

Plant Electrophysiology

Alexander G. Volkov (Ed.)

Plant Electrophysiology

Theory and Methods

With 142 Figures, 26 in Color, and 4 Tables

 Springer

Prof. Dr. Alexander G. Volkov
Department of Chemistry
Oakwood College
7000 Adventist Boulevard
Huntsville, AL 35896, USA
e-mail: agvolkov@yahoo.com

Library of Congress Control Number: 2006925966

ISBN-10 3-540-32717-7 Springer Berlin Heidelberg New York
ISBN-13 978-3-540-32717-2 Springer Berlin Heidelberg New York

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilm or in any other way, and storage in data banks. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the German Copyright Law of September 9, 1965, in its current version, and permissions for use must always be obtained from Springer-Verlag. Violations are liable for prosecution under the German Copyright Law.

Springer is a part of Springer Science+Business Media

springer.com

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2006
Printed in The Netherlands

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

Cover design: Design & Production GmbH, Heidelberg, Germany
Typesetting and production: SPi

Printed on acid-free paper SPIN 11392699 149/3100/SPi 5 4 3 2 1 0

Preface

Plants continually gather information about their environment. Environmental changes elicit various biological responses. The cells, tissues, and organs of plants possess the ability to become excited under the influence of environmental factors. Plants synchronize their normal biological functions with their responses to the environment. The synchronization of internal functions, based on external events, is linked with the phenomenon of excitability in plant cells. The conduction of bioelectrochemical excitation is a fundamental property of living organisms.

The conduction of bioelectrochemical excitation is a rapid method of long distance signal transmission between plant tissues and organs. Plants promptly respond to changes in luminous intensity, osmotic pressure, temperature, cutting, mechanical stimulation, water availability, wounding, and chemical compounds such as herbicides, plant growth stimulants, salts, and water potential. Once initiated, electrical impulses can propagate to adjacent excitable cells. The bioelectrochemical system in plants not only regulates stress responses, but photosynthetic processes as well. The generation of electrical gradients is a fundamental aspect of signal transduction.

This book consists of a historical introduction to plant electrophysiology, and two parts. The first one deals with the methods in plant electrophysiology. Seven chapters present methods of measuring the membrane potentials, ion fluxes, transmembrane ion gradients, ion-selective microelectrode measurements, patch-clamp technique, magnetic measurements, new solid state microsensors and electrochemical sensors. The second part deals with experimental results and theoretical interpretation. All chapters are comprehensively referenced throughout.

Green plants are a unique canvas for studying signal transduction. Plant electrophysiology is the foundation for discovering and improving biosensors for monitoring the environment; detecting effects of pollutants, pesticides, and defoliant; monitoring climate changes; plant-insect interactions; agriculture; and directing and fast controlling of conditions influencing the harvest.

I am grateful to my colleagues for their valuable contribution to this book. We thank the authors for the time they spent on this project and for teaching us about their work. I would like to thank our Acquisition Editor, Dr. Christina Eckey, and our Production Editor, Ursula Gramm, for their friendly and courteous assistance.

Alexander George Volkov

Contents

Part I Methods of Plant Electrophysiology

1	Historical Introduction to Plant Electrophysiology	
	RAINER STAHLBERG	3
1.1	Intracellular recording of membrane potentials and other improvements	5
1.2	Plant action potentials	6
1.3	“Plants have no nerves!”	8
1.4	Photoelectric response of green leaves	10
	References	11
2	Electrochemical Methods and Measuring Transmembrane Ion Gradients	
	ANTHONY J. MILLER AND DARREN M. WELLS	15
2.1	Methods for electrical recordings from plants	15
2.1.1	Making contact	15
2.1.2	Recording from plants	17
2.2	Manufacture and use of ion-selective electrodes	18
2.2.1	Theory of ISEs	18
2.2.2	Types of ISEs	20
2.2.3	Making ISEs	21
2.2.3.1	<i>Pulling of glass micropipettes</i>	21
2.2.3.2	<i>Silanization of glass surface</i>	23
2.2.3.3	<i>Backfilling</i>	23
2.2.3.4	<i>Cocktail components</i>	24
2.2.4	Calibration and storage	25
2.3	Data analysis, interpretation and presentation	27
2.4	Finding problems with ion-selective microelectrodes and a comparison with other methods	28
2.4.1	Troubleshooting guide	28
2.4.2	Comparison with other methods	30
2.5	Transport and transmembrane ion gradients	31
	References	33

3	Non-Invasive Microelectrode Ion Flux Measurements In Plant Stress Physiology	
	SERGEY SHABALA	35
3.1	Introduction: membranes and plant stress responses	35
3.2	Basic techniques for studying membrane transport in plants	36
	3.2.1 Comparative analysis of basic techniques	36
	3.2.2 Non-invasive ion flux measurements	39
3.3	MIFE technique for non-invasive ion flux measurements	40
	3.3.1 Theory	40
	3.3.2 MIFE hardware	42
	3.3.3 Methodological issues	44
3.4	Application of ion-selective microelectrodes to study plant adaptive responses to environmental conditions	45
	3.4.1 Nutritional disorders	45
	3.4.2 Salinity	46
	3.4.2.1 <i>Specific and non-specific components of salt stress</i>	46
	3.4.2.2 <i>Delineating the role of the plasma membrane H⁺-pump in salt stress responses</i>	47
	3.4.2.3 <i>K⁺ homeostasis as a key feature of salt tolerance</i>	47
	3.4.2.4 <i>Ameliorative effects of Ca²⁺</i>	48
	3.4.3 Osmotic stress	49
	3.4.4 Temperature extremes	51
	3.4.5 Soil pH	52
	3.4.6 Oxygen deprivation	55
	3.4.7 Oxidative stress	56
	3.4.8 Biotic stresses	58
3.5	Prospects and conclusions	61
	References	62
4	Electrochemical Sensor Applications to the Study of Molecular Physiology and Analyte Flux in Plants	
	MARK A. MESSERLI, KENNETH R. ROBINSON AND PETER J.S. SMITH	73
4.1	Introduction	73
4.2	Electrochemical detection with microelectrodes	74
	4.2.1 Properties of electrochemical sensors	74
	4.2.2 Response time	75
	4.2.3 Spatial resolution	78
	4.2.4 Electrode types	79
	4.2.4.1 <i>Potentiometric: construction</i>	79
	4.2.4.2 <i>Potentiometric: selectivity</i>	80
	4.2.4.3 <i>Potentiometric: positional artifacts</i>	82
	4.2.4.4 <i>Amperometric: construction</i>	83
	4.2.4.5 <i>Amperometric: selectivity</i>	84
	4.2.4.6 <i>Amperometric: positional artifacts</i>	84
4.3	Self-referencing	85
	4.3.1 Introduction	85
	4.3.2 Self-referencing of ion-selective electrodes	87
	4.3.3 Self-referencing of amperometric electrodes	90

4.3.4	Calculation of flux	91
4.3.5	Correction for analyte buffering	92
4.3.6	Other considerations for corrections	93
4.3.7	Theoretical considerations for signal detection and increased signal to noise	94
4.3.8	Data collection	96
4.4	Self-referencing as applied to plants	100
4.4.1	Ca ²⁺ fluxes in an alga: comparison of radiotracers and a self-referencing Ca ²⁺ electrode	100
4.4.2	Evaluation of self-referencing of ion-selective electrodes on pollen tube ion dynamics.	101
4.5	Conclusion	104
	References.	104
5	Use of Non-Invasive Ion-Selective Microelectrode Techniques for the Study of Plant Development	
	JOSEPH G. KUNKEL, SOFIA CORDEIRO, YU (JEFF) XU, ALAN M. SHIPLEY AND JOSÉ A. FEIJÓ	109
5.1	Ion dynamics in plant development.	109
5.2	Molecular basis of ion fluxes in plants.	109
5.3	Scanning probe: technical advantages and disadvantages.	110
5.4	Capabilities of scanning microelectrode technology	116
5.4.1	Artificial point source device	117
5.5	Calibrations of probes using particular sampling rules	119
5.6	Point sources used to test the resolution of microelectrodes	122
5.7	Different plant systems investigated	123
5.8	Pollen tubes	124
5.9	Root hairs	133
5.10	Fertilization in higher plants	134
5.11	Conclusions	135
	References.	135
6	Use of Double Barrel Micropipettes to Voltage-Clamp Plant and Fungal Cells	
	ROGER R. LEW	139
6.1	Intracellular measurements in intact, turgid cell compared to protoplasts	139
6.1.1	Protoplasts are required for patch clamp	139
6.2	Voltage clamping intact turgid cells.	140
6.2.1	Discontinuous voltage clamp: a single barrel used for both current injection and voltage monitoring	140
6.2.2	Dual impalements	141
6.2.3	Double barrel micropipettes	142
6.3	Double barrel micropipette fabrication	142
6.3.1	Limitations	144
6.3.1.1	<i>Crosstalk between barrels</i>	144
6.3.1.2	<i>Maximal current injection</i>	144
6.3.1.3	<i>Space clamping</i>	145

6.4	Use: electronics and computer control	145
6.4.1	Electrometers and voltage clamp circuit	147
6.5	Examples of measurements	147
6.5.1	Input resistance	149
6.5.2	Current-voltage relations	150
6.5.3	Cell-to-cell coupling.	150
6.6	Summary	150
	References.	153
7	New Solid State Microsensors in Plant Physiology	
	STEFANO MANCUSO AND ANNA MARIA MARRAS.	155
7.1	Introduction.	155
7.2	IAA-selective microelectrode	156
7.2.1	Preparation of the IAA-selective microsensor.	157
7.2.2	Calculation of the diffusion coefficient for IAA	158
7.2.3	Example of use of the IAA-selective microelectrode	158
7.3	O ₂ -selective microelectrode	160
7.3.1	Preparation of the O ₂ -selective microsensor	160
7.3.2	Example of use of the O ₂ -selective microelectrode	161
7.4	The NO-selective microelectrode.	163
7.5	The Cu ²⁺ -selective microelectrode	166
7.6	Future prospects	168
	References.	169
8	Electrophysiological Characterization of Plant Cation Channels	
	VADIM DEMIDCHIK, ANATOLY SOKOLIK AND VLADIMIR YURIN.	173
8.1	Introduction	173
8.2	Overview of electrophysiological techniques	174
8.2.1	Extracellular recordings	175
8.2.2	Intracellular recordings.	176
	8.2.2.1 <i>Measurement of membrane potential</i>	
	<i>by impaling with single electrode</i>	176
	8.2.2.2 <i>Two-electrode voltage-clamp technique.</i>	177
	8.2.2.3 <i>Patch-clamp technique</i>	179
8.3	Conclusions and perspectives.	182
	References.	182
9	Magnetic Measurements in Plant Electrophysiology	
	ZVONKO TRONTELJ, GERHARD THIEL AND VOJKO JAZBINSEK.	187
9.1	Introduction	187
9.2	On SQUID sensors.	188
9.3	Basic steps in analysis and modeling of sources of electric	
	activity connected to electric and magnetic measurements.	193
9.3.1	Direct and inverse problem.	194
9.3.2	Single cylindrically shaped cell [core (volume)	
	conductor model].	195

9.3.3	Covariance method—dC fields	197
9.3.4	Current distribution with the minimum norm estimation	197
9.4	Case studies	198
9.4.1	Measurements of action current (AC)—magnetic analogy to action potential (AP) in <i>Chara corallina</i> using the multichannel SQUID measuring system	199
9.4.2	Chemical nature of the AP in <i>Chara corallina</i> as it can be seen from the non-invasive observation (by SQUID microscope) of the intracellular current under the influence of light.	204
9.4.2.1	<i>Experimental</i>	205
9.4.2.2	<i>Modeling</i>	209
9.4.2.3	<i>Other studies on Chara corallina</i>	212
9.4.3	Magnetic detection of injury induced ionic currents	212
	References.	215

Part II Plant Electrophysiology

10 Electrogenic Pumps

	ROGER M. SPANSWICK	221
10.1	Introduction	221
10.2	Problems with the neutral ion pump assumption	223
10.2.1	Effects of external ion concentrations	223
10.2.2	Membrane conductance	223
10.3	Alternatives to the neutral pump assumption.	224
10.3.1	Criteria for electrogenic ion pumps	224
10.4	Electrophysiological evidence for electrogenic pumps at the plasma membrane.	225
10.4.1	Electrophysiology of characean cells	226
10.4.2	Electrophysiology of marine algae—the electrogenic Cl ⁻ pump of <i>Acetabularia</i>	234
10.4.3	Electrophysiology of higher plant cells	234
10.5	Plant plasma membrane H ⁺ -ATPase	235
10.5.1	Isolated plasma membrane vesicles	236
10.6	Tonoplast	237
10.6.1	Electrophysiology.	237
10.6.2	Isolated tonoplast vesicles.	238
10.7	Conclusions	239
	References.	240

11 Effects of Electrical and Electromagnetic Fields on Plants and Related Topics

	ANDREW GOLDSWORTHY	247
11.1	Non-polar effects of DC electric fields.	247
11.1.1	High voltage natural fields and the rise and fall of electroculture.	247

	11.1.1.1	Phenomenology	247
	11.1.1.2	Ecological significance of natural electric fields	248
	11.1.2	Low voltage fields and plant tissue cultures	249
	11.1.3	Mechanism of the non-polar effects of DC fields	249
11.2		Polar effects of DC electric fields	250
	11.2.1	Direct current effects on single cells.	250
	11.2.2	Direct current effects on multicellular structures.	251
	11.2.2.1	Effects on plant tissue cultures	251
	11.2.2.2	Tropic curvatures.	253
11.3		Effects of weak time-varying electromagnetic fields.	254
	11.3.1	Phenomenology	254
	11.3.2	Hypothesis	255
	11.3.3	Why are eddy currents necessary?	256
	11.3.4	How do low frequency eddy currents affect membrane permeability?	256
	11.3.4.1	Amplitude dependent mechanism	257
	11.3.5	Why are some frequencies more effective than others?	259
	11.3.5.1	What is ion cyclotron resonance?	259
	11.3.5.2	What are the biological effects of resonance?	259
	11.3.6	How are ion channels involved?	261
	11.3.7	How do modulated radio waves give their effects?	262
	11.3.8	How does membrane permeability affect metabolism?	263
	11.3.9	Summary of the hypothesis.	264
		References.	265
12		Long-Distance Electrical Signaling and Physiological Functions in Higher Plants	
	JÖRG FROMM		269
	12.1	Introduction	269
	12.2	Perception of electrical signals	270
	12.3	Aphid technique as a tool for measuring electrical signals in the phloem.	272
	12.4	Electrical properties of the phloem and characteristics of phloem-transmitted signals	274
	12.5	Electrical signaling via the phloem and its effect on phloem transport	275
	12.6	Role of electrical signals in root-to-shoot communication of water-stressed plants.	277
	12.7	Role of electrical signaling during fertilization.	278
	12.8	Long-distance electrical signaling in woody plants	279
	12.8.1	Membrane potential, electrical signals and growth of willow roots.	279
	12.8.2	Electrical properties of wood-producing cells.	279
	12.8.3	Role of electrical signaling in the regulation of photosynthesis.	281
	12.9	Conclusions	282
		References.	282

13 Potassium Homeostasis in Salinized Plant Tissues	
TRACEY A. CUIN AND SERGEY SHABALA	287
13.1 Introduction	287
13.2 Potassium acquisition and distribution in plants	288
13.2.1 Uptake at the root level	289
13.2.2 Xylem loading	289
13.2.3 Potassium compartmentation at the tissue and whole-plant levels	290
13.2.4 Intracellular K ⁺ compartmentation	290
13.2.5 Remobilization and recycling	291
13.3 Ionic mechanisms of K ⁺ acquisition and transport in plants	291
13.3.1 General features of K ⁺ transporters in plants	291
13.3.2 Basic features and control modes of potassium transporters	292
13.3.2.1 <i>Shaker family of potassium channels</i>	292
13.3.2.2 “Two-pore” potassium channels	294
13.3.2.3 <i>Cyclic nucleotide-gated (CNG) channels</i>	295
13.3.2.4 <i>K⁺/H⁺ antiporters</i>	295
13.3.2.5 <i>KUP/HAK/KT transporters</i>	295
13.3.2.6 <i>HKT transporters</i>	296
13.3.2.7 <i>LCT1</i>	297
13.3.2.8 <i>Glutamate receptors</i>	298
13.3.2.9 <i>Other transport systems</i>	298
13.4 Specificity of salinity effect on K ⁺ homeostasis in plant tissues	298
13.4.1 K ⁺ /Na ⁺ competition for uptake—channels and symporters	298
13.4.1.1 <i>Inward-rectifying channels from the Shaker family</i>	299
13.4.1.2 <i>KUP/HAK/KT transporters</i>	299
13.4.1.3 <i>High affinity transporters—HKT1</i>	300
13.4.1.4 <i>LCT1</i>	301
13.4.1.5 <i>Non-selective cation channels</i>	301
13.4.2 Sodium/cation antiporters	301
13.4.2.1 <i>The SOS-signal transduction pathway</i>	302
13.4.2.2 <i>Tonoplast Na⁺/H⁺ antiporters</i>	303
13.4.2.3 <i>HAL genes</i>	304
13.4.3 Mitigating effect of calcium	305
13.4.4 Ion compartmentation between roots and shoots	305
13.4.5 Compartmentation at the tissue level	307
13.5 Conclusions and future perspectives	308
References	309
14 Electrophysiology in Mechanosensing and Wounding Response	
TERUO SHIMMEN	319
14.1 Mechanosensing	319
14.1.1 Responses of plants to mechanical stimulus	319
14.1.2 Receptor potential in higher plants	319

14.1.3	Analysis of receptor potential in Characean cells	320
14.1.4	Stretch-activated channel	325
14.1.5	Signal transmission by action potential	325
14.1.6	Ionic mechanism of action potential analyzed in Characeae	326
14.1.7	Control by action potential	328
14.1.7.1	<i>Turgor movement in M. pudica</i>	328
14.1.7.2	<i>Intracellular signal processing induced by action potential</i>	329
14.2	Wounding response	331
14.2.1	Electrical response in wounded plants	331
14.2.1.1	<i>Leaf movement in Mimosa pudica</i>	332
14.2.1.2	<i>Propagation of action potential and variation potential</i>	333
14.2.2	Analysis in Characean cells	333
14.2.3	Transformation of pressure signal into electrical signal	335
	References	337
15	Electrochemical Potential Around the Plant Root in Relation to Metabolism and Growth Acceleration	
	TSUTOMU TAKAMURA	341
15.1	Introduction	341
15.2	Potential distribution around the root of seedling in culturing solution	342
15.2.1	Introduction	342
15.2.2	Experimental set-up	343
15.2.3	Results and discussion	345
15.3	pH change around the root during the growth of seedlings	347
15.3.1	Introduction	347
15.3.2	Experimental	347
15.3.3	Results and discussion	349
15.4	Effect of cotyledon on electrochemical potential near the root	355
15.4.1	Introduction	355
15.4.2	Experimental	356
15.4.3	Results and discussion	356
15.5	Growth acceleration of dicotyledon seedlings by application of potential to the root in the culturing bath	359
15.5.1	Introduction	359
15.5.2	Experimental	360
15.5.3	Results and discussion	360
15.6	Growth acceleration of a monocotyledon seedling by application of potential in culturing bath	365
15.6.1	Introduction	365
15.6.2	Experimental	365
15.6.3	Results and discussion	365

	15.6.3.1	Growing acceleration by square wave application	365
	15.6.3.2	Mechanism analysis	366
15.7		Control of lateral root shooting position	367
	15.7.1	Introduction	367
	15.7.2	Experimental	367
	15.7.3	Results and discussion	368
	15.7.3.1	Acceleration of lateral root shooting at voltage applied position	368
	15.7.3.2	Wave shape and degree of acceleration	369
15.8		Effect of Ca ²⁺ and phosphate ions for the growth acceleration by voltage application	370
	15.8.1	Introduction	370
	15.8.2	Experimental	370
	15.8.3	Results and discussion	370
15.9		Conclusions	372
		References	373
16		Electrophysiology of Turgor Regulation in Charophyte Cells	
		MARY J. BEILBY, MARY A. BISSON AND VIRGINIA A. SHEPHERD	375
16.1		Turgor regulation	375
	16.1.1	What is turgor pressure?	375
	16.1.2	How do plant cells regulate turgor?	376
	16.1.3	Other consequences of turgor stress	376
16.2		Why study giant-celled algae?	377
	16.2.1	Advantages of aquatic systems	377
	16.2.2	Advantages of studying algae	378
	16.2.3	Advantages of studying algae with giant cells	380
16.3		Charophyte algae	381
	16.3.1	Phylogeny	381
	16.3.2	Advantages to study	384
	16.3.2.1	Ionic species likely to have an affect on electrophysiological properties during turgor regulation	385
	16.3.2.2	Turgor regulation	387
	16.3.2.3	I/V profiles and modeling	391
16.4		Future avenues for study	400
16.5		Summary	400
	16.5.1	I/V curve technique	400
	16.5.2	“Giant” cells	401
		References	401
17		Electrical Signals in Plants: Facts and Hypotheses	
		ERIC DAVIES	407
17.1		What is the context?	407
17.2		What are major definitions and types of signal?	408

17.3	What are action potentials?	409
17.4	What are variation potentials?	411
17.5	What stimuli evoke AP and VP and what are the consequences?	411
17.6	How do you measure AP and VP?	414
17.7	How do you differentiate between AP and VP?	416
17.8	Why do plants have electrical signals and why are there two types?	417
	References.	418
18	Electrophysiology of Plant Gravitropism	
	BRATISLAV STANKOVIĆ	423
18.1	Introduction	423
18.2	Extracellular gravielectric potentials	424
	18.2.1 Shoots	424
	18.2.2 Roots	426
18.3	Intracellular gravielectric potentials	427
	18.3.1 Shoots	427
	18.3.2 Roots	428
18.4	Physiology of the gravielectric phenomena.	430
18.5	Prospects.	433
	References.	434
19	Electrochemistry of Plant Life	
	ALEXANDER G. VOLKOV AND COURTNEY L. BROWN	437
19.1	Green plants: electrochemical interfaces	437
19.2	Effects of environmental conditions on the electrochemistry of plants.	441
	19.2.1 Atmospheric electrochemistry: effects of the electric double layer of the Earth and acid rains	441
	19.2.2 Effects of pesticides, pollutants, uncouplers, and protonophores	443
	19.2.3 Insect-induced bioelectrochemical signals in potato plants	446
19.3	Electrical activity of excitable membranes	446
19.4	Measuring of action and variation potentials in plants	448
19.5	Electrochemistry of photosynthetic systems	451
	19.5.1 Structure and composition of the oxygen-evolving complex in vivo	451
	19.5.2 Molecular mechanism of oxygen evolution in vivo	455
19.6	Conclusions and future perspectives	456
	References.	457
20	Electrophysiology and Plant Responses to Biotic Stress	
	MASSIMO MAFFEI AND SIMONE BOSSI	461
20.1	Abiotic and biotic stress	461
	20.1.1 What is an abiotic stress?	461
	20.1.2 What is a biotic stress?	462

20.2	Plant responses to herbivore attack	464
20.3	Plant responses to plant attack	466
20.4	Methods in plant electrophysiology following herbivore attack	467
20.4.1	Our model system for electrophysiology	467
20.4.2	Bite and wounds: is there any difference?	472
20.4.3	Action potentials and membrane potentials: continuous recording	473
20.4.4	Much more than a bite: the effect of larvae regurgitates	476
20.5	Conclusions	477
	References	478
21	Control of Plant Development by Hydro-Electrochemical Signal Transduction: a Means for Understanding Photoperiodic Flower Induction	
	EDGAR WAGNER, LARS LEHNER, JUSTYNA VEIT, JOHANNES NORMANN, MARCO VERVLIIET-SCHEEBAUM AND JOLANA T.P. ALBRECHTOVÁ	483
21.1	Introduction: photoperiodic flower induction	483
21.2	Model system <i>Chenopodium</i> : induction of flowering from physiology to molecular biology	484
21.3	Electrophysiology and plant behaviour	486
21.4	Circadian rhythms as metabolic bases for hydro-electrochemical signal transduction	488
21.5	Hydraulic-electrochemical oscillations as integrators of cellular and organismic activity	490
21.6	Local hydraulic signaling: the shoot apex in transition	492
21.7	Summary and perspectives: electrophysiology and primary meristems	495
	References	497
	Index	503

List of Contributors

JOLANA T. P. ALBRECHTOVÁ

University of Freiburg, Institute of Biology II, Schänzlestr. 1, Freiburg, D-79104, Germany

MARY J. BEILBY

Department of Biophysics, School of Physics, The University of New South Wales, Sydney 2052, Australia

MARY A. BISSON

Department of Biological Sciences, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14260, USA

SIMONE BOSSI

Department of Plant Biology, Centre of Excellence CEBIOVEM, University of Turin, 25 Viale P.A. Mattioli, Turin 10125, Italy

COURTNEY BROWN

Department of Chemistry, Oakwood College, 7000 Adventist Blvd., Huntsville, AL 35896, USA

SOFIA CORDEIRO

Centro de Biologia do Desenvolvimento, Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciencia, PT-2780-156 Oeiras, Portugal

TRACEY A. CUIN

School of Agricultural Science, University of Tasmania, Private Bag 54, Hobart, Tas 7001, Australia

ERIC DAVIES

North Carolina State University, Department of Botany, 1231 Gardner Hall, Raleigh, NC 27695-7612, USA

VADIM DEMIDCHIK

Department of Plant Sciences, University of Cambridge, Downing Street, CB23EA, Cambridge, UK

JOSÉ FEIJÓ

Universidade de Lisboa, Fac. Ciências, Dept. Biologia Vegetal, Campo Grande C2, 1749-016 Lisboa, Portugal and Centro de Biologia do Desenvolvimento, Instituto Gulbenkian Ciência, PT-2780-156 Oeiras, Portugal

JÖRG FROMM

Wood Biology, Technical University of Munich, Winzererstrasse 45, 80797 Munich, Germany

ANDREW GOLDSWORTHY

6 Sandall Road, London W5 1JD, UK

VOJKO JAZBINSEK

Department of Physics, IMFM, University of Ljubljana, Jadranska 19, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

JOSEPH G. KUNKEL

Department of Biology, University of Massachusetts Amherst, MA 01003-5810, USA

LARS LEHNER

University of Freiburg, Institute of Biology II, Schänzlestr. 1, Freiburg, D-79104, Germany

ROGER R. LEW

Department of Biology, York University, Toronto, Ontario M3J 1P3, Canada

MASSIMO MAFFEI

Department of Plant Biology, Centre of Excellence CEBIOVEM, University of Turin, 25 Viale P.A. Mattioli, Turin 10125, Italy

STEFANO MANCUSO

Department of Horticulture, University of Firenze, Viale delle Idee 30, 50019 Sesto Fiorentino, Italy

ANNA MARIA MARRAS

Department of Pharmaceutical Science, Polo Scientifico, Università di Firenze, via Ugo Schiff 6, 50019 Sesto Fiorentino, Italy

MARK A. MESSERLI

BioCurrents Research Center, Program in Molecular Physiology, Marine Biological Laboratory, 7 MBL Street, Woods Hole, MA 02543, USA

ANTHONY J. MILLER

CPI Division, Rothamsted Research, Harpenden, Hertfordshire, AL5 2JQ, UK

JOHANES NORMANN

University of Freiburg, Institute of Biology II, Schänzlestr. 1, Freiburg, D-79104, Germany

KENNETH R. ROBINSON

Department of Biological Sciences, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA

SERGEY SHABALA

School of Agricultural Science, University of Tasmania, Private Bag 54, Hobart, Tas 7001, Australia

VIRGINIA A. SHEPHERD

Department of Biological Sciences, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14260, USA

TERUO SHIMMEN

Department of Life Science, Graduate School of Science, Himeji Institute of Technology Harima Science Park City, Hyogo, 658-1297 Japan

ALAN M. SHIPLEY

Applicable Electronics Inc., Forestdale, MA 02644, USA

PETER J. S. SMITH

Director, BioCurrents Research Center, Program in Molecular Physiology, Marine Biological Laboratory, 7 MBL Street, Woods Hole, MA 02543, USA

ANATOLY SOKOLIK

Laboratory of Plant Cell Physiology, Biological Faculty, Belarusian State University, 4 Skaryna Avenue, 220050, Minsk, Belarus

ROGER SPANSWICK

Department of Biological and Environmental Engineering, Cornell University, 316 Riley-Robb Hall, Ithaca, NY 14853-5701, USA

RAINER STAHLBERG

University of Washington, POB 355325, Seattle WA 98195, USA

BRATISLAV STANKOVIĆ

Brinks Hofer Gilson & Lione, 455 N. Cityfront Plaza Drive, Chicago, Illinois 60611, USA

TSUTOMU TAKAMURA

Department of Applied Chemistry, Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin, China; Permanent address: 3-31-16, Azamino, Aobaku, Yokohama 225-0011, Japan

GERHARD THIEL

Institute of Botany, Plant Biophysics, Darmstadt University of Technology, D-64287, Darmstadt, Germany

ZVONKO TRONTELJ

Department of Physics, IMFM, University of Ljubljana, Jadranska 19, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

JUSTYNA VEIT

University of Freiburg, Institute of Biology II, Schänzlestr. 1, Freiburg, D-79104, Germany

MARCO VERVLiet-SCHEEBAUM

University of Freiburg, Institute of Biology II, Schänzlestr. 1, Freiburg, D-79104, Germany

ALEXANDER G. VOLKOV

Department of Chemistry, Oakwood College, 7000 Adventist Blvd., Huntsville, AL 35896, USA

EDGAR WAGNER

University of Freiburg, Institute of Biology II, Schänzlestr. 1, Freiburg, D-79104, Germany

DARREN M. WELLS

CPI Division, Rothamsted Research, Harpenden, Hertfordshire, AL5 2JQ, UK

YUE (JEFF) XU

Department of Biology, University of Massachusetts at Amherst, MA 01003-5810, USA

VLADIMIR YURIN

Department of Physiology and Biochemistry of Plants, Biological Faculty, Belarusian State University, 4 Skaryna Avenue, 220050, Minsk, Belarus

PART I METHODS OF PLANT
ELECTROPHYSIOLOGY

1 Historical Introduction to Plant Electrophysiology

RAINER STAHLBERG

It is hardly conceivable that reflex responses, memory and brain activity were once explained without consideration of the electrical activity in nerves and muscles. One must remember that electricity was only known then either as lightning or as the repelling/attracting charges that certain substances (such as amber, the Greek word for which is *electron*) accumulate when rubbed against wool or other textiles. Among the first people who thought about electrical phenomena and their possible biological consequences were de Sauvages (1706–1767), S. Hales (1677–1761), J.A. Nollet (1700–1770) and most importantly the prior Pierre Bertholon de St Lazare (1742–1791), who proposed to improve agriculture with a novel electroculture of crops (Bertholon 1783). This idea was repeatedly revived, e.g. by Lemstrom (1902), who attempted to demonstrate stimulating effects of natural electrostatic fields by growing plants outside and under Faraday cages. Effects of electrical fields on plants and animals continue to be a flourishing field of serious study and some controversy (see Chapter 11).

The birth of the larger field of experimental electrophysiology, however, is inseparably intertwined with the discovery of useable forms of electricity itself. The well-known common starting point was Luigi Galvani's discovery of "animal electricity" or his observing the contraction of isolated frog legs suspended between copper hooks and the iron grit of his balcony (Galvani 1791). Aside from stimulating dubious medical treatments such as "galvanism" and "mesmerism", this momentous event established electrophysiology as a major discipline of biology (Galvani's work was continued by the studies of A. Matteucci, E. Du Bois-Reymond and many others, see below) and stimulated A. Volta to develop the first practical batteries (the existence of batteries in ancient Egypt has been suggested, but cannot be reliably confirmed). These portable sources of electricity were called galvanic elements. Based on the different redox potentials of metals and non-metals, they provided reliable sources of various fixed voltages. This invention not only laid the foundations of electricity as a novel discipline of the physical sciences but also turned electricity into useable reality that would later serve as the basis for at least two industrial revolutions. Electrical currents, voltages, resistances and fields

University of Washington, POB 355325; Seattle, WA 98195, USA (e-mail: raista@u.washington.edu)

Plant Electrophysiology – Theory & Methods (ed. by Volkov)
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2006

could now be experimentally studied and applied to wires and wire networks as well as to animals and plants. The physical understanding of batteries itself also served well as a model to explain some fundamental phenomena of electrophysiology such as the stunning of prey by electrically hunting fishes from the new world (Du Bois-Reymond 1848). As reflected in this book, electrophysiology became to encompass not only the development of methods and instruments for the actual measurement of electrical signals but also the study of physiological effects deriving from electric and electromagnetic currents and fields.

It soon became clear that the role of the electric current in the contraction of frog legs was not to provide the energy for the movement, but to simulate a stimulus that existed naturally in the form of directionally transmitted electrical potentials. Frog legs had just been first and serendipitous current-recording devices to indicate the flow of electrical current in the moment they touched the iron grit of the balcony and their violent jerks were supposedly visible enough to scare Mrs. Galvani, the observant wife of the great scientist. In follow-up studies both Matteucci and Du Bois-Reymond then recognized that wounding of nerve strands generated the appearance of a large voltage difference (called wound potential) between the wounded (internal) and intact (external) site of nerves. This wound potential was the first, crude measurement of what later became known and understood as membrane or resting potential of nerve and other cells. Importantly, this potential could be measured and it was soon found that electrical or mechanical stimulation of the nerve reduced its size (in today's terms: these stimuli caused a depolarization). To describe the phenomenon, novel terms such as action potential (AP) and action current were created (Du Bois-Reymond 1848). After plasmolysis experiments in plant cells suggested that all living cells are surrounded by semi-permeable membranes (Pfeffer 1873, 1906, 1921), it did not take long until W. Nernst (1889) and J. Bernstein (1912) proposed an updated understanding of existing potentials and AP-mediated excitations on the basis of the existence and collapse of K^+ ion gradients across the plasma membrane. It was also recognized that nerves propagate such excitations instantly or with very high speed. In 1850, H. von Helmholtz succeeded in actually measuring this speed in the *Nervus ischiadicus* of frogs and Hermann (1868) developed the "Strömchen" theory to explain the speed and efficiency of AP propagation in nerves in analogy with a leaky wire cable. Until about 1930, this seemed to be all that was to know about nervous signals. However, clever experiments showed surprisingly that signaling between nerve cells through their dendritic connections does not occur by way of a continuation of the electrical action current but by the release of chemical signals diffusing through an intercellular cleft. Following the anatomical work of S. Ramon y Cajal, the biochemical studies of O. Loewi and the terminology of Sir Charles Sherrington, the phenomenon of synaptic transmission was recognized and this meant a gigantic step towards the understanding of nervous integration (Eccles 1964). With these events, the full range of modern electrophysiology

was established and the following examples are added to remind us that this progress was not confined to the academic field but inspired many practical improvements in medical and psychological diagnosis. In 1895, electrocardiography (EEC) was tested and introduced by W. Einthoven and in 1934 H. Berger developed a related method for brain responses in the form of electro-encephalography (EEG; Grey Walter 1954; Brazier 1962). The discovery of piezo-electricity in bones led the way to novel electro-therapeutic treatments for accelerated healing of fractures (Basset 1965). The realization that diaphoretic and alternative changes in skin resistance closely relate the emotional state of individuals turned into another important tool of diagnosis for psychological tests and criminal investigations; the lie detector.

1.1 Intracellular recording of membrane potentials and other improvements

For many years, the application of external electrodes to the surface of plant and animal organs was the only available technique for measuring potentials. The only way to deduce the internal potential of cells was through measuring “wound potentials” in the manner described above (Beutner 1920). Rather than relying on such indirect methods, the membrane theory (Bernstein 1912) made it desirable to measure directly the value of cell membrane potentials. This was facilitated by the introduction of microelectrodes (KCl-filled glass micropipettes with a tip diameter small enough to be inserted into living cells; Montenegro et al. 1991) to record intracellular, i.e. real, membrane potentials (V_m). This technique was first adopted for giant cells from axons of cephalopods such as *Loligo* and *Sepia* (see Keynes 1958) and charophytic algae such as *Chara* and *Nitella*. Early attempts to insert microelectrodes into charophytic cells resulted in long-term damage and were reflected in very low V_m values around -30 mV (Brooks and Gelfan 1928). Improved talent, glass needles, incubation procedures and micromanipulators led to a rapid (i.e. within 1–4 min) return of the initially depolarized V_m of *Nitella* cells to values between -100 and -170 mV (Umrath 1930, 1932; Osterhout 1936). Aside from making the first reliable measurements of V_m values in plant cells, the work of Umrath and Osterhout shows the first intracellular recordings of plant APs as well. When this new technique was complemented with precise electronic amplifiers and voltage clamp circuits in the 1940 s, it permitted measurement of ion currents instead of voltages, and with it monitoring of the activity of ion channels. The smart application of these techniques led to a new, highly detailed understanding of the ionic species and mechanisms involved in V_m changes, especially APs (Hodgkin et al. 1949). Now it could be seen that the depolarization during an AP went beyond zero and well into the range of positive voltages, indicating that other ions in addition to K^+ must participate in the AP. Voltage clamp was introduced to demonstrate the contribution of

various ion currents involved in the AP in nerve cells (Hodgkin et al. 1949; Hille 1992) as well as *Chara* cells (Lunevsky et al. 1983; Wayne 1994). Whereas the depolarizing spike in animal nerve cells is driven by an increased influx of Na^+ ions, plant APs were found to involve influx of Ca^{2+} and/or efflux of Cl^- ions (Sibaoka 1969, 1991). To this day, charophytic algae have served as important models and stepping-stones on the way to the investigation of higher plant cells (see Chapter 16).

Parallel voltage (V) and current (I) measurements allowed I-V-curves to be plotted and so permitted to differentiate between the action of an ion channel (ohmic or parallel changes in I and V) or ion pump (non-ohmic relation between V and I changes; Higinbotham 1973). These new recording techniques led to the recognition of another important difference between plant and animal cells. Whereas most animal cells in their resting stage are very close to the Nernst potential for K^+ ions (as first suggested by Nernst 1889), plant cells can obtain much higher values due to the operation of an electrogenic H^+ -ATPase-driven pumps (up to a record V_m value of -296 mV reported by R. Spanswick in *Elodea canadensis*; Higinbotham 1973; see also Chapter 10). As a next step to improve recording possibilities, the patch clamp technique was invented. By going from single cells to isolated membrane patches, one can record the current of as small a unit as a single channel (Neher and Sakmann 1976). Developed for animal cells, this technique was rapidly adopted for plant cells as well (e.g. Hedrich and Schroeder 1989).

1.2 Plant action potentials

The first known recording of a plant AP was done on leaves of the Venus fly-trap (*Dionea muscipula* Ellis) in 1873 by the medical physiologist Sir John Burdon-Sanderson in England. This event was organized by C. Darwin, who had found *Dionea* a “most animal-like plant” that showed analogy to the animal nerve reflex (Darwin 1875, 1896). Burdon-Sanderson measured the voltage difference between adaxial and abaxial surfaces of a *Dionea* leaf half while he stimulated the other half mechanically by touching the hairs (Burdon-Sanderson 1873, 1899). Ever since then, the trap closure in *Dionea* has been considered as a model case that shows comparable roles of APs in plants and nerve-muscle preparations of animals (e.g. Simons 1992). However, this was and is not a generally accepted view. Reminding his readers that Burdon-Sanderson measured the APs in leaves that were prevented from closure by a plaster harness, Stern (1924), in a first consolidating monograph on plant electrophysiology, concluded that APs had no proven direct connection with the closure movement and that APs produced before and after trap closure do not seem to differ (see similar results by Hodick and Sievers 1988). However, Stern noted that while in resting *Dionea* leaves the upper site is positive relative to the lower one, this relation gets inverted with stimulation.

Other objects of investigation were sensitive plants in the genus *Mimosa*, where the folding movement of the leaflets actually makes the propagating wave of excitation visible. After the wounding of a leaflet action spikes were found to arise in parallel with the visible leaflet movements (Kunkel 1878; Haberlandt 1890; Biedermann 1895; Bose 1906, 1926). However, it was Dutrochet and Pfeffer (1873, 1906) who found that an experimental interruption of the vascular bundles by incision prevented the excitation from propagating beyond the cut. While they concluded that the stimulus moved through the woody or hadrome part of the bundles (in modern terms the xylem), Haberlandt cut or steam-killed the external, non-woody part of the vascular bundles (the leptom, i.e. in modern terms the phloem) and emphasized that not the xylem but the phloem strands were the pathways to conduct the excitation signals in plants. "The effects of incision show that stimuli are actually propagated in this system of highly turgescient tubes and that the mode of transmission is a hydrodynamic one" (Haberlandt 1914). However, this hypothesis was difficult to prove (Tinz-Fruchtmeier and Gradmann 1990) and up to this day we do not know much about pressure propagation in the phloem except that pressure gradients are considered vital and the driving force of mass flow and net solute transport (Lee 1981; van Bel 2003).

It was namely for that reason that Ricca (1916) and Snow (1924) suggested an alternative mechanism in which an excitation substance is released into the xylem and moved by the transpiration flow is the ultimate cause for the propagating excitation. The most convincing experiment in favor of a chemical substance was to cut through a *Mimosa* stem and then reconnect the two pieces with a water-filled tube. Flame-stimulation of leaves connected to the lower part of the stem frequently caused an excitation response in the upper shoot. It is often forgotten, however, that other researcher could not confirm these results (e.g. Koketsu 1923; Bose 1925, 1926). Observing both leaflet movement and electrical signals, Bose (1926) finally proposed that vascular bundles act analogous to nerves by enabling the propagation of an excitation that moved from cell to cell.

Ignoring Haberlandt's and Bose's results, Houwinck (1935) proposed that wound excitation in *Mimosa* can be propagated by a chemical wound signal (called Ricca's factor) in the xylem which then could be translated into an AP via the mediation of a new type of electric signal, which he called variation potential. One cannot help noticing that the conversion of a chemical into an electrical signal is a process with striking parallels to post-synaptic events in animals. Houwinck's idea circumvented the existing controversy by including both chemical and electrical signals in the transmission mechanism for the excitation signal in *Mimosa*. In spite of Houwinck's diplomatic proposal, the conflict between chemical and electrical propagation persists to this day (Cheeseman and Pickard 1977; Schildknecht 1984). A recent modification in the controversy is the recognition that massive wounding causes a large and propagating pressure increase at the wound site. These wound-induced increases in xylem pressure cannot only temporarily reverse the direction of

the transpiration-driven xylem flow (Malone 1996) but are also sufficient cause for a large depolarization in the form of a slow wave potential (Stahlberg and Cosgrove 1996, 1997). Accordingly, the hydrodynamic propagation of electrical signals proposed by Kunkel (1878) and Haberlandt (1914) has been found to occur less in the phloem (Tinz-Fruchtmeier and Gradmann 1990) than in the xylem, where it provides the major mechanism for the propagation of a propagating signal called slow wave potentials (Stahlberg et al. 2006).

The majority of recent studies in *Mimosa* and other plant species confirmed Haberlandt's suggestion of the phloem being the pathway of excitation. APs have their largest amplitude near and in the phloem and there again in the sieve cells (Sibaoka 1969; Opritov 1978; Fromm and Eschrich 1988; Fromm and Bauer 1994; Rhodes et al. 1996; Dziubinska et al. 2001). Other studies found that AP-like signals propagate with equal rate and amplitude through all cells of the vascular bundle (Herde et al. 1998). Bose (1907, 1913, 1926) went one huge step ahead when he started studies with isolated vascular bundles (e.g. in the fern *Adiantum*). Comparing the amplitudes, he found the response to heat in the isolated vascular bundles to be much stronger than in the intact stem. Bose found a series of interesting results; among them an increase in amplitude of heat-induced spikes by repeated stimulation (tetanisation) and by incubation of the strands in 0.5% solution of sodium carbonate and other salts. This daring advance has yet to be repeated and confirmed by other labs. Since the recorded behavior of the isolated vascular strands was comparable to that of isolated frog nerves, Bose felt justified in referring to them as plant nerves.

1.3 “Plants have no nerves!?”

Although Burdon-Sanderson described APs in in *Dionea* plants as early as 1873 and Bose described APs in *Mimosa* as early as 1906, the scientific community was slow to respond with experimental and theoretical follow-up. This lack of enthusiasm was at least in part conditioned by the reiterated belief that plants have no nerves and muscles, that the APs were not involved in activities of primary relevance for plant life such as, e.g. photosynthesis. And yet for some, the existence of APs in *Dionea* and *Mimosa* plus the discovery of plant mechanoreceptors not only in *Dionea*, but also at tendrils and surfaces of common plants (Haberlandt 1890, 1906) was sufficient stimulation to look for structures that could facilitate the rapid propagation of signals. Around 1900, several researchers started took a closer look at plasma strands that run across the lumen of many plant cells, continue over several cells and might possibly serve as excitation-conducting structures similar as nerves. Strands were shown to occur and likely to be involved in the traumatotropic responses of several plant roots (Nemec 1901), but were also seen in the leaves of insectivorous butterworts of the genus *Pinguicula* where they

connect the mucous glue-containing hair tips with the more basal peptidase-producing glands (France 1909, pictured in France 1911). Haberlandt reinvestigated these views and suggested later that the only potential nerve-like structures of plants were the vascular bundles, and in particular the phloem (Haberlandt 1914; but see also recent re-evaluation by Baluska and Hlavacka 2005).

From then on and often to this day papers and textbooks reiterate the statement that “plants have no nerves”. This unproductive expression ignores the work of Darwin, Pfeffer, Haberlandt and Bose, together with the result that nerves and vascular bundles share the analog function of conducting electrical signals. Similar anatomical and functional differences were never seen as an obstacle to stating that both plants and animals consist of cells. The mechanistic similarity of excitations in plant and nerve cells were elegantly demonstrated by direct comparison of action potentials in *Nitella* and the giant axon of squids (Cole and Curtis 1938, 1939). Today, the consideration of nerve-like structures in plants involves an increasing number of further aspects of comparison. We know that many plants can efficiently propagate action potentials and hydraulo-electric signals in the form of slow wave potentials (variation potentials) and that the long-distance propagation of these signals proceeds in the vascular bundles. We also know that plants like *Dionea* can propagate APs with high efficiency and speed without the use of vascular bundles because their cells are electrically coupled through plasmodesmata. Other analogies with neurobiology include vesicle-operated intercellular clefts in axial root tissues (the so-called plant synapses; Baluska et al. 2005) as well as the existence and operation of substances like neurotransmitters and synaptotagmins in plant cells (e.g. Wipf et al. 2002). Such similarities were recently the focus of studies presented at the First Symposium on Neurobiology of Plants in 2005 (Baluska et al 2006).

For a long time, plants were thought to be living organisms whose limited ability to move and respond was appropriately matched by limited abilities of sensing (Trewavas 2003). Exceptions to this rule were made only for plants with rapid and/or purposeful movements such as *Mimosa pudica* (also called the sensitive plant), *Drosera* (sundews), *Dionea muscipula* (flytraps) and tendrils of climbing plants. These sensitive plants attracted the attention of outstanding pioneer researchers such as Burdon-Sanderson (1873, 1899), Pfeffer (1873), Haberlandt (1890, 1906, 1914), Darwin (1896) and Bose (1926). They found them not only to be equipped with various mechanoreceptors that exceeded the sensitivity of a human finger but also to trigger action potentials (APs) that implemented these movements.

Although at the time a hardly noticed event, the discovery that normal plants such as pumpkins had propagating APs just as the esoteric “sensitive” plants (Gunar and Sinykhin 1962, 1963; Karmanov et al. 1972) was a scientific breakthrough with important consequences. First, it corrected the long-held belief that normal plants are less sensitive and responsive than so-called “sensitive plants.” Second, it led to a new, eagerly pursued belief that such

widely distributed electric signals were not random fluctuations but indeed carried important messages with a broader relevance than the established induction of organ movements in “sensitive plants.” In different laboratories around the world, this anticipation became the driving force for a renewed quest for the meaning of the electrical signals (Pickard 1973; Pyatygin 2003).

The ensuing studies made considerable progress in linking electrical signals with respiration and photosynthesis (Gunar and Sinykhin 1963; Koziolok et al. 2003), pollination (Sinykhin and Britikov 1967; Spanjers 1981), phloem transport (Opritov 1978; Fromm and Eschrich 1988; Fromm and Bauer 1994) and the rapid, plant-wide deployment of plant defenses (Wildon et al. 1992; Malone et al. 1994; Herde et al. 1995, 1996; Volkov and Haak 1995; Stankovic and Davies 1996, 1998; Volkov 2000).

1.4 The photoelectric response of green leaves

From the view of many botanists, it was probably equally or more important to decipher the mechanism of action potentials as it was to find the particularities in electric behavior that derive from photosynthetic activity in green plant cells. The first to address this question was Haake (1892). Using leaves of various species, he established that relative to the midvein, the mesophyll had a positive voltage in the dark that turned negative under illumination (in modern understanding and assuming that the midvein potential did not change, this result can be interpreted as a light-induced hyperpolarization of the mesophyll). The further steps in deciphering of the photoelectric response have been described by Higinbotham (1973), Rybin (1977) and also by Lüttge and Higinbotham (1979). Jeschke (1970) and Spanswick (1974) found that illumination of *Elodea* and *Nitella* cells caused them to hyperpolarize by 50–130 mV (in *Elodea canadensis* up to a record V_m value of -296 mV) due to the increased activity of the P-type H^+ ATPase.

For the photoelectric response of higher land plants, it was most revealing to compare green and chlorophyll-free cells within the same variegated leaf. Such a comparison identified a rapid light-induced depolarization as the major photosynthetic contribution to the photoelectric response of mesophyll cells from leaves of higher plants (Stahlberg et al. 2000). The depolarization is associated with and can be simulated by the reduction of inter- and intracellular levels of carbon dioxide (Stahlberg et al. 2001). It is inhibited by the electron-transport blocker DCMU (3-3'-4'-dichlorophenyl-1,1-dimethylurea) and may involve K^+ , Ca^{2+} and/or Cl^- currents (Spalding et al. 1992; Elzenga et al. 1995; see also Chapter 10). This transient depolarization response differs from the light-induced hyperpolarizations reported as the major photosynthetic light responses in *Elodea* and *Nitella* cells. A delayed hyperpolarization associated with the P-type H^+ ATPase is also present in leaf cells of higher land plants. It occurs in response to photosynthetic and other factors in a way that

remains unresolved to this day (Stahlberg and Van Volkenburgh 1999). Plants also generate other, non-photosynthetic types of intracellular and intercellular electrical events in response to light. Recently, it was found that the irradiation of soybean plants at 450 ± 50 nm induced APs and that their suppression by ion channels blockers inhibited the phototropic response of these plants (see Chapter 19).

By studying the particularities of photosynthesis, plant transporters, plant membrane potentials, action potentials, slow wave potentials and their coupled responses, electrophysiological studies contributed much to the understanding of the living world and one of its central questions: the defining similarities and differences between animals and plants. Details of these and other contributions can be found in the following chapters.

References

- Baluska F, Hlavacka A (2005) Plant formins come of age: something special about cross-walls.- *New Phytologist* 168: 499–503
- Baluska F, Volkmann D, Menzel D (2005) Plant synapses: actin-based domains for cell-to-cell communication. *Trends Plant Sci* 10:106–111
- Baluska F, Mancuso S, Volkmann D (2006) Communications in plants. Neuronal aspects of plant life. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York
- Basset AL (1965) Electrical effects in bone. *Sci Am* 213:18–25
- Bernstein J (1912) *Elektrobiologie*. Thieme, Braunschweig
- Bertholon (1783) *De l'électricité des végétaux*. Paris
- Beutner R (1920) *Die Entstehung elektrischer Ströme in lebenden Geweben*. Fischer, Stuttgart
- Biedermann W (1895) *Elektrophysiologie*. Fischer, Jena
- Bose JC (1906) *Plant response as a means of physiological investigation*. Longman Green, London
- Bose JC (1913) *Researches on the irritability of plants*. Longman Green, London
- Bose JC (1925) Physiological and anatomical investigations on *Mimosa pudica*. *Proc R Soc Ser B* 98:280–299
- Bose JC (1926) *The nervous mechanism of plants*. Longman Green, London
- Brazier MAB (1962) The analysis of brain waves. *Sci Am* 206:142–153
- Brooks SC, Gelfan S (1928) Bioelectric potentials in *Nitella*. *Protoplasma* 5:86–96
- Burdon-Sanderson J (1873) Note on the electrical phenomena which accompany stimulation of leaf of *Dionea muscipula*. *Proc R Soc* 21:495–496
- Burdon-Sanderson J (1899) On the relation of motion in animals and plants to the electrical phenomena which are associated with it. *Proc R Soc* 65:37–64
- Cheeseman JM, Pickard BG (1977) Depolarization of cell membranes in leaves of *Lycopersicon* by extract containing Ricca's factor. *Can J Bot* 55:511–519
- Cole KS, Curtis HJ (1938) Electric impedance of *Nitella* during activity. *J Gen Physiol* 22:37–64
- Cole KS, Curtis HJ (1939) Electric impedance of the squid giant axon during activity. *J Gen Physiol* 22:37–64
- Darwin C (1896) *The power of movements in plants*. Appleton, New York
- Darwin C (1875) *Insectivorous plants*. Murray, London
- Du Bois-Reymond (1848) *Untersuchungen über thierische Elektrizität*. Reimer, Berlin
- Dziubinska H, Trebasz K, Zawadzki T (2001) Transmission route for action potentials and variation potentials in *Helianthus annuus* L. *J Plant Physiol* 158:1167–1172
- Eccles JC Sir (1964) *The physiology of synapses*. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York

- Elzenga JTM, Prins HBA, van Volkenburgh E (1995) Light-induced membrane potential changes of epidermal and mesophyll cells in growing leaves of *Pisum sativum*. *Planta* 197:127–134
- France RH (1909) Pflanzenpsychologie als Arbeitshypothese der Pflanznephysiologie. Kosmos, Stuttgart
- France RH (1911) Pflanzenkunde für jedermann. Ullstein, Berlin
- Fromm J, Bauer T (1994) Action potentials in maize sieve tubes change phloem translocation. *J Exp Bot* 273:463–469
- Fromm J, Eschrich W (1988) Transport processes in stimulated and non-stimulated leaves of *Mimosa pudica*. *Trees* 2:7–24
- Galvani L (1791) De viribus electricitatis in motu musculari commentaries. Bononiae Instituti Scientiarum, Bologna
- Gunar II, Sinykhin AM (1962) A spreading wave of excitation in higher plants. *Proc Acad Sci USSR (Bot)* 142:214–215
- Gunar II, Sinykhin AM (1963) Functional significance of action currents affecting the gas exchange of higher plants. *Soviet Plant Physiol* 10:219–226
- Grey WF (1954) The electrical activity of the brain. *Sci Am* 190:54–63
- Haake O (1892) Über die Ursachen elektrischer Ströme in Pflanzen. *Flora* 75:455–487
- Haberlandt G (1890) Das reizleitende Gewebesystem der Sinnpflanze. Engelmann, Leipzig
- Haberlandt G (1906) Sinnesorgane im Pflanzenreich zur Perzeption mechanischer Reize. Engelmann, Leipzig
- Haberlandt G (1914) Physiological plant anatomy. Macmillan, London
- Hedrich R, Schroeder JI (1989) The physiology of ion channels and electrogenic pumps in higher plants. *Annu Rev Physiol Plant Mol Biol* 40:539–569
- Herde O, Fuss H, Pena-Cortes H, Fisahn J (1995) Proteinase inhibitor II gene expression induced by electrical stimulation and control of photosynthetic activity in tomato plants. *Plant Cell Physiol* 36:737–742
- Herde O, Atzorn R, Fisahn J, Wasternak C, Willmitzer L, Pena-Cortes H (1996) Localized wounding by heat initiates the accumulation of proteinase inhibitor II in abscisic acid deficient tomato plants by triggering jasmonic acid biosynthesis. *Plant Physiol* 112:853–860
- Herde O, Fuss H, Pena-Cortes H, Willmitzer L, Fisahn J (1998) Remote stimulation by heat induces characteristic membrane-potential responses in the veins of wild-type and abscisic acid-deficient tomato plants. *Planta* 206:146–153
- Hermann L (1868) Untersuchungen zur Physiologie der Muskeln und Nerven. Hirschwald, Berlin
- Higinbotham N (1973) Electropotentials of plant cells. *Annu Rev Plant Physiol* 24:25–46
- Hille B (1992) Ionic channels of excitable membranes. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts
- Hodgkin AL, Huxley AF, Katz B (1949) Ionic currents underlying activity in the giant axon of the squid. *Arch Sci Physiol* 3:129–150
- Hodick D, Sievers A (1988) The action potential of *Dionea muscipula* Ellis. *Planta* 174:8–18
- Houwincq AL (1935) The conduction of excitation in *Mimosa pudica*. *Receuil Traverse Bot Neerlandais* 32:51–91
- Jeschke WD (1970) Lichtabhängige Veränderungen des Membranpotentials bei Blattzellen von *Elodea densa*. *Z Pflanzenphysiol* 62:158–172
- Karmanov VG, Lyalin OO, Mamulashvili GG (1972) The form of action potentials and cooperativeness of the excited elements in stems of winter squash. *Soviet Plant Physiol* 19:354–420
- Keynes RD (1958) The nerve impulse and the squid. *Sci Am* 199:83–90
- Koketsu R (1923) Journal of the Department of Agriculture of the Kyashu Imperial University 1:55 (cited according to Bose 1926)
- Koziolek C, Grams TE, Schreiber U, Matyssek R, Fromm J (2003) Transient knockout of photosynthesis mediated by electrical signals. *New Phytologist* 161:715–722
- Kunkel KAJ (1878) Über elektromotorische Wirkungen an unverletzten lebenden Pflanzenteilen. *Arbeiten Botan Institut Würzburg* 2:1–17
- Lee DR (1981) Synchronous pressure-potential changes in the phloem of *Fraxinus americana*. *Planta* 151:304–308

- Lemstrom S (1902) *Elektrokultur*. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York
- Lunevsky VZ, Zherelova OM, Vostrikov IY, Berestovsky GN (1983) Excitation of *Characeae* cell membranes as a result of the activation of calcium and chloride channels. *J Membr Biol* 72:43–58
- Lüttge U, Higinbotham N (1979) *Transport in plants*. Springer, Berlin Heidelberg New York
- Malone M (1996) Rapid, long-distance signal transmission in higher plants. *Adv Bot Res* 22:163–228
- Malone M, Palumbo L, Boari F, Monteleone M, Jones HG (1994) The relationship between wound-induced proteinase inhibitors and hydraulic signals in tomato seedlings. *Plant Cell Environ* 17:81–87
- Montenegro MI, Queiros MA, Daschbach JL (1991) *Microelectrodes: theory and applications*. Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht
- Neher E, Sakmann B (1976) Single-channel currents recorded from membrane of denervated frog muscle fibers. *Nature* 260:779–802
- Nemec B (1901) *Die Reizleitung und reizleitende Strukturen bei den Pflanzen*. Fischer, Jena
- Nernst W (1889) Die elektromotorische Wirksamkeit der Ionen. *Z Phys Chem* 4:129–181
- Opritov VA (1978) Propagating excitation and assimilate transport in the phloem. *Soviet Plant Physiol* 25:1042–1048
- Osterhout WJV (1936) Electrical phenomena in large plant cells. *Physiol Rev* 16:216–237
- Pfeffer W (1873) *Physiologische Untersuchungen*. Engelmann, Leipzig
- Pfeffer W (1906) *The physiology of plants, a treatise upon the metabolism and sources of energy in plants*. Clarendon Press, Oxford
- Pfeffer W (1921) *Osmotische Untersuchungen; Studien zur Zellmechanik*. Engelmann, Leipzig
- Pickard BG (1973) Action potentials in higher plants. *Bot Rev* 39:172–201
- Pyatygin SS (2003) Electrogenesis of plant cells under stress (in Russian). *Prog Mod Biol (Moscow)* 123:552–562
- Rhodes JD, Thain JF, Wildon DC (1996) The pathway for systemic electrical signal conduction in the wounded tomato plant. *Planta* 200:50–57
- Ricca U (1916) Soluzione d'un problema di fisiologia: la propagazione di stimolo nella *Mimosa*. *Nuovo G Bot Ital* 23:51–170
- Rybin IA (1977) The history of concepts on the light-induced bio-electrical responses of plant leaves (in Russian). In: Rybin IA, Mikheeva SA, Birukova EG (eds) *The light-induced bio-electrical activity of plant leaves*. Uralsk State University Press, Uralsk (Russia)
- Schildknecht H (1984) Turgorins—new chemical messengers for plant behavior. *Endeavour NS* 8:113–117
- Sibaoka T (1969) Physiology of rapid movements in higher plants. *Annu Rev Plant Physiol* 20:165–184
- Sibaoka T (1991) Rapid plant movements triggered by action potentials. *Bot Mag (Tokyo)* 104:73–95
- Simons P (1992) *The action plant. Movement and nervous behavior in plants*. Blackwell, Oxford
- Sinyukhin AM, Britikov EA (1967) Action potentials in the reproductive system of plants. *Nature* 215:1278–1280
- Snow R (1924) Conduction and excitation in stem and leaf of *Mimosa pudica*. *Proc R Soc Lond Ser B* 96:344–360
- Spalding EP, Slayman CL, Goldsmith MHM, Gradmann D, Bertl A (1992) Ion channels in *Arabidopsis* plasma membrane. Transport characteristics and involvement in light-induced voltage changes. *Plant Physiol* 99:96–102
- Spanjers AW (1981) Bioelectric potential changes in the style of *Lilium longiflorum* Thunb. after self- and cross-pollination of the stigma. *Planta* 153:1–5
- Spanswick RM (1974) Evidence for an electrogenic pump in *Nitella translucens*. I. Control of the light-stimulated component of the membrane potential. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 332:387–398
- Stahlberg R, Cosgrove DJ (1996) Induction and ionic basis of slow wave potentials in seedlings of *Pisum sativum* L. *Planta* 200:416–425
- Stahlberg R, Cosgrove DJ (1997) The propagation of slow wave potentials in pea epicotyls. *Plant Physiol* 113:209–217