.74,170.64,170.25,170.12,169.80,169.63$, 95.85, 83.49, 72.90, 70.74, 70.20, 69.46, 68.77, 68.21, 62.97, 61.76, 43.57, 42.35, 32.71, 32.27, 25.61, 21.07, 20.96, 20.87, 20.80, 20.76. TOF MS ES ${ }^{+}$Calculated mass for $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{39} \mathrm{ClO}_{17} \mathrm{~S}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]=737.1494$, Found mass $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]=737.1469$.

### 4.2.8. Protocol for step a of Scheme 3

a) Carb-NDIs 1-4 and 9-12. A solution of (+)-sodium-L-ascorbate $(12 \mathrm{mg}, 0.06 \mathrm{mmol})$, copper(II) sulfate pentahydrate $(1.5 \mathrm{mg}$, 0.006 mmol ) and alkynyl NDI dimethylamine derivative $\mathbf{1 8}$ ( $30 \mathrm{mg}, 0.06 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in 2 ml of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added to azido-glycoderivative ( $0.09 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{eq}$.), dissolved into 2 ml of tBuOH. The suspension was stirrer at r.t. under nitrogen atmosphere for 2 h . The resulting red solution was concentrated under vacuum and a red solid was obtained. The crude product was analysed and purified by reverse phase column chromatography, $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}: \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O} 0.1 \% \mathrm{TFA}\right)$ according to methods described in the previous section.

Compounds 1 and 2 ( $\beta$-D-glc-O-C2-NDI-NMe 2 and $\alpha$-D-man-O-C2-NDI-NMe 2 ) were synthesized according to the published synthetic protocol [21].

Compound 3. $\beta$-D-gal-O-C2-NDI-NMe 2 . Red solid, yield $=91 \%$, ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right), \delta 8.21\left(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J_{\text {orto }}=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.13(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$; $7,97\left(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J_{\text {orto }}=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.88(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.79(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.63(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.25$ (d, 1H, $J=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $4.20(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.04(\mathrm{bs}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.74(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J=3.3 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $3.56-3.47(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.44(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J=3.3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.33(\mathrm{t}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz})$, $3.20-3.12(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.05(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{J}=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.82(\mathrm{~s}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 2.05-2.03$ ( $\mathrm{m}, 4 \mathrm{H}$ ). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) $\delta 165.4 ; 163.9$; 163.7; 163.3; 151.5; 143.5; 130.9; 128.3; 126.8; 124.7; 124.4; 122.3; 119.8; 118.5; 102.9; 99.4; 75.0; 72.4; 70.4; 68.3; 67.9; 60.7; 55.1; 50.4; 42.6; 37.8; 37.6; 36.9; 22.7. HRMS (ESI): $m / z$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{35} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{10}+\mathrm{H}^{+}$: $739.3410[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$; found: 739.3409 .

Compound 4. $\beta$-D-malt-O-C2-NDI-NMe 2 . Red solid, yield $=86 \%$, ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), $\delta 8.18$ (d, 1H, Jorto = 7.8 Hz ), $8.12(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$; $7,94(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, Jorto $=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.80(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.77(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.61(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $4.20(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J=8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.19-4.17(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.02(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 4.0-3.97(\mathrm{~m}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 3.80(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{J}=3.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.66-3.62(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}), 3.50-3.45(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H})$, 3.36-3.23 (m, 3H), 3.22-3.14 (m, 4H), 3.11-2.91 (m, 2H), 2.83 (s, $12 \mathrm{H}), 2.08-2.0(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), $\delta 167.0$; 165.4 ; 165.2; 164.7; 153.2; 132.8; 130.0; 128.4; 126.9; 126.4; 124.0; 121.5; 120.2; 119.9; 116.0; 104.8; 103.8; 101.1; 80.8; 77.1; 76.2; 75.8; 74.3; 74.2; 72.4; 70.1; 69.7; 62.6; 61.8; 57.0; 56.9; 52.2; 44.5; 44.4; 39.7; 39.5; 38.9; 24.6. HRMS (ESI): $m / z$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{41} \mathrm{H}_{56} \mathrm{~N}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{15}+\mathrm{H}^{+}$: $901.3938[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$; found: 901.3936.

Compound 9. $\beta$-D-glc-S-C2-NDI-NMe 2 . Red solid, Yield $=92 \%$, ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right), \delta 8.12\left(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{J}_{\text {orto }}=8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.09(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 7,88$ $\left(\mathrm{d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J_{o r t o}=8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.72(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.76$ ( $\left.\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right), 4.61(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.23(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $J=9.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.01$ (bs, 4 H$), 3.69(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J=12 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.44(\mathrm{dd}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J=6$, $12 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.24-3.18(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 3.06-3.00(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.99(\mathrm{t}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J=9 \mathrm{~Hz})$,
$2.84(\mathrm{~s}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 2.04(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), $\delta 165.1 ; 163.5$; 163.3; 162.8; 151.3; 143.3; 130.9; 128.1; 126.4; 125.0; 124.9; 122.1; 119.8; 118.2; 114.2; 99.2; 85.2; 79.6; 76.9; 72.2; 69.3; 60.7; 55.1; 50.5; 42.7; 38.0; 37.6; 37.0; 22.7. HRMS (ESI): $m / z$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{35} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{9 \mathrm{~S}}+\mathrm{H}^{+}$: $755.3181[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$; found: 755.3169.

Compound 10. $\alpha$-D-man-S-C2-NDI-NMe 2 . Red solid, Yield $=92 \%{ }^{1}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right), \delta 8.12(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) ; 8.11(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.J_{\text {orto }}=8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7,88\left(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J_{\text {orto }}=8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.72(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.11(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.82(\mathrm{~s}$, $2 \mathrm{H}), 4.01(\mathrm{t}, 4 \mathrm{H}, J=7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.78(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J=2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.59-3.55(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $3.45(\mathrm{t}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J=9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.34(\mathrm{dd}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J=3,8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.23-3.15(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H})$, $3.07(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.85(\mathrm{~s}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 2.05(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) $\delta 165.2 ; 163.6 ; 163.3 ; 162.9 ; 151.3 ; 143.5 ; 130.9 ; 128.1 ; 126.5 ; 124.9$; 124.6; 124.5; 122.2; 119.6; 118.2; 99.3; 85.0; 73.3; 71.4; 70.8; 66.6; 60.6; 55.2; 55.1; 49.7; 42.7; 38.0; 37.6; 37.0; 31.2; 22.7. HRMS (ESI): $m / z$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{35} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{~S}+\mathrm{H}^{+}$: $755.3181[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$; found: 755.3170.

Compound 11. $\beta$-D-gal-S-C2-NDI-NMe2. Red solid, yield $=89 \%$, ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) $\delta 8.18$ ( $\mathrm{d}, J=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), 8.11 ( $\left.\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right), 7.94$ (d, $J=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.83(\mathrm{~d}, J=12 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.80(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 4.22(\mathrm{~d}$, $J=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.04(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.77(\mathrm{~d}, J=3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.57-3.55(\mathrm{~m}$, 2 H ), 3.50-3.42 (m, 2H), 3.33-3.15 (m, 7H), 2.85 ( $\mathrm{s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 2.83(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H})$, $2.63(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 2.09-2.01(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 1.97(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ) $\delta(\mathrm{ppm})=164.9,163.4,163.2,162.7,151.1,130.6,127.8,126.3,124.7$, 124.2, 121.9, 119.8; 118.07, 99.0, 85.3, 85.3, 78.5, 73.4, 69.1, 68.1, 60.6, $54.8,54.8,50.1,42.3,37.3,36.6,29.9,22.3$. HRMS (ESI): $m / z$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{35} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{~S}+\mathrm{H}^{+}$: $755.3181[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$; found: 755.3170 .

Compound 12. $\beta$-D-malt-S-C2-NDI-NMe 2 . Red solid, yield $=74 \%$, ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), $\delta 8.20(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{J}$ orto $=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.05(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$; $7.98(\mathrm{~d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{J}$ orto $=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.75(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.18(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.74(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.27$ $(\mathrm{d}, 1 \mathrm{H}, J=9.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 3.89(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.66-3.35(\mathrm{~m}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 3.18(\mathrm{t}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $J=9.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $3.15(\mathrm{bs}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.11-2.98(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.77(\mathrm{~s}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 1.93(\mathrm{bs}$, 4H). ${ }^{13}$ C NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), $\delta 165.3$; 163.7; 163.5; 163.0; 151.5; 143.4; 131.1; 128.2, 127.3; 126.5; 125.2; 125.1; 124.7; 122.3; 120.0; 118.4; 99.8; 85.2; 78.1; 77.2; 77.1; 72.7; 72.6; 72.1; 71.5; 69.1; 60.6; 60.3; 55.2; 55.1; 50.3; 42.7; 38.1; 30.6; 22.7. HRMS (ESI): m/z calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{41} \mathrm{H}_{56} \mathrm{~N}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{14} \mathrm{~S}+\mathrm{H}^{+}$: $917.3709[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$; found: 917.3726.

Compound 17. Prop-NDI-NMe ${ }_{2}$ which was fully characterized according to the literature [21].
b) Carb-NDIs 5-8 and 13-16. A solution of (+)-sodium-L-ascorbate ( $7.3 \mathrm{mg}, 0.04 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), copper(II) sulfate pentahydrate $(0.9 \mathrm{mg}$, 0.006 mmol ) and alkynyl NDI morpholine derivative 19 ( 20 mg , 0.04 mmol ) in 2 ml of $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added to azido-glyco-derivative ( $0.06 \mathrm{mmol}, 1.5 \mathrm{eq}$. ), dissolved into 2 ml of tBuOH. The suspension was stirrer at r.t. under nitrogen atmosphere for 2 h . The resulting red solution was concentrated under vacuum and a red solid was obtained. The crude product was analysed and purified by reverse phase column chromatography, $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}: \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right.$ $0.1 \% \mathrm{TFA}$ ) according to methods described in the previous section.

Compound 5. $\beta$-D-glc-O-C2-NDI-morph. Red solid, Yield $=81 \%$, ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), $\delta 8.33$ (d, $J_{o r t o}=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), 8.11 (d, Jorto $=6.43 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.08(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.03(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.85(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.65-4.62(\mathrm{~m}$, $4 \mathrm{H}), 4.48-4.46(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 4.28(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=7.88 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.06(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H})$, $3.74-3.69(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 3.51-3.46(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 3.30-3.22(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 3.03(\mathrm{~m}$, 2 H ), 1.26 ( $\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=6.68 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), $\delta 165.5$; 164.1 ; 164.03; 163.46; 151.73; 143.66; 131.22; 128.66; 126.89; 125.33; 124.75; 122.52; 120.28; 118.78; 102.23; 99.52; 75.71; 75.37; 72.84; 69.41; 67.81; 63.54; 60.48; 54.65; 54.32; 52.16; 50.39; 37.86; 34.66; 34.23. HRMS (ESI): $m / z$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{37} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{12}+\mathrm{H}^{+}: 795.3308$ [M +H$]^{+}$; found: 795.3292.

Compound 6. $\alpha$-D-man-O-C2-NDI-morph. Red solid, Yield $=72 \%,{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right), \delta 8.3\left(\mathrm{~d}, J_{\text {orto }}=7.83 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right)$,
$8.08(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.04\left(\mathrm{~d}, J_{\text {orto }}=9.48 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right), 4.84(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.78(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.65(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 4.59(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.42-4.41(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.86(\mathrm{~m}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 3.67(\mathrm{~m}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.48-3.31(\mathrm{~m}, 20 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), $\delta 165.53,164.19$, $163.55,160.82,151.84,131.17,131.11,130.64,129.05,128.79,124.65$, 124.47, 122.57, 113.45, 103.47, 99.41, 72.61, 70.25, 69.75, 66.09, $63.75,60.45,60.40,54.66,54.29,53.43,53.38,52.21,50.07,43.10$, 37.79, 34.93, 33.85. HRMS (ESI): $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{37} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{12}+\mathrm{H}^{+}$: $795.3308[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$; found: 795.3275.

Compound 7. $\beta$-D-gal-O-C2-NDI-morph. Red solid, Yield $=25 \%$, ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right), \delta 8.23\left(\mathrm{~d}, J_{\text {orto }}=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right), 8.16(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.0$ $\left(\mathrm{d}, J_{\text {orto }}=7.85 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right), 7.93(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.8(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.66-4.63(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})$, 4.45-4.43 (m, 4H), 4.28-4.26 (m, 3H), 4.08-4.04 (m, 6H), $3.78-3.46(\mathrm{~m}, 17 \mathrm{H}), 3.37(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.22(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( 75 MHz , $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), $\delta 165.23,163.89,163.73,163.19,151.53,143.35,131.14,128.42$, $126.64,125.05,124.84,122.26,120.14,118.52,102.92,99.22,74.99$, $72.49,70.47,68.36,67.90,63.51,60.76,54.57,54.28,52.13,50.45$, 37.92, 34.64, 34.19. HRMS (ESI): $m / z$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{37} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{12}+\mathrm{H}^{+}$: $795.3308[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$; found: 795.3281.

Compound 8. $\beta$-D-malt-O-C2-NDI-morph. Red solid, Yield $=85 \%{ }^{1}{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), $\delta 8.3$ (d, Jorto $=7.88 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), $8.08-8.05(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.95(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=3.59 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.84(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, $4.7-4.62(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 4.43-4.4(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 4.28(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=9.84 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 3.88$ $(\mathrm{m}, 8 \mathrm{H}), 3.68(\mathrm{~d}, J=10.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 3.52-3.2(\mathrm{~m}, 28 \mathrm{H}), 2.97(\mathrm{~m}, 1 \mathrm{H})$. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), $\delta 165.44,164.04,163.96,163.36,151.75$, 131.19, 128.61, 126.83, 125.32, 125.05, 124.73, 122.50, 120.42, 118.75, 99.72, 99.59, 85.14, 78.14, 77.15, 77.01, 72.68, 72.57, 72.06, 71.44, $69.08,63.73,63.68,60.57,60.31,54.58,54.23,52.16,50.30,37.94$, 34.84, 34.36. HRMS (ESI): $m / z$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{43} \mathrm{H}_{56} \mathrm{~N}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{17}+\mathrm{H}^{+}$: $957.3836[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$; found: 957.3805.

Compound 13. $\beta$-D-glc-S-C2-NDI-morph. Red solid, Yield $=90 \%$ ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), $\delta 8.4$ (d, Jorto $\left.=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right), 8.16$ (d, Jorto $=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.1(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.9(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.6(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) 4.5-4.49(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})$, $4.19(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.88 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.07(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.7-3.69(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 3,47(\mathrm{~m}$, $6 \mathrm{H}), 3.28-3.12(\mathrm{~m}, 10 \mathrm{H}), 3.02(\mathrm{~d}, J=9.19 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR $(75 \mathrm{MHz}$, $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), $\delta 168.72,167.30,166.69,154.92,134.25,131.88,130.07,128.51$, 127.87, 127.81, 125.73, 123.55, 122.03, 102.83, 88.10, 82.70, 79.91, $75.24,72.24,66.57,63.68,57.71,57.33,55.18,53.53,40.88,37.65$, 37.28, 33.14. HRMS (ESI): $m / z$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{37} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{11} \mathrm{~S}+\mathrm{H}^{+}$: $811.3080[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$; found: 811.3053.

Compound 14. $\alpha$-D-man-S-C2-NDI-morph. Red solid, Yield $=88 \%{ }^{1}{ }^{1}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), $\delta 8.21$ (d, Jorto $=7.91 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}$ ), $8.13(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.98\left(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{Jorto}^{2}=7.87 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right), 7.88(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.12(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.79$ ( $\mathrm{s}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), $4.66(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.44-4.42(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 4.08-4.04(\mathrm{~m}, 5 \mathrm{H}), 3.85(\mathrm{~s}$, $1 \mathrm{H}), 3.73-3.58(\mathrm{~m}, 12 \mathrm{H}), 3.52-3.47(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}), 3.24-3.11(\mathrm{~m}, 7 \mathrm{H}){ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), $\delta$ 165.3, 163.9, 163.7, 163.2, 151.6, 143.5, 131.2, $128.4,126.7,125.1,124.7,124.6,122.3,120.1,118.6,99.3,84.8,73.2$, $71.5,70.9,66.8,63.6,60.6,54.6,54.3,52.2,49.8,38.0,34.7,34.2$, 30.8. HRMS (ESI): $m / z$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{37} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{11} \mathrm{~S}+\mathrm{H}^{+}: 811.3080$ $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$; found: 811.3049.

Compound 15. $\beta$-D-gal-S-C2-NDI-morph. Red solid, Yield $=82 \%$, ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right), \delta 8.3\left(\mathrm{~d}, J_{\text {orto }}=7.89 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right), 8.13(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $8.07\left(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}_{\text {orto }}=7.86 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right), 7.99(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.85(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.7(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})$, $4.46-4.44(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 4.24-4.21(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=9.47 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 4.05(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})$, $3.79-3.10(\mathrm{~m}, 23 \mathrm{H}), 1.23(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ ), $\delta 168.48$, $167.12,167.01,166.42,154.75,146.55,134.19,131.65,129.86,128.29$, $127.73,125.50,123.38,122.01,121.79,102.52,88.71,81.86,76.73$, 72.50, 71.51, 66.55, 63.92, 57.66, 57.28, 57.23, 55.16, 53.51, 45.41, 40.92, 37.64, 37.24, 33.19. HRMS (ESI): $m / z$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{37} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{11} \mathrm{~S}+\mathrm{H}^{+}$: $811.3080[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$; found: 811.3070.

Compound 16. $\beta$-D-malt-S-C2-NDI-morph. Red solid, Yield $=70 \%{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right) \delta 8.22(\mathrm{~d}, J=12 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.03$ $(\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.98(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 7.87(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 5.00(\mathrm{~d}, J=4.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.76(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.57(\mathrm{~s}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 4.38(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 4.24(\mathrm{~d}, J=10 \mathrm{~Hz}, 1 \mathrm{H})$, $4.02-3.96(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 3.64-2.91(\mathrm{~m}, 28 \mathrm{H}), 2.95(\mathrm{t}, J=10 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $75 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{D} 2 \mathrm{O}$ ) $\delta$ 165.5, 164.1, 164.0, 163.5, 151.8, 143.6, 131.3,
128.7, 126.9, 125.3, 125.0, 124.8, 122.6, 120.5, 118.8, 99.8, 99.6, 85.2, $78.2,77.2,77.1,72.7,72.6,72.1,71.5,69.2,63.6,60.7,60.4,54.7,54.3$, 52.2, 50.4, 38.0, 34.7, 34.2, 30.4. HRMS (ESI): $m / z$ calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{43} \mathrm{H}_{56} \mathrm{~N}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{16} \mathrm{~S}+\mathrm{H}^{+}$: $973.3608[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$; found: 973.3588.

### 4.3. Biophysical methods

### 4.3.1. FRET melting assay

FRET melting assay was performed in 96 -well plates and the fluorescence of the different labelled oligonucleotides was recorded using a CFX96 qPCR instrument (Biorad). Oligonucleotides were annealed at $0.23 \mu \mathrm{M}$ strand concentration ( $95^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, 5 min ) in K10 buffer ( $10 \mathrm{mM}, 10 \mathrm{mM}$ lithium cacodylate, $90 \mathrm{mM} \mathrm{LiCl}, \mathrm{pH} 7.2$ ). After a slow cool down to room temperature, they were added to each well (final concentration of $0.2 \mu \mathrm{M}$ ) which was incubated with or without the tested ligands, to a final volume of $25 \mu \mathrm{~L}$. Competition experiments were performed in presence of a non-labelled auto complementary duplex, ds26, in 3 and 10 fold excess. The microplate was incubated at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 min , after which the temperature was increased by increments of $0.5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ per minute to reach $95^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The collected signal was normalized to 1 and the melting temperature (Tm) was defined when the normalized signal was 0.5 . $\Delta \mathrm{Tm}$ corresponds to the difference of Tm between the oligonucleotides with and without the ligands. Ligands were tested in duplicates.

### 4.3.2. Mass spectrometry

The experiments were performed on a Bruker 7T SolariX XR ESI-Q-FTICRMS (Bruker, Bremen, Germany) with the ESI source operated in negative ion mode. The injection flow rate was $180 \mu \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{h}$. All spectra were acquired in soft conditions [50]. The capillary exit voltage was -180 V , and skimmer 1 voltage was -5 V . The collision energy (entrance of the hexapole collision cell) was set to 1 V . Sample preparation: The stock solutions of the oligonucleotides ( $50 \mu \mathrm{M}$ concentration) are prepared in 100 mM ammonium acetate ( $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{Ac}$ ). The mixture of ligand with DNA solution is made by dilution up to $5 \mu \mathrm{M}$ in DNA and $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ in ligand.

### 4.4. Biological methods

### 4.4.1. Cell culture

'Single marker' (S16) BSF T. brucei (Lister 427, antigenic type MiTat 1.2, clone 221a) [51] were cultured at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 5 \% \mathrm{CO} 2$ in HMI-9 medium supplemented with $20 \%$ heat-inactivated fetal bovine serum (hiFBS, Invitrogen), as previously described [52]. L. major (MHOM/IL/80/Friedlin) promastigotes were cultured at $28{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in modified RPMI-1640 medium (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA) [52]. HT-29 and MRC-5 cells were cultured in DMEM (Invitrogen) medium plus $10 \%$ hiFBS serum [10]. MRC-5 cells were grown in monolayer ( $5 \%$ $\mathrm{CO}_{2}, 37{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) in DMEM medium ( $4.5 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ glucose for HT- 29 cells and $1 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ for MRC-5), supplemented with $10 \%$ inactivated Fetal Bovine Serum, $100 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{mL}$ penicillin, $100 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ streptomycin and 2 mM Lglutamine. Cells were plated and passaged according to ATCC recommendations and were used for the experiments while in the exponential growth phase.

### 4.4.2. Antiparasitic activity

The trypanocidal activity of the compounds was assessed by the alamarBlue ${ }^{\circledR}$ assay (ThermoFisher scientific) [10,53]. Briefly, $1 \times 10^{3} \mathrm{BSF}$ T. brucei were incubated in 96 -wells plates alone or in the presence of increasing concentrations of compounds for 72 h $\left(5 \% \mathrm{CO}_{2}, 37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right) .20 \mathrm{~mL}$ resazurin ( $110 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{mL}$ ) were then added and the parasites were incubated for 4 additional hrs at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Finally, cells were lysed with 50 mL of $3 \%$ SDS solution. Fluorescence was measured with an Infinite F200 plate reader (Tecan Austria, GmbH), exciting at 550 nm and recording the emission at 590 nm . The
results are expressed as the concentration of compound that reduces cell growth by $50 \%$ versus untreated control cells (IC50) using SigmaPlot (Four Parameter Logistic Curve). Data are presented as the average of three independent measurements all conducted in triplicate conditions.

The leishmaniacidal activity of the compounds in experiments of drug susceptibility on L. major (MHOM/IL/80/Friedlin) was first carried out on promastigotes as previously described [51]. Briefly, $1 \times 10^{6} / \mathrm{mL}$ promastigotes were incubated for 72 h at $28{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in $96-$ well plates in modified RPMI-1640 medium supplemented with $10 \%$ hiFBS, containing increasing concentration of compounds. Cell proliferation was determined using a MTT-based assay [54]. IC50 was calculated as described above.

### 4.4.3. Cytotoxicity

Cytotoxicity was measured through the MTT assay [55] as previously reported [10]. Briefly, $5 \times 10^{3}$ MRC-5 or HT- 29 cells were seeded in 96 -wells plates in the presence of increasing concentrations of compounds. After 48 h of incubation at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ of MTT solution ( $5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ ) were added to each well and cells were reincubated for 4 h at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The medium was then removed and DMSO was added. The plate was reincubated at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h and then analysed at the plate reader, measuring the absorption at 575 nm . IC50 was calculated as described above.

### 4.4.4. Cellular and parasitic uptake assays

225,000 cells (HT-29 or MRC5) were harvested by trypsinization and incubated with $10 \mu \mathrm{M}$ of a NDI-Compound in 0.75 mL of medium for 2 h at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After centrifugation ( 30 s at $13,000 \mathrm{rpm}$ ), supernatant removal (by pippeting), and washing with 1x PBS (3 times), the cell pellet was resuspended in $3 \%$ sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS; 750 mL ), sonicated ( 30 min ) and homogenized by vortexing. Fluorescence values were then normalized through a protein quantification assay by using Pierce BCA tests (ThermoFisher Scientific) according to the manufacturer. Compound concentration values were extrapolated from a fluorescence-NDI concentration calibration curve carried out with cells lysates. Fluorescence was detected with a TECAN infinite F200 fluorescence-intensity multiplate reader (excitation wavelength: 485 nm , emission wavelength: 535 nm ).

200,000 parasites (BSF T. brucei) were incubated with $7,89 \mu \mathrm{M}$ of a NDI-Compound in 0.95 mL of medium for 2 h at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After centrifugation ( 30 s at $13,000 \mathrm{rpm}$ ), supernatant removal (by Eppendorf inverting), and washing with 1X PBS (3 times), the cell pellet was resuspended in $10 \%$ sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS; 300 mL ), sonicated ( 30 min ) and homogenized by vortexing. Fluorescence values were then normalized through a protein quantification assay by using Pierce BCA tests (ThermoFisher Scientific) according to the manufacturer. Compound concentration values were extrapolated from a fluorescence-NDI concentration calibration curve carried out with cells lysates. Fluorescence was detected with a TECAN infinite F200 fluorescence-intensity multiplate reader (excitation wavelength: 485 nm , emission wavelength: 535 nm ).

### 4.4.5. Fluorescence microscopy

T. brucei parasites ( $1 \times 10^{7} / \mathrm{mL}$ ) were incubated with compounds $\mathbf{4}$ or $\mathbf{1 2}(5 \mu \mathrm{M})$, in 0.5 mL of medium without FBS for 30 and 120 min at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $100 \%$ of humidity. The parasitic samples were then centrifuged, the supernatant was removed and parasites were fixed with 200 mL of cold paraformaldehyde $4 \%$ for 30 min on an ice bath. Then, samples were washed twice with 500 mL cold phosphate buffered saline (PBS), the supernatant was removed and prolong DAPI staining ( 10 mL ) was added. 15 minutes later 3 mL of the sample was loaded to a poly lysine carrier and processed by
microscope observation. HT-29 cells ( $2 \times 10^{4}$ cells $/ \mathrm{mL}$ ) were growth (in 0.5 mL of medium without FBS ) on a cover slide in a 24 well culture plate for 24 h and then treated with compounds $\mathbf{4}$ or $\mathbf{1 2}$ $(25 \mu \mathrm{M})$ for 30 or 120 min at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After that, covers were washed 5 times (inside the wells) with 500 mL room temperature PBS and fixed on an ice bath with paraformaldehyde $2 \%$ for 20 minutes. Two extra PBS washings ( 10 minutes each) were also necessary. Then, the cover slide was immersed first in water and lately in ethanol and let it to dry over a whattman paper. In the final step Prolong DAPI ( $3-4 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) was used as mounting medium and samples were processed by microscope observation.Images were acquired using a widefield DMI8 LED microscope. Excitation was done with the 375435 and 542-566 filters for DAPI and compounds 4 or 12, respectively. A quadruple filter was used to detect the fluorescence emission of both, DAPI ( $437-474 \mathrm{~nm}$ ) and compounds 4 or 12 (578610 nm ). Wide field images were adquired by DIC (differential interference contrast technique)The images were deconvoluted using Huygens Professional image processing software from Scientific Volume Imaging (http://www.svi.nl). The merge of the images was made with Fiji software (https://fiji.sc/).
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