Sorption of Aluminum to Plasma Membrane Vesicles lsolated from Roots of Scout **66** and Atlas **66** Cultivars of Wheat

Uri Yermiyahu, David K. Brauer, and Thomas **B.** Kinraide*

Appalachian Soil and Water Conservation Research Laboratory, Agricultura1 Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Beaver, West Virginia 2581 3-0400

To further elucidate the mechanisms of differential genotypic tolerance to AI, plasma membrane **(PM)** vesicles were isolated from whole roots, root tips, and tipless roots of Al^{3+} -sensitive and Al^{3+} tolerant cultivars (cv) of wheat *(Triticum aestivum* **1.** cv Scout 66 and cv Atlas 66, respectively). Vesicles from cv Scout root tips sorbed more AI than vesicles prepared from any other source. The intrinsic surface-charge density of vesicles isolated from cv Scout was **26%** more negative than vesicles from cv Atlas **(-37.2** versus -29.5 millicoulombs m^{-2}). Growth experiments indicated that cv Scout is slightly more sensitive to La^{3+} than is cv Atlas, that the cultivars are equally sensitive to H⁺, and that cv Atlas is slightly more sensitive to SeO₄²⁻. The difference in sensitivity to Al³⁺ was very large; for a **50%** inhibition, a 16-fold greater activity of AI3+ was required for cv Atlas. Using a newly developed Couy-Chapman-Stern model for ion sorption to the **PM** together with growthresponse curves, we estimate that the difference in surface-charge density can account for the slightly greater sensitivity of cv Scout to cationic toxicants and the slightly greater sensitivity of cv Atlas to anionic toxicants. According to our estimates the differences in PM surface negativity and AI sorptive capacity probably account for some of the difference in sensitivity to Al^{3+} , but the greater part of the difference probably arises from other tolerance mechanisms expressed in cv Atlas root tips that reduce the amount of $Al³⁺$ that can reach the **PM.**

In recent years there has been much progress in elucidating the mechanisms of differential genotypic tolerance to Al, an important rhizotoxicant in acidic soils throughout the world (Kochian, 1995). For severa1 species the secretion of organic acids by root apices is stimulated by A1 in tolerant genotypes but not in sensitive genotypes. The citrate secreted by snap beans (Miyasaka et al., 1991) and maize (Pellet et al., 1995) and the malate secreted by wheat *(Triticum aestivum L.; Delhaize et al., 1993) chelate Al³⁺ and* significantly reduce growth inhibition at organic acid concentrations of less than 0.1 mm. The stimulation of organic acid secretion by Al^{3+} is quite specific. La³⁺ is highly rhizotoxic but fails to stimulate malate secretion in wheat (Delhaize et al., 1993), and Al^{3+} -tolerant and Al^{3+} -sensitive genotypes are nearly equally sensitive to La^{3+} (Parker, 1988; Kinraide et al., 1992; Delhaize et al., 1993).

Even if organic acid secretion is a principal mechanism of tolerance, it apparently is not the sole mechanism, at least in some wheat genotypes. Genetic studies indicate that Al^{3+} tolerance can be multigenic (Aniol, 1990; Carver and Ownby, 1995). The highly tolerant wheat cv Atlas 66 not only secretes malate when challenged by AI but it also secretes phosphate constitutively at the root apices (Pellet et al., 1996). In addition, the isolated cell walls of the tolerant cvs Atlas 66 and Yecora Rojo had lower affinities for A1 than the two sensitive cvs Scout 66 and Hart, despite having a higher density of carboxyl groups (Masion and Bertsch, 1997).

Another hypothesis for differential tolerance to Al^{3+} relates to negative electrical charges at the cell surface, either in the cell wall or on the surface of the PM. Treatments that reduce cell-surface negativity reduce the sensitivity of roots to cationic toxicants (Kinraide et al., 1992; Kinraide, 1994) and increase the sensitivity to at least one anionic toxicant, $SeO₄²⁻$ (Kinraide, 1994). Consequently, it was proposed decades ago that negative surface-charge densities may be lower in Al^{3+} -tolerant genotypes (Vose and Randall, 1962).

Severa1 reports indicate that, within closely related taxa, higher genotypic sensitivity to Al^{3+} corresponds to higher genotypic cation-exchange capacity of whole roots (Rengel and Robinson, 1989, and refs. therein; see refs in Allan et al., 1990; Blamey et al., 1990, and refs. therein). Other studies failed to support these results. Higher titratable acidity of isolated cell walls corresponded to greater Al³⁺ tolerance (Allen et al., 1990), and in a reference to unpublished data, Wagatsuma et al. (1995) asserted that the cation-exchange capacity of terminal 1-cm root segments was not correlated with Al^{3+} tolerance in 10 plant species. (See also the study of Masion and Bertsch [1997] mentioned earlier.) Therefore, a role for cell wall electrical properties in Al^{3+} tolerance is uncertain.

It remains possible that the surface electrical properties of the PM may play a role in Al^{3+} tolerance. Wagatsuma and Akiba (1989) measured the ζ potentials (a measure of the surface electrical potential) of protoplasts isolated from five genotypes from five plant genera. In general, the PM

^{*} Corresponding author; e-mail **kinraideQasrr.arsusda.gov;** fax 1-304 -256 -2921.

Abbreviations: $[A]_{Eq}$, equilibrium concentration of Al in the bulk-phase medium after any sorption to vesicles has been completed; $[Al]_{T}$, total concentration of Al in the reaction mixture whether A1 is sorbed to vesicles or free in the bulk phase medium; mC, millicoulombs; PM, plasma membrane; RL, root length; RRL, relative root length; σ_{0} , intrinsic charge density on the plasma membrane surface (i.e. surface charge density when no solute ions are bound to the plasma membrane).

surfaces were more negative in the more Al^{3+} -sensitive genotypes. In a subsequent study (Wagatsuma et al., 1991), the stainability of root-tip protoplasts with methylene blue (supposedly a measure of surface negativity) correlated with the Al^{3+} sensitivity of four of the genotypes used before. No studies of membrane electrical properties have compared genotypes within a species, but three studies using three different pairs of wheat genotypes indicate that genotypes tolerant of Al^{3+} are not tolerant of La^{3+} (Parker, 1988; Kinraide et al., 1992; Delhaize et al., 1993). This is not consistent with a significant role for surface electrical potential in genotypic tolerance to Al^{3+} .

In addition to the likely role of root exudation and the uncertain role of cell-surface electrical properties, other factors may influence genotypic sensitivity to Al^{3+} . In general, the roots of the more sensitive genotypes take up more A1 than the less sensitive genotypes (Rincon and Gonzales, 1992; Tice et al., 1992). Exclusion of AI by root exudates could account for this difference, but it is possible that the more sensitive genotypes have a greater number of Albinding sites at the cell surfaces or that the binding sites have a higher binding affinity. Caldwell (1989) reported that the PM proteins of a more sensitive wheat genotype bound AI more strongly than those of a less sensitive genotype. This greater binding capacity may or may not be associated with a greater negative cell-surface charge density.

In the present study we measured surface electrical charges and the sorption of AI by PM vesicles isolated from whole roots, root tips, and tipless roots of the Al^{3+} -tolerant cv Atlas 66 and the Al^{3+} -sensitive cv Scout 66. Genotypic sensitivity to four ionic toxicants, Al^{3+} , La^{3+} , H^+ , and SeO_4^2 , were also measured and considered in terms of the membrane properties.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Preparation of Vesicles and Sorption Experiments

Sorption experiments were performed as described previously (Yermiyahu et al., 1997) with right-side-out PM vesicles isolated from approximately 10-cm, 4-d-old whole roots, 5-mm root tips, or the remaining tipless roots of wheat *(Triticum aestivum* L.). Vesicles were prepared from the Al^{3+} -tolerant cv Atlas 66 and the Al^{3+} -sensitive cv Scout 66, according to the method of Larsson et al. (1988), with slight modification. The final wash solution included 0.25 **M** Suc and 5 mM KCI adjusted to pH 7.2 with 1 **M** KOH (Yermiyahu et al., 1997). The relative purity of these PM vesicles was determined by comparing the specific activities of marker enzymes in this preparation against the specific activities of a microsomal fraction (Brauer et al., 1990). The PM vesicles were enriched more than 3-fold for each genotype in vanadate-sensitive ATPase and depleted more than 3-fold for each genotype in NADH Cyt c reductase, Cyt c oxidase, and $NO₃⁻$ -sensitive ATPase relative to the microsomal fraction.

Sorption of Al and H^+ to the vesicles was measured as the reduction in concentration in media to which a concentrated suspension of vesicles (or a vesicle-free control solution) was added. Estimates of H^+ sorption take into account the H⁺-generating effect of Al^{3+} hydrolysis, which is affected by changes in $[H^+]$ and $[A]^{3+}$] (Yermiyahu et al., 1997). To measure solute reductions in the vesicle suspensions (25 μ g of vesicle protein in a 500- μ L reaction volume containing 0.25 **M** SUC, 0.5 mM KCl, and variable [AICI,] and $[H^+]$, the assays for H^+ and Al had to be sensitive. The pH of the unfiltered $500 - \mu L$ suspensions was measured with a combination glass electrode to the nearest 0.01 unit, and A1 in the filtrate was assayed by inductively coupled Ar plasma emission spectrometry (model JY 46 P, Jobin Yvon Emission Instruments, Longjumeau, France) capable of detecting $\langle 0.2 \mu M \rangle$ Al at 167.02 nm (Uehiro et al., 1984). A11 sorption experiments were performed at least twice with three replicates within each experiment.

Estimation of σ_0

The σ_{0} expressed in millicoulombs per square meter, of the PM vesicles, was determined by the 9-aminoacridine fluorescence method as described previously (Yermiyahu et al., 1997). The σ_0 is the surface-charge density when no solute ions are tightly bound to the membrane surface. The procedure calls for the progressive addition of a monovalent and a divalent salt that bind weakly or not at all to the PM surface. Consequently, we used tetramethylammonium Cl and hexamethonium \cdot Cl₂.

Growth Experiments

Root elongation in response to Al^{3+} , La^{3+} , H^+ , and SeO_4^2 was measured by placing together in the same solution five or more newly germinated seedlings of both cvs Scout and Atlas into holders floated on the surface of 1-L solutions. For the Al^{3+} experiments, previously published data were used (fig. 9 in Kinraide et al., 1992). For the La³⁺ experiments, the media contained 0.35, 0.7, 1.4, 2.8, or 5.6 μ m LaCl₃ and 0.2, 0.4, or 0.8 mm CaCl₂ in a factorial design, and solutions were adjusted to pH 5.0 with HCl. For the H^+ experiments, the media contained 0.2, 0.4, or 0.8 mm CaCl₂ adjusted to pH 3.6, 3.9, 4.2, 4.5, or 4.8 with HCl in a factorial design. For the SeO_4^{2-} experiments, the media contained 1, 10, or 100 μ m Na₂SeO₄ and 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.4, or 0.8 mm CaCl₂ in a factorial design. The SeO₄²⁻ solutions were adjusted to pH 7.0 with $NaHCO₃$, aerated overnight, and then readjusted with HCI and NaOH to pH 7.0 before adding seedlings.

The seedlings were incubated in the aerated solutions for 2 d, and then the two longest roots of each seedling were measured. RL measurements were used to compute RRL. RRL, expressed as a percentage, was computed by $100(RL_{Tox} - RL_S)/(RL_C - RL_S)$, where RL_{Tox} is the mean RL in the presence of toxicant, RL_C is the mean RL in toxicant-free solutions, and RL_s is the mean RL in high levels of toxicant sufficient to fully inhibit toxicantsensitive growth $(RL_s$ is nearly equal to RL at the time of seedling transfer to the test solutions). Growth data are presented as means from two replicates of each experiment.

RESULTS

Sorption of AI and H+ to PM Vesicles from Whole Roots

The amount of A1 sorbed to PM vesicles as a function of $[A]_T$ is presented in Figure 1A. The experiment included vesicles from whole roots from two genotypes and included two levels of treatment pH. The amount of sorbed Al increased with increasing $[AI]_T$ and was greater at the higher treatment pH. The term "treatment pH" refers to the pH of the 450- μ L solution to which the vesicles (or control solution) were added. The vesicles (or control solution) were added in 50 μ L at pH 6.0 \pm 0.2. Figure 1B presents the amount of Al sorbed as a function of $[Al]_{Eq}$. The $[Al]_{Eq}$ is comparable to the [Al] in large volumes of growth media that do not undergo significant depletions in concentration because of uptake. Sorbed A1 was computed from the difference between [Al]_{Eq} in the reaction mixtures with or without vesicles. Under similar solute conditions sorption of A1 by the cv Scout vesicles was greater than sorption by the cv Atlas vesicles.

Figure 1. AI sorbed to PM vesicles isolated from whole roots as a function of genotype, treatment pH, and **[AI],** in the reaction mixture **(A)** and **[AI],,** (6). Bars refer to the **SES** *of* the values at the ends of the curves.

Figure 2. H⁺ sorbed to PM vesicles isolated from whole roots as a function of genotype, treatment pH , and $[Al]_T$ in the reaction mixture **(A)** and **[AI],,** (6). Bars refer to the **SES** *of* the values at the ends of the curves.

The amount of H^+ sorbed to PM vesicles as a function of $[Al]_T$ in the reaction mixture is presented in Figure 2A. The amount of sorbed H⁺ decreased with increasing $[Al]_T$ and was greater at the lower treatment pH. The $Al³⁺$ -induced release of H^+ from cv Atlas (indicated by negative values) at a treatment pH of 4.3 reflects the displacement of some H+ initially on the PM vesicles. Figure 2B presents sorbed H^+ as a function of $[A]_{Eq}$. Under similar solute conditions sorption of H^+ by the cv Scout vesicles was greater than sorption by the cv Atlas vesicles.

Sorption of AI and H+ to PM Vesicles from Root Tips and Tipless Roots

Experiments similar to the preceding were performed except that vesicles were prepared from 5-mm root tips and from the remaining tipless portions of the root. Figure 3 illustrates that at three treatment pH values the sorption of

A1 was greatest by vesicles from cv Scout root tips. Sorption by vesicles from tipless roots was equal for the two genotypes. Only at pH 3.7 was the sorption by vesicles from cv Atlas tips greater than the sorption by the vesicles from tipless roots. Differences in **A1** sorption among the vesicle types were greater at lower pH values.

The sorption of H^+ by vesicles from cv Scout and cv Atlas root tips and tipless roots is complicated (Fig. 4). Sorption by vesicles from cv Atlas tipless roots was slightly higher than sorption by vesicles from cv Scout tipless roots. These values were generally higher than values for sorption by vesicles from root tips. At low or 0 [Al]_{Eq}, sorption by vesicles from cv Scout tips was greater than sorption by

Figure 3. AI sorbed to PM vesicles isolated from root tips and tipless roots as a function of genotype, treatment pH, and [Al]_{Eq}. Bars refer to the *SES* of the values at the ends of the curves.

Figure 4. H⁺ sorbed to PM vesicles isolated from root tips and tipless roots as a function of genotype, treatment pH, and [Al]_{Eq}. Bars refer to the **SES** of the values at the ends of the curves.

vesicles from cv Atlas tips, but a crossover occurred at higher $[A]_{E_{\alpha}}$.

Measurement of *a,*

 σ_0 was measured for PM vesicles from cv Scout and cv Atlas roots in three separate experiments. The computed σ_0 (mean \pm se in mC m⁻²) of the PM vesicle surfaces were: from cv Scout root tips, -35.6 ± 5.8 ; from cv Atlas root tips, -29.4 ± 3.1 ; from cv Scout tipless roots, -38.3 ± 5.5 ; and from cv Atlas tipless roots, -29.5 ± 3.5 . Apparently, there was little difference in σ_0 for root tips and tipless roots within a genotype, but the difference between genotypes

could be measured whether vesicles were isolated from tips or tipless roots. Combined measurements yielded the following values: all cv Scout (tips and tipless roots), -37.2 *2* 3.6; a11 cv Atlas, -29.5 *2* 2.2; a11 tips (cvs Scout and Atlas), -32.4 ± 3.2 ; and all tipless roots, -33.9 ± 3.5 . The difference of 7.7 $mC m^{-2}$ between cvs Scout and Atlas was significant at the 3% probability level according to a twotailed Student's *t* test for paired observations.

Growth Experiments

Results of the growth experiments are presented in Figure 5. Each point represents the RRL of cv Atlas plotted on the y axis and the RRL of cv Scout plotted on the *x* axis. Furthermore, each point refers to measurements of seedlings from the two genotypes grown together in the same beaker. Conventional plots of root elongation versus toxicant activities can be seen in other publications (Kinraide et al., 1992), but a11 of the data presented in Figure 5 are from new experiments, except for the Al^{3+} data.

Figure 5 indicates that cv Atlas is much more Al^{3+} tolerant than cv Scout, which is in agreement with a previous report that a 50% inhibition of cv Atlas required a 16-fold greater activity of Al^{3+} than was required for cv Scout (Kinraide et al., 1992). In Figure 5 we see that an [Al] that reduced RRL in cv Scout to 34% increased RRL in cv Atlas to 107%. This high-toxicant tolerance by cv Atlas appears to be specific for Al^{3+} . The greater tolerance to La^{3+} by cv Atlas relative to cv Scout was slight but consistent with a previous study that also indicated a somewhat greater La^{3+} tolerance by cv Atlas (Kinraide et al., 1992). In two other studies with wheat the more Al³⁺-tolerant genotypes were slightly more La^{3+} tolerant than the Al^{3+} -sensitive genotypes (Delhaize et al., 1993 [sensitive ES3 versus tolerant ET3]; Parker, 1988 [sensitive Tyler versus tolerant Seneca]). Resistance to H^+ by cvs Scout and Atlas was about equal in the present study, which is in agreement with a previous study (Kinraide, 1993). In contrast to results with cationic toxicants, cv Atlas appears to be more sensitive to $SeO₄²⁻$ than cv Scout.

A statistical test for these growth data is problematic. A two-tailed Student's *t* test for paired observations indi-RRL_{ev Scout})]/N) and statistical significance: 37.0 (1.8%) for Al³⁺, 7.0 (6.5%) for La³⁺, -4.6 (2.3%) for H⁺, and -14.8 (<0.1%) for SeO_4^2 ⁻. This test is not entirely appropriate and may be overly stringent, because no differences are expected at very low (RRL = 0) or very high (RRL = 100) toxicant levels. Another test was done to determine whether the data fall on a downwardly concave (e.g. Al^{3+} toxicity) or an upwardly concave (e.g. $SeO₄²⁻$ toxicity) curve. For the equation $RRL_{cv \text{Atlas}} = aRRL_{cv} \text{S}\text{.}$ s_{cout}, the curve will pass through O and will be downwardly concave if $b < 1$ and upwardly concave if $b > 1$. Regression analyses yielded the following values for $b: 0.077$ for Al^{3+} , 0.70 for La^{3+} , 1.1 for H⁺, and 1.9 for SeO₄²⁻. Only in the case of H⁺ toxicity was *b* not statistically different from 1 (i.e. the 95% confidence intervals encompassed 1); $r^2 > 0.78$ in all cases. Therefore, there was a progressive change in relative sencates the following mean differences $([\Sigma(RRL_{cv \text{ Atlas}} -$

Figure 5. RRLs for seedlings of cvs Scout 66 and Atlas 66 grown together in solutions containing the toxicants **AI3+,** La3+, *H',* and SeO_4^2 . Points lying above the unit-slope line indicate a greater sensitivity of cv Scout to the toxicant, and points lying below the line indicate a greater. sensitivity of cv Atlas.

sitivity to ionic toxicants as the ionic charge progressed from $3+$ to $2-$.

DISCUSSION

Sorption of A1 by PM vesicles isolated from the root tips of cv Scout exceeded the sorption of AI by vesicles isolated from the tipless roots of cv Scout and from vesicles isolated from any part of the roots of cv Atlas. This finding may be related to genotypic differences in Al^{3+} sensitivity for these reasons: inhibition of root elongation by AI occurs only when the tip portion is exposed to AI (Ryan et al., 1993), whole roots exposed to AI accumulate more AI in the tips than elsewhere (Rincon and Gonzales, 1992; Tice et al., 1992), and the roots of Al^{3+} -sensitive cultivars accumulate more Al than the roots of Al^{3+} -tolerant cultivars (Rincon and Gonzales, 1992; Tice et al., 1992). The present study suggests that the PM itself may account for part of these effects, i.e. neither metabolic activity (presumably needed for organic acid synthesis and secretion) nor the presence of cell walls or multicellular structures was required for the differential sorption observed in the present study.

To explain the differential sorption of AI we considered a possible role for σ_0 . Other things being equal, a higher negative σ_0 will cause a higher sorption of cations (Yermiyahu et al., 1997). More cations will bind to the PM surface, and the interfacial activity of free cations will be higher because of a more negative surface electrical potential. Estimates using the 9-aminoacridine fluorescence technique indicate that σ_0 for cv Scout was about 26% more negative than σ_0 for cv Atlas. However, a difference in Al sorption by vesicles from cv Scout root tips and tipless roots was not accompanied by a difference in σ_{0} , and a difference in σ_0 of vesicles from tipless roots of cvs Scout and Atlas was not accompanied by a difference in A1 sorption. This indicates that sorption must be based on some factor in addition to σ_0 . This is certainly possible because Al^{3+} may bind to uncharged (zwitterionic) ligands (Akeson et al., 1989), and different ligands of similar charge may have different binding strength for Al^{3+} (Tam and McColl, 1990).

Nevertheless, we estimate that the σ_0 does play a small role in the differential sensitivity of the two genotypes to ionic toxicants. Previous studies demonstrate high negative correlations between root elongation and the computed activity of toxicant ions at the PM surface (Kinraide, 1994; Kinraide et al., 1994). Treatments that reduced surface negativity reduced the toxic effects of cationic toxicants and increased the toxic effect of the anionic toxicant $SeO₄²⁻$. Using a recently developed model for ion sorption by cv Scout root PM (Yermiyahu et al., 1994, 1997) together with growth-response curves, we estimate that the difference in σ_0 between cvs Scout and Atlas can account for the greater sensitivity of cv Scout to La^{3+} and the greater sensitivity of cv Atlas to $SeO₄²⁻$ observed in the growth experiments. However, we are unable to explain the very large difference in sensitivity to Al^{3+} by electrostatic effects alone.

The following computations serve as an example. From experimental data, root elongation by cv Scout was inhibited 50% in a medium of 1.13 μ M AlCl₃ and 0.4 mM CaCl₂ at pH 4.5 (Kinraide et al., 1992). For cv Scout the modelcomputed membrane surface activity of free Al^{3+} is 11.8 μ _M and the model-computed surface concentration of bound Al is 0.0390 μ mol m⁻². To achieve a 50% inhibition of cv Atlas root elongation experimentally, it was necessary to increase $[AlCl₃]$ to 18.1 μ m. For cv Atlas the modelcomputed membrane surface activity of free Al^{3+} is 16.5 μ M and the model-computed surface concentration of bound Al is 0.0620 μ mol m⁻². The model used to compute these values (Yermiyahu et al., 1997) was changed in only one parameter for the two genotypes: σ_0 was -37.2 mC m^{-2} for cv Scout and -29.5 mC m⁻² for cv Atlas. This reduction in surface negativity did not come close to equalizing the computed exposure to AI (surface activity and bound concentration) of the PM of the two genotypes. Consequently, according to the sorption model, σ_0 cannot account for much of the difference in Al^{3+} sensitivity.

If we disregard σ_0 and consider only the measured differences in AI sorption (Figs. 1 and 3), it is still questionable whether we can account for the great differences in Al^{3+} sensitivity of the genotypes. To achieve a given amount of Al sorption, cv Atlas requires higher $[Al]_{Eq}$ than cv Scout, but not a 16-fold higher concentratíon. Inspection of Figure 3 indicates that $[A]_{Eq}$ must be 5.7, 10.1, or 7.4 μ M at treatment pH values of 4.3, 4.0, or 3.7, respectively, for cv Atlas root tip vesicles to sorb as much AI as cv Scout root tip vesicles in 1 μ _M [Al]_{Eq}. Consequently, it may be possible to account for some, but not all, of the difference in genotypic sensitivity on the basis of AI sorption characteristics of the PM.

The mechanisms of genotypic tolerance to Al^{3+} have been of interest for many years, and whether PM surface negativity plays a role in this genotypic tolerance has been an issue. We conclude from our study that the 26% higher negative σ_0 of cv Scout PM relative to cv Atlas PM very likely makes cv Scout slightly more sensitive to cationic toxicants and slightly less sensitive to anionic toxicants. In the case of Al, vesicles isolated from the Al^{3+} -sensitive tip region of cv Scout sorb more AI than vesicles from the nonsensitive, tipless region of cv Scout or from any region of cv Atlas roots. Some of that differential sorption may be attributable to differences in membrane composition rather than σ_0 .

In conclusion, electrostatic sorption models for the PM can account for the slight differences in genotypic sensitivity to La^{3+} and $SeO₄^{2–}$ but not for the great differences in genotypic sensitivity to Al^{3+} . According to our estimates, the differences in PM surface negativity and AI sorptive capacity, whatever the cause of the latter, probably account for some of the difference in genotypic sensitivity to Al^{3+} , but the greater part of that difference may arise because malate and phosphate secretion by cv Atlas root tips reduces the amount of Al^{3+} that can reach the PM (Huang et al., 1996; Pellet et al., 1996). The evidence that malate release is a general mechanism for tolerance in wheat is reasonably strong now. Correlations are strong among 36 wheat cultivars for Al-induced malate secretion versus root growth in the presence of AI (Ryan et al., 1995).

ACKNOWLEDCMENTS

We thank Dr. David Bligh and Ms. Barbara White for developing the procedures for the assay of Al.

Received April 28, 1997; accepted July 25, 1997. Copyright Clearance Center: 0032-0889/97/ 115/1119/07

LITERATURE ClTED

- Akeson MA, Munns DN, Burau RG (1989) Adsorption of Al^{3+} to phosphatidylcholine vesicles. Biochim Biophys Acta 986: 33-40
- Allan DL, Shann JR, Bertsch PM (1990) Role of root cell walls in iron deficiency of soybean *(Glycine max)* and aluminium toxicity of wheat *(Triticum aestivum). In* ML van Beusichem, ed, Plant Nutrition-Physiology and Applications. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, pp 345-349
- Aniol A (1990) Genetics of tolerance to aluminium in wheat *(Triticum aestivum* L. Thell). Plant Soil 123: 223-227
- Blamey FPC, Edmeades DC, Wheeler DM (1990) Role of root cation-exchange capacity in differential aluminum tolerance of *Lotus* species. J Plant Nutr 13: 729-744
- Brauer D, Schubert C, Tu S-I (1990) Characterization of a Ca^{2+} translocating ATPase from corn root microsomes. Physiol Plant **78:** 335-344
- Caldwell CR (1989) Analysis of aluminum and divalent cation binding to wheat root plasma membrane proteins using terbium phosphorescence. Plant Physiol 91: 233-241
- Carver BF, Ownby JD (1995) Acid soil tolerance in wheat. Adv Agron 54: 117-173
- Delhaize E, Ryan PR, Randall PJ (1993) Aluminum tolerance in wheat *(Triticum aestivum* L.). 11. Aluminum-stimulated excretion of malic acid from root apices. Plant Physiol 103: 695-702
- Huang JW, Pellet DM, Papernik LA, Kochian LV (1996) Aluminum interactions with voltage-dependent calcium transport in plasma membrane vesicles isolated from roots of aluminumsensitive and -resistant wheat cultivars. Plant Physiol 110: 561-569
- Kinraide TB (1993) Aluminum enhancement of plant growth in acid rooting media. A case of reciprocal alleviation of toxicity by two toxic cations. Physiol Plant 88: 619-625
- Kinraide TB (1994) Use of a Gouy-Chapman-Stern model for membrane-surface electrical potential to interpret some features of mineral rhizotoxicity. Plant Physiol 106: 1583-1592
- Kinraide TB, Ryan PR, Kochian LV (1992) Interactive effects of Al^{3+} , H⁺, and other cations on root elongation considered in terms of cell-surface electrical potential. Plant Physiol 99: 1461-1468
- Kinraide TB, Ryan PR, Kochian LV (1994) Al^{3+} -Ca²⁺ interactions in aluminum rhizotoxicity. II. Evaluating the Ca^{2+} -displacement hypothesis. Planta 192: 104-109
- Kochian LV (1995) Cellular mechanisms of aluminum toxicity and resistance in plants. Annu Rev Plant Physiol Plant Mo1 Biol 46: 237-260
- Larsson C, Widell **S,** Sommarin M (1988) Inside-out plant plasma membrane vesicles of high purity obtained by aqueous twophase partitioning. FEBS Lett 229: 289-292
- Masion A, Bertsch PM (1997) Aluminium speciation in the presence of wheat root cell wall: a wet chemical study. Plant Cell Environ 20: 504-512
- Miyasaka SC, Buta JG, Howell RK, Foy CD (1991) Mechanism of aluminum tolerance in snapbeans. Root exudation of citric acid. Plant Physiol 96: 737-743
- Parker \overline{DR} (1988) Speciation and phytotoxicity of mono- and polynuclear aluminum in dilute hydroxy-aluminum solutions. PhD thesis. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg
- Pellet DM, Grunes DL, Kochian LV (1995) Organic acid exudation as an aluminum-tolerance mechanism in maize *(Zea mays* L.). Planta 196: 788-795
- Pellet DM, Papernik LA, Kochian LV (1996) Multiple aluminumresistance mechanisms in wheat. Roles of root apical phosphate and malate exudation. Plant Physiol 112: 591-597
- Rengel **Z,** Robinson DL (1989) Determination of cation exchange capacity of ryegrass roots by summing exchangeable cations. Plant Soil 116: 217-222
- Rincon M, Gonzales RA (1992) Aluminum partitioning in intact roots of aluminum-tolerant and aluminum-sensitive wheat *(Triticum aestivum* L.) cultivars. Plant Physiol 99: 1021-1028
- Ryan PR, Delhaize E, Randall PJ (1995) Malate efflux from root apices and tolerance to aluminum are highly correlated in wheat. Aust J Plant Physiol 22: 531-536
- Ryan PR, DiTomaso JM, Kochian LV (1993) Aluminium toxicity in roots: an investigation of spacial sensitivity and the role of the root cap. J Exp Bot 44: 437-446
- Tam S-C, McColl JG (1990) Aluminum- and calcium-binding affinities of some organic ligands in acidic conditions. J Environ Qual 19: 514-520
- Tice KR, Parker DR, DeMason DA (1992) Operationally defined apoplastic and symplastic aluminum fractions in root tips of aluminum-intoxicated wheat. Plant Physiol 100: 309-318
- Uehiro T, Morita **M,** Fuwa K (1984) Vacuum ultraviolet emission line for determination of aluminum by inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectrometry. Ana1 Chem 56: 2020-2024
- Vose PB, Randall PJ (1962) Resistance to aluminium and manganese toxicities in plants related to variety and cation-exchange capacity. Nature 196: 85-86
- Wagatsuma T, Akiba R (1989) Low surface negativity of root protoplasts from aluminum-tolerant plant species. Soil Sci Plant Nutr 35: 443-452
- Wagatsuma T, Jujo K, Ishikawa **S,** Nakashima T (1995) Aluminum-tolerant protoplasts from roots can be collected with positively charged silica microbeads: a method based on differences in surface negativity. Plant Cell Physiol 36: 1493-1502
- Wagatsuma T, Nakashima T, Tawaraya K (1991) Identification of aluminium-tolerant protoplasts in the original root protoplast population from severa1 plant species differing in aluminium tolerance. *In* RJ Wright, VC Baligar, RP Murrmann, eds, Plant-Soil Interactions at Low pH. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, pp 789-793
- Yermiyahu U, Nir *S,* Ben-Hayyim G, Kafkafi U (1994) Quantitative competition of calcium with sodium or magnesium for sorption sites on plasma membrane vesicles of melon *(Cucumis melo* L.) root cells. J Membr Biol 138: 55-63
- Yermiyahu U, Rytwo G, Brauer DK, Kinraide TB (1997) Binding and electrostatic attraction of lanthanum (La^{3+}) and aluminum $(A1^{3+})$ to wheat root plasma membranes. J Membr Biol 159: 239-252