SHORT COMMUNICATIONS 179

This work was supported by National Institutes of Health Research Grant AM-04652 and U.S. Atomic Energy Commission Contract AT(30-1)-2147. The assistance of F. C. Davis and P. J. Bredderman is gratefully acknowledged.

Department of Physical Biology, New York State Veterinary College, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y. 14850 (U.S.A.) R. H. WASSERMAN

- I R. H. WASSERMAN AND A. N. TAYLOR, Science, 152 (1966) 791.
- 2 R. H. Wasserman, R. A. Corradino and A. N. Taylor, J. Biol. Chem., 243 (1968) 3978.
- 3 A. N. Taylor and R. H. Wasserman, Arch. Biochem. Biophys., 119 (1967) 536.
- 4 R. A. CORRADINO, R. H. WASSERMAN, M. H. PUBOLS AND S. I. CHANG, Arch. Biochem. Biophys., 125 (1968) 378.
- 5 A. N. TAYLOR AND R. H. WASSERMAN, J. Histochem. Cytochem., in the press.
- 6 R. H. Wasserman and A. N. Taylor, J. Biol. Chem., 243 (1968) 3987.
- 7 R. H. Wasserman, R. A. Corradino and A. N. Taylor, J. Gen. Physiol., 54 (1969) 114.
- 8 A. B. PARDEE, Science, 162 (1968) 632.
- 9 F. G. Bray, Anal. Biochem., 1 (1960) 279.
- 10 A. D. BANGHAM, Progr. Biophys. Mol. Biol., 18 (1968) 29.
- II W. E. KOLPFENSTEIN, Biochim. Biophys. Acta, 181 (1969) 323.
- 12 R. M. C. Dawson, in D. Chapman, Biological Membranes, Physical Fact and Function, Academic Press, New York, 1968, p. 203.
- 13 P. V. Subbaiah, P. S. Sastry and J. Ganguly, Biochem. J., 113 (1969) 441.
- 14 A. A. Rosenblum and P. Elsbach, Am. J. Physiol., 214 (1968) 161.
- 15 L. L. VAN DEENEN AND G. H. DE HAAS, Ann. Rev. Biochem., 35 (1966) 157.

Received November 10th, 1969

Biochim. Biophys. Acta, 203 (1970) 176-179

BBA 73099

Variation in tissue resistance in rat small intestine: Its relationship to observed potential changes

In a previous paper¹ it was shown that the increase in the potential difference between the mucosal and serosal surfaces of rat small intestine, in the presence of actively transported amino acids in the mucosal bathing fluid, was greatest in the ileum and smallest in the proximal jejunum. Similar observations were made both in vivo and in vitro. The same study, as well as many others², suggests that the change in potential difference (PD) is proportional to the rate of amino acid transfer. Varying patterns of amino acid absorption along the length of the intestine have been reported³ but the differences do not appear to account for the pattern of PD changes observed. It was suggested¹ that either the stoichiometry between amino acid and ion transport varied along the intestine or the results could be due to differences in tissue resistance.

The present study was designed to choose between these alternatives. We have examined the effects of L-histidine on electrical parameters of the small intestine and also compared histidine transfer in the mid-intestine and ileum. Histidine was chosen because it is very little metabolised during transfer⁴ and gives a comparatively large maximum PD¹.

Abbreviation: PD, potential difference.

The techniques used to measure PD, both *in vivo* and *in vitro*, and short-circuit current were those previously described^{5,6}. Transfer of histidine was assessed as "mucosal transfer" (the total amount appearing in the gut wall and serosal fluid) using a ¹⁴C-labeled tracer in the everted sac preparation⁷. A preliminary measurement showed that the serosa to mucosa flux was less than 5% of the mucosa to serosa flux under the conditions of the experiment and the latter thus constitutes a good estimate of the net flux. The concentration of L-histidine chosen (40 mM) was the highest used in the PD measurements and was expected to bring the transfer system close to saturation.

In one set of experiments with 30-min incubation periods, using intestines from 9 animals, $44 \pm 3 \mu \text{moles}$ of histidine were transferred by the mid-intestine and $27 \pm 1 \mu \text{moles}$ by the ileum. The sacs represented the middle and terminal fifth of the combined jejunum and ileum⁸. Thus, although it is always difficult to choose an appropriate parameter of transfer, there is no evidence of a larger transfer in the ileum.

Changes in the PD across the wall of the intestine were determined for each of a range of concentrations between 2.5 and 40 mM mucosal L-histidine, using 6 sacs for each concentration, and allowance was made for osmotically induced potentials as previously described. In agreement with this earlier study, L-histidine gave a maximum PD change of around 5 mV in mid-intestine, using the *in vitro* preparation. In the ileum, the initial PD changes were much larger but were rather poorly maintained. In a previous study of hexose-induced potentials similar difficulties were experienced with preparations of ileum. For this reason, comparisons between midintestine and ileum were made using the *in vivo* technique. These studies gave PD maxima of 5 mV in mid-intestine (the same as *in vitro*) and 9.5 mV in the ileum. In both regions, the apparent K_m for the PD change was 20 mM, double the value in the *in vitro* preparation. Both the maximum PD change and the apparent K_m were estimated from a plot of 1/PD change against 1/concentration as previously described. A similar difference was previously observed for L-alanine. These experiments confirm that amino acids produce much larger PD changes in the ileum.

The values obtained from measurements of tissue resistance are given in Table I. The presence of maximal amounts of histidine or mannitol in the mucosal bathing medium had no detectable effect on the tissue resistance, but the resistance of the ileum was about double that for the mid-intestine. The lack of effect of transferred substrate on tissue resistance is in agreement with earlier findings for glucose⁶.

TABLE I tissue resistance for everted mid-intestine and ileum of the rat Results as mean \pm S.E. (number of experiments in parentheses).

Mucosal medium	Resistance (\Omega/cm length of gut)	
	Mid-intestine	Ileum
and the second s		
Krebs bicarbonate buffer	14.4 ± 2.0 (6)	$27.5 \pm 2.9 (6)$
4 40 mM mannitol	$14.7 \pm 1.6 (4)$	30.1 1.2 (4)
+ 40 mM L-histidine	15.2 1 2.1 (3)	27.0 A. 4.4 (3)

SHORT COMMUNICATIONS 181

Several authors have noted the inherent dangers of measuring changes in PD rather than short-circuit current, and changes in the ionic composition of the bathing media have been shown to alter the tissue resistance of rat intestine9. This study shows that similar problems arise when comparing electrical changes in different regions of the small intestine. Nevertheless, it is difficult to interpret short-circuit current measurements in situations in which ion fluxes are far from the steady state 10, and it is impossible to make valid measurements in vivo¹¹. Under these conditions PD measurements can still provide useful information.

The present work confirms the previous observation of larger amino acid evoked PD changes in the ileum than jejunum which cannot be explained by differences in rates of amino acid transfer. However, it seems likely that the differences can be attributed to differences in tissue resistance without the need to invoke a difference in the stoichiometry between amino acid and ion transport.

```
Department of Physiology,
University of Sheffield,
Sheffield SIO 2TN (Great Britain)
```

D. Cotterell* P. G. Kohn**

```
1 P. G. Kohn, D. H. Smyth and E. M. Wright, J. Physiol., 196 (1968) 723.
```

Received November 3rd, 1969

Biochim. Biophys. Acta, 203 (1970) 179-181

² S. G. SCHULTZ AND P. F. CURRAN, in Handbook of Physiology, Section 6, Vol. 3, p. 1245.

³ G. WISEMAN, in Handbook of Physiology, Section 6, Vol. 3, p. 1277.

⁴ L. R. FINCH AND F. J. R. HIRD, Biochim. Biophys. Acta, 43 (1960) 268.

⁵ R. J. C. Barry, S. Dikstein, J. Matthews, D. H. Smyth and E. M. Wright, J. Physiol., 171 (1964) 316.

⁶ R. J. C. BARRY, D. H. SMYTH AND E. M. WRIGHT, J. Physiol., 181 (1965) 410.

⁷ R. H. Wilson and G. Wiseman, *J. Physiol.*, 123 (1954) 116. 8 B. A. Barry, J. Matthews and D. H. Smyth, *J. Physiol.*, 157 (1961) 279.

⁹ S. G. SCHULTZ, P. F. CURRAN AND E. M. WRIGHT, Nature, 214 (1967) 509.

¹⁰ B. Z. GINZBURG AND J. HOGG, J. Theoret. Biol., 14 (1967) 316.

¹¹ W. S. Rehm, J. Theoret. Biol., 20 (1968) 341.

^{*} Present address: Department of Physiology, University of Leicester, Leicester, Great Britain.

^{**} Present address: Institute of Physiology, University of Aarhus, 8000 Aarhus C, Denmark.