Stimulation of Nitrate and Nitrite Efflux by Ammonium in Barley *(Hordeum vulgare* **1.) Seedlings'**

Muhammad Aslam, Robert 1. Travis, and Ray C. Huffaker*

Department of Agronomy and Range Science, University of California, Davis, California 95616

The inhibitory effect of NH₄⁺ on net NO₃⁻ uptake has been **attributed to an enhancement of efflux and, recently, to an inhibition of influx. To study this controversy, we devised treatments to distinguish the effects of NH4+ on these two processes. Roots of intact barley** *(Hordeum* **vulgare 1.) seedlings, uninduced or induced** with NO₃⁻ or NO₂⁻, were used. Net uptake and efflux, respectively, **were determined by following the depletion and accumulation in** the external solutions. In roots of both uninduced and NO₂⁻induced seedlings, NO₃⁻ efflux was negligible; hence, the initial **uptake rates were equivalent** to **influx. Under these conditions,** NH₄⁺ had little effect on NO₃⁻ uptake (influx) rates by either the low- or high-K_m uptake systems. In contrast, in plants preloaded with NO₃⁻, NH₄⁺ and its analog CH₃NH₃⁺ decreased net uptake, **presumably by enhancing** $NO₃⁻$ **efflux. The stimulatory effect of NH₄⁺ on NO₃⁻ efflux was a function of external NH₄⁺ and internal NO3- concentration. These results were corroborated by the ab**sence of any effect of NH₄⁺ on NO₂⁻ uptake unless the roots were preloaded with NO₂⁻. In this case NH₄⁺ increased efflux and decreased net uptake. Hence, the main effect of NH₄⁺ on net NO₃⁻ **and NOz- uptake appears to be due to enhancement of efflux and not to inhibition of influx.**

The influence of NH_4 ⁺ on net NO_3 ⁻ uptake (defined as the difference between influx and efflux) in higher plants has been widely studied. Results of those studies have varied considerably, with reports ranging from little or no effect (Smith and Thompson, 1971; Schrader et al., 1972; Oaks et al., 1979) to strong inhibition (Jackson et al., 1976; Rao and Rains, 1976; Doddema and Telkamp, 1979; MacKown et al., 1982a; Deane-Drummond and Glass, 1983; Rufty et al., 1983; Breteler and Siegerist, 1984; Glass et al., 1985; Ingemarsson et al., 1987; Oscarson et al., 1987; Lee and Drew, 1989; Wamer and Huffaker, 1989; de Ia Haba et al., 1990; Chaillou et al., 1994). Since net uptake is a balance between influx and efflux, an inhibitory effect of NH₄⁺ could be due to either inhibition of influx or enhancement of efflux. In the reports cited above, the question of whether NH_4 ⁺ affects $NO_3^$ influx and/or efflux is also controversial.

Early investigators reported that external $NH₄$ ⁺ increased NO3- efflux in *Arabidopsis* (Doddema and Telkamp, 1979), barley *(Hordeum vulgare;* Deane-Drummond and Glass, 1983), pea *(Pisum sativum)* seedlings, and *Chara corallina*

(Deane-Drummond, 1985, 1986). In one recent report of longer-tem studies with soybeans, Chaillou et al. (1994) showed increased periods of net $NO₃⁻$ efflux in the presence of NH₄⁺. In accordance with the findings that NH₄⁺ increased $NO₃⁻$ efflux, several reports also showed that $NH₄⁺$ had no effect on $36C1O_3$ ⁻ influx when the latter was used as an analog for NO₃⁻ (Deane-Drummond and Glass, 1983; Deane-Drummond, 1985, 1986).

On the other hand, based on the use of ${}^{13}NO_3^-$, the recent consensus is that $NH₄$ ⁺ inhibits net $NO₃$ ⁻ uptake by inhibiting its influx per se rather than by enhancing efflux (Glass et al., 1985; Lee and Clarkson, 1986; Ingemarsson et al., 1987; Oscarson et al., 1987; Lee and Drew, 1989; Ayling, 1993; King et al., 1993). Decreased influx of ¹³NO₃⁻ was correlated with depolarization of membrane potentials of barley and tomato *(Lycopersicon esculentum)* roots (Ayling, 1993) and of *Lemna* (Ullrich et al., 1984). Investigators using $^{15}NO₃$ and longer term studies also reported that NH₄⁺ inhibited NO₃⁻ influx and had no effect on efflux in wheat *(Triticum aestivum;* Jackson et al., 1976) and com *(Zea mays;* MacKown et al., 1982a).

The results of the studies that showed no effect of $NH₄$ ⁺ on $36C1O_3$ ⁻ influx have been attributed to anomalies that occurred when $36^{\circ}ClO_3^-$ was used as an NO_3^- analog (Glass et al., 1985). In addition, the finding of increased efflux by $NH₄$ ⁺ has been attributed to using plants that have been perturbed from steady state, i.e. removed from a high concentration of **NO3-** and placed in a low concentration (Glass et al., 1985; Ingemarsson et al., 1987).

If the effect of NH_4 ⁺ were on NO_3^- influx, then one would expect that an inhibitory effect on net NO₃⁻ uptake would always be found when $NH₄⁺$ is present. Evidently, this has not been the case. To study this problem, we have used plant systems in which the effect of NH_4 ⁺ on NO_3 ⁻ influx can be measured initially with little efflux occurring. In addition, we have compared the effect of NH4+ on **NO3-** efflux **in** roots of seedlings, both loaded and not loaded with $NO₃^-$. Included also are comparable uptake experiments with $NO₂^-$, which has similar transport systems. $NO₂⁻$ is a competitive inhibitor of $NO₃^-$ uptake (Aslam et al., 1992), it induces the uptake systems for both ions (Aslam et al., 1993), and it is also metabolized after uptake, We have included short-term experiments that (a) minimize changes in properties of transporters and possible secondary regulation of their activity by metabolites and (b) compare roots that were either perturbed or not perturbed from steady state during the measurement of efflux.

This work was supported in part by a grant to R.C.H. from the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA NCC 2-9).

Corresponding author; fax 1-916-752-4361.

In this study, we show that $NH₄⁺$ had little effect on either $NO₃$ ⁻ or $NO₂$ ⁻ influx. NH₄⁺ increased $NO₃$ ⁻ and $NO₂$ ⁻ efflux as a function of their intemal concentrations. Hence, when NH_4^+ decreased net uptake of NO_3^- and NO_2^- , it did so by presumably facilitating their efflux.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Plant Material

Barley **(Hordeum** *vulgare* L. var CM-72) seedlings were grown hydroponically as described before (Aslam et al., 1979). Seedlings were grown in 0.2 mm CaSO₄ in the dark for 6 d. The seedlings were then transferred to aerated onequarter-strength Hoagland solution lacking N (Hoagland and Amon, 1950) and placed in the growth chamber under continuous light at 25°C and 60 to 65% RH. The PPFD (400-700 nm) at the seedling canopy was 400μ mol m⁻² s⁻¹ and was provided by incandescent and cool-white fluorescent lamps. The seedlings either were grown in N-free solution for 48 h in light (uninduced seedlings) or were transferred after **24** h to large volumes (5-10 L) of the induction solutions containing 0.002, 0.1, or 1.0 mm NaNO₃ or 0.1 mm NaNO₂ for an additional 8 h $(0.002 \text{ mm NO}_3^-$ treatment only) or 24 h to induce the $NO₃⁻$ and $NO₂⁻$ uptake systems.

In some experiments, seedlings induced with 0.1 mm $NO₂$ ⁻ were loaded with $NO₃⁻$ or $NO₂⁻$ by placing them into 2.5 L of the appropriate **2.0** m~ solution for 1 h. Cycloheximide **(2** μ g/mL) was added to the loading solution containing NO₃⁻ to inhibit further induction (if any) of the $NO₃^-$ uptake system.

Measurement of NO3- and NOz- Uptake

Intact seedlings were used in all experiments. Net uptake was determined by following the depletion of $NO₃⁻$ or $NO₂$ from the uptake solutions. A11 experiments were done in a mini-growth chamber set at 25°C, 700 μ mol m⁻² s⁻¹ light intensity **(400-700** nm), and **60** to 65% RH. The growth chamber was part of a fully automatic system described by Goyal and Huffaker (1986). Uptake was started by placing 15 seedlings in a Pyrex beaker (80 **X** 50 mm) containing 50 mL of the appropriate solution. The first sample was obtained about **2** min after the transfer of the seedlings into the uptake solutions. The solutions contained 1.0 mm Mes (pH 6.0), 0.2 mm CaSO₄, NO₃⁻ or NO₂⁻, and NH₄⁺ or CH₃NH₃⁺ as indicated in the figure and table legends. Ammonium was supplied as ammonium sulfate. The solutions were aerated vigorously to ensure thorough mixing. The beaker was fitted with a stainless steel screen about 10 mm above the bottom, and a magnetic bar was placed below the screen. The roots were held above the screen. The beaker was placed on the magnetic stirrer for thorough and rapid mixing of the solutions. Aliquots (0.4 mL) for $NO₃⁻$ and $NO₂⁻$ determination were removed automatically at 1.0-, **1.5-,** or 3.0-min intervals by the HPLC system. In one study samples were withdrawn manually every **15** s. The cumulative uptake was computed from the concentration and volume data (Goyal and Huffaker, 1986). The experiments were repeated three to five times, and the results from representative experiments are shown. The initial uptake rates were calculated by linear regression analysis of the cumulative data during a 10- to **12** min period. The r^2 values of the regression analysis were significant at $P = 0.001$.

Measurement of NO3- and NOz- Efflux

 $NO₃⁻$ efflux was determined where specified by following the accumulation of the ion in the uptake solutions, after the addition of 1 or 2 mm NO₂⁻ or by transferring the seedlings into specific efflux solutions containing 1.0 mm Mes (pH 6.0), 0.2 mm CaSO₄, 1.0 mm NO₂⁻ with or without 1.0 mm NH₄⁺ or CH_3NH_3 ⁺. The solution for the measurement of $NO_2^$ efflux contained 1.0 mm $NO₃⁻$ instead of $NO₂⁻$. Since $NO₃$ and $NO₂⁻$ are competitive inhibitors of each other's uptake (Aslam et al., 1992; Siddiqi et al., 1992), the presence of the counterion at 1.0 or 2.0 mm in the efflux solutions markedly inhibited the reabsorption of the effluxed ion (Table I). For the measurement of $NO₃⁻$ and $NO₂⁻$ efflux, the roots were rinsed for 5 s in an N-free solution and transferred to 50 mL of efflux solution contained in a Pyrex beaker fitted with the stainless steel screen as described above. Efflux was determined by removing aliquots (0.4 mL) at 1-min iníervals for **12** to **15** min by the automatic HPLC system. Cumulative efflux was calculated from the concentration and solution volume data as previously described (Goyal and Huffaker, 1986).

NO3-, NOz-, and NH,+ Determination

The concentrations of $NO₃⁻$ and $NO₂⁻$ were determined spectrophotometrically by measuring their A_{210} after separation by HPLC on a Partisal-10 SAX anion-exchange column (Thayer and Huffaker, 1980). For analysis of internal $NO₃⁻$, $NO₂⁻$, and $NH₄⁺$ concentrations, roots (1.0–1.5 g) were washed with distilled deionized water and homogenized in **4.0** mL/g fresh weight of cold, distilled, deionized water in a chilled mortar and pestle in the presence of acid-washed sand. The extracts were centrifuged at 30,OOOg for 10 min, and the supernatants were used for determination of the ions. $NO₃^-$ was determined by HPLC as described above; $NO₂^$ was determined at A_{540} after color development for 15 min with a 1:1 mixture of 1% (w/v) sulfanilamide in 1.5 N HCl and **0.02%** (w/v) **n-naphthylethylenediamine** dihydrochloride. NH₄⁺ was determined by measuring the electrical conductivity of ammonia gas evolved after reacting the sample with KOH using the continuous flow system of Carlson (1978). A11 of the results are presented on the basis of fresh weight of the roots.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We devised two sets of experimental conditions, to distinguish between the effect of NH_4 ⁺ on NO_3^- influx and efflux. Influx can be measured when efflux is prevented or minimized. Similarly, efflux can be measured when influx is inhibited. These experiments are described in sequence below.

Table 1. Effect *of NO2- on NO3-* uptake *(influx) by* roots of intact seedlings induced with O. *I mM NOZ- for 24 h*

The seedlings were grown and induced with 0.1 mm $NO₂⁻$ as described in "Materials and Methods." Cumulative uptake of $NO₃⁻$ was then determined during a 12-min period by following its depletion from the uptake solutions initially containing 0.025, 0.05, and 0.1 mm substrate and 0, 1.0, or 2.0 mm $NO₂$. Uptake rates were calculated by linear regression analysis of the cumulative uptake data. The depletion of NO₃⁻ from the uptake solution containing 0 NO₂⁻ was 20 to 25%. The values are means \pm sp of two replicate measurements.

Effect of NH₄⁺ on NO₃⁻ and NO₂⁻ Uptake (Influx) by Uninduced Seedlings

Seedlings that have not been previously exposed to $NO₃$ or $NO₂⁻$ (uninduced seedlings) have constitutive low- K_m uptake systems for both ions and yet contain little if any $NO₃$ or $NO₂⁻$ (Aslam et al., 1993). Thus, when $NO₃⁻$ or $NO₂⁻$ is added to the substrate solution, efflux of either ion would not be expected or would be minimal during the initial phase of uptake. Under these conditions, any effect of $NH₄$ ⁺ should be primarily on influx. NH_4 ⁺ at 1 mm had little effect on uptake of either ion from a 0.05 mm substrate solution during the first *6* to 9 min (Fig. 1).

Effect of NH₄⁺ on NO₃⁻ and NO₂⁻ Uptake (Influx) and Efflux by N02--lnduced Seedlings

We recently reported that $NO₂⁻$ effectively induces the high-K_m uptake systems of both NO_3^- and NO_2^- with little accumulation of either ion (Aslam et al., 1993). Thus, when the $NO₃^-$ uptake system is induced with $NO₂^-$, efflux would be minimized during the initial phase of uptake. This was substantiated by linear cumulative uptake (constant rate) during the initial 20 min (Fig. 2A). Therefore, any effect of NH₄⁺ should be primarily on influx. An uptake rate decreasing with time would be expected if efflux began. In this experiment, seedlings were induced with 0.1 mm $NO₂⁻$ for 24 h and then placed in 0.1 mm $NO₃⁻$ for measurement of uptake (Fig. 2A). NH₄⁺ had little effect on NO₃⁻ uptake whether it was added at the beginning or **15** or 22 min after the initiation of uptake (Fig. 2A). Similarly, NH₄⁺ had little effect on $NO₂$ ⁻ uptake by either $NO₃$ ⁻-induced (data not shown) or $NO₂⁻$ -induced roots not loaded with $NO₂⁻$ (Table **11).** de la Haba et al. (1990) also found no effect of **NH4+** on $NO₂$ ⁻ uptake in $NO₃$ ⁻-induced sunflower seedlings.

To substantiate the observation that little $NO₃⁻$ efflux was occurring, uptake at 20 min was interrupted by the addition of 1 mm $NO₂⁻$ (Fig. 2B). At this time, the $NO₃⁻$ concentration in the uptake solution was depleted to about 0.025 mM. At such $NO₃^-$ concentrations, $NO₂^-$ at 1 or 2 mm inhibits $NO₃^$ uptake (influx) 90% or more (Table I). Under these conditions, net uptake ceased, no efflux was detected, and there was no effect of NH_4 ⁺ on efflux observed (Fig. 2B). Since efflux would be manifested by the appearance of $NO₃⁻$ in the extemal solution, it would be expressed as a decrease in cumulative uptake.

 $NO₂⁻$ is a strong competitive inhibitor of $NO₃⁻$ uptake (Aslam et al., 1992; Siddiqi et al., 1992). The effect of $NO₂$ is likely on $NO₃⁻$ influx, since inhibition occurs immediately in roots of uninduced seedlings or in seedlings induced in $NO₂^-$, both of which contain little $NO₃^-$ (Aslam et al., 1993).

Effect of NH₄⁺ on NO₃⁻ Uptake and Efflux in **N03--lnduced Seedlings**

In contrast to seedlings containing little $NO₃^-$, when seedlings were preloaded by incubation in 0.1 mm $NO₃⁻$ for 24 h, NH4+ rapidly decreased net uptake whether added at the beginning or 12 or 20 min after the initiation of uptake (Fig. 3). This effect was a function of both the external $NH₄$ ⁺

Figure 1. Effect of NH_4 ⁺ on NO_3^- (A) and NO_2^- (B) uptake by roots of uninduced, intact seedlings. The seedlings were grown in N-free Hoagland solution for 6 d in the dark followed by 2 d in the light. The seedlings were then transferred to uptake solutions containing 0.05 mm NO_3^- or NO_2^- and 0 or 1 mm NH_4^+ . Cumulative uptake of the ions was determined by following their depletion as described in "Materials and Methods."

Figure 2. Effect of $NH₄⁺$, supplied at different intervals either alone (A) or with $NO₂⁻$ (B) on net $NO₃⁻$ uptake by roots induced with 0.1 m_M NO₂⁻ for 24 h. The seedlings were grown in N-free Hoagland solution as described in Figure 1. After 24 h of light, they were transferred to solutions containing 0.1 mm $NO₂⁻$ for 24 h in continuous light. Uptake was then determined from solutions containing 0.1 mm $NO₃⁻$. A, NH₄⁺ (1 mm) was added to the uptake solutions at different intervals. B, $NO₂⁻$ (1 mm) \pm 1 mm NH₄⁺ was added to the uptake solutions at the time indicated by the arrow. At this time, the $NO₃$ concentration in the uptake solution was depleted to about 0.025 mm. Cumulative uptake was determined by sampling at 1-min intervals as described in "Materials and Methods." $NO₃$ concentration of the roots was 0.40 ± 0.13 µmol/g fresh weight.

concentration and the internal concentration of $NO₃⁻$ in the tissue (Table III).

The results shown in Tables **I1** and **I11** establish that NH4+ had little effect on net $NO₃⁻$ uptake by roots low in $NO₃$ whether the uptake system was induced with either $NO₃⁻$ or $NO₂$. To further compare the effect of NH₄⁺ on NO₂⁻- and N03--induced uptake systems, roots of intact seedlings were induced in 0.1 mm $NO₂⁻$ and then loaded with $NO₃⁻$ for a brief period (Table 11). Cycloheximide was added to the solution to inhibit any further induction by $NO₃⁻$ during loading. NH_4 ⁺ appreciably inhibited net NO_3 ⁻ uptake only

Figure 3. Effect of NH₄⁺, supplied at different intervals, on NO₃⁻ uptake by roots induced with 0.1 mm NO₃⁻ for 24 h. Experimental details are the same as described in Figure 2A, excepi that the seedlings were induced with 0.1 mm NO₃⁻. NO₃⁻ concentration of the roots was $27.6 \pm 1.0 \mu$ mol/g fresh weight.

when the seedlings, induced in either $NO₃⁻$ or $NO₂⁻$, had been loaded with $NO₃⁻$.

To determine the effect of $NH₄$ ⁺ on efflux from roots containing differing internal concentrations of $NO₃^-$, seedlings were induced for 24 h in either 0.1 or 1 mm $NO₃⁻$ (Fig. **4).** After the **24-h** induction, linear cumulative net uptake at 0.1 mm $NO₃^-$ during a 15-min period showed a steady-state rate in both sets of seedlings. At this time, the $NO₃⁻$ concentration was about 0.04 mm, and the addition of 2 mm $\text{NO}_2^$ restricted net uptake (Table I). Net $NO₃⁻$ efflux (indicated by the negative slope for cumulative uptake) was detected within 1 min from the roots of both sets of seedlings and was greater from those induced in 1 mm $NO₃⁻$. The presence of $NH₄⁺$ increased the efflux of $NO₃⁻$ in both sets of seedlings, with the effect being greater in the seedlings induced in 1 m $NO₃$ ⁻.

Other investigators have attributed the enhancement of $NO₃⁻$ efflux by $NH₄⁺$ to the perturbation of plant rcots from

Table **II.** Effect of *NH4+ on NO3-* and *NO2-* uptake rates in intact roots of seedlings induced with *O.* ⁷ m *M* NO_2^- for 24 *h* and then some were loaded with NO_3^- or NO_2^-

For loading, the seedlings were placed in 2.0 mm $NO₃⁻$ or $NO₂⁻$ solutions for 1 h. The loading solution containing NO₃⁻ also contained cycloheximide (2 μ g/mL) to inhibit further induction (if any) of $NO₃⁻$ uptake system. The cumulative uptake of the ions was then determined during a 12-min period. The uptake solutions contained 0.1 mm $NO₃⁻$ or $NO₂⁻$ and 0 or 1.0 mm $NH₄⁺$. The uptake rates were determined by linear regression analysis of the cumulative uptake data. The values are means \pm sp of two replicate measurements.

Table 111. Effect *of* different concentrations *of NH,+* on *NO3-* uptake by seedlings varying in root *NO,-* content

The seedlings were induced with 0.1 mm $NO₂$ for 24 h or 0.002 mm $NO₃$ for 8 h to obtain low, 0.05 mm NO₃⁻ for 24 h to obtain medium, or 1.0 mm NO₃⁻ for 24 h to obtain high NO₃⁻ concentrations in the roots. The uptake solutions contained 0.1 mm $NO₃⁻$ and different concentrations of $NH₄⁺$. Rates of $NO₃$ uptake were determined by linear regression anaysis of the cumulative uptake curves during a 12-min period. The NO₃⁻ concentrations of the roots (μ mol/g) were 0.65 to 0.72 (low), 8.5 (medium), and 29.7 (high).

^aUptake rates within each column followed by different letters are significantly different at P *5* 0.05.

Figure 4. Effect of NH₄⁺ on NO₃⁻ efflux by roots of intact seedlings induced with 0.1 **mM (A)** or 1 **mM (B)** NO3- for 24 h. The induced seedlings were rinsed in $NO₃⁻$ free solution for 5 s and transferred to the uptake solutions containing 0.1 mm $NO₃⁻$. Net uptake was measured over 15 min by following $NO₃⁻$ depletion. At the time indicated by the arrow, *NO₃* was depleted from the uptake solution to about 0.04 mm. At this point, 2 mm $NO₂⁻ \pm 1$ mm $NH₄⁺$ were added to the uptake solutions, and the appearance **of** NO, from the roots into the externa1 solution was followed to determine cumulative efflux. Under these conditions, the rate of net efflux is indicated by the negative slope of cumulative net uptake. $NO₃$ ⁻ concentrations of the roots were 25.9 ± 0.7 and 41.3 ± 1.0 μ mol/g fresh weight, respectively, for roots fed 0.1 mm and 1.0 mm $NO₃$ ⁻.

steady state, i.e. removed from a high concentration of $NO₃$ and placed in a low or zero concentration (Glass et al., **1985;** Ingemarsson et al., **1987).** This was not a problem here, since the NO_2^- and NH_4^+ were added when cumulative uptake was linear (uptake rate was at steady state) and the concentration of $NO₃$ ⁻ was not changed to determine efflux.

To determine whether the $NO₂⁻$ treatment had changed the transport characteristics of the plasma membrane, $NO₃$ ⁻ uptake by the roots was compared before and after treatment with $NO₂$. The rate of net $NO₃$ uptake by the roots treated with 2.0 mm NO_2^- was within 10% of the control rate determined before treatment with $NO₂⁻$ (Fig. 5). We have found no evidence for any toxic effects from the short-term treatments (15 min) with $1.0 \text{ or } 2.0 \text{ mm}$ NO_2^- or from inducing the barley seedlings at 0.1 mm for 24 h.

Effect of Methylamine

Methylamine, an analog of $NH₄$ ⁺, increased $NO₃^-$ efflux (Fig. 6) and affected $NO₃⁻$ and $NO₂⁻$ uptake in the same manner as $NH₄⁺$ (Table IV). Inhibition of net uptake occurred only when there was sufficient $NO₃⁻$ inside the root tissues. Other cations such as Na, K, and Ca did not replace NH_4 ⁺ in this effect (data not shown).

Effect of Brief Loading with NO₂⁻ and NO₃⁻ on **Efflux and Uptake**

Figure 7A shows the effect of NH_4 ⁺ on NO_2 ⁻ efflux by roots of seedlings induced in 0.1 mm NO₂⁻ for 24 h. A low level of NO_2^- accumulated, a small amount of efflux occurred, and little effect of NH₄⁺ was detected. However, when the roots were preloaded for a brief period with NO₂⁻ by placing the seedlings into a solution of 2 mM NO₂⁻ for 1 h, considerable efflux occurred and $NH₄$ ⁺ increased the amount of $NO₂^-$ effluxed. $NH₄^+$ decreased net uptake only

Figure 5. Effect of pretreatment with NO_2^- on subsequent $NO_3^$ uptake by roots of intact seedlings induced with 0.1 mm $NO₃⁻ (A)$ or NO₂⁻ (B) for 24 h. The seedlings were induced as described in Figure 2. After induction, cumulative uptake of $NO₃$ at 0.05 mm $NO₃$ ⁻ was determined during a 12-min period (control). The seedlings were then placed into solutions containing 0.05 mm $NO₃⁻$ and 2.0 mm $NO₂^-$ (treated). After 15 min, the seedlings were rinsed with distilled water for **30 s,** and cumulative uptake was determined from uptake solutions containing 0.05 mm $NO₃⁻$ as described in "Materials and Methods."

in seedlings preloaded with a high concentration of $NO₂$ (Table 11).

As described above (Fig. **2B),** NO3- efflux was not detected from roots of seedlings induced in NOz- for **24** h; however, when these seedlings were briefly loaded $(1 h)$ in $2 mMNO₃⁻$, efflux was readily detected and was increased by NH_4^+ (Fig. 7B). Interestingly, $NO₂$ ⁻ efflux from loaded roots was greater than that of NO_3^- , although the internal NO_2^- concentration was about 4 times less than that of $NO₃⁻$ (1.58 versus 6.13 μ mol/g fresh weight). Even though these seedlings were perturbed from steady state by complete removal of $NO₂⁻$ or NO3- from the extemal solutions, and perhaps showed greater efflux as a result, their efflux was still increased by the presence of $NH₄$ ⁺. Table II shows the effect of the same treatments on net uptake of $NO₂⁻$ and $NO₃⁻$. NH₄⁺ inhibited net uptake only when the plants were preloaded with either $NO₂⁻$ or $NO₃⁻$.

Rapidity of NH4+ Response

As noted above, increased efflux of $NO₃⁻$ from $NO₃$ loaded roots was observed within 1 min after the addition of NH4+ (Fig. **4).** This is in agreement with the observed decrease in cumulative net $NO₃⁻$ uptake within 15 s after $NH₄⁺$ was supplied to the roots of $NO₃$ -loaded seedlings (Fig. 8). Other investigators have found similar rapid effects of $NH₄$ ⁺ on NO3- uptake. Lee and Drew **(1989)** and Ayling **(1993),** using $^{13}NO₃$, found inhibition by NH₄⁺ within 2 min. Ingemarsson et al. (1987) reported immediate inhibition by NH₄⁺ following the disappearance of NO₃⁻.

Requirement for NH4+ in Externa1 Solution

Several investigators reported that $NH₄$ ⁺ must be present in the external solution to affect $NO₃⁻$ uptake (Dearie-Drummond and Glass **1983;** Ingemarsson et al., **1987;** Lee and Drew, 1989). Inhibition by NH₄⁺ was rapidly reversed in barley roots after it was removed from the extemai solution (Lee and Drew, **1989;** Wamer and Huffaker, **1989).** Conversely, King et al. **(1993)** pretreated barley seedlings for a longer time (24 h) with high concentrations of NH₄⁺ and found that the pretreatment greatly decreased $NO₃⁻$ influx. The decreased influx was attributed to possible $N.H₄$ ⁺ feedback inhibition.

When barley seedlings were preloaded with a high concentration of NH4+ **(10** mM; with or without Met sulfoximine, an inhibitor of NH4+ assimilation) for **1** h, followed by the remova1 of both compounds, there was little effect **011** ensuing uptake of either NO_3^- or NO_2^- , even though the treated roots had accumulated 17 to 24 times more NH₄⁺ than the control roots (Table V).

The results presented here suggest that the enhancement effect of NH_4 ⁺ on NO_3 ⁻ efflux occurs externally to the plasma membrane. However, it is also possible that the stimulation of $NO₃⁻$ efflux could occur by the NH₄⁺ in the cytoplasm. Roberts and Pang **(1992)** and Wang et al. **(1993)** reported that NH4+ is rapidly sequestered in the vacuole. **Thus,** when $NH₄$ ⁺ is removed from the external medium, its concentration in the cytoplasm may quickly decrease. If this does in fact occur, and if the regulation by $NH₄$ ⁺ is at the level of the cytoplasm, then this might account for the lack of an effect

Figure 6. Comparative effect of NH_4^+ and $CH_3NH_3^+$ on NO_3^- efflux from intact roots induced with 1.0 mm NO₃⁻ for 24 h. The seedlings were grown and induced with 1 mm $NO₃⁻$ as described in the legend for Figure 2. For the measurement of $NO₃⁻$ efflux, the roots were rinsed for 5 s in a $NO₃⁻$ -free solution and transferred immediately to efflux solutions containing 1 mm Mes (pH 6.0), 1 mm $NO₂⁻$, and 0 (control) or 1 mm $NH₄⁺$ or 1 mm $CH₃NH₃⁺$. Cumulative efflux was determined during a 15-min period as described in "Materials and Methods." The $NO₃⁻$ concentration of the roots was $39.0 \pm 1.2 \mu$ mol/g fresh weight.

Table IV. *Effect of CH₃NH₃⁺ on NO₃⁻ and NO₂⁻ uptake in roots of intact seedlings induced with 1.0 mM NO3- or* o. **7** *mM NOz- for 24 h*

Uptake rates were determined by following the depletion of the ions from the uptake solutions initially containing 0.1 mm substrate and different concentrations of $CH_3NH_3^*$ as described in Table I.

^a Uptake rates within each column followed by different letters are significantly different at $P \le 0.05$. ^b N.D., Not determined. ^b N.D., Not determined.

of NH₄⁺ on efflux following its removal from the external medium.

NH4+ on NOs- Kinetics

Attempts to show the effect of $NH₄$ ⁺ on the kinetics of NO₃⁻ influx have led to variable results. Inhibition of NO₃⁻ uptake by $NH₄$ ⁺ has been described as noncompetitive in *Neurospora* (Schloemer and Garrett, 1974); however, Lee and Drew (1989) reported that simple noncompetitive inhibition did not describe their results. In their work (Lee and Drew, 1989), the slopes of the double-reciproca1 plots were not directly proportional to the NH₄⁺ concentration but were approximately proportional to the logarithm of the **NH4+**

concentration. If the effect of NH_4 ⁺ is mainly on NO_3 ⁻ efflux and not on influx, then the above results are not surprising.

Relation to Other Work

It appears that the contrary views regarding which component of net NO_3^- uptake is affected by NH_4^+ may be related to the methods used by the different investigators. For example, the use of ³⁶ClO₃⁻, ¹³NO₃⁻, and ¹⁵NO₃⁻ isotopes to determine the effect of NH₄⁺ on NO₃⁻ uptake has led to opposite interpretations. Deane-Drummond and Glass (1983) and later work by Deane-Drummond (1985, 1986), using $ClO₃$ ⁻ as an analog for $NO₃$ ⁻ to determine $NO₃$ ⁻ influx, showed no effect of $NH₄⁺$ on influx and attributed decreased net uptake to efflux by C. corallina cells. However, the use of 36° ClO₃⁻ as an analog of NO₃⁻ seems suspicious. Glass et al. (1985) pointed out that contamination of ${}^{36}ClO_3^-$ with ${}^{36}Cl$ may introduce significant error when it is used as a tracer for

Figure 7. Effect of NH_4 ⁺ on NO_2^- (A) and NO_3^- (B) efflux from roots of intact seedlings induced with 0.1 mm $NO₂⁻$ for 24 h and then loaded with 2 mm NO_2^- or NO_3^- for 1 h. NO_2^- and $NO_3^$ efflux were then determined as described in "Materials and Methods." The NO_2^- and NO_3^- concentrations of the roots loaded with NO_2^- and NO_3^- were, respectively, 1.6 \pm 0.1 and 6.1 \pm 0.1 μ mol/ g fresh weight.

Figure 8. Effect of NH_4 ⁺ on cumulative uptake of NO_3 ⁻ by intact roots induced with 0.1 mm NO_3^- for 24 h. The experimental details are the same as described in Figure 2A, except that uptake was determined by sampling at **15-5** intervals for 2 min only.

lable V. Effect *of* pretreatment *with NH4+ on* subsequent *NO,* and *NO2-* uptake *by roots of* intact seedlings induced *with 1.0 m,w NO3-* for *24 h*

For pretreatment with NH_4^+ , the seedlings were placed in 500 mL of solutions containing 10 mm NH_4^+ , 1.0 mm NO_3^- , and 0 or 1.0 mm methionine sulfoximine (MSO) for 1 h. After pretreatment, the roots were rinsed in a NH_4 ⁺-free solution for 30 s. The uptake solutions contained 0.1 mm $NO₃^-$ or $NO₂^-$ and O (pretreated) or 10 mm (not pretreated) NH_4^+ . $[NH_4^+]$ in the roots was determined prior to measurement of uptake. Uptake rates were computed by linear regression of the cumulative uptake data.

^aUptake rates within each column followed by different letters are significantly different at P *5* 0.05.

NO3-. Kosola (1991) and Siddiqi et al. (1992) found that $ClO₃$ ⁻ may be a poor analog for $NO₃$ ⁻ in some organisms. We also found ClO_3^- to be a poor analog for NO_3^- (data not shown).

To our knowledge, all studies in which $13NO₃$ ⁻ has been used to determine the effect of NH₄⁺ on NO₃⁻ uptake have concluded that NO₃⁻ influx is inhibited by the presence of NH4+ (Glass et al., 1985; Lee and Clarkson, 1986; Ingemarsson et al., 1987; Oscarson et al., 1987; Lee and Drew, 1989; Ayling, 1993; King et al., 1993). Lee and Drew (1986) suggested, however, that the influx of $NO₃⁻$, as measured by 13 NO₃⁻, may be underestimated by as much as 25 to 30% at concentrations of 0.15 mm because of concurrent efflux of the tracer during the uptake period. Siddiqi et al. (1989) pointed out that this depends on the rate of increase of cytoplasmic specific activity and the rate of efflux. Perhaps the presence of $NH₄$ ⁺ can facilitate such efflux. This would be detected as decreased NO₃⁻ influx in the presence of NH_4^+ . In $^{15}NO_3^-$ experiments, decreased NO_3^- influx ascribed to NH4+ (MacKown et al., 1982a) required longer uptake times (2 h) relative to the half-life of cytoplasmic exchange, e.g. **4** min (Lee and Clarkson, 1986) and 7 min (Siddiqi et al., 1991); therefore, these studies may actually reflect net uptake (Fried et al., 1965).

Other factors may also contribute to the reported variability. Genotypic variation occurs in barley (Bloom and Finazzo, 1986) and com (Pan et al., 1985) roots relative to the effect of NH₄⁺ on NO₃⁻ uptake. Decreased in vivo reduction of root NO_3^- in the presence of NH_4^+ has been proposed as a possible secondary effector causing decreased NO₃⁻ uptake (MacKown et al., 1982b; Pan et al., 1985). Although this may occur in long-term studies, evidence indicates that it likely does not affect shorter-tem studies. The double barley mutant, which lacks both the NADH and NAD(P)H nitrate reductase isozymes and, therefore, can reduce very little $NO₃⁻$, had net $NO₃⁻$ uptake rates similar to those of the wild type (Warner and Huffaker, 1989).

SUMMARY

Our results show that $NH₄$ ⁺ had little effect on $NO₃$ ⁻ influx in roots of plants that contained negligible concentrations of $NO₃⁻$. As expected, no $NO₃⁻$ efflux was detected from such seedlings. In contrast, $NH₄⁺$ inhibited net $NO₃⁻$ uptake as a function of the internal concentration of NO₃⁻. This was the direct result of increased $NO₃⁻$ efflux in the presence of NH₄+.

The results were substantiated by determining :he effects of NH_4 ⁺ on NO_2 ⁻ uptake. There was little if any effect of NH_4 ⁺ on NO_2 ⁻ uptake unless the roots were loaded with $NO₂$ ⁻ just prior to determination of uptake. Under those conditions, net NO₂⁻ uptake was decreased as a result of increased efflux in the presence of $NH₄⁺$.

Received March 21, 1994; accepted July 20, 1994. Copyright Clearance Center: **0032-0889/94/l06/1293/09.**

LITERATURE CITED

- **Aslam M, Huffaker RC, Rains DW, Rao KP** (1979) Influence of light and ambient carbon dioxide concentration on nitrate assimilation by intact barley seedlings. Plant Physiol 63: 1205-1209
- Aslam M, Travis RL, Huffaker RC (1992) Comparative kinetics and reciproca1 inhibition of nitrate and nitrite uptake in roots of **unin**duced and induced barley *(Hordeum uulgare* L.) seedlings. Plant Physiol 99: 1124-1133
- **Aslam M, Travis RL, Huffaker RC** (1993) Comparative induction of nitrate and nitite uptake and reduction systems by ambient nitrate and nitite in intact roots of barley *(Hordeum uulgare* L.) seedlings. Plant Physiol 102: 811-819
- **Ayling SM** (1993) The effect of ammonium ion on membrane potential and anion flux in roots of barley and tomato. Plant Cell Environ **16** 297-303
- **Bloom AJ, Finazzo J** (1986) The influence of ammoniurn and chloride on potassium and nitrate absorption by barley roots depends on time of exposure and cultivar. Plant Physiol81: 67-69
- **Breteler H, Siegerist M** (1984) Effect of ammonium on nitrate utilization by roots of dwarf bean. Plant Physiol 75: 1099-1103
- Carlson RM (1978) Automated separation and conductimetric determination of ammonia and dissolved carbon dioxide. Ana1 Chem *⁵⁰*1528-1531
- **Chaillou S, Rideout** *JW,* **Raper CD, Morot-Gaudry J-F** (1994) Responses of soybean to ammonium and nitrate supplied in combination to the whole root system or separately in a split-root system. Physiol Plant **90** 259-268
- de la Haba P, Aguera E, Maldonado JM (1990) Differential effects of ammonium and tungsten on nitrate and nitrite uptake and reduction by sunflower plants. Plant Sci 70: 21-26
- **Deane-Drummond CE** (1985) Regulation of nitrate uptake into *Chara corallina cells via NH*⁺ stimulation of NO₃⁻ eliflux. Plant Cell Environ 8: 105-111
Deane-Drummond CE (1986) Nitrate uptake into *Pisum sativum* L
- cv. Feltham First seedlings: commonality with nitrate uptake into Chara corallina and *Hordeum vulgare* through a substrate cycling model. Plant Cell Environ 9: 41-48
- **Deane-Drummond CE, Glass ADM** (1983) Short tem studies of nitrate uptake into barley plants using ion-specific electrodes and 36° ClO₃⁻. II. Regulation of NO_3 ⁻ efflux by NH_4 ⁺. Plant Physiol 73: 105-110
- **Doddema H, Telkamp GP** (1979) Uptake of nitrate by mutants of *Arabidopsis thalianu* disturbed in uptake or reduction o' nitrate. **11.** Kinetics. Physiol Plant 45: 332-338
- Fried M, Zsoldos F, Vose PB, Shatokhin IL (1965) Characterizing

the NO_3^- and NH_4^+ uptake process of rice roots by use of ¹⁵N labelled NH₄NO₃. Physiol Plant 18: 313-320

- **Glass ADM, Thompson RG, Bordeleau L** (1985) Regulation of NO₃⁻ influx in barley. Studies using ¹³NO₃⁻. Plant Physiol 77: 379-381
- **Goyal SS, Huffaker RC** (1986) A nove1 approach and a fully automated microcomputer-based system to study kinetics of $NO₃⁻$, $NO₂^-$, and $NH₄$ ⁺ transport simultaneously by intact wheat seedlings. Plant Cell Environ 9: 209-215
- **Hoagland DR, Arnon DI** (1950) The water culture method for growing plants without soil. Calif Agric Exp Stn Bull347: 32
- **Ingemarsson B, Oscarson P, af Ugglas M, Larsson C-M** (1987) Nitrogen utilization in *Lemna.* **111.** Short tem effects of ammonium on nitrate uptake and nitrate reduction. Plant Physiol 85: 865-867
- **Jackson WA, Kwik KD, Volk RJ, Butz RG** (1976) Nitrate influx and efflux by intact wheat seedlings: effects of prior nitrate nutrition. Planta 132: 149-156
- **King BJ, Siddiqi MY, Ruth TJ, Warner RL, Glass ADM** (1993) Feedback regulation of nitrate influx in barley roots by nitrate, nitrite, and ammonium. Plant Physiol 102: 1279-1286
- **Kosola KR** (1991) Transport of ammonium, nitrate, methylammonium, and chlorate in tomato *(Lycopersicon esculentum*, Mill, cv T5), and characterization of a nitrate reductase deficient tomato mutant. PhD thesis, University of Califomia, Davis
- **Lee RB, Clarkson DT** (1986) Nitrogen-13 studies of nitrate fluxes in barley roots. I. Compartmental analysis from measurements of ¹³N efflux. J Exp Bot **37:** 1753-1767
- **Lee RB, Drew MC** (1986) Nitrogen-13 studies of nitrate fluxes in barley roots. **11.** Effect of plant N status on the kinetic parameters of nitrate influx. J Exp Bot 37: 1768-1779
- Lee RB, Drew MC (1989) Rapid, reversible inhibition of nitrate influx in barley by ammonium. J Exp Bot $40: 741-752$
- **MacKown CT, Jackson WA, Volk RJ** (1982a) Restricted nitrate influx and reduction in com seedlings exposed to ammonium. Plant Physiol 69: 353-359
- **MacKown CT, Volk RJ, Jackson WA** (1982b) Nitrate assimilation by decapitated com root systems: effects of ammonium during induction. Plant *Sci Lett* 24: 295-302
- **Oaks A, Stulen I, Boesel IL** (1979) Influence of amino acids and ammonium on nitrate reduction in com seedlings. Can J Bot 57: 1824-1829
- **Oscarson P, Ingmarsson 8, af Ugglas M, Larsson C-M** (1987) Short

term studies of NO_3^- uptake in *Pisum* using $\frac{13}{NO_3^-}$. Planta 170: 550-555

- **Pan WL, Jackson WA, Mo11 RH** (1985) Nitrate uptake and partitioning by com root systems. Differential effects of ammonium among genotypes and stages of root development. Plant Physiol 77: 560-566
- **Rao KP, Rains DW** (1976) Nitrate absorption by barley. I. Kinetics and energetics. Plant Physiol $57: 55-58$
- **Roberts JKM, Pang MKL** (1992) Estimation of ammonium ion distribution between cytoplasm and vacuole using nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy. Plant Physiol **100** 1571-1574
- **Rufty TW, Raper CD, Jackson WA** (1983) Growth and nitrogen assimilation of soybeans in response to ammonium and nitrate nutrition. Bot Gaz 144: 466-470
- **Schloemer RH, Garrett RH** (1974) Nitrate transport system in *Neurospora crassa.* J Bacteriol **118:** 259-269
- **Schrader LE, Domska D, Jung PE, Peterson LA** (1972) Uptake and assimilation of ammonium-N and nitrate-N and their influence on the growth of corn (Zea mays L.). Agron J 64: 690-695
- **Siddiqi MY, Glass ADM, Ruth TJ** (1991) Studies of the uptake of nitrate in barley. III. Compartmentation of NO₃⁻. J Exp Bot 42: 1455-1463
- **Siddiqi MY, Glass ADM, Ruth TJ, Fernando M** (1989) Studies on the regulation of nitrate influx by barley seedlings using ¹³NO₃⁻. Plant Physiol 90: 806-813
- **Siddiqi MY, King BJ, Glass ADM** (1992) Effects of nitrite, chlorate, and chlorite on nitrate uptake and nitrate reductase activity. Plant Physiol 100: 644-650
- **Smith FW, Thompson JF** (1971) Regulation of nitrate reductase in excised barley roots. Plant Physiol 48: 219-223
- **Thayer JR, Huffaker RC** (1980) Determination of nitrate and nitrite by high-pressure liquid chromatography: comparison with other methods for nitrate determination. Ana1 Biochem 102: 110-119
- **Ullrich WR, Larsson M, Larsson C-M, Lesch S, Novacky A** (1984) Ammonium uptake in *Lemna gibba* G1, related membrane potential changes, and inhibition of anion uptake. Physiol Plant 61: 369-376
- **Wang MY, Siddiqi MY, Ruth TJ, Glass ADM** (1993) Ammonium uptake by rice roots. I. Fluxes and subcellular distribution of ¹³NH₄⁺. Plant Physiol 103: 1249–1258
- **Warner RL, Huffaker RC** (1989) Nitrate transport **is** independent of NADH and NAD(P)H nitrate reductases in barley seedlings. Plant Physiol 91: 947-953