Letters to the Editor

Muscle Cross-Bridge Chemistry and Force

The recent article by Baker et al. (1999) presents a thermodynamic formalism that challenges the commonly held assumption that force production by muscle is localized to individual actin-bound myosin molecules. By assuming that the chemical reaction for the force-producing step is close enough to equilibrium to set $\Delta G = 0$, the sum of the chemical and mechanical potentials of the products can be set equal to the sum of the chemical potentials of the reactants. To obtain the chemical potentials, Baker et al. chose the reaction

$$A + M.D.P_i \leftrightarrow A.M.D + P_i \quad (1)$$

in which A is actin, M is a myosin cross-bridge, D is MgADP, and P_i is orthophosphate. Force is produced as $M.D.P_i$ binds A and dissociates P_i. The nature of the mechanical potential, μ_{mech}, is not constrained in their formalism. The standard free energy equation for the near-equilibrium force-generating step is

$$\Delta G^\circ = -RT\ln[A.M.D][P_i]/[M.D.P_i][A] - \mu_{mech}. \quad (2)$$

In contrast, the mechanical potential is constrained in almost all previous molecular level models. The authors note that those models include the assumption that the internal work performed by myosin conformational changes when actin binds is localized to displacements of elastic elements associated with individual myosin cross-bridges (Huxley, 1957; Hill, 1974).

Some critical properties of force production are determined experimentally by measuring cross-bridge orientation and force as a function of $[P_i]$, during isometric contraction of small bundles of skinned skeletal muscle fibers. Force is found to decrease with increasing $[P_i]$, but the distribution of cross-bridge orientations remains constant, within 1% (Baker et al., 1999). The lack of correspondence between force, cross-bridge orientation, and the chemical equilibrium in Eq. 1 leads the authors to propose that those twentieth century models of contraction, which have force production localized to chemical reactions associated with individual cross-bridges, should be abandoned. They suggest that force production is distributed among, not within, the myosin cross-bridges, and they describe several muscle fiber properties in light of that hypothesis. Measurements of force generated in vitro by isolated individual cross-bridges bound to actin (Warrick et al., 1993), which certainly suggest that localized force production is possible, are not addressed.

The thermodynamic formalism and the experiments reported by Baker and colleagues are thought-provoking. The authors identify several existing limitations to a full understanding of force production by skeletal muscle fibers. However, there are two elements contributing to their proposal that force generation is not localized to chemical reactions at individual cross-bridges that are problematic, in my opinion.

The first is that in the models that are being challenged, the conformational changes that make A.M.D a force-producing complex, whatever they are, do not require cross-bridge reorientation. It is true that muscle fiber shortening, with or without work, requires cross-bridge reorientation. But force is generated before cross-bridge reorientation or shortening, due to internal cross-bridge conformational changes caused by actin binding and phosphate dissociation. Force causes reorientation, and the force generated by an individual A.M.D will decrease as reorientation occurs. But in the case of isometric contraction, for the near equilibrium conditions of the Baker et al. formalism, reorientation is restrained. The reported observation, that increasing $[P_i]$ reduces force but does not change the distribution of cross-bridges orientations, is not inconsistent with models currently in use, because without shortening cross-bridge reorientation is not expected.

The second problem is that it is difficult to see how the effect of $[P_i]$ on localized force production by an actin-bound individual cross-bridge, which is usually assigned to A.M.D in the reaction

$$A.M.D.P_i \leftrightarrow A.M.D + P_i \quad (3)$$

can be evaluated when that reaction has not been made explicit in the formalism. The current working hypothesis in the field has $M.D.P_i$ binding A to form an $A.M.D.P_i$ complex. Next, the dissociation of P_i from the complex changes the internal structure of the actin-bound myosin in such a way that A.M.D is generating force (Johnson and Taylor, 1978; Eisenberg and Hill, 1985; Webb et al., 1986). The orientation of A.M.D.P and A.M.D are the same, and remain the same when shortening does not occur. In their formalism (Eq. 2), the authors use the reaction $A + M.D.P_i \leftrightarrow A.M.D + P_i$ (Eq. 1), which has cross-bridge binding to actin, force production and phosphate dissociation occurring as a concerted reaction, without an explicit $A.M.D.P_i$ intermediate. Such a concerted reaction may be force-generating (Kawai and Halvorson, 1991; Brust-Mascher et al., 1999). However, if the $[P_i]$-dependent step that produces the actin-bound force-generating intermediate is

Received for publication 3 March 2000 and in final form 3 May 2000.

Address reprint requests to Dr. Stefan Highsmith, University of the Pacific, Department of Biochemistry, 2155 Webster Street, San Francisco, CA 94115-2399. Tel.: 415-929-6670; Fax: 415-929-6654; E-mail: shighsmith@uop.edu.

0006-3495/00/09/1686/02 $2.00

left out the reaction scheme, the authors cannot reasonably use the scheme to test for the validity of force generation localized to actin-bound cross-bridges by varying [P_i].

On the other hand, if the more traditional reaction in Eq. 3 replaces the concerted reaction in Eq. 1 as the reaction that is taken to be near equilibrium, then the change in force observed by Baker and his colleagues is tightly coupled to the action of P_i localized to individual cross-bridges. The decrease in force with increasing [P_i] is then due to P_i binding to A.M.D. This increases [A.M.D.P_i], which is not generating force, at the expense of [A.M.D], which is. This redistribution of force-producing cross-bridge states does not require a redistribution of cross-bridge orientations. The binding of P_i also reduces the affinity of a cross-bridge for actin, which will reduce the number bound. Cross-bridges dissociated by ATP binding to A.M certainly change orientation as they go through the hydrolytic cycle. To what degree the P_i-induced increase in [A.M.D.P], which is in rapid equilibrium with an increased [M.D.P], will contribute to changes in orientation is not as clear. What is important is that when the intermediate A.M.D.P is included in the reaction, force production remains localized at the individual cross-bridges and dependent on [P_i], in which case the reported measurements actually confirm the assumption that force and chemistry are localized to the actin-bound cross-bridge.

Supported by National Institutes of Health grant AR42895.

REFERENCES

Baker, J. E., L. E. W. LaConte, I. Brust-Mascher, and D. D. Thomas. 1999. Mechanochemical coupling in spin-labeled, active, isometric muscle. *Biophys. J.* 77:2657–2664.

Brust-Mascher, I., L. E. W. LaConte, J. E. Baker, and D. D. Thomas. 1999. Myosin light chain domain rotates upon muscle activation but not ATP hydrolysis. *Biochemistry.* 38:12607–12613.

Eisenberg, E., and T. L. Hill. 1985. Muscle contraction and free energy transduction in biological systems. *Science.* 227:999–1006.

Hill, T. L. 1974. Theoretical formalism for the sliding filament model of contraction of striated muscle. Part 1. *Prog. Biophys. Mol. Biol.* 28: 267–340.

Huxley, A. F. 1957. Muscle structure and theories of contraction. *Prog. Biophys.* 7:255–317.

Johnson, K. A., and E. W. Taylor. 1978. Intermediate states of subfragment 1 and actosubfragment 1 ATPase: reevaluation of the mechanism. *Biochemistry.* 17:3432–3442.

Kawai, M., and H. R. Halvorson. 1991. Two step mechanism of phosphate release and the mechanism of force generation in chemically skinned fibers of rabbit psoas muscle. *Biophys. J.* 59:329–342.

Warrick, H. M., R. M. Simmons, J. T. Finer, T. Q. P. Uyeda, S. Chu, and J. A. Spudich. 1993. In vitro methods for measuring force and velocity of the actin-myosin interaction using purified proteins. *Methods Cell Biol.* 39:1–21.

Webb, M. R., M. G. Hibberd, Y. E. Goldman, and D. R. Trentham. 1986. Oxygen exchange between Pi in the medium and water during ATP hydrolysis mediated by skinned fibers from rabbit skeletal muscle. Evidence for Pi binding to a force generating state. *J. Biol. Chem.* 261:15557–15564.

Stefan Highsmith

Department of Biochemistry
University of the Pacific School of Dentistry
San Francisco, CA 94115

Muscle Chemistry and Force

In a recent article (Baker et al., 1999), we reported that the distribution of myosin orientational and biochemical states is independent of P_i-induced changes in the force of fully activated isometric muscle, despite observations that this distribution does vary with calcium-induced changes in the force of partially activated isometric muscle (Ostap et al., 1995; Baker et al., 1998; Brust-Mascher et al., 1999). We then showed that a simple chemical thermodynamic analysis directly explains these data and challenges the independent force generator model of muscle contraction. In his Letter to the Editor of the *Biophysical Journal*, Highsmith (2000) presents an accurate summary of our article followed by an intriguing and testable alternative interpretation of our data. Specifically, Highsmith proposes that the independent force generator model might still be consistent with our data, if changes in muscle force were localized to internal conformational/biochemical changes of actin-attached myosin cross-bridges and if global rotations of myosin cross-bridges only occurred when muscle is allowed to shorten. Highsmith does not specify the nature of the internal myosin conformational change that he believes is responsible for a P_i-induced decline in muscle force. What our data require (Baker et al., 1999) is that Highsmith's proposed conformational change is not detected in our electron paramagnetic resonance (EPR) studies and is distinct from the myosin conformational changes correlated with force generation upon muscle activation, i.e., disorder-to-order in the myosin catalytic domain and a distinct rotation of the myosin light-chain domain (Ostap et al., 1995; Baker et al., 1998; Brust-Mascher et al., 1999). Although the mechanism proposed by Highsmith is feasible, interesting, and important to consider, it has not been incorporated into the independent force generator formalism (Huxley, 1957; T. L. Hill, 1974) and tested against our data; thus, it does not constitute

Received for publication 27 March 2000 and in final form 26 May 2000.
Address reprint requests to Josh E. Baker, Department of Molecular Physiology and Biophysics, University of Vermont College of Medicine, Given Building, Burlington, VT 05405-0068. Tel.: 802-656-3820; Fax: 802-656-0747; E-mail: jbaker@salus.med.uvm.edu.

0006-3495/00/09/1687/02 $2.00

an alternative to our model, nor does it formally refute our conclusions.

Highsmith further suggests that the independent force generator model might be able to explain our data if the ternary complex, A.M.D.P_i, were explicitly included in our reaction scheme. Specifically, Highsmith suggests that an increase in [P_i] would shift the distribution of myosin heads from A.M.D to A.M.D.P_i, and this shift might not be detected in our experiments. However, if the M.D.P_i to A.M.D.P_i transition is reversible, mass action would further shift myosin heads from the A.M.D.P_i to the M.D.P_i state, and this shift would be detected in our experiments (Ostap et al., 1995). Much work supports the hypothesis that transitions among all weak-binding states are reversible (Eisenberg and Hill, 1985), and in the model proposed by Highsmith, M.D.P_i and A.M.D.P_i are both weak-binding (non-force-producing) states. If the transitions among the M.D.P_i, A.M.D.P_i, and A.M.D states are near equilibrium, the chemical potential of the A.M.D.P_i state cancels out of the free energy equation (Eq. 2 in Baker et al., 1999), and Eq. 2 applies regardless of whether the A.M.D.P_i state is explicitly included in the reaction scheme.

EPR of spin-labeled myosin in muscle has revealed an unexpected correlation between active, isometric muscle force and myosin biochemistry (Baker et al., 1999). We have modeled these data by applying basic chemical principles to a well-defined rotating cross-bridge mechanism (Baker et al., 1999), and we have shown that this formal model accurately describes steady-state muscle mechanics, energetics, and biochemistry (Baker, 1999). Until Highsmith's proposal can be developed into an equally self-consistent independent force generator model, we maintain that our data challenge the assumption of independent force generators in muscle. Though this conclusion may be controversial, it is certainly not new; others before us (Leibler and Huse, 1993; Jülicher and Prost, 1995; Vilfan et al., 1998) have suggested that cooperative interactions among cross-bridges in muscle might be considered. Moreover, our model is consistent with the classic muscle model of A. V. Hill (1938) in which he described mechanochemical coupling at the level of the macroscopic muscle system, not at the level of the individual molecules in that system. As discussed in our paper, our data imply that the chemical energy available for work by muscle, RTln([A.M.D]/[M.D.P_i]), is proportional to the macroscopic muscle force (Eq. 4 in Baker et al., 1999). In fact, we have shown (Baker, 1999) that A. V. Hill's energy equation and force-velocity relationship (A. V. Hill, 1938) can be directly obtained from Eq. 4 in Baker et al. (1999). In essence, a simple chemical thermodynamic analysis of our EPR data provides a molecular basis for A. V. Hill's model.

REFERENCES

Baker, J. E. 1999. Mechanochemical coupling in muscle: determining the relationship between myosin biochemistry, myosin structure, and muscle force. Ph.D. thesis, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. 55–91.

Baker, J. E., I. Brust-Mascher, S. Ramachandran, L. E. W. LaConte, and D. D. Thomas. 1998. A large and distinct rotation of the myosin light chain domain occurs upon muscle contraction. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA.* 95:2944–2949.

Baker, J. E., L. E. W. LaConte, I. Brust-Mascher, and D. D. Thomas. 1999. Mechanochemical coupling in spin-labeled, active, isometric muscle. *Biophys. J.* 77:2657–2664.

Brust-Mascher, I., L. E. W. LaConte, J. E. Baker, and D. D. Thomas. 1999. Myosin light-chain domain rotates upon muscle activation but not ATP hydrolysis. *Biochemistry.* 38:12607–12613.

Eisenberg, E., and T. L. Hill. 1985. Muscle contraction and free energy transduction in biological systems. *Science* 227:999–1006.

Highsmith, S. 2000. *Biophys. J.* 79:99049.

Hill, A. V. 1938. The heat of shortening and the dynamic constants of muscle. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B (Biol. Sci.)* 126:136.

Hill, T. L. 1974. Theoretical formalism for the sliding filament model of contraction of striated muscle. Part I. *Prog. Biophys. Mol. Biol.* 28: 267–340.

Huxley, A. F. 1957. Muscle structure and theories of contraction. *Prog. Biophys.* 7:255–317.

Jülicher, F., and J. Prost. 1995. Cooperative molecular motors. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 75:2618–2621.

Leibler, S., and D. A. Huse. 1993. Porters versus rowers: a unified stochastic model of motor proteins. *J. Cell Biol.* 121:1357–1368.

Ostap, E. M., V. A. Barnett, and D. D. Thomas. 1995. Resolution of three structural states of spin-labeled myosin in contracting muscle. *Biophys. J.* 69:177–188.

Vilfan, A., E. Frey, and F. Schwabl. 1998. Elastically coupled molecular motors. *Eur. Phys. J. B.* 3:535–546.

Josh E. Baker

Department of Molecular Physiology and Biophysics
University of Vermont
Burlington, VT 05405

Leslie E. W. LaConte

David D. Thomas

Department of Biochemistry
University of Minnesota Medical School
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Ingrid Brust-Mascher

Division of Biological Sciences, Molecular and Cellular Biology
University of California, Davis, CA 95616