Cyclic and Noncyclic Photophosphorylation in Isolated Guard Cell Chloroplasts from *Vicia faba* L.\(^1\)
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ABSTRACT

High rates of both cyclic and noncyclic photophosphorylation were measured in chloroplast lamellae isolated from purified guard cell protoplasts from *Vicia faba* L. Typical rates of light-dependent incorporation of \(^{32}\)P into ATP were 100 and 190 micromoles ATP per milligram chlorophyll per hour for noncyclic (water to ferricyanide) and cyclic (phenazine methosulfate) photophosphorylation, respectively. These rates were 50 to 80% of those observed with mesophyll chloroplasts. Noncyclic photophosphorylation in guard cell chloroplasts was completely inhibited by 3-(3,4-dichlorophenyl)-1,1-dimethylurea supporting the notion that photophosphorylation is coupled to linear electron flow from photosystem II to photosystem I. Several lines of evidence indicated that contamination by mesophyll chloroplasts cannot account for the observed photophosphorylation rates.

A comparison of the photon fluence dependence of noncyclic photophosphorylation in mesophyll and guard cell chloroplasts showed significant differences between the two preparations, with half saturation at 0.04 and 0.08 millimole per square meter per second, respectively.

Chloroplasts are a constant feature of guard cells (26). Recent studies have shown that guard cell chloroplasts have light harvesting pigments for PSI and PSII (5, 15, 21, 23, 27) and the capacity for photosynthetic electron transport (13, 21, 27) and O\(_2\) evolution (7, 21). Indirect evidence for photophosphorylation in guard cell chloroplasts includes the presence of the \(\alpha\)- and \(\beta\)-subunits of the coupling factor complex (5), the demonstration of typical Chl \(a\) fluorescence transients (10, 11, 13, 21), and the light-induced 518-nm electrochromic shift (6). A role of guard cell chloroplasts in stomatal movements is supported by the wavelength dependence of stomatal opening (12, 19, 20, 29), the inhibition of opening by the photosynthetic electron transport inhibitor, DCMU, particularly under red light (19, 20). and observations showing that achlorophyllous stomata of the orchid *Paphiopedilum* fail to open under red irradiation (28).

The hypothesis that guard cell chloroplasts supply ATP for active ion transport during stomatal movements is a classic concept in stomatal physiology (8, 16). Photophosphorylation has been measured in guard cell chloroplasts from epidermal peel preparations (9, 17), but these results have been difficult to interpret because of the possible contamination from mesophyll chloroplasts (27). Since the ratio of Chl content in guard cells to mesophyll cells is about 1 to 80 (22), a 1.3% mesophyll contamination would yield preparations containing equal amounts of Chl from the two cell types. Such levels of contamination are difficult to avoid in work with epidermal peels.

The availability of highly purified preparations of guard cell protoplasts (21, 22) as a source of isolated chloroplasts provided us with an improved approach to this question. We report here that isolated guard cell chloroplasts from *Vicia*, judged free of mesophyll contamination by several criteria, exhibited high rates of cyclic and noncyclic photophosphorylation. A comparison of the photon fluence dependency of photophosphorylation in guard cell and mesophyll chloroplasts showed significant differences which might have functional implications.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Preparation of Guard Cell and Mesophyll Chloroplasts. Plants of *Vicia faba* L. cv Long Pod (Atlee Burpee Co., Warminster, PA) were grown in a commercial potting soil under natural light in a greenhouse (19). Epidermal strips were obtained from the abaxial (lower) surface of young, fully expanded leaves (4 to 7 week-old plants) and accumulated in ice-cold distilled H\(_2\)O. The strips were cut into small pieces with scissors, sonicated for 30 s at 0°C (Ultrasonics Inc. model W-225), and washed with distilled H\(_2\)O. The sonication treatment breaks the epidermal cells and removes most adhering mesophyll contaminants from the strips (6, 12, 21).

Guard cell protoplasts were isolated from the sonicated epidermal strips by a two-step enzymic digestion at 20 ± 1°C (21). In the first step, strips were digested in 4% cellulase (Onozuka R-10), 0.25 mM manitol, and 1 mM CaCl\(_2\) for 1 h, with shaking at 60 strokes min\(^{-1}\). After filtration through a 58-μm nylon mesh and washing in 0.4 mM manitol and 1 mM CaCl\(_2\), the strips were subjected to a second digestion step for about 20 h, with the manitol and CaCl\(_2\) increased to 0.4 mM and 5 mM, respectively, and the shaking reduced to about 40 strokes min\(^{-1}\). Released guard cell protoplasts were separated from the epidermal peels by filtration through a 30-μm nylon mesh, collected by low-speed centrifugation (100g, 10 min) and stored in ice-cold 0.4 mM mannitol and 1 mM CaCl\(_2\). In a typical experiment, 150 leaves were peeled, yielding a total guard cell Chl of 10 to 15 µg.

For the isolation of chloroplasts, the guard cell protoplasts (300 µl) were poured onto a 5-μm nylon mesh which was placed at the top of a microfuge tube (E and K Scientific Products), filled with 0.8 ml of the chloroplast isolation medium (50 mM Tricine-NaOH buffer [pH 7.5], 0.4 M sucrose, 20 mM NaCl, and 5 mM MgCl\(_2\)). The protoplasts were ruptured by rapid centrifugation (16,000g for 10 s) in an Eppendorf microfuge (model 5412). The pellet containing the guard cell chloroplasts was gently homogenized in a Teflon homogenizer and suspended uniformly in the same medium at 0°C. For the isolation of mesophyll chloroplasts, 5 to 10 g (fresh weight) of *Vicia* leaf segments devoid of main veins were combined with 80 ml of ice-cold isolation medium and homogenized in an Ultra Turrax blender (Janke and Kunkel, West Germany) at 0°C. After filtration through four layers of Miracloth, the homogenate was centrif-

\(^1\) Supported by the National Science Foundation, the United States Department of Agriculture, and the United States Department of Energy.
fuged at 200g for 3 min. The chloroplasts were isolated from the supernatant by further centrifugation at 1500g for 7 min and suspended uniformly in the isolation medium. Chl concentrations were determined by the method of Arnon (1).

Measurement of Photophosphorylation. Light-dependent ATP formation was determined by measuring 32P incorporation according to the method of Asada et al. (2). The basic reaction mixture (2.1 ml) contained 20 mM Tricine-NaOH buffer, pH 8.3, 0.1 mM sucrose, 5 mM MgCl2, 0.2 mM ADP, 0.91 mM K2HPO4 (0.4 µCi 32P), 0.6 mM potassium ferricyanide, and chloroplasts containing 0.2 to 0.6 µg Chl. For the measurement of cyclic photophosphorylation, the potassium ferricyanide was replaced by 0.05 mM PMS. Unreacted 32P-labeled orthophosphate was extracted as phosphomolybdic acid by organic solvents (2). Radioactivity of the final aqueous phase was measured as Cerenkov radiation (2). Typical counts for a sample with 0.55 µg Chl were 350, 380, and 70 cpm for the ferricyanide, PMS, and dark-ferricyanide treatments, respectively.

The guard cell chloroplast preparations were handled under dim green light at room temperature. Photophosphorylation was initiated by illumination with orange actinic light from the bottom of the test tube, and the reaction was terminated after 3 min by adding 5 ml of 10% HClO4 to 2.1 ml of the reaction medium. Actinic light was provided by a tungsten lamp (Sylvania, 150 w), filtered by one layer of orange gelatinous film (Cinemoid 5A) and a 4-cm layer of 0.2% copper sulfate solution. Photon fluence rates at the surface of the tube, measured with a Li Cor quantum sensor (model 185B), was 0.61 mmol m⁻² s⁻¹, unless otherwise specified. 32P radioactivity was measured in a Beckman liquid scintillation counter in a coincidence mode, at room temperature. The counting efficiency was corrected by internal standardization.

RESULTS

Evaluation of the Purity of Guard Cell Protoplasts. Mesophyll protoplasts can be easily distinguished from guard cell protoplasts under bright field microscopy because of their larger size and higher chloroplast content. Extensive examination of purified guard cell protoplast preparations failed to reveal mesophyll cell contaminants. A typical optical field from a guard cell protoplast preparation is shown in Figure 1A. The same preparations were examined under fluorescence microscopy to test for the presence of free mesophyll chloroplasts, which are larger and fluoresce much more intensely than guard cell chloroplasts (30), also with negative results.

Further evaluation of this criterion of purity was undertaken by preparing defined mixtures of guard cell and mesophyll protoplasts. For that purpose, the cell densities of separate preparations of the two protoplast types were determined with a hemocytometer and sufficient mesophyll protoplasts to contribute 1 or 5% of the final cell number was added to purified preparations of guard cell protoplasts. In initial experiments, the differences in osmotic potential between standard mesophyll and guard cell protoplast media (0.6 and 0.4 mM mannitol, respectively) was ignored, and the calculated aliquot of mesophyll protoplast suspension was added to the 0.4 mM mannitol medium with the guard cell protoplasts. Mesophyll protoplasts burst in this medium, making it necessary to conduct the mixing experiments in 0.6 mM mannitol. Guard cell protoplasts shrank in that solution but remained stable. Examination of these mixed preparations under bright field (Fig. 1B) and fluorescence microscopy readily revealed the presence of mesophyll protoplasts, at both levels of contamination. Thus, the maximum contamination level of the purified guard cell protoplast preparations was significantly lower

3 Abbreviations: PMS, phenazine methosulfate; RuBP, ribulose 1,5-

biphosphate.

Fig. 1. A, Isolated guard cell protoplasts from Vicia faba in 0.4 M mannitol. The guard cell chloroplasts can be clearly seen. B, Micrograph from a preparation in which 1% (on a cell number basis) mesophyll protoplasts from Vicia were added to a suspension of guard cell protoplasts in 0.6 M mannitol. Arrow, mesophyll protoplast. Scale bars, 10 µm.
PHOTOPHOSPHORYLATION IN GUARD CELLS

Table 1. Typical Rates of Noncyclic and Cyclic Photophosphorylation in Guard Cell and Mesophyll Chloroplasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Rate of ATP Formed in</th>
<th>Guard cell chloroplasts</th>
<th>Mesophyll chloroplasts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>μmol mg⁻¹ Chl. h⁻¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂O → Fe(CN)₆³⁻</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂O → Fe(CN)₆³⁻(+DCMU)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMS</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. 2. Rate of noncyclic photophosphorylation as a function of incident photon fluence rate of orange light in guard cell (○) and mesophyll (□) chloroplast preparations. Basic reaction mixture as in Table 1. Total Chl in the reaction mixture was 0.38 and 0.51 μg for guard cell and mesophyll chloroplasts, respectively. Light intensity was reduced with neutral density filters.

PSII to PSI occurs in guard cell chloroplasts (11). The DCMU effect and the observed light dependency indicate that mitochondrial phosphorylation did not occur in these experimental conditions. ³²P incorporation was nil in darkness and in the absence of exogenous ADP. A total of six experiments performed with different protoplast isolates yielded comparable results (rates for noncyclic photophosphorylation in the six experiments were: 127, 98, 106, 129, 103, and 103 μmol ATP mg⁻¹ Chl h⁻¹).

Photon Fluence Dependence of Photophosphorylation in Guard Cell and Mesophyll Chloroplasts. A comparison of the photon fluence dependency of noncyclic photophosphorylation in mesophyll and guard cell chloroplasts is shown in Figure 2. At low photon fluences, rates increased linearly with fluences in both preparations but the initial slope was about 60% less with guard cell chloroplasts. Half saturation occurred at about 0.04 mmol m⁻² s⁻¹ in mesophyll and 0.08 mmol m⁻² s⁻¹ in guard cell chloroplast preparations. Identical results were obtained in two separate experiments conducted with different protoplast isolates.

DISCUSSION

A conclusive demonstration of photophosphorylation in guard cell chloroplast preparations critically depends on the lack of mesophyll contamination. Several lines of evidence indicate that this condition has been achieved in the experiments described here. Somatication of the Vicia epidermal peels removed most of the nonstomatal chloroplasts (6, 12, 21), and any remaining epidermal and mesophyll cells were eliminated by the first digestion step in 0.25 M mannitol. Furthermore, any residual mesophyll protoplasts would lyse during the extended digestion in 0.4 M mannitol. An independent criterion of purity arises from a previous study in which protoplasts were isolated with the same method used in the present work, showing clear-cut differences in the fluorescence transients from guard cell and mesophyll protoplast preparations (21). Contaminated guard cell protoplast preparations would be expected to show the characteristic M peak of the mesophyll (11, 21). Finally, guard cell chloroplasts exhibited rates of noncyclic photophosphorylation approaching 80% of the mesophyll rates, on a Chl basis. Given a ratio of Chl content in guard cells to mesophyll cells of about 1:80, it can be calculated that a minimum of 1% mesophyll contamination would be necessary to account for all the noncyclic photophosphorylation in a hypothetically inactive guard cell chloroplast preparation. The mixing experiments described in "Results" showed that in guard cell protoplast preparations known to be contaminated with 1% mesophyll protoplasts, the contaminant was readily detectable under bright field or fluorescence microscopy, whereas purified guard cell protoplast preparations showed virtually no mesophyll contaminants. The level of contamination of the purified preparations can therefore be estimated to be 0.1% or less, ruling out the possibility that contaminant mesophyll could account for the observed photophosphorylation activity.

The reported method for the isolation of purified guard cell chloroplasts opens previously unavailable opportunities for comparative biochemistry of mesophyll and guard cell chloroplasts. The in vitro photophosphorylation observed with isolated guard cell chloroplasts shows that a significant portion of their photosynthetic apparatus remains functional after the isolation. Further improvement of the isolation procedure might render intact chloroplasts, facilitating studies of stromal reactions.

Measurements of cyclic and noncyclic photophosphorylation in guard cell chloroplasts confirm previous inferences about their photophosphorylation capacity based on fluorescence spectroscopy (6, 10, 11, 13, 21). The measured photophosphorylation rates were similar, although somewhat lower than in the mesophyll. It is unclear if the observed lower rates were a result of an intrinsically low photosynthetic capacity or a consequence of some damage from the long enzymic digestion required for guard cell protoplast isolation, a step not used with the mesophyll material. A strict comparison under the same experimental conditions was not possible because of the basic differences between the isolation procedures (21) and the instability of the mesophyll protoplasts when subjected to long incubation in the cellulolytic enzymes.

The contribution of photophosphorylation by guard cell chloroplasts to the energy supply during stomatal opening can be evaluated on the basis of data showing that, under saturating red irradiation, Vicia stomata in epidermal peels exhibit a net increase in aperture of about 4 μm over a 2-h period (19). Considering noncyclic photophosphorylation alone (Table 1) and a Chl content of 2 μg guard cell⁻¹, irradiated guard cell chloroplasts would supply 0.41 pmol ATP guard cell⁻¹ over a 2-h period. Estimates of the ATP required to drive the ion uptake occurring during such an aperture increment (4) indicate that this calculated supply of ATP would suffice. Much more information is needed to validate these estimates for in vivo conditions, but the calculations strengthen previous conclusions based on physiological evidence, suggesting that guard cell photophosphorylation is the source of energy for stomatal opening in the leaf under...
moderate to high irradiances (16, 26, 29).

Possible damage from the isolation procedure also constrains the interpretation of the differential light sensitivity of guard cell chloroplasts as compared to their mesophyll counterparts (Fig. 2). The in vitro findings, however, are validated by observations of the higher photon fluence requirement for stomatal opening in the red, which primarily depends on photosynthesis from guard cell chloroplasts, as compared with the response of mesophyll photosynthesis, which shows no similar threshold (29). Furthermore, a comparison of fluorescence transients from guard cell and mesophyll chloroplasts (10) showed a photon fluence dependency similar to that of in vitro photophosphorylation, indicating that the lower light sensitivity of guard cell chloroplasts might reflect an intrinsic property of their photosynthetic apparatus.

An evaluation of the rates of cyclic and noncyclic photophosphorylation in guard cell and mesophyll chloroplasts fails to reveal an unusually high PSI activity in guard cell chloroplasts, as postulated in previous studies (9, 16, 18). Comparable, high noncyclic photophosphorylation capacity in both preparations also substantiates electron flow from PSI to PSI in guard cell chloroplasts (13, 21, 27), implicating the reduction of NAPD+, as the physiological electron acceptor. The fate of the NAPD+ generated by guard cell chloroplasts remains an intriguing aspect of guard cell biology.

Demonstration of photophosphorylation capacity in guard cell chloroplasts adds to the growing number of features of these organelles found to match the properties of mesophyll chloroplasts, including light harvesting pigments of PSI and II, electron transport, and a CO2 sensitivity of the slow fluorescence transients associated with the high energy state (11). Although the later feature is inconsistent with the reported lack of RuBP carboxylase in guard cell chloroplasts (14), a recent immunological study showing reactivity of these organelles to antibodies against RuBP carboxylase (35), may reopen the question of a complete absence of RuBP carboxylase in guard cells. Regardless of the definitive answer to that problem, the bulk of the available evidence indicates that guard cell chloroplasts do not fix significant amounts of CO2 under conditions typical for mesophyll chloroplasts (14, 24, 25). In the absence of CO2 fixation, the ATP generated in illuminated guard cell chloroplasts would be available for export to the cytoplasm, for use by a plasmalemma ATPase (26). Simultaneous responses of guard cell and mesophyll chloroplasts to light would therefore constitute one component of the parallel responses coupling mesophyll photosynthesis with stomatal conductance (3, 29). The emerging picture strengthens the notion of an important role of guard cell chloroplasts in the light response of stomata and the photocontrol of photosynthesis and stomatal conductance in the intact leaf.
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