

# Effect of Photosynthetic Inhibitors and Uncouplers of Oxidative Phosphorylation on Nitrate and Nitrite Reduction in Barley Leaves<sup>1</sup>

Received for publication June 1, 1982 and in revised form September 8, 1982

NOAH BEN-SHALOM, RAY C. HUFFAKER, AND LAWRENCE RAPPAPORT

*Department of Vegetable Crops (N. B.-S., L. R.), Plant Growth Laboratory (R. C. H.), and Department of Agronomy and Range Science (R. C. H.), University of California, Davis, California 95616*

## ABSTRACT

The effects of several photosynthetic inhibitors and uncouplers of oxidative phosphorylation on  $\text{NO}_3^-$  and  $\text{NO}_2^-$  assimilation were studied using detached barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L. cv Numar) leaves in which only endogenous  $\text{NO}_3^-$  or  $\text{NO}_2^-$  were available for reduction. Uncouplers of oxidative phosphorylation greatly increased  $\text{NO}_3^-$  reduction in both light and darkness, while photosynthetic inhibitors did not.

The  $\text{NO}_2^-$  concentration in the control leaves was very low in both light and darkness; 98% or more of the  $\text{NO}_2^-$  formed from  $\text{NO}_3^-$  was further assimilated in control leaves. More  $\text{NO}_2^-$  accumulated in the leaves in light and darkness in the presence of photosynthetic inhibitors. Of this  $\text{NO}_2^-$ , 94% or more was further assimilated. It appears that metabolites, either external or internal to the chloroplast, capable of reducing NADP (which, in turn, could reduce ferredoxin via NADP reductase) might support  $\text{NO}_2^-$  reduction in darkness and light when photosynthetic electron flow is inhibited by photosynthetic inhibitors.

Nitrite assimilation was much more sensitive to uncouplers in darkness than in light: in darkness, 74% or more of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  formed from  $\text{NO}_3^-$  was further assimilated, whereas in light, 95% or more of the  $\text{NO}_2^-$  was further assimilated.

An increase in the internal concentration of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  in leaves in light has been used to assess the effects of herbicides on inhibition of chloroplastic reactions (5, 8–11), since  $\text{NO}_2^-$  assimilation occurs in the chloroplast (4, 12, 14, 15, 17, 20) and can utilize photosynthetically derived electrons (12, 14, 15). A determination of the accumulation of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  in the substrate medium (5) or in the plant tissues (11) measures only the concentration of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  pools and tells nothing of pool turnover. Information regarding the effect of inhibitors of photosynthetic electron flow on the magnitude of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  assimilation is therefore lacking.

It has been hypothesized that uncoupling agents (e.g. DNP<sup>2</sup>) increase  $\text{NO}_3^-$  reduction (5, 11). The basis for this was that in darkness leaf  $\text{NO}_2^-$  accumulated to a greater extent in treatments containing DNP (11). It was assumed that  $\text{NO}_2^-$  was not reduced in darkness, so  $\text{NO}_3^-$  reduction must have increased. Recently, we

showed that both  $\text{NO}_3^-$  (1, 7) and  $\text{NO}_2^-$  (1) are reduced in darkness, so an accumulation of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  in DNP-treated tissues in darkness is difficult to interpret if the rate of further  $\text{NO}_2^-$  reduction is not known.

Presumably, for  $\text{NO}_2^-$  reduction to occur in darkness, carbohydrates supply the necessary electrons to Fd via NADP reductase (2, 12). The same process may occur in light to facilitate  $\text{NO}_2^-$  reduction when the photosynthetic electron flow has been inhibited by Atrazine or DCMU, until carbohydrates become rate-limiting. This possibility further reinforces the need for a better understanding of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  assimilation in the presence of photosynthetic inhibitors. This report shows the effects of several photosynthetic inhibitors and uncoupling agents on  $\text{NO}_3^-$  and  $\text{NO}_2^-$  reduction in light and darkness.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L. cv Numar) was grown for 7 d in a growth chamber (16-h day, 8-h night, 400  $\mu\text{E}/\text{m}^2 \cdot \text{s}$ , 25°C) in half-strength Hoagland solution.

Leaves (6-cm long) were cut from the seedlings and floated in Petri dishes on 12 ml of treatment solution in darkness for 20 min. The aqueous treatment solutions all contained 1% ethanol, 0.3% Triton X-100, and herbicides. The concentrations of inhibitors used were as follows: DNP, 0.5 mM; DNBP, 0.5 mM; CCCP, 0.1 mM; Atrazine, 0.5 mM; DCMU, 0.2 mM. The control solutions contained all ingredients except the herbicides. After treatment, the leaves were wiped, weighed, and placed in Petri dishes (9 cm in diameter) with a moist cotton swab for 2 h according to the method of Klepper (11).

Next, the leaves were homogenized in 7 ml water and centrifuged at 30,000g for 15 min. A sample of the supernatant was used to assay for  $\text{NO}_3^-$  and  $\text{NO}_2^-$ . Nitrate reduction was determined as the amount of  $\text{NO}_3^-$  disappearing from the leaves with time. Nitrite assimilation was determined by subtracting the amount of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  in the leaves from the amount of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  calculated to have been produced from  $\text{NO}_3^-$  reduction. Reduction of both  $\text{NO}_3^-$  and  $\text{NO}_2^-$  was assumed as they disappeared from the leaves during the course of the experiment. We previously showed that  $^{15}\text{NO}_2^-$  taken up by detached barley leaves in light or darkness was stoichiometrically converted to reduced products (1).

Each experiment was repeated three times, and each treatment was replicated three times. The data reported are the averages of the triplicated treatments from one representative experiment. Nitrate was determined by separation on an anion exchange column by HPLC (19). Nitrite was assayed as described by Schrader *et al.* (18).

<sup>1</sup> Supported partially by Environmental Protection Agency grant No. R806435010 (to L. R.)

<sup>2</sup> Abbreviations: DNP, dinitrophenol; Atrazine, 2-chloro-4-ethylamino-6-isopropylamine-1-triazine; DNBP, 2-*sec*-butyl-4,6-dinitrophenol; DCMU, 3-(3',4'-dichlorophenyl)-1,1-dimethylurea; CCCP, carbonyl cyanide-*m*-chlorophenylhydrazone.

Table I. Effect of Atrazine (0.5 mM) and DNP (0.5 mM) on  $\text{NO}_3^-$  and  $\text{NO}_2^-$  Assimilation in Light and Darkness

	$\text{NO}_3^-$ in Leaves		$\text{NO}_3^-$ Reduced <sup>a</sup>		$\text{NO}_2^-$ in Leaves		$\text{NO}_2^-$ Reduced <sup>b, c</sup>	
	$\mu\text{mol/g} \cdot 2 \text{ h}$		%		$\mu\text{mol/g} \cdot 2 \text{ h}$		%	
<b>A. Light</b>								
Control	30.7 ± 4.5	NS	— <sup>d</sup>	— <sup>d</sup>	0.06 ± 0.01	— <sup>d</sup>	— <sup>d</sup>	— <sup>d</sup>
Atrazine	31.1 ± 3.3	NS	— <sup>d</sup>	— <sup>d</sup>	0.19 ± 0.02	— <sup>d</sup>	— <sup>d</sup>	— <sup>d</sup>
DNP	21.1 ± 1.0	12.7	38	38	0.18 ± 0.01	12.6	38	99
DNP + Atrazine	22.7 ± 4.1	11.1	32	32	1.17 ± 0.10	10.0	32	90
	$\text{NO}_3^-$ at $t_0$ , 33.8 ± 2.8				$\text{NO}_2^-$ at $t_0$ , 0.06 ± 0.01			
<b>B. Darkness</b>								
Control	34.6 ± 2.2	2.7	7	7	0.07 ± 0.01	2.7	7	100
Atrazine	34.8 ± 1.4	2.5	7	7	0.17 ± 0.03	2.4	7	94
DNP	26.9 ± 4.2	10.4	28	28	2.62 ± 0.19	7.8	28	75
DNP + Atrazine	27.3 ± 1.8	10.0	27	27	2.66 ± 0.17	7.4	27	74
	$\text{NO}_3^-$ at $t_0$ 37.3 ± 1.4				$\text{NO}_2^-$ at $t_0$ 0.06 ± 0.01			

<sup>a</sup>  $\text{NO}_3^-$  reduced =  $\text{NO}_3^-$  at  $t_0$  -  $\text{NO}_3^-$  at  $t_{2h}$ .<sup>b</sup>  $\text{NO}_2^-$  reduced =  $\text{NO}_3^-$  reduced +  $\text{NO}_2^-$  at  $t_0$  -  $\text{NO}_2^-$  at  $t_{2h}$ .<sup>c</sup> %  $\text{NO}_2^-$  reduced =  $\text{NO}_2^-$  reduced (100)/ $\text{NO}_3^-$  reduced +  $\text{NO}_2^-$  at  $t_0$ .<sup>d</sup> Calculated only when significant  $\text{NO}_3^-$  reduction occurred.Table II. Effect of Atrazine (0.5 mM) and DNBP (0.5 mM) on  $\text{NO}_3^-$  and  $\text{NO}_2^-$  Assimilation in Light and Darkness

	$\text{NO}_3^-$ in Leaves		$\text{NO}_3^-$ Reduced <sup>a</sup>		$\text{NO}_2^-$ in Leaves		$\text{NO}_2^-$ Reduced <sup>b, c</sup>	
	$\mu\text{mol/g} \cdot 2 \text{ hr}$		%		$\mu\text{mol/g} \cdot 2 \text{ h}$		%	
<b>A. Light</b>								
Control	26.3 ± 0.8	4.1	13	13	0.05 ± 0.01	4.1	13	100
Atrazine	26.7 ± 1.3	3.7	12	12	0.19 ± 0.01	3.6	12	96
DNBP	17.4 ± 1.0	13.0	43	43	0.78 ± 0.05	12.3	43	94
DNBP + Atrazine	18.1 ± 1.1	12.3	40	40	2.90 ± 0.25	9.5	40	77
	$\text{NO}_3^-$ at $t_0$ , 30.4 ± 1.1				$\text{NO}_2^-$ at $t_0$ , 0.05 ± 0.01			
<b>B. Darkness</b>								
Control	34.2 ± 1.3	3.6	10	10	0.07 ± 0.01	3.6	10	98
Atrazine	33.1 ± 3.2	4.7	12	12	0.15 ± 0.01	4.6	12	97
DNBP	28.0 ± 2.5	9.8	26	26	2.30 ± 0.10	7.6	26	77
DNBP + Atrazine	28.7 ± 2.5	9.1	24	24	2.35 ± 0.21	6.8	24	74
	$\text{NO}_3^-$ at $t_0$ 37.8 ± 1.8				$\text{NO}_2^-$ at $t_0$ , 0.06 ± 0.01			

<sup>a</sup>  $\text{NO}_3^-$  reduced =  $\text{NO}_3^-$  at  $t_0$  -  $\text{NO}_3^-$  at  $t_{2h}$ .<sup>b</sup>  $\text{NO}_2^-$  reduced =  $\text{NO}_3^-$  reduced +  $\text{NO}_2^-$  at  $t_0$  -  $\text{NO}_2^-$  at  $t_{2h}$ .<sup>c</sup> %  $\text{NO}_2^-$  reduced =  $\text{NO}_2^-$  reduced (100)/ $\text{NO}_3^-$  reduced +  $\text{NO}_2^-$  at  $t_0$ .

## RESULTS

Nitrate reduction was greatly increased by DNP (Tables I and IV), DNBP (Table II), and CCCP (Table III). In contrast, Atrazine (Tables I, II, and III) and DCMU (Table IV), alone or when combined with uncouplers, had no effect on  $\text{NO}_3^-$  assimilation in light or darkness. Nitrite accumulated in light was about 2.5 to 3 times higher in plants in the presence of DNP than in controls (Tables I, A and IV, A), 15 times higher in DNBP (Table II, A), and about 3 times higher in CCCP (Table III). Even so, 94 to 99% of the  $\text{NO}_2^-$  formed in the presence of those inhibitors was further assimilated.

Nitrite concentration also greatly increased in darkness in the presence of the uncouplers. Nitrite increased 37 times in plants in the presence of DNP compared with controls (Tables I, B and IV, B), 33 times in DNBP (Table II, B), and 22 times in CCCP (Table III, B). Nevertheless, 72 to 83% of the  $\text{NO}_2^-$  formed in the presence of the uncouplers was further assimilated.

Atrazine and DCMU increased the  $\text{NO}_2^-$  concentration in the leaves in light about the same amount as did DNP (Tables I, A

and IV, A) and CCCP (Table III, A). When  $\text{NO}_3^-$  assimilation in light was at a detectable level, 96% (Table II, A) and 97% (Table III, A) of the  $\text{NO}_2^-$  formed was further assimilated in the presence of Atrazine. The further assimilation of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  was calculated only when  $\text{NO}_3^-$  reduction was significant.

Atrazine (Tables I, B; II, B; and III, B) and DCMU (Table IV, B) also increased  $\text{NO}_2^-$  concentration in darkness to almost the same extent that they did in light. Nevertheless, 94 to 97% of the  $\text{NO}_2^-$  formed was further assimilated in their presence.

Similar to Klepper's results (11), leaf  $\text{NO}_2^-$  concentration was greatly increased in light when Atrazine (Tables I, A; II, A; and III, A) or DCMU (Table IV, A) were present along with the uncouplers. Still, 90% of the  $\text{NO}_2^-$  formed was further assimilated in the presence of combined Atrazine and DNP (Table I), 77% in the presence of combined Atrazine and DNBP (Table II, A), 91% in the presence of Atrazine and CCCP (Table III, A), and 92% in the presence of combined DCMU and DNP (Table IV, A).

In light, the effect of an uncoupler on  $\text{NO}_2^-$  accumulation in the presence of Atrazine or DCMU was much more than additive; however, in darkness, the presence of either Atrazine or DCMU

Table III. Effect of CCCP (0.1 mM) and Atrazine (0.5 mM) on NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> Assimilation in Light and Darkness

	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> in Leaves	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> Reduced <sup>a</sup>		NO <sub>2</sub> <sup>-</sup> in Leaves	NO <sub>2</sub> <sup>-</sup> Reduced <sup>b, c</sup>	
	μmol/g·2 h		%	μmol/g·2 h		%
<b>A. Light</b>						
Control	27.4 ± 0.8	3.0	10	0.05 ± 0.01	3.0	100
Atrazine	26.7 ± 1.3	3.7	12	0.13 ± 0.01	3.6	97
CCCP	21.5 ± 1.1	8.9	29	0.15 ± 0.01	8.8	98
CCCP + Atrazine	21.3 ± 1.2	9.1	30	0.90 ± 0.03	8.3	91
	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> at t <sub>0</sub> , 30.4 ± 1.8			NO <sub>2</sub> <sup>-</sup> at t <sub>0</sub> , 0.05 ± 0.01		
<b>B. Darkness</b>						
Control	35.3 ± 1.3	2.5	7	0.07 ± 0.01	2.5	100
Atrazine	35.1 ± 4.2	NS	— <sup>d</sup>	0.15 ± 0.01	— <sup>d</sup>	— <sup>d</sup>
CCCP	29.0 ± 3.2	8.8	23	1.55 ± 0.21	7.3	83
CCCP + Atrazine	28.8 ± 3.0	9.0	25	1.63 ± 0.15	7.4	82
	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> at t <sub>0</sub> , 37.8 ± 1.2			NO <sub>2</sub> <sup>-</sup> at t <sub>0</sub> , 0.06 ± 0.01		

<sup>a</sup> NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> reduced = NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> at t<sub>0</sub> - NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> at t<sub>2h</sub>.<sup>b</sup> NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> reduced = NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> reduced + NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> at t<sub>0</sub> - NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> at t<sub>2h</sub>.<sup>c</sup> % NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> reduced = NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> reduced (100)/NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> reduced + NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> at t<sub>0</sub>.<sup>d</sup> Calculated only when significant NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> reduction occurred.Table IV. Effect of DCMU (0.1 mM) + DNP (0.5 mM) on NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> Assimilation in Light and Darkness

	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> in Leaves	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> Reduced <sup>a</sup>		NO <sub>2</sub> <sup>-</sup> in Leaves	NO <sub>2</sub> <sup>-</sup> Reduced <sup>b, c</sup>	
	μmol/g·2 h		%	μmol/g·2 h		%
<b>A. Light</b>						
Control	28.3 ± 3.2	3.7	12	0.07 ± 0.01	3.7	100
DCMU	29.7 ± 3.0	NS	— <sup>d</sup>	0.16 ± 0.02	— <sup>d</sup>	— <sup>d</sup>
DNP	19.5 ± 2.1	12.5	39	0.17 ± 0.01	12.4	99
DNP + DCMU	19.3 ± 1.8	12.7	40	0.97 ± 0.09	11.8	92
	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> at t <sub>0</sub> , 32.0 ± 2.1			NO <sub>2</sub> <sup>-</sup> at t <sub>0</sub> , 0.07 ± 0.01		
<b>B. Darkness</b>						
Control	32.7 ± 3.6	2.6	7	0.07 ± 0.01	2.6	100
DCMU	32.7 ± 2.4	2.8	7	0.15 ± 0.01	2.5	94
DNP	26.3 ± 2.1	9.0	25	2.58 ± 0.27	6.5	72
DCMU + DNP	25.6 ± 3.1	9.7	27	2.67 ± 0.29	7.1	73
	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> at t <sub>0</sub> , 35.3 ± 2.4			NO <sub>2</sub> <sup>-</sup> at t <sub>0</sub> , 0.07 ± 0.01		

<sup>a</sup> NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> reduced = NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> at t<sub>0</sub> - NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> at t<sub>2h</sub>.<sup>b</sup> NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> reduced = NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> reduced + NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> at t<sub>0</sub> - NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> at t<sub>2h</sub>.<sup>c</sup> % NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> reduced = NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> reduced (100)/NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> reduced + NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> at t<sub>0</sub>.<sup>d</sup> Calculated only when significant NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> reduction occurred.

with an uncoupler had no further effect on NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> accumulation above that of the uncoupler alone (Tables I, B; II, B; III, B; and IV, B).

## DISCUSSION

These results show that simply following the appearance of NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> in leaf tissue tells little about how inhibitors affect the magnitudes of NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> assimilation. By itself, a NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> determination shows pool size at the time of measurement without providing any information concerning pool turnover. An example of this limitation is found in a comparison of leaf NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> concentration and turnover of the NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> pool in the presence of inhibitors. Although leaf NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> concentrations in light were almost identical for Atrazine, DCMU, and DNP treatments, 12% or less of the available NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> moved through the NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> pool in the presence of Atrazine or DCMU, whereas 36 to 39% of the available NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> moved through the NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> pool in the presence of DNP (Tables I, A and IV, A). In each of these treatments, over 99% of the NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup>

formed was further assimilated. The amount of NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> accumulating in the leaves due to the inhibitor treatments was very similar to that reported earlier by Klepper (11).

**NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> Assimilation in Light and Darkness.** The results corroborate our previous studies (1, 7) showing that NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> are assimilated both in light and darkness. Since nitrate reductase (NR) is apparently in the cytoplasm (4, 17, 20), reactions producing NADH would support NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> reduction, e.g. glycolysis in either light or darkness. Kow *et al.* (12) showed recently that metabolites external to isolated chloroplast particles in darkness generated NADPH and subsequently reduced Fd (via NADP reductase [2]). Fd then reduced NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> to NH<sub>3</sub> stoichiometrically. Thus, NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> respiration could function in darkness in the chloroplast. Metabolites internal to the chloroplasts could also support NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> respiration via the oxidative pentose-P cycle or the glycolytic pathway between starch and PGA (12). In contrast, Canvin and Atkins (3) and Reed and Canvin (16) reported that NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and NO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup> reduction occurs only in light in barley leaves and wheat

protoplasts.

**Effect of Inhibitors on  $\text{NO}_3^-$  Assimilation.** Atrazine and DCMU had no short-term effect on  $\text{NO}_3^-$  assimilation either alone or when combined with uncouplers. On the other hand, DNP, DNBP, and CCCP greatly increased  $\text{NO}_3^-$  assimilation in both light and darkness. The uncouplers might have enhanced NADH production and hence accelerated  $\text{NO}_3^-$  reduction, or possibly made more  $\text{NO}_3^-$  available to the metabolic pool from a major storage pool (e.g. the vacuole). The vacuole has been identified as a major storage pool for  $\text{NO}_3^-$  in barley leaves (6, 13). The uncouplers might act by making the tonoplast less capable of retaining the highly mobile  $\text{NO}_3^-$ .

**$\text{NO}_2^-$  Assimilation in the Presence of Atrazine and DCMU.** Both inhibitors increased the leaf  $\text{NO}_2^-$  in light to a concentration about 3 times greater than that found in the control leaves. The levels of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  found were similar to those reported by Klepper (11). If metabolites, either external or internal to the chloroplast, can supply electrons for reduction of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  in darkness, it seems reasonable to expect that they could also supply electrons in light if photosynthetic electron flow were inhibited. This appeared to be the case; although internal  $\text{NO}_2^-$  increased in the presence of Atrazine or DCMU in light, more than 96% of the  $\text{NO}_2^-$  formed was further metabolized.

The  $\text{NO}_2^-$  accumulation in darkness may be due to an inhibition by Atrazine or DCMU of some of the processes required for reduction of  $\text{NO}_2^-$ , e.g. transport of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  into the chloroplast, transport of metabolites supplying electrons into the chloroplast, or pathways producing reduced Fd.

**Effect of Uncouplers on  $\text{NO}_2^-$  Assimilation.** Inasmuch as more  $\text{NO}_3^-$  was reduced in the presence of uncouplers in light or darkness, higher pool levels of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  might be expected. In light,  $\text{NO}_2^-$  accumulation increased about 3 times, and more than 94% of the  $\text{NO}_2^-$  formed was further metabolized. In darkness,  $\text{NO}_2^-$  accumulation increased from 22 to 37 times in the presence of uncouplers, and 72 to 83% of the  $\text{NO}_2^-$  formed was further assimilated. Apparently, the uncouplers inhibited the processes required for dark reduction of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  much more than those required for  $\text{NO}_2^-$  assimilation in light.

**Effect of Combined Uncouplers and Photosynthetic Inhibitors on  $\text{NO}_2^-$  Assimilation.** A suitable explanation for the synergistic effect of the uncouplers and Atrazine or DCMU, increasing the internal leaf concentration of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  in light, is not obvious. This interaction did not occur in darkness, in which the major effect was attributed to the uncouplers. The presence of Atrazine or DCMU with an uncoupler in light did not increase the reduction of  $\text{NO}_3^-$  over that of the uncoupler alone. Therefore, the synergistic effect seemed to be manifested only on inhibition of the assimilation of  $\text{NO}_2^-$ . Again, the effect might be on  $\text{NO}_2^-$  transport or metabolites into the chloroplast or on the production of reduced Fd within the chloroplast. Even so, 72% or more of the  $\text{NO}_2^-$

formed was further assimilated.

Uncouplers of oxidative phosphorylation greatly increased  $\text{NO}_3^-$  reduction in both light and darkness, whereas photosynthetic inhibitors had no short-term effect on  $\text{NO}_3^-$  reduction. Nitrite assimilation occurred in light and darkness in the absence or presence of uncouplers or photosynthetic inhibitors, although  $\text{NO}_2^-$  in leaves was higher in the inhibitor treatments than in the controls. The detected accumulation of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  may have been due to a somewhat slower rate of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  reduction if metabolites, either external or internal to the chloroplasts, supply the necessary electrons rather than photosynthetic electron flow.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- ASLAM M, RC HUFFAKER, DW RAINS, KP RAO 1979 Influence of light and ambient carbon dioxide concentration on nitrate assimilation by intact barley seedlings. *Plant Physiol* 63: 1205-1209
- BOGER P 1979 Transhydrogenase. In M Gibbs, E Latzko, eds. *Photosynthetic Carbon Metabolism and Related Processes*. Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, pp 399-409
- CANVIN DT, CA ATKINS 1974 Nitrate, nitrite and ammonia assimilation: effect of light, carbon dioxide and oxygen. *Planta* 116: 207-224
- DALLING MJ, NE TOLBERT, RH HAGEMAN 1972 Intercellular location of nitrate reductase and nitrite reductase. I. Spinach and tobacco leaves. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 283: 505-512
- FINKE RL, RL WARNER, JJ MUZID 1977 Effect of herbicides in *in vivo* nitrate and nitrite reduction. *Weed Sci* 23: 18-22
- GRANSTEDT RC, RC HUFFAKER 1982 Identification of the leaf vacuole as a major nitrate storage pool. *Plant Physiol* 70: 410-413
- HALLMARK, WB, RC HUFFAKER 1978 The influence of ambient nitrate, temperature, and light on nitrate assimilation in Sudangrass seedlings. *Physiol Plant* 44: 147-152
- KLEPPER LA 1974 A mode of action of herbicides: inhibition of the normal process of nitrite reduction. *Neb Res Bull* 259
- KLEPPER LA 1975 Inhibition of nitrite reduction by photosynthetic inhibitors. *Weed Sci* 23: 188-190
- KLEPPER LA 1976 Nitrite accumulation within herbicide-treated leaves. *Weed Sci* 23: 533-535
- KLEPPER LA 1979 Effects of certain herbicides and their combinations on nitrate and nitrite reduction. *Plant Physiol* 64: 273-275
- KOW YW, DL ERBES, M GIBBS 1982 Chloroplast respiration. A means of supplying oxidized pyridine nucleotide for dark chloroplastic metabolism. *Plant Physiol* 69: 442-447
- MARTINOIA E, U HECK, A WIEMKEN 1981 Vacuoles as storage compartments for nitrate in barley leaves. *Nature* 289: 293
- MIFLIN BJ 1974 Nitrite reduction in leaves: studies on isolated chloroplasts. *Planta* 116: 187-196
- NEYRA CA, RH HAGEMAN 1974 Dependence of nitrite reduction on electron transport in chloroplasts. *Plant Physiol* 54: 480-483
- REED AJ, DT CANVIN 1982 Light and dark controls of nitrate reduction in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) protoplasts. *Plant Physiol* 69: 508-513
- RITENOUR GL, KW JOY, JJ BUNNING, RH HAGEMAN 1967 Ultracellular location of nitrate reductase, nitrite reductase and glutamic dehydrogenase in green leaf tissue. *Plant Physiol* 42: 233-237
- SCHRADER LE, GL RITENOUR, GL EILRICH, RH HAGEMAN 1968 Some characteristics of nitrate reductase from higher plants. *Plant Physiol* 43: 930-940
- THAYER JR, RC HUFFAKER 1980 Determination of nitrate and nitrite by high-pressure liquid chromatography: comparison with other methods for nitrate determination. *Anal Biochem* 102: 110-119
- WALLSGROVE RM, PJ LEA, BJ MIFLIN 1979 Distribution of enzymes of nitrogen assimilation within the pea leaf cell. *Plant Physiol* 63: 232-236