

## HYBRIDIZATION STUDIES WITH RNA AND DNA ISOLATED FROM *EUGLENA GRACILIS* CHLOROPLASTS AND MITOCHONDRIA

Edwin J. CROUSE\*, Jobst P. VANDREY\*\* and Erhard STUTZ\*

*Department of Biological Sciences, Northwestern University,  
Evanston, Ill. 60201, USA*

### 1. Introduction

*Euglena gracilis* when grown in light contains chloroplasts and mitochondria. Both types of organelles contain their own set of duplex DNA [1-3] which replicate at a different pace than the nuclear DNA [4,5] does. These organelles also are equipped with functional 70 S ribosomes containing 23 S, 16 S rRNA [6].

Organellar rRNA is considered to be a transcript of the respective organellar DNA. *Euglena* chloroplast DNA (chDNA) was shown to code for 23 S, 16 S rRNA [7-9]. The number of cistrons per chromosome, however, is still in doubt and could be between one and three [9-11]. We have reported that the hybridization capacity of chDNA for 23 S, 16 S chloroplast RNA varies with the amount of a 'heavy' chDNA component, isolated from highly purified chloroplasts. This 'heavy' component, depending on the average fragment size, has a buoyant density of 1.692 to 1.701 g/cc (peak densities) [12]. Since *Euglena* mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) was reported to have densities in the range of 1.690 to 1.692 g/cc [1-3], the 'heavy' chDNA might be, at least partly, of mitochondrial origin. In order to clarify this point, we found it necessary to isolate and characterize mtDNA from *Euglena gracilis* and in particu-

lar to measure the affinity of chloroplast rRNA for this DNA. Further, it seemed necessary to measure as well the hybridization capacity of mtDNA towards its own major RNA components since such an experiment was still lacking.

Mitochondrial rRNA hybridizes with mtDNA to 3.7%, while only to 0.16% with chDNA under identical incubation conditions. Chloroplast rRNA hybridizes with total chDNA, containing 30% of 1.692 g/cc DNA to 2.9%, while only to 0.12% with mtDNA. We conclude that the 1.692 g/cc DNA found in chloroplast DNA preparations is not of mitochondrial origin.

### 2. Materials and methods

#### 2.1. Buffers

Buffer I: 0.05 M Tris-HCl (pH 7.9), 0.1 M KCl, 0.01 M MgCl<sub>2</sub>, 5 mM 2-mercaptoethanol. Buffer II: 0.01 M Tris-HCl (pH 7.9), 0.1 M KCl, 0.01 M MgCl<sub>2</sub>. Buffer III: 0.1 M Tris-HCl (pH 7.9), 2.5% sodium dodecyl sulfate, 0.01 M EDTA. Buffer IV: 0.1 M NaCl, 0.05 M Na<sub>2</sub>HPO<sub>4</sub>, 0.05 M NaH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>, 0.1 mM EDTA (pH 6.8). Buffer V: 0.04 M Tris-acetate (pH 7.9), 0.1 M sodium acetate, 1 mM magnesium acetate.

#### 2.2. Isolation and purification of mitochondrial RNA

For the isolation of mitochondria, we used the aplastidic strain W<sub>3</sub>BUL (a gift from J. A. Schiff, Brandeis University). Cells were grown in a heterotrophic medium [13] modified by using the trace element combination of Cramer and Meyers [14]. W<sub>3</sub>BUL

#### New addresses:

\* Laboratoire de physiologie végétale et biochimie.  
Institut de Botanique, Université de Neuchâtel, rue de  
Chantemerle 18, CH-2000 NEUCHÂTEL, Suisse.

\*\* Department of Pathology, St. Louis University School  
of Medicine, St. Louis, Mo. 63104, USA.

does not contain chDNA [2] yielding, therefore, uncontaminated mtDNA.

Mitochondria were isolated from freshly harvested cells (batches of 150 g, wet weight) by grinding with a mortar, pestle and glass beads [6]. The mitochondria were purified by differential centrifugation and flotation in a Renografin (Squibb and Sons, Inc., Princeton) step gradient [15].

Purified mitochondria were lysed in 5% Triton X-100 (Buffer I). Membranous material was removed by centrifugation (Sorvall SS-34, 48 200 g, 10 min). The supernatant was adjusted to 2% sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) and shaken for 5 min with a half volume of phenol/m-cresol/8-hydroxyquinoline (PCQ, 90/10/0.1, v/v/w). A volume of chloroform/isoamyl alcohol (24/1, v/v) equal to the PCQ volume was added and shaking was continued for 5 more min. The aqueous phase was treated with deoxyribonuclease (Bovine Pancreas, DN-EP, Sigma) for 1 hr. After further extraction with chloroform/isoamyl alcohol, the RNA was precipitated with 1.5 vol of ethanol ( $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$ ). The precipitate, resuspended in Buffer II, was reprecipitated with ethanol.

Mitochondrial RNA (Buffer II) was further purified in a 12 ml convex sucrose gradient in Buffer II (Spinco SW40 rotor, 40 krpm, 16.5 hr). The peak fractions corresponding to 14 S, 11 S, 9 S RNA were combined, dialysed against  $0.1 \times \text{SSC}$  (standard saline citrate =  $1 \times \text{SSC} = 0.15 \text{ M NaCl}, 0.015 \text{ M sodium citrate}$ ), concentrated in vacuo and reextracted with phenol/chloroform/isoamyl alcohol (25/24/1; v/v/v). The aqueous phase was passed through Sephadex G-50, fine grade column (1.5 cm  $\times$  30 cm). The fractions containing RNA were combined and the RNA again precipitated with ethanol. From approximately 700 g cells (wet weight), we obtained 1 mg of mitochondrial RNA. The  $A_{260}/A_{280}$  and  $A_{260}/A_{240}$  ratios were approximately 2.0.

### 2.3. Isolation and purification of chloroplast rRNA

The isolation and purification of 23 S, 16 S rRNA from *Euglena gracilis* Klebs (z-strain) chloroplasts has been described in detail [16].

### 2.4. Labeling of mitochondrial and chloroplast RNA

One mg of each were labeled in vitro with 5 mCi [ $^3\text{H}$ ] dimethylsulfate (New England Nuclear, 385 mCi/mM) according to Smith et al. [17], and as modi-

fied by Rawson and Haselkorn [9]. The labeled RNA again was passed through the Sephadex column to remove low molecular weight labeled components and then filtered 3 times through nitrocellulose filters (Schleicher and Schuell, B6) to remove residual basic proteins and poly-(A) RNA fragments.

### 2.5. Isolation of mitochondrial DNA

Purified mitochondria were lysed in Buffer III and the DNA was isolated using PCQ, and chloroform/isoamyl alcohol as protein denaturing agents. RNA was digested with ribonuclease (bovine pancreas, type VII, Sigma). The reextracted aqueous phases were dialysed against Buffer IV and further purified by passing through a methylated bovine serum albumin coated Kieselguhr column (MAK). Fractions containing nucleic acids were combined and further purified via a preparative CsCl density gradient. Final yield from several batches was 1.25 mg DNA/1.8 kg of cells (wet weight). This mtDNA had a buoyant density of 1.689 g/cc.

### 2.6. Isolation of chloroplast DNA

This was done as reported earlier [12]. This chDNA preparation contained a major DNA component of 1.685 g/cc density (approx. 70%) and a 'heavy' DNA component of 1.692 g/cc. Average molecular weight was  $2 \times 10^7$ .

## 3. Results and discussion

### 3.1 Characterization of mitochondrial RNA

Controversial reports concerning the molecular weight of *Euglena gracilis* mitochondrial RNA makes it necessary to shortly characterize the mitochondrial RNA used in the following experiments. Krawiec and Eisenstadt [18] obtained 14 S and 11 S RNA as the two major mitochondrial RNA components. On the other hand, Avadhani and Buetow (6) reported 23 S and 16 S RNA to be the RNA components found in the mitochondrial 70 S ribosomes. These latter authors inferred that the 14 S, 11 S RNA though of ribosomal origin could be degradation products of the 23 S, 16 S RNA. This assumption is supported by the fact, that the base composition reported for both RNA preparations [6,18] match within the limits of analytical error.

Although we followed the procedure of Avadhani and Buetow (see paragraph 2.2.), we routinely found

before sucrose gradient purification only 14 S, 11 S, 9 S RNA along with a considerable amount of transfer RNA (fig. 1a). The S-values are assigned relative to 23 S, 16 S rRNA from *E. coli* ribosomal subunits (fig. 1b). The 14 S, 11 S, 9 S RNAs were separated in preparative sucrose gradients from tRNA and used in the following hybridization experiments. We consider these RNAs also as degraded but nevertheless representative mitochondrial rRNA. However, this isolation procedure does not exclude contamination by messenger RNA (mRNA).

### 3.2. DNA/RNA hybridization

In fig. 2, we show the saturation curve obtained when hybridizing increasing amounts of mitochon-




Fig. 1. Disc gel electrophoretic analysis of *Euglena* mitochondrial RNA. 30  $\mu$ g of mitochondrial RNA (0.2 M sucrose-Buffer V) were layered on precooled 2.4%, 6 cm long polyacrylamide gels [21] in Buffer V. The RNA band was first concentrated on top of the gel by a 15 min run (5 mA/gel tube). Subsequent electrophoresis conditions were, 10 mA/gel tube (16 V/cm), 2 hr, 4°C, Buffer V. The gels (soaked in Buffer V, 15 min) were scanned at 265 nm with a Gilford 2000 Spectrophotometer equipped with a Model 2410 Linear Transport System. a) mitochondrial RNA; b) mitochondrial plus *E. coli* RNA. The ratio of 23 S to 16 S rRNA from *E. coli* represents an arbitrary mixture of the two markers isolated from purified subunits (a gift from G. Van Diejen and H. Noll, Northwestern University).




Fig. 2. Hybridization of mitochondrial RNA with mtDNA. Mitochondrial DNA (5.3  $\mu$ g DNA/filter) was annealed using in essence the methods of Gillespie and Spiegelman (22) with variable amounts of mitochondrial RNA. Each point represents the average of two values which were corrected for un-specific RNA binding to the filters. Incubation conditions: 4–8 filters, including blanks, per vial with 2 ml of  $2 \times$  SSC, 0.5% SDS, 59°C, 16 hr. Counting: toluene counting solution (Omnifluor, New England Nuclear), Packard Tricarb Model 3375 Liquid Scintillation Counter.

drial RNA with mtDNA. A plateau is reached at a  $\mu$ gRNA/ $\mu$ gDNA ratio of 0.6. This experiment was repeated with several different mtDNA preparations and we routinely obtained hybridization values between 3.6 to 3.8%. At higher  $\mu$ gRNA/ $\mu$ gDNA ratios, the % hybridization slightly and steadily increases, most likely due to mRNA contamination. Nevertheless, we consider the average 3.7% hybridization value to reflect the percentual amount of ribosomal DNA present within the mitochondrial genome.

In table 1, the data from homologous and heterologous hybridization experiments are compiled. These experiments demonstrate that mtDNA hybridizes to 3.7% with its own rRNA but much less with chloroplast rRNA (0.12%). The reciprocal annealing experiment using total chDNA and either mitochondrial or chloroplast rRNA shows relatively small affinity between chDNA and mitochondrial rRNA (0.16%). The 2.9% hybridization value (chDNA/chloroplast rRNA) corresponds to 1.5 copies of the 23 S, 16 S rRNA cistron per circular chloroplast chromosome [19].

The total chDNA used for these experiments contained about 30% of 1.692 g/cc DNA. If the 1.692 g/cc DNA would be mtDNA as recently postulated [20],

Table 1  
Hybridization of *Euglena* chloroplast and mitochondrial DNA with homologous or heterologous rRNA

Source of DNA (density; g/cc)	Source of RNA	$\mu\text{g DNA}$ filter	$\mu\text{g RNA}$ $\mu\text{g DNA}$	cpm* corrected	Hybridization (%)
mitochondria (1.689)	mitochondria	5.3	1	693	3.7
mitochondria (1.689)	chloroplasts	4.8	1.5	34	0.12
chloroplasts (1.685 + 1.692)	mitochondria	5.4	1	31	0.16
chloroplasts (1.685 + 1.692)	chloroplasts	3.0	1.5	503	2.9

\*Average of two filters.

[ $^3\text{H}$ ]RNA from mitochondria: 3645 cpm/ $\mu\text{gRNA}$ ; 2% standard deviation.

[ $^3\text{H}$ ]RNA from chloroplasts: 5686 cpm/ $\mu\text{gRNA}$ ; 2% standard deviation.

then this chloroplast DNA preparation should hybridize with mitochondrial RNA to approximately 1.2%. The 0.16% obtained in this experiment (about 13% of the due value) would be the upper limit of a possible mtDNA contamination. We consider, however, the residual affinity in the heterologous hybridization experiments not to be due to a mtDNA contaminant but rather to be the result of base sequence similarities between the two types of organellar rRNA. Since no melting studies of the DNA/RNA hybrids were made, so far, the quality of the hybrids is unknown. As previously reported [12], chDNA enriched in the 'heavy' component (1.692 g/cc) hybridizes with chloroplast rRNA up to 6.9%, which further supports the argument that the 1.692 g/cc chDNA is not of mitochondrial origin, a problem already raised by Ray and Hanawalt [1].

These are the first hybridization studies with *Euglena* mtDNA and mitochondrial RNA. The 3.7% hybridization can tentatively serve to estimate the mitochondrial genome size: Assuming that *Euglena* mitochondria contain, per full complement of genes (genome), only one cistron coding for 23 S and 16 S RNA (equivalent to a molecular weight of approximately  $1.6 \times 10^6$ ), the genome size would be equivalent to  $4 \times 10^7$ . Should this genome be accommodated on one DNA molecule as is the case for several fungal and animal mtDNAs, then the *Euglena* mtDNA molecule would have a total length of approximately 20  $\mu\text{m}$ . This would bring *Euglena* mtDNA into a size range comparable with the mtDNA of other protists [23].

### Acknowledgements

This investigation was supported in part by National Science Foundation, Washington, grant no. GB-19191 and in part by Fonds National Suisse de la Recherche Scientifique, grant no. 3.030.73. We thank Dr. Barbara Lippincott for excellent technical assistance.

### References

- [1] Ray, D. S. and Hanawalt, P. C. (1965) *J. Mol. Biol.* 11, 760-768.
- [2] Edelman, M., Schiff, J. A. and Epstein, H. T. (1965) *J. Mol. Biol.* 11, 769-774.
- [3] Edelman, M., Epstein, H. T. and Schiff, J. A. (1966) *J. Mol. Biol.* 17, 463-469.
- [4] Manning, J. E. and Richards, O. C. (1972) *Biochemistry* 11, 2036-2043.
- [5] Richards, O. C. and Ryan, R. S. (1974) *J. Mol. Biol.* 82, 57-75.
- [6] Avadhani, N. G. and Buetow, D. E. (1972) *Biochem. J.* 128, 353-365.
- [7] Scott, N. S. and Smillie, R. N. (1967) *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* 28, 598-603.
- [8] Stutz, E. and Rawson, J. R. (1970) *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* 209, 16-23.
- [9] Rawson, J. R. and Haselkorn, R. (1973) *J. Mol. Biol.* 77, 125-132.
- [10] Stutz, E. and Vandrey, J. P. (1971) *FEBS Letters* 17, 277-280.
- [11] Scott, N. S. (1973) *J. Mol. Biol.* 81, 327-336.
- [12] Vandrey, J. P. and Stutz, E. (1973) *FEBS Letters* 37, 174-177.

- [13] Greenblatt, C. L. and Schiff, J. A. (1959) *J. Protozool.* 6, 23-28.
- [14] Cramer, M. and Meyers, J. (1952) *Arch. Mikrobiol.* 17, 384-402.
- [15] Krawiec, S. and Eisenstadt, J. M. (1970) *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* 259, 120-131.
- [16] Rawson, J. R. and Stutz, E. (1969) *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* 190, 368-380.
- [17] Smith, K. D., Armstrong, G. L. and McCarthy, B. J. (1967) *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* 142, 323-330.
- [18] Krawiec, S. and Eisenstadt, J. M. (1970) *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* 217, 132-141.
- [19] Manning, J. E. and Richards, O. C. (1972) *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* 259, 285-296.
- [20] Stolarsky, L., Slavik, N. and Hershberger, C. L. (1974) *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* 335, 30-34.
- [21] Loening, U. E. (1969) *Biochem. J.* 113, 131-138.
- [22] Gillespie, D. and Spiegelman, S. (1965) *J. Mol. Biol.* 12, 829-842.
- [23] Borst, P. (1972) *Annual Rev. Biochem.* 41, 333-376.