Osmotic Pressure of Aqueous Polyethylene Glycols¹

Relationship between Molecular Weight and Vapor Pressure Deficit

Nicholas P. Money²

Division of Molecular and Cellular Biology, National Jewish Center, Denver, Colorado 80206

ABSTRACT

Osmotic pressures (II) of aqueous solutions of polyethylene glycols (PEGs) of average relative molecular weight (M_r) between 200 and 10,000 were measured using vapor pressure deficit osmometry. The relationships between molarity and II were described with high precision by second order polynomials for each of the PEGs studied. In contrast to previous reports, equivalent weights of different polymers in solution did not generate the same II; low M_r PEGs generated a higher II than the higher M_r PEGs. The effect of PEGs upon II represents an interaction between concentration and M_r .

Water soluble PEGs have been widely used as inert, nonionic solutes in the study of the water relations of plants (9, 16, 17), fungi (11, 13, 14), and animals (24). The availability of these polymers over a wide range of M_r has been exploited in measurements of cell wall porosity (3, 6, 13). Another important application has been the use of PEGs to promote the transformation and fusion of protoplasts (2, 7, 21).

In many experiments, it has been necessary to determine the osmotic pressure (Π^3) of PEG solutions. The II has been measured using both freezing point depression and vapor pressure deficit osmometry (1, 5, 8, 12, 19, 20), and also by equilibration with sucrose solutions (10). However, much controversy persists concerning the best method for measuring the II of polymer solutions and the relationships between concentration, M_r and II (20).

Previous studies have employed molal PEG solutions (10, 12, 19, 20) which facilitates the thermodynamic interpretation of the relationship between concentration and Π by reference to the ideal gas equation (*i.e.*, molality corrects for solute volume) (4, 10). However, molarity is often a more convenient expression of concentration for experimental purposes and has been used in the present study. I have attempted to provide a set of standard curves relating molarity to Π for PEGs of average M_r between 200 and 10,000 over a range of concentrations encompassing those used in physiological experi-

³ Abbreviation: Π , osmotic pressure.

ments. New information has also been provided on the relationship between M_r and Π .

II was measured by vapor pressure deficit osmometry since the variation of osmotic coefficient (which accounts for the nonlinearity of concentration versus II responses) is strongly temperature dependent (10, 12), reducing the usefulness of freezing point depression data at physiological temperatures (except for very dilute solutions).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

PEGs of average M_r between 200 and 10,000 were used as supplied by Fluka Chemical Corp., New York. The M_r ranges stated by the supplier are listed in Table I. For each concentration of each PEG, the solute was weighed out separately and dissolved in distilled water to avoid possible cumulative errors due to serial dilution. All measurements were made on fresh solutions at $21 \pm 1^{\circ}$ C within an hour of preparation to reduce error due to evaporative concentration. Ten µL samples were pipetted onto 6 mm diameter filter paper discs placed previously into the sample chamber of a Wescor 5100C Vapor Pressure Deficit Osmometer (Wescor, Inc., Logan, UT). The osmolality of each solution was measured repeatedly until a series of three readings were obtained which lay within a 5 mosmol range (minimum of three replicates per concentration of each PEG). A mean value of osmolality was calculated from the closest three measurements and the solvent contribution (correction factor = osmolality of distilled water registered by the osmometer) was subtracted from the mean. The correction factor was determined at the end of each concentration of PEG to adjust for osmometer drift due to thermocouple contamination (22). The osmometer was frequently recalibrated over the range 100 to 1000 mmol·kg⁻¹ using NaCl osmolality standards (Wescor, Inc.) during the experiments.

Osmolality measurements were converted to II (MPa) using the formula II = RTc; where c = osmolality in moles·kg⁻¹ and RT = 2.446 kg·MPa·mol⁻¹ at 21°C.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Figure 1 shows the relationships between molarity and Π for PEG-200 through -10,000. As reported in previous investigations (5, 10, 20), there was not a linear relationship between concentration and Π . This behavior reflects considerable divergence from ideality (ideal behavior of KCl is shown in Fig. 1A for comparison). However, the relationships be-

¹ This research was supported in part by grant DCB 86-18694 from the Developmental Biology Program of the National Science Foundation (to F. M. Harold).

² Present Address: Department of Biochemistry, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523.

OSMOTIC PRESSURE OF AQUEOUS POLYETHYLENE GLYCOL

tween molarity and II were described with a high degree of precision by second order polynomials for the complete range of PEGs studied (Table IIA). Curves were fitted by regression analysis and F values were all significant at $P \le 0.0001$.

PEG concentration is often expressed as a percentage, sometimes without qualification as either w/v solution (molar) or w/w solvent (molal) (24, 25). However, the qualification is an important one since molar solutions (being more concentrated) increase the II to a greater extent than molal solutions of the same numerical value. This is shown in Figure 2 for the most commonly used PEG with an average M_r of 6000. Within the resolution of the osmometer (~5 mosmol), this effect was exhibited above 10 mmolar/10 mmolal (60 g· L⁻¹ solution or 60 g·kg⁻¹ distilled water) as the molar volume of the polymer began to affect the concentration of the solution significantly.

For a given molarity, the larger polymers clearly increased the Π more than the smaller ones (Fig. 1). This effect of M_r on Π has also been documented, based upon osmolality determinations of molal solutions, by Steuter et al. (20) who suggested that "... the total mass or total number of molecular subunits, rather than total number of particles (polymer chains) may be an important factor controlling water potential." The data of Williams and Shaykewich (23) for PEG-6000 and -20,000 were in agreement with this conclusion. In the present study, a comparison was made between solutions of identical volume containing identical weights of the different polymers (i.e., a range of molarities). Figure 3 shows that low M_r PEGs had a greater effect upon Π than higher $M_{\rm r}$ s. The effect of these polymers upon II represents a more complex interaction between concentration and M_r than that suggested by Steuter et al. (20); although the mass of material in solution does have a strong influence upon the vapor pressure (Fig. 1), long chain PEGs do not behave as a number of individual subunits (Fig. 3). Previous studies (20, 23) were limited to the higher $M_{\rm r}$ PEGs obscuring this strong influence of polymer size on Π .

In common with the PEGs, sucrose did not behave as an ideal solute (Fig. 1A). However, sucrose generated a lower II than that predicted for a PEG of comparable M_r (Fig. 3). This suggests that the effect of PEGs upon II reflects specific characteristics of these polymers. There have been various proposals to account for the deviation from ideality of PEGs. On the basis of viscosity measurements, Michel and Kauf-

Table I.	Average M, of	f PEGs Used in	the Study with	Corresponding
M, Rang	es Determined	by the Supplie	er (Fluka Chemie	cal Corp.)

Average Mr	M, Range	
200	190–210	
300	285-315	
400	380-420	
600	570-630	
1,000	950–1,050	
1,500	1,400–1,600	
2,000	1,900–2,200	
3,000	2,700-3,300	
4,000	3,500-4,500	
6,000	6,000–7,500	
10,000	8,500-11,500	



Figure 1. Relationships between concentration (molarity) and osmotic pressure (II) for PEG-200 through -10,000, sucrose, and KCI. Note the changes in scale of abscissa and ordinate between A, B, and C. Curves were fitted by regression analysis; see Table IIA.

mann (12) suggested that the configuration of the PEG molecule might change in response to concentration: extended at low concentrations, folding with increasing concentration. PEG-6000 in an aqueous solution exists as rigid helical segments and most of the hydrogen bonding of water occurs at those oxygens exposed at positions along the disordered parts Degrees of freedom (df) are for model, error

A. Curves in Figure 1 relating II to concentration were fitted by polynomial regression and constrained to pass through zero. Accuracy limited at very low solute concentrations.

MONEY

	•		•				
M,ª	α	β	r²	F	Р	df	
200	1.9	1.8	0.9995	11,106	0.0001	2, 10	
300	1.7	3.3	0.9998	30,243	0.0001	2, 10	
400	1.6	5.0	0.9998	23,495	0.0001	2, 10	
600	1.0	11.4	0.9997	18,279	0.0001	2, 10	
1000	-0.8	31.9	0.9980	1,494	0.0001	2, 6	
1500	-2.9	72.3	0.9986	1,448	0.0001	2, 4	
2000	-5.2	128.1	0.9986	1,391	0.0001	2, 4	
3000	-12.1	328.4	0.9940	334	0.0001	2, 4	
4000	-8.5	435.2	0.9992	2,542	0.0001	2, 4	
6000	-12.1	980.0	0.9990	2,019	0.0001	2, 4	
10000	-37.9	3379.3	0.9947	378	0.0001	2, 4	
SUC⁵	1.7	1.9	0.9997	15,594	0.0001	2, 10	
 KCl⁵	4.1		0.9997	34,021	0.0001	2, 11	

Form: $\Pi = \alpha \cdot C + \beta \cdot C^2$, where Π is osmotic pressure in MPa and C is the molarity.

B. Curves in Figure 2, relating concentration of PEG-6000 ($g \cdot L^{-1}$ solution and $g \cdot kg^{-1} H_2O$) to II (MPa) fitted by polynomial regression as above (same form of equation as A).

Concn.	α	β	r²	F	Р	df
g ⋅ L ^{−1} (molar)	-2.7 × 10 ⁻⁴	1.5 × 10 ^{−5}	0.9985	2260	0.0001	2, 7
g ⋅ kg ^{−1} (molal)	5.1 × 10 ⁻⁵	9.8 × 10 ^{−6}	0.9996	8313	0.0001	2, 7

C. Curves of Figure 3, relating M_r to Π (MPa) fitted by regression.

. . . .

Form: $\Pi = \gamma (\log M_r)^\circ$, where	II is the osmotic pressure ((MPa) and M_r = the average mol wt.
---	------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Concn.	γ	δ	r ²	F	Р	df	
300 g ⋅ L ⁻¹	41.9	-2.4	0.9185	101	0.0001	1, 9	
200 g · L ⁻¹	54.6	-3.4	0.9483	165	0.0001	1, 9	
100 g·L ⁻¹	540.7	-7.1	0.9411	112	0.0001	1, 7	
^a M _r values refer to PEGs.		^b Sucrose (SU	C) and plot for	KCI is linea	$r \ (\beta = 0).$		



Figure 2. Relationship between concentration and osmotic pressure for PEG-6000, molar and molal series. Curves fitted by regression; see Table IIB.

of the helix (unpublished data of GJ Safford discussed in ref. 12). Disorder and binding of water could increase with concentration, depressing the thermodynamic activity of water and increasing the measured II. Steuter *et al.* (20) argued for a micellar or colloidal behavior of PEGs in solution, and a disproportionate effect upon the chemical potential of water due to resulting matric effects. The II measured by vapor pressure deficit osmometry integrates both the dissolved solute and matric components (15, 18), which influence the vapor pressure above the sample. Whether the matric component of II is significant or not, vapor pressure deficit data represent the best available guide that we have to the total osmotic effect of PEGs in solution. PEGs can be used effectively when elevated ionic or metabolizable solutes are undesirable in an experiment.

It should be noted that there is some synergism between ionic components and PEGs when they are combined in solution (8, 12); simple addition of the separate values of Π for the unsupplemented nutrient solution and for the PEG in distilled water may not reflect the absolute Π of the medium. The Π of a complex medium supplemented with PEG can be more than 7% higher than the value predicted by addition of the separate Π so f the different components (12) (NP Money,



Figure 3. Relationship between average M_r and osmotic pressure (II) for three different concentrations of polymer. Sucrose (300 g·L⁻¹ only) shown for reference. Data points derived from curves fitted to measurements of Figure 1, by interpolation and extrapolation. Curves fitted by regression; see Table IIC.

unpublished observations). Therefore, when the value of Π is of critical importance, osmometric determinations should be made upon PEGs in the experimental medium.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank John La Brecque for valuable assistance with the statistical analyses and Frank Harold for helpful discussions.

LITERATURE CITED

- 1. Applegate HG (1960) Freezing-point depressions of Hoagland's 'Carbowax' systems. Nature 186: 232-233
- Ballas N, Zakai N, Loyter A (1987) Transient expression of the plasmid pCaMVCAT in plant protoplasts following transformation with polyethyleneglycol. Exp Cell Res 170: 228-234
- 3. Carpita N, Sabularse D, Montezinos D, Delmer DP (1979) Determination of the pore size of cell walls of living plant cells. Science 205: 1144-1147
- 4. Flory PJ (1953) Principles of Polymer Chemistry. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY

- Franks F (1982) Apparent osmotic activities of water soluble polymers used as cryoprotectants. Cryo-Letters 3: 115-120
- Gerhardt P, Black SH (1961) Permeability of bacterial spores. II. Molecular variables affecting solute permeation. J Bacteriol 82: 750-760
- Keller U, Poschmann S, Krengel U, Kleinkauf H, Kraepelin G (1983) Studies of protoplast fusion in *Streptomyces chryso*mallus. J Gen Microbiol 129: 1725-1731
- Lagerwerff JV, Ogata G, Eagle HE (1961) Control of osmotic pressure of culture solutions with polyethylene glycol. Science 133: 1486–1487
- Lawlor DW (1970) Absorption of polyethylene glycols by plants and their effects on plant growth. New Phytol 69: 501-513
- McClendon JH (1981) The osmotic pressure of concentrated solutions of polyethylene glycol 6000, and its varation with temperature. J Exp Bot 32: 861-866
- Mexal J, Reid CPP (1973) The growth of selected mycorrhizal fungi in response to induced water stress. Can J Bot 51: 1579– 1588
- 12. Michel BE, Kaufmann MR (1973) The osmotic potential of polyethylene glycol 6000. Plant Physiol 51: 914-916
- Money NP, Webster J (1988) Cell wall permeability and its relationship to spore release in Achlya intricata. Exp Mycol 12: 169-179
- 14. Money NP, Webster J (1989) Mechanism of sporangial emptying in *Saprolegnia*. Mycol Res **92**: 45–49
- 15. Nobel PS (1983) Biophysical Plant Physiology and Ecology. WH Freeman, San Francisco, CA, pp. 75–77
- Oertli JJ (1985) The response of plant cells to different forms of moisture stress. J Plant Physiol 121: 295-300
- Oertli JJ (1986) The effect of cell size on cell collapse under negative turgor pressure. J Plant Physiol 124: 365-370
- Passioura JB (1980) The meaning of matric potential. J Exp Bot 31: 1161-1169
- Rogers JA, Tam T (1977) Solution behaviour of polyethylene glycols in water using vapor pressure osmometry. Can J Pharm Sci 12: 65-70
- Steuter AA, Mozafar A, Goodin JR (1981) Water potential of aqueous polyethylene glycol. Plant Physiol 67: 64–67
- Tully M, Gilbert HJ (1985) Transformation of *Rhodosporidium* toruloides. Gene 36: 235–240
- Wescor Instruction Manual (1984) Manual M2010 for Vapor Pressure Osmometer Model 5100C. Wescor, Inc, Logan, UT
- Williams J, Shaykewich CF (1969) An evaluation of polyethylene glycol (P.E.G.) 6000 and P.E.G. 20,000 in the osmotic control of soil water matric potentials. Can J Soil Sci 49: 397– 401
- Zimmerberg J, Parsegian VA (1986) Polymer inaccessible volume changes during opening and closing of a voltage-dependent ionic channel. Nature 323: 36–39
- Zur B (1966) Osmotic control of soil water matric potential. I. Soil-water system. Soil Sci 102: 394–398