# **Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory**

**Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory**

# **Title**

The Effect of Thioctic Acid on the Quantum Efficiency of the Hill Reaction

# **Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/52w2r34x>

# **Authors**

Bradley, D.F. Calvin, M.

**Publication Date** 1954-05-19

## $UCRL = 2186$ (rev) Unclassified Chemistry Distribution

### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Radiation Laboratory

Contract No. W-7405-eng-48

# THE EFFECT OF THIOCTIC ACID ON THE QUANTUM EFFICIENCY OF THE HILL REACTION D. F. Bradley and M. Calvin

May 19, 1954

Berkeley, California

-2- **ERL-2186** (rev) Unclassified Chemistry Distribution

# THE EFFECT OF THIOCTIC ACID ON THE QUANTUM EFFICIENCY OF THE HILL REACTION

**D**, **F**. Bradley and **M**, Calvin

Radiation Laboratory and Department of Chemistry University of Galifornia, Berkeley, California

#### ABSTRACT

### May 19, 1954

- 1. Conditions have been defined under which 6-thioctic acid, 6T, increases the quantum efficiency of the Hill reaction in Scenedesmus. This increase occurs when the control rate is quinone-limited, under conditions of high light intensity, low quhone concentration, high temperature , and high algal density, Uhen **the** control rate is inhibited by **high** concentrations of quinone or photolyzed quinone,  $6T$  results in a further decrease in rate.
- 2. Fundamental characteristics of the Hill reaction suggest that 6T either increases the rate at which water is separated into reduced and oxidized fragments (quantum conversion agent) or decreases the rate at which these fragments later recombine (hydrogen carrier or quinone diffusion).
- *3.* **The** variation **of** the effect with *4T* concentration, incubation conditfoma, pH, quinone concentration, temperature, preillumination of quinone, dark contact time with quinone, light intensity, algal density, sulfhydryl poisons, plant species and other reagents does not permit an unequivocal discrimination between the two possible mechanisms.

 $(*)$ The work described in this paper was sponsored by the **U.S.** Atomic Energy Commission.

# THE EFFECT OF THIOCTIC ACID ON THE QUANTUM EFFICIENCY OF THE HILL REACTION

D. F. Bradley and M. Calvin

#### Radiation Laboratory and Department of Chemistry University of California, Berkeley, California

It has recently been proposed (1) that 6-thioctic acid,  $6T^{**}$ , is the primary quantum conversion agent of photosynthesis. By this is meant that the energy liberated when photochemically excited chlorophyll is returned to its ground state is transferred to the five-membered disulfide ring of 6T, labilizing the S-S bond and allowing it to undergo reactions which are energetically not possible in the ground state of 6T. Energy of the quantum absorbed by chlorophyll may be converted into chemical bond energy by this process and hence the term, quantum conversion agent. The reagents with which the activated 6T reacts may either be a hydrogen carrier, or  $H_0O_2$  or an oxygen carrier, presumably forming either a dithiol, a thiol sulfenic acid, or a disulfide monoxide, respectively. These three possible reactive species may then carry on the oxidation-reduction processes required in natural photosynthesis.

If 6T were operating in the manner described then it should be possible to realize conditions under which synthetic 6T added to the plant could be utilized to increase the rate of quantum conversion and result in a higher quantum efficiency of photosynthesis. The demonstration of such an effect in the Hill reaction  $(2,3,4)$  in which the photochemical apparatus is experimentally separated from the carbon dioxide reduction system would provide even more convincing confirmatory evidence for the proposed mechanism of quantum conversion.

Scenedesmus does exhibit such a predicted increase in quantum efficiency when incubated with synthetic 6T prior to the Hill reaction. Unfortunately, we cannot with certainty prove that the 6T is giving the predicted result in the postulated manner, although most evidence is consistent with such a model. The effect is not easily observed for there are many conditions both physical and biological which need to be satisfied simultaneously. **We** have described below in somedetail the minimum number of such conditions which seem to guarantee the reproducibility of the effect.

#### Materials and Methods

Scenedesmus obliquus and Chlorella pyrenoidosa were grown in continuous culture under conditions described briefly in a previous publication  $(5)$ . 900 co, of the culture (pH = 7,1> was harvested every **24** hours leaving 100 cc. as the inoculum, together with 900 cc. fresh nutrient medium  $(\text{pH} = 6.8)$ . The temperature of the culture was maintained for prolonged periods at 18 at  $25^{\circ}$ C., the algae grown at the latter temperature generally yielding more rapid Hill reaction rates. The carbon dioxide concentration above the mechanically shaken culture vessels was maintained at 4% as continuously recorded by an infrared **C02** analyzer. Only sterile cultures were used in the experiments, The light incident upon the culture flasks was provided by a bank of Sylvania white 100 watt fluorescent lamps with a radiant energy output of  $1.8 \times 10^4$  ergs/cm<sup>2</sup>/sec. determined bolometrically.

The harvested cells were successively centrifuged (1900 **x** g) and washed with distilled water from 2 to 4 times. As the Hill activity declines rapidly when the cells are stored in the packed condition, recent experiments have been carried out with but two centrifugations. The packed cells were resus-

pended to the desired algal density, generally 20  $\text{mm}^3$  packed cells/ml., in a buffer (pH = 6.7) made by dissolving 1/30 mole  $KH_2PO_4$ , 1/30 mole  $K_2HPO_4$ , and **ll100** mole lCCl in 1 Liter distilled water,. **%he** pH of the algal suspension was identical with that of the original buffer. The packed volume of cells per liter of culture medim was calculated from the observed packed volune/900 **ee** . of harvest and is termed the culture density, CD. Scenedesmus cells suspended as above retained mst of **their** Hill activity for Z hours if kept in **the dark** at *3-5%* **.** Aliquots of the original cklbture after harvesting containing a known volume of cells were centrifuged. The packed cells were resuspended in  $3$  ml. 80% ethanol and heated to boiling for approximately 1 minute, extracting the cell pigments quantitatively. The visible absorption spectrum of the combined **extract** and two successive ethanol washings was measured with a **Cary** record- $\overline{\phantom{0}}$ ing sipectrophotometer. The optical density at the 660-670 **A** maximmmltiplied by the combined volume of extracts and divided by the volume of cells (in  $mm<sup>3</sup>$ ) in the aliquot is termed herein the relative chlorophyll content, **XC.** This number may be converted to mmoles chlorophyll  $a/\text{mm}^3$  cells by dividing by the aolar extinction coefficient of chlorophyll a in ethanol, An approximate value based on ether as solvent is  $\boldsymbol{\xi} = 9$  x 10<sup>4</sup> liter mole<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>. (6)

Quinone was used as oxidant and was freshly purified by sublimation before each experiment, as inhibitory products are produced upon storage, especially when illuminated, Solutions of 1-2 mg. quinone/ml. distilled water were used immediately after preparation. Solutions of dl 6T (yellow cryst.), dl 5T (white cryst.), dl 6DT (oil), and dl 6 MO (oil), were prepared in  $M/3$ phosphate buffer (pH =  $6.7$ ) in concentrations of  $0.25 - 1.0$  mg./0.050 ml.<sup>\*\*\*</sup>

Standard Warburg double side-arm manometer flasks were used, The illu- $\texttt{minated surface area (bottom) of the vessels was 7.9 - 8.3 cm}^2.$  The flask constants were determined three times with water as described by Umbreit, et al.  $(7)$ . The experiments were carried out in a thermostat bath which was illuminated through a window in the bottom of the bath by either  $(1)$  seven General Electric reflector spots, (2) three 40 watt fluorescents, (3) seven General Electric reflector floods,  $(4)$  five General Electric photofloods. Measurements reported herein were made with the reflector floods with an intensity of 1.6 x  $10^5$  ergs/cm<sup>2</sup>/sec. impinging on the vessels. The fluorescents were not intense enough to yield **6T** stimulated rates; the reflector spots did not produce a sufficiently uniform light field; the photofloods were too short-lived for convenience. With the reflector floods the light field was uniform to within **5%** throughout **the** thermostat,

The vessels were prepared for the Hill reaction as follows: 0,20 ml. of 20% KOH was added to the center well (greased lip) containing a 1 **em'**  filter strip. Two ml, of algal suspension was pipetted into the main compartment. To the control algae 100  $\lambda$  of M/3 phosphate buffer (pH = 6.7) and to the "thioctic algae"  $100\lambda$  of  $6T$ , etc. in  $M/3$  phosphate buffer was added **and** let stand with the cells for 10 minutes. One ml. of quinone solution was then inserted into the side arm and the vessels placed in the thermostat in the dark. It is important to add the quinone solution after the 6T as the quinone sublimes directly from the solution in the side **am** to cell suspension, preventing **the** utilization of 6T. After thermal equilibration of the vessels in the thermostat the quinone was tipped into the cell suspension and after 10 minutes the lights were turned on. Early experiments were carried

**out** in **N2** atmosphere introduced after the 6T had first been incubated with the algae in air, but as there was no difference between the rate in **82** and air, current experiments are being carried out in air. The rate of shaking in \_light. :gas about 150 **spm** and readings were taken at 2 minub intervals.

In calculating the rate values,  $R$ , used herein the microliters oxygen  $(\mu 1, 0)$  evolved was divided by the illumination time in minutes for each twominute reading. The mean of the three highest of these average rates throughout each experiment is termed **R**, corresponding most nearly to the "initial rate<sup>"</sup> found frequently in the literature of the Hill reaction, Frequently the  $\mu$ 1. O<sub>2</sub> evolved in the first two minutes was several  $\mu$ 1. smaller than in successive two-minute inhmals and hence in these cases **B** was somewhat greater than the initial rate. In general, **B** values were found **b be** reproducible with a particular culture to 0.5  $\mu$ 1./min, and differences are not to be considered significant unless the difference,  $\Delta R$ , is greater than 1.5  $\mu$ 1/min. R vaJues varied considerably from harvest to harvest **ad** interharvest rate comparisons are not significant.

#### Experimental

#### Gross character of effect of thioctic acid on the Hill reaction. -

Illuminated Scenedesmus incubated with quinone evolved oxygen at rates approaching 20  $\mu$ 1.  $0/$ min./40  $\mu$ 1. cells (30 cell volumes/hour). The yield of oxygen corresponded to 91.3%  $+$  3 of the stoichiometric yield, considerably higher **than** reported by earlier observers using cellular material for **tb**  Hill reaction  $(4,8,9,10)$ . Gells incubated with  $0.1 - 1.0$  mg. 6T prior to incubation with qufnone evolved oxygen more rapidly **(Fig. 1)** but with **the**  same final yield as controls without added 6T. In 91 experiments, for example,



Figure 1

Stimulation of the Hill reaction by 6-thioctic acid. 1.5 mg. quinone, 0.25 mg. 6-thioctic acid, 30 **nnr?**  Scenedesmus. 15.7° C., aerobic.

detail below. tory, inhibitory or without stiect, and these conditions are described in some desimis physical conditions were found under which of could be either stimulaprior incubation with added of. In investigating the effect of of Scenegenerated by the sem series of the statement of the rate was not the increased by physical conditions Chicagala evolved oxygen with quinone as oxidant with incubated with the fine absence of quinone was illuminated. Under the same eT. In confirmation of this observation no O<sub>2</sub> was evolved when <u>Scenedesmus</u> peppe ivontive accepts these experiments that in the controls without added be reduced to 6DT and act with quinone as a Hill oxidant. Actually 34  $\mu$ l. enough of was added to yield a total of 1821 additional  $\mu$ l. O<sub>2</sub> if of ware to

## Effect of bog non the quantum efficiency of the Hill Reaction. -

ence, i.e.  $\mathbf{M}$   $\div$  flontrol rate.

ence between of and control rates, is. At rather than the proportional differquinone: These observations emphasize the importance of the numerical differphr not) es seeu ut pue brearions exbergued en trust here ber milligram pleiv mutasl oxidation-reduction. The off thus increases the quantum yield that of allows light energy which would otherwise be useted to be used in k with added of that reflects an actual increase in the quantum efficiency, i.e. dilusion of 02 trom the cells or the gas-liquid equilibration. The increased the absence of refe-determining steps involving either the formation and ciable rate, of. Table I. The evolution of 0<sub>2</sub> immediately ceased indicating by terminating the illumination while the cells were evoluting O<sub>2</sub> at an apprebenisg saw To yd noltslumits eter ent To erwien ent oini thglani latouro A

-8−

## Chemical specificity of the 6T effect. -

Conclusions as to the significance of the rate stimulation depend upon the chemical specificity of 6T. When 0.5 mg. of the six-membered ring isomer of 6T, i. e . 5,8-thioc tic acid, was added to the cells (cf , Table **11)** , the stimulation, measured by  $\Delta \mathbb{R}$ , amounted to as much as  $2/3$  of the effect with 0.5 mg. **6T,** However, as the concentration of added 6T and 5T was decreased, the stimulation decreased more rapidly with 5T than 6T so that  $\Delta R$  was nearly five tinaes as great with 0.125 **mg.** 6T as with 0 .I25 **mg.** 5T, indicating that although 5T was stimulatory, it was only  $1/5$  as active per milligram at low concentration levels  $(2 \times 10^{-4} \text{ M})$ . That 5T appeared more active proportionately per milligram at high concentration levels (1 x 10<sup>-3</sup> M) is attributable to a 6T concentration saturation phenomenon (cf. below). The 6MT which possesses the 5-membered *ring* structure of 6T was 60-708 as effective as the latter at the O,25 **mg.** level. 6DT and 6 MO were inactive, when incubated either in **dark** or light (Table **11). DPN** and **DPNH** were inactive (cf. Table TII). 10-3 **<sup>M</sup>** iodoacetate did not affect either the control or 6T stimulated rate.  $10^{-3}$  M HgCl<sub>2</sub> inhibited the control rate somewhat less than the 6T stimulated rate.  $10^{-3}$  M hydroxylamine hydrochloride was completely inhibitory in both control and 6T cells. 1-2  $mg$ . hydroquinone did not affect the rate or yield of  $0<sub>2</sub>$ evolution (cf. Table IV).

## Effect of 6T concentration on the rate of the Hill Reaction. -

As mentioned above, the effect of 6T upon the rate depends upon the concentration of added 6T. As can be seen from Table **V, R** increased with increasing 6T up to about 0.1 mg./vessel  $(2 \times 10^{-4}$  M) and then became insensitive to the 6T concentration. The two experiments carried out one **year** apart demonstrate

## Table I

Effect of 6T upon the Quantum Efficiency of the Hill Reaction  $40 \text{ mm}^3$  **<u>Scenedesmus</u>**, RCC =  $0.58$ , CD =  $2.9$ ,  $2.0.5$  mg. 6T



(1) Relative chlorophyll content

(2) Culture density

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

 $(3)$ 6 minutes illumination

(4.) 6 minutes illumination followed by 6 minutes dark

Table II

Chemical Specificity of the Effect of 6T on the Rate of the Hill Reaction

 $40$  mm<sup>3</sup> Scenedesmus, exp. temp.  $15.7^\circ$ 



Average of duplicates.  $\Xi$ 

0.25 mg. added when used.  $(2)$ 

Light incubation for 50 minutes.  $\overline{c}$ 

Standard dark incubation 50 minutes.  $\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{r} \\ \mathbf{r} \end{array}$ 

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

Table III

 $\frac{1}{2}$ 

Effect of Misc. Additives upon the Rate of the Hill Reaction  $\ddot{\phantom{a}}$ 

Exp. temp. 15.7



 $\hat{\gamma}_k$ 

UCRL-2186 $(rev)$ 

## Table IV

Effect of Iiydroquinone on the Rate **of** the Hill Reaction **Exp. temp.** 15.7°, 30 mm<sup>3</sup> Scenedesmus



## Table V

Effect of 6T Concentration on the Rate of the Hill Reaction



20 mm<sup>3</sup> Scenedesmus, exper. temp. 15.7<sup>°</sup>

**(1) Average of duplf** cates

the remarkable constancy of the effect of 6T. The natural concentration of  $35$  in these cells is approximately 1-2 x 10<sup>-5</sup> mg.  $6$ T per 40 mm<sup>3</sup> Scenedesmus (ll] so that a ten-thousand fold excess **of** exogenous 6T is required under the incubation conditions used to reach maximum stimulation.

### Incubation conditions. -

The increase in R by 6T is quite sensitive to certain conditions of the incubation with Scenedesmus. In a typical experiment (Exp. date  $3-11-53$ , 1.51 mg. quinone,  $0.25$  mg. 6T when added) the control rate was  $5.0 \mu$ 1./min.; with 6T incubated with Scenedesmus in air for 50 minutes followed by 60 minutes in  $N_2$  before illumination in  $N_2$  the rate was 6.8  $\mu$ 1./min.; with 10 minutes air incubation followed by 60 minutes **M** as above the rate was again 6.8; when 2 incubated 60 minutes in  $\frac{N}{2}$  before illumination the rate was 5.1; when the 6T was pre-mixed with quinone and added together the rate was  $5.0$ ; when the 6T was added to the cells **in N five** minutes after the quinme addition and 10 **2**  minutes before illumination, the rate was 4.5  $\mu$ 1./min. Apparently the cells use oxygen to prepare 6T for its stimulatory function. This same effect is evident in Table VI in **which** it is shown that the control rate **was** identical in air or commercial nitrogen atmosphere but that oxygen was required during the incubation period.

Table VII compares the effect of 6T upon the rate **with** identical samples **of** Scenedesmug one of which was kept at room temperature for 6 hows in diffuse light and the other which **was** stored at 3' in **dark** for the same period. Scenedesmus loses much of its ability to carry out the Hill reaction under the former conditions as well as their ability to use 6T as a rate stimulant.

As seen in Table II light or dark incubation made little change in the effect **of** 6T,

## Table VI

Effect of Incubation Conditions on the Rate of the Hill Reaction  $40$  mm<sup>3</sup> Scenedesmus, exper. temp. 15.7°, 1.04 mg. quinone,

 $1/2$  hour incubation time



 $(1)$ Averages of duplicates.

### Table VII

Effect of Storage Conditions on the Rate of the Hill Reaction

40 mm<sup>3</sup> Scenedesmus, 1.54 mg. quinone, exper. temp. 15.7<sup>°</sup>



### Sfect of **d.** -

To test the effect of pH 100  $\lambda$  1 M KOH or 100  $\lambda$  1 M HC1 were added to the cells prior to 6T incubation, and after the illumination the pH **of** the suspensions were determined. The rate stimulation was essentially insensitive to pH (cf. Table VIII). In other experiments the pH of the initial buffer, cell suspension before and after illumination with quinone and with or without **6T** was found to be within 0.02. That 6T controls %he rate by changing the pH is improbable.

#### **Effect of quinone concentration upon the rate of the Hill reaction. -**

The particular conditions **of** light intensity, reaction temperature, and algal density chosen for early experiments resulted in control rates which could be increased by increasing quinone concentration, cf. Table IX. While the rate was frequently nearly first order in quinone concentration between 1 and 2 mg., the rates became zero order in quinone generally between 2 and 4 mg. Beyond 4 mg. quinone per vessel the control rates decreased with increasing qufnone, an effect observed previously in the Hill reaction (9,10, *2.2).* The 6T appeared as stimulatory in the quinone-dependent region, had no effect at qulnone-saturation, and was inhibitory at quinone-inhibition. The variation in rates between experiments (Table IX) indicates the presence of variables, presumably involving algal culture conditions which are not **yet**  under complete control,

Temperature apparently affects the 6T effect by changing the sensitivity of the control rate to quinone concentration. At higher temperatures the control rate was more highly quinone-limited, as measured by  $\triangle$ R, and 6T was more highly stimulatory.

Table X shows similar data with Chlorella. As has been observed previously (9,10) the control rates with this organism were quinone-independent or quinone-

 $-16-$ 

## Table VIII

Effect of pH on the Rate of the Hill Reaction Exper. date  $1-27-54$ , 40 mm<sup>3</sup> Scenedesmus

0.5 mg. 6T when used,

1.02 mg. quinone, exper. temp.  $15.7^\circ$ 



(1) Average of duplicates.

 $\sim$   $\mu_{\rm s}$ 

Table II

Effect of Quinone Concentration and 6T upon the Rate of the Hill Reaction in Scenedesmus

 $40$  mm<sup>3</sup> Scenedesmus,  $0.50$  mg.  $6T$  added



UCRL-2186(Rev)

# **Table X**

Efect of &uinone Concentration and **6T** 

upon the **Rate** of the Hill Reaction in Chlorella

0 Exper. temp. **15.7** 



inhibited and hence the 6T effect was also either nil or inhibitory. This Chlorella was cultured under as nearly the same conditions of nutrient, CO<sub>2</sub> pressure, light intensity and temperature as Scenedesmus as possible. We are investigating the possibility of extending the range of measurements to conditions under which Chlorella will yield quinone-dependent control rates.

Quinone limited Hill reaction rates have not been reported although to the authors<sup>1</sup> knowledge Scenedesmus has not been used previously in the Hill reaction with quinone. A possible interpretation of such quinone limitation **1s** that the diffusion of quinone into the cell is rate limiting and this process is accelerated by 6T. Such an interpretation, if the quinone within the cells is never a large fraction of the total quinone in the system, would require that the preliminary incubation of the living, respiring cells specifically with 6T, in same way enhances the subsequent diffusion rate of the quinone (hydroquinone ) into (and out **of)** the dead cells . Alternatively, if the quinone within the cells becomes a large fraction **of'** the total quinone in the system prior to illumination, increasing the time allowed for this process in the dark should increase the effective quinone concentration in the cells and hence the rate. Table XI demonstrates the lack of effect **of** dark contact time between cells and quinone and makes this interpretation improbable. Preillumination of Quinone, -<br>Table XII demonstrates the inhibitory effect of illuminating quinone

(9,10) in the side arm of the vessel before mixing with the Scenedesmus. The inhibition selectively reduced the rate with added  $6T$ . The R values do not reflect this fact adequately since R decreased much more rapidly as the reaction proceeded in illuminated Scenedesmus, using preilluminated quinone, with 6T than without. In one hour for example the former evolved 60  $\mu$ 1. O<sub>2</sub> while the latter,

 $-20-$ 

## Table XI

Efect of Contact Time with Quinone upon the

Rate **of** the Hill Reaction

*<sup>3</sup>***0** 40 **mm** Scenedesmus, exper. temp. 15.7



## Table XI1

Effect **of** Preillzanination **of** Quinone on the

Rate **of** the Hill Reaction

**<sup>3</sup>**0 40 **mm** Scenedesmus , exper. **f emp** . 15.7 , 1.55 **mg** . quinone



 $-21-$ 

**PI1**  $\mu$ **1.** This inhibition may be closely related to the inhibitory effect of high quinone concentration and the further inhibition by 6T under such conditions. It will be difficult to interpret the nature of the 6T effect especially as to the comparison between maximum rates with and without 6T until more is learned about the chemistry of the quinone inhibition.

It is important to note that the maximum concentration of the photoproduced inhibitor (Table XII) can be set at  $10^{-5}$  M based upon estimates of intact quinone remaining after the preillumination.

#### Effect of light intensity upon the rate. -

An extremely important condition for 6T rate stimulation is a very high light intensity. As far as we have been able to discern, no intensity is too high. Table XIII shows this effect by comparing the stimulation,  $\Delta R$ , with and without a non-selective light filter (calibrated bolometrically) covering the bottom of the Warburg flask. On the average, under the particular experimental conditions, reducing the incident light intensity to  $42\%$  reduced  $\Delta R$ by a factor of  $6$ -fold. In several instances a stimulation at 1.6 x  $10^5$  ergs/  $\frac{2}{3}$  became an inhibitory effect at 0.7 x 10<sup>5</sup> ergs/cm<sup>2</sup>, demonstrating the coexistence of a stimulatory and an inhibitory effect which depend in different ways upon light intensity, quinone concentration, etc. In other words it would seem that 6T definitely raises the "ceiling" of the light intensity-rate curve but that its effect on the lower, linear part of the curve is obscured by an opposing inhibitory effect.

#### Effect of algal density. -

Because of mutual shading in the rather dense suspensions used (20 mm<sup>3</sup> cells/ml.) and the sensitive relation between light intensity and 6T effect it might be expected that the stimulation would decrease with increasing algal **e**  density. Table XIV indicates that this is not the case. Presumably it is the

 $-22-$ 

## Table XIII

Effect of Light Intensity on the Rate of the Hill Reaction



# $40$  mm<sup>3</sup> Scenedesmus

## Table XIV

Effect of Algal Density on the Rate of the Hill Reaction

Exper. temp.  $15.7^\circ$ 



 $\chi^{-3}$ 

 $-53-$ 

quinone/alga ratio which determines the quinone-limitation rather than the quinone molarity and this ratio decreases more rapidly than light/alga resulting in the observed increase in  $\Delta$ R as density is increased.

### Combined effects of light and quinone. -

As seen above,  $(1)$  at lower light intensities the rate stimulation by 6T was smaller and the control rates less quinone-limited; (2) at higher quinone concentrations control rates were more light-limited and the 6T stimulation was again smaller and occasionally negative, demonstrating the inhibitory component of 6T effect, cf. Table XV.

#### Comparison with Photosynthesis. -

Several papers have reported stimulations of the Hill reaction in chloroplast preparations by inorganic ions, such as chloride, as well as organic materials  $(10, 13, 14)$ . However, in such cases the control rates have been very low compared with photosynthesis, coinciding with very low % stoichiometric yields. The maximum rate of the Hill reaction in saturating light, 1 mg. quinone, and neutral phosphate buffer is reported to be nearly the precise value for photosynthesis in Warburg No. 9 buffer for Chlorella (9). This appeared to be the case with Scenedesmus under these conditions (Table XVI), and the 6T stimulated rate was thus above the photosynthetic rate. The correspondence between the control photosynthesis and Hill rates was coincidental since the Hill rate with Scenedesmus was quinone-limited at 1 mg. quinone. The 20% stimulation of photosynthesis requires further investigation to determine whether it is an artifact and/or reproducible effect.

 $-24-$ 

## Table XV

## Combined Effects of Light and Quinone Concentration



40 mm<sup>3</sup> Scenedesmus, exper. temp. 15.7° C

## Table XVI

Comparison of the Effect of 6T on the Rates of

Photosynthesis and the Hill Reaction

40 mm<sup>3</sup> Scenedesmus, exper. temp. 15.7°

![](_page_26_Picture_36.jpeg)

 $(1)$ Averages of duplicates.

#### Discussion

In discussing the nature of the effect of 6T upon the Hill reaction several aspects of the reaction itself are pertinent. The necessary characteristics of the mechanism are clear. Light is absorbed by chlorophyll, giving rise to the separation of water into reduced and oxidized fragments, the former leading to quinone reduction and the latter to oxygen evolution. Since no oxygen is evolved in the absence of quinone these oxidized and reduced fragments must be capbLe of uniting to ref om water. Since the yield **of** oxygen comesponds very nearly to the transfer of two H-atoms from water to quinone, there can be no appreciable side reactions of these oxidized and reduced fragments other than their reunion. The effect which we have observed is that synthetic 6T incubated with Scenedesmus increases the yield of oxygen per unit of absorbed light, and hence the rate, but does not increase the ultimate yield of oxygen (Figure 1). From what has been said above 6T can therefore act either to increase the efficiency with which light is used to separate water into oxidized or reduced fragments or to reduce the rate at which they later reunite. Either mechanism would give rise to the observed increase in quantum efficiency with no change in ultimate yield.

Under the conditions in which 6 T is stimulatory, increasing the quinone concentration also increases the quantum efficiency without increasing the ultimate yield per milligram quinone (Table IX). Presumably quinone acts to prevent the reunion of redox fragments rather than to increase the rate of water photolysis, although there is some indirect evidence that quinone may be intimately associated with the chlorophyll  $(15,16)$ . The mechanism may involve a competition between quinone and an oxidized water fragment for a reduced **water** fragment, the quinone being favored by increasing its concentration. At sufficiently high quinone concentrations the quantum efficiency reaches a maxi-

 $-26-$ 

nun value (Table **M)** resulting either from the complete prevention of redox reunion, a diffusion or otherwise limited quinone reduction, or a limiting inhibitory effect of quinone. Since the quantum efficiency decreases with increasing quinone concentration beyond the optimum value, such an inhibitory effect does supercede eventually.

If 6T increases the rate of redox separation the observation that at quinone saturation there is no observable 6T stimulation (Table IX) must be explained by a diffusion or otherwise limited quinone reduction, or a limiting inhibitory quinone effect. If either of these explanations were valid then an increase in the rate of redox separation brought about by increased light at quinone saturation rather than increased 6T should not increase the rate of oxygen production, i.e., the yield of oxygen per unit time of illumination. In experiments carried out under conditions in which it is known that increasing the redox separation by increased light does indeed give higher rates (Table XV), the maximum quantum efficiency is not greater with added 6T than without. Taken at face value these experiments would eliminate the possibility that 6T does nothing but increase the efficiency with which quanta are used to separate the redox fragments of water. However, there is evidence that in these experiments 6T increases the inhibitory effect **of** qubone and **this** side effect may well mask %he true relationships of quinone-saturated rates.

If, on the other hand, 6T acts to prevent the reunion of redox fragments it may act similarly to quinone, i.e. in competition with an oxidized water fragment for a reduced water fragment. If this were the case then we would expect a higher yield of oxygen with 6T than without, corresponding to the transfer of 2 H-atoms from water to 6T, and this is not observed. Hence we must further assume that the reduced 6T in turn reduces quinone and thus acts merely as a hydrogen transfer system. Since 0.1 mg. 6T is about as effective in increasing the quantum efficiency as 1.0 mg, quinone (Table  $IX$ ) we must assume that 6T is reduced and subsequently reduces quinone, the whole process occurring at approximately 20 times

 $UCRL-2186(Rev)$ 

the rate (on a molar basis) as guinone is /reduced directly. Alternatively, 6T may act in **this** manner at a different point of redox reunion from quinone, i.e., as an intermediate hydrogen carrier not directly involved in quinone reduction. This would seem more reasonable in view of the rapidity with which the presumably non-enzymatic "by-pass" reduction of guinone would be required to proceed.

The stimulation of quantum efficiency by  $6T$  increases with increasing light intensity (Table XIII). This observation is consistent with the action of 6T either in redox separation or hydrogen carrier functions. With increasing light intensity both the quantum conversion and hydrogen transport systems approach their limiting capacity, reeulting in increased quantum decay and reunion of redox fragments, and providing 6T with greater opportunity to increase the efficiency. Furthermore, the net 6T effect is the result of a sthulatory action and a smaller inhibitory action which is presumably not light sensitive, so that increases in the stimuLatory effect by increased light absorption are made to appear proportionately greater in the net stimulatory effect.

The rise of quantum efficiency produced by 6T increases with increasing temperature (Table IX). At low temperatures the major part of the redox fragments formed reunite rather than form oxygen and hydroquinone. Regardless of whether  $6T$  acts by increasing the rate of redox separation or as a hydrogen carrier **we** mmt assume that at low temperatures the redox fragments at another point in the 6T stimulated reaction sequence reunite at a more rapid rate than in the control, to offset in prrt the increased efficiency of the **6T** reaction.

The kinetic data discussed above do not unequivocally discriminate between the action of 6T in redox separation as contrasted with prevention of redax reunion and the question arises as to whether these is any **chemical basis** 

 $-28-$ 

 $UCRI - 2186 (Rev)$ 

upon which such a decision can be made. The 6T is a cyclic disulfide which exhibits specific redox properties as demonstrated by its role as the coenzyme in pyruvic acid oxidation (17,18). The strain-energy in its 5-membered ring (1, 19) presumably makes it a better oxidant than the 6-membered ring disulfide. 5T, which may explain the greater Hill activity of the **6T.** Its mode of action in the Hill reaction may thus involve cyclic oxidation-reduction of the disulfidedithiol, as in pyruvate oxidation, in acting as a hydrogen carrier although there are several other redox possibilities within this system. An alternative possibility, suggested by Calvin and Barltrop (I) is 'that **the** strain energy of *6T* would lower the **energy** required to open the sulfur-sulfur bond so that energy from an excited state of chlorophyll could accomplish the fission. It appears now that the 6T would need to be closely associated with the chlorophyll and that the energy be transformed by a process of internal conversion from electronic to vibrational excitation in the complex. The resulting activated 6T may then reaef directly with water as proposed by Barltrop, Calvin and **Hayes (191** to form a thiol sulfenic acid. This single step would accomplish the redox separation required of photosynthesis and the Hill reaction since the thiol is a good reductant and the sulfenic acid appears to be a reasanably strong aidant **(19)** . The fact that the dithiol, 6DT, and monoxide, 6MO, are inactive under present conditions in the Hill reaction (Table II) suggests that some other intermediates are involved, or that these are not susceptible to incorporation under the conditions used. Since the relative effectiveness of 6T and 5T is dtfferent in pyruvate oxidation from what it has been found to be in the Hill reaction, one would suppose that the rate-limiting step is different in the two cases.

Thus, according to this quantum conversion model, the natural 6T concentration associated with the chloroplast would not be sufficient to convert all of the absorbed quanta at high light intensities and added 6T assists in

 $-29-$ 

this naturally dccurring process. Our present knowledge of the chemistry of 6T thus is consistent with quantum conversion and/or hydrogen transport func $t$ ions.

One important problem is whether the 6T acts to increase the quantum efficiency by competing with a naturally occurring process or by accelerating a process which is otherwise carried out more slowly with a smaller amount of naturally occurring 6T. Studies on the inhibition of the Hill reaction have generally observed a marked lack of sensitivity of the reaction to sulfhydryl reagents such as mercury compounds, iodoacetate, arsenite, etc. (Table III; ref. 20) , Taken at face mlue this would indicate that **6T** is not naturally involved in this reaction and that it must act in competition with a natural process. However, it is difficult to determine whether these poisons are able to penetrate to the locus of **6T** action, possibly being physically excluded or tied up chemically by other, more easily accessible thiols. That this is a very real possibility is borne out by the fact that when these poisons do not inhibit the control reaction they also do not inhibit even the 6T stimuhation which ought tobe reduced if the poisons are sulfhydryl active. It is *only* when the control reaction itself is inhibited that the **6T** stimulation is reduced.

It would seem improbable that if 6T were not a natural intermediate in the Kill reaction, metabolic acitivity would be required to prepare the 6T for its stimulatory function (Table VI and Text). We believe this oxygen requirement during incubation is closely related to the binding of the 6T to the chlorophyll molecule or complex to prepare it to internally convert electronic excitation **of** the chlorophyll to a vibrational exoftation and fission of the sulfur-sulfur bond of 6T.

Inhibition of the Hill reaction may be brought about either by a high

 $-30-$ 

quinone concentration (Table  $IX$ ), photolyzed quinone at lower concentrations (Table XII), or a moderate quinone concentration and added 6T (Table  $\mathbb X$ ). The chemical and kinetic behavior of this effect may prove extremely important in elucidating the Hill mechanism. It may be that an interaction between quinone itself or more probably a derivative such as hydroxyquinones (21), and 6T either natural or added, results in the inhibition, supporting the idea that 6T is a natural Hill intermediate. It is also **of** great interest to discover whether the quinone-saturation of rate is primarily the result **of** the inhibitory effect, as the saturation mtes are important clues as to the mode of 6T stimulatory action.

#### Summary

**1.** Conditions have been defined under which 6-thioctic acid, 6T, increases the quantum efficienty of the Hill reaction in Scenedesmus. This increase occurs when the control rate is quinone-limited, under conditions of high Ught intensity, low quinone concentration, high temperature, and high algal density. When the control rate is inhibited by high concentrations of quinone **or** photolyzed quinone, 6T results in a further decrease in rate.

2. Fundamental characteristics of the Hill reaction suggest that 6T either increases the rate at which water is separated into reduced and oxidized fragments (quantum conversion agent) or decreases the rate at which these fragments later recombine (hydrogen carrier or quinone diffusion).

**3** - The variation **of** the effect with 6T concentration, incubation conditions, pH, quinone concentration, temperature, preillumination of quinone, dark contact time with quinone, light intensity, algal density, sulfhydryl poisons, plant species, and other reagents does not permit an unequivocal discrimination between the two possible mechanisms.

 $-31-$ 

#### Footnotes

- (\*) The work described in this paper was sponsored by the **U**. S. Atomic Ebergy Commission. This **paper has** been abstracted from the thesis of D. F. Bradley submitted to the Graduate Division of the University of California in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor **of** Philosophy.
- (\*\*) The following abbreviations will be used throughout this paper: 6T, 6,8-dithiooctanoic acid; 6DT, 6,8-dithioloctanoic acid; 6M0, 6,8dithiooctanoic acid monoxide; 5T, 5,8-dithiooctanoic acid; 4T, 4,8dithiooctanoic acid; 6MT, 8-methyl, 6,8-dithiooctanoic acid; DPN, diphosphopyridine nucleotide.
- (\*\*\*) We are indebted to Dr. T. H. Jukes of Lederle Laboratories for making samples of synthetic 6T, 6DT, 6MO, 5T, 4T and 6MT available to us for this investigation.

#### UCRI-2186 (Rev)

#### References

- (1) **Calvin, M. and Barltrop, J. A., J. Am. Chem. Soc., 74, 6153 (1952).**
- $(2)$ Hill, R., Nature, 139, 881 (1937).
- (3) Hill, R. and Scarisbrick, R., Nature,  $\underline{146}$ , 61 (1940).
- $(4)$ Warburg,  $0.,$  and Ilittgens, W., Biokhimiia,  $\underline{11}, 303$  (1946).
- (5) Benson, A. A., Calvin, M., Haas, V. A., Aronoff, S., Hall, A. G., Bassham, J. A., Weigl, J. W., "Photosynthesis in Plants," Chapt. 19,<br>381-401, Iowa State Goll. Press., Ames, Iowa, 1949.
- *(6)* Rabinowitch, **E;** I ., "Photosynthesis and elated Processes, **11,** vol. 1" New York, Interscience, 1951.
- (7) Umbreit, W. W., Burris, R. H. and Stauffer, J. F., "Manometric Techniques and Related Methods for the Study **of** Tissue %tabolism." Hinneapolis, Burgess Publ. Co., 1946.
- (8) Fan, C. S., Stauffer, J. F., and Umbreit, W. W., J. Gen. Physiol., 27, 15 (1943)
- (9) Clendenning, K. A., and Ehrmantrant, H. C., Arch. Biochem. Biophys., **2,** 387 (1950)
- (10) Arnon, D. I. and Whatley, F. R., Arch. Biochem., 23, 141 (1949).
- 
- *(11)* Fuller, R. C., personal communication.<br>*(12)* Ehrmantrant, H. O. and Rabinowitch, E., Arch. Biochem. Biophys., <u>38</u>, 67  $(1952)$ .
- (13) Gorham, P. R. and Clendenning, K. A., Arch Biochem. Biophys., 37, 199  $(1952)$ .
- (14) Mehler, A. H., Arch Biochem. Biophys., 24, 339 (1951).
- (15) Uvingston, R. and Ke, C . **L.,** J . Am. Chem. Soc . , **72,** 909 (1950) .
- (16) Shiau, Y. G. and Franck, J., Arch. Biochem., 14, 253 (1947).
- **(17)** Bullock, M. W., Broduuan, J. A., Patterson, **E. L.,** Peirce, **J. V.,** and Stokstad, L. R., J. Am. Chem. Soc.,  $\mathbb{Z}_4$ , 3445 (1952).
- (18) 0'Kane, D. J. and Gunsalus, I. G., J. Bact., 54, 20 (1947).

 $-33-$ 

- <sup>09</sup>1 Barltrop, J. **A,, Calvin, M.** and Hayes, P. M., **Jo Am.** Chem. **Soc.,** in **press,** 1954.
- (20) Wessels, **J. S. C. and Havinga, E., Rec. Trav. Chim., 72, 1076 (1953).**
- (21) Aronoff, S., Plant Physiol., 21, 393 (1946).