
This copy is for your personal, non-commercial use only.

If you wish to distribute this article to others, you can order high-quality copies for your colleagues, clients, or customers by [clicking here](#).

Permission to republish or repurpose articles or portions of articles can be obtained by following the guidelines [here](#).

The following resources related to this article are available online at www.sciencemag.org (this information is current as of July 22, 2011):

Updated information and services, including high-resolution figures, can be found in the online version of this article at:

<http://www.sciencemag.org/content/332/6035/1307.full.html>

Supporting Online Material can be found at:

<http://www.sciencemag.org/content/suppl/2011/06/08/332.6035.1307.DC1.html>

This article **cites 35 articles**, 13 of which can be accessed free:

<http://www.sciencemag.org/content/332/6035/1307.full.html#ref-list-1>

This article appears in the following **subject collections**:

Biochemistry

<http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/collection/biochem>

served in 5b, were accreted, along with (presumably) amino acid precursors. The α -amino acids were probably produced during alteration on the Tagish Lake parent body, presumably by Strecker synthesis (37, 39), although other formation mechanisms for both α and other amino acids before their incorporation in the parent body have been suggested (40). Modest alteration may have produced light acetic acid and an initial complement of MCAs from IOM, by analogy with experiments (11), as well as a slight ee in isovaline, to provide the SOM characteristics observed in 5b. These components were then modified on the parent body through further hydrothermal alteration, resulting in reduction of aliphatic character and D/H in IOM, exchange of isotopically heavy C with MCA carboxyl C, production of glycine, and a fresh influx of racemic amino acids, as represented by organic matter in 11h. By analogy with MCAs, the exchange of isotopically heavy C with amino acid carboxyl C may explain the positive $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values of amino acids in 11h (such as glycine). The increase in IOM $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ with the degree of alteration (Table 1) is consistent with the loss of isotopically lighter C, associated with aliphatics, such as MCAs in 11i and 11v. Further hydrothermal alteration resulted in further modification of IOM and decreases in overall concentration of MCAs in 11i and 11v and a nearly complete loss of amino acids in 11i. The conditions of hydrothermal alteration inferred by analogy with experiments, especially temperature ($\sim 300^\circ\text{C}$) (10, 11, 25), are at odds with the mineralogy and preservation of volatile organic compounds, which provide an upper limit of $\sim 150^\circ\text{C}$ (23). The Tagish Lake specimens may therefore have experienced alteration at lower temperatures than those in the experiments, with the more extensively altered samples having been subjected to longer periods of alteration, higher temperatures, and/or higher water/rock ratios (11).

13. Information on materials and methods is available as supporting material on Science Online.
14. Hydrothermal alteration occurred early in the history of the carbonaceous chondrite parent bodies owing to accumulation of the heat of radioactive decay, so that liquid water was transiently present and percolated through the mineral matrix. The evidence for this process is preserved in mineral alterations. Furthermore, in the interior of the parent body, the temperature and pressure can rise high enough to produce hydrolysis of organic material.
15. M. E. Zolensky et al., *Meteorit. Planet. Sci.* **37**, 737 (2002).
16. T. Hiroi, M. E. Zolensky, C. M. Pieters, *Science* **293**, 2234 (2001).
17. M. M. Grady, A. B. Verchovsky, I. A. Franchi, I. P. Wright, C. T. Pillinger, *Meteorit. Planet. Sci.* **37**, 713 (2002).
18. S. Pizzarello et al., *Science* **293**, 2236 (2001).
19. G. Kminek, O. Botta, D. P. Glavin, J. L. Bada, *Meteorit. Planet. Sci.* **37**, 697 (2002).
20. K. Nakamura-Messenger, S. Messenger, L. P. Keller, S. J. Clemett, M. E. Zolensky, *Science* **314**, 1439 (2006).
21. R. K. Herd, C. D. K. Herd, *Lunar Planet. Sci.* XXXVIII, abstr. 2347 (2007).
22. P. G. Brown et al., *Science* **290**, 320 (2000).
23. A. J. Brearley, in *Treatise on Geochemistry*, H. D. Holland, K. K. Turekian, Eds. (Elsevier Pergamon, Oxford, 2003), vol. 1, pp. 247–268.
24. A. L. D. Kilcoyne et al., *J. Synchrotron Radiat.* **10**, 125 (2003).
25. H. Yabuta, L. B. Williams, G. D. Cody, C. M. O. Alexander, S. Pizzarello, *Meteorit. Planet. Sci.* **42**, 37 (2007).
26. G. D. Cody, C. M. O. D. Alexander, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **69**, 1085 (2005).
27. M. C. Anguera et al., *J. Biol. Chem.* **281**, 18335 (2006).
28. G. K. Smith, W. T. Mueller, L. J. Sliker, C. W. DeBrosse, S. J. Benkovic, *Biochemistry* **21**, 2870 (1982).
29. D. Deamer, J. P. Dworkin, S. A. Sandford, M. P. Bernstein, L. J. Allamandola, *Astrobiology* **2**, 371 (2002).
30. Y. S. Huang et al., *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **69**, 1073 (2005).
31. G. Yuen, N. Blair, D. J. Des Marais, S. Chang, *Nature* **307**, 252 (1984).
32. R. F. Dias, K. H. Freeman, M. D. Lewan, S. G. Franks, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **66**, 2755 (2002).
33. D. P. Glavin, J. P. Dworkin, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **106**, 5487 (2009).
34. R. Bowen, in *Isotopes in the Earth Sciences*, R. Bowen, Ed. (Kluwer, New York, 1988), pp. 452–469.
35. D. P. Glavin, M. P. Callahan, J. P. Dworkin, J. E. Elsila, *Meteorit. Planet. Sci.* **45**, 1948 (2010).
36. J. R. Cronin, S. Pizzarello, S. Epstein, R. V. Krishnamurthy, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **57**, 4745 (1993).
37. E. T. Peltzer, J. L. Bada, G. Schlesinger, S. L. Miller, *Adv. Space Sci.* **4**, 69 (1984).
38. S. Pizzarello, M. Zolensky, K. A. Turk, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **67**, 1589 (2003).
39. E. T. Peltzer, J. L. Bada, *Nature* **272**, 443 (1978).
40. J. E. Elsila, J. P. Dworkin, M. P. Bernstein, M. P. Martin, S. A. Sandford, *Astrophys. J.* **660**, 911 (2007).
41. Where given, the errors are half the difference (standard error of the mean) between the compositions of two residues prepared from two separate aliquots of each specimen. Typically, the differences in elemental ratios and isotopic compositions are larger than the intrinsic measurement precisions. Where only one measurement was made, the uncertainties of the other samples are a guide to the likely uncertainties.

Acknowledgments: Funding for this study was provided by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, Alberta Innovates, NASA (Astrobiology, including Carnegie Institution Astrobiology and the Goddard Center for Astrobiology; Origins of Solar Systems; Cosmochemistry and Postdoctoral Programs), the U.S. Office of Naval Research, the CIW, Grant MacEwan University, and the Carnegie Institution of Canada. The Canadian Institute for Advanced Research is thanked for hosting workshops that facilitated work on the MCAs. J. Kirby assisted with MCA analysis. R. Bowden carried out bulk IOM analyses. XANES data were acquired on the Scanning Transmission X-ray Microscope at beamline 5.3.2.2 of the Advanced Light Source, which is supported by the Director of the Office of Science, U.S. Department of Energy, under contract no. DE-AC02-05CH11231, and by a W.M. Keck Foundation grant to the CIW. Three anonymous reviewers are thanked for constructive comments that improved the manuscript.

Supporting Online Material

www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/332/6035/1304/DC1

Materials and Methods

Figs. S1 to S5

Tables S1 to S4

References (42–50)

25 January 2011; accepted 6 May 2011

10.1126/science.1203290

References and Notes

1. E. R. D. Scott, A. N. Krot, in *Treatise on Geochemistry*, H. D. Holland, K. K. Turekian, Eds. (Elsevier Pergamon, Oxford, 2007), vol. 1, pp. 1–72.
2. I. Gilmour, in *Treatise on Geochemistry*, H. D. Holland, K. K. Turekian, Eds. (Elsevier Pergamon, Oxford, 2003), vol. 1, pp. 269–290.
3. O. Botta, J. L. Bada, *Surv. Geophys.* **23**, 411 (2002).
4. J. R. Cronin, S. Pizzarello, D. P. Cruikshank, in *Meteorites and the Early Solar System*, J. F. Kerridge, M. S. Matthews, Eds. (Univ. of Arizona Press, Tucson, AZ, 1988), pp. 819–857.
5. H. Busemann et al., *Science* **312**, 727 (2006).
6. S. A. Sandford et al., *Science* **314**, 1720 (2006).
7. J. Duprat et al., *Science* **328**, 742 (2010).
8. C. M. O. D. Alexander, M. Fogel, H. Yabuta, G. D. Cody, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **71**, 4380 (2007).
9. C. F. Chyba, P. J. Thomas, L. Brookshaw, C. Sagan, *Science* **249**, 366 (1990).
10. Y. Huang, M. R. Alexandre, Y. Wang, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* **259**, 517 (2007).
11. Y. Oba, H. Naraoka, *Meteorit. Planet. Sci.* **41**, 1175 (2006).
12. L. Remusat, S. Derenne, F. Robert, H. Knicker, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **69**, 3919 (2005).

Activation of Visual Pigments by Light and Heat

Dong-Gen Luo,^{1,3*} Wendy W. S. Yue,^{1,3,4} Petri Ala-Laurila,^{5,6} King-Wai Yau^{1,2,3*}

Vision begins with photoisomerization of visual pigments. Thermal energy can complement photon energy to drive photoisomerization, but it also triggers spontaneous pigment activation as noise that interferes with light detection. For half a century, the mechanism underlying this dark noise has remained controversial. We report here a quantitative relation between a pigment's photoactivation energy and its peak-absorption wavelength, λ_{max} . Using this relation and assuming that pigment activations by light and heat go through the same ground-state isomerization energy barrier, we can predict the relative noise of diverse pigments with multi-vibrational-mode thermal statistics. The agreement between predictions and our measurements strongly suggests that pigment noise arises from canonical isomerization. The predicted high noise for pigments with λ_{max} in the infrared presumably explains why they apparently do not exist in nature.

Our visual system has an extremely high sensitivity to light under dark-adapted conditions (1). This feat requires a photo-

transduction mechanism with high amplification (2) and a thermally quiet visual pigment for minimizing noise. Thermal energy is a double-edged

word: It extends the spectral sensitivity of a pigment to long wavelengths by overcoming the energy deficit of a long-wavelength photon to drive pigment excitation (3–6), but it also triggers pigment activation occasionally in darkness to produce noise (7). More than 50 years ago, Barlow (8) proposed that pigments with longer peak-absorption wavelengths (λ_{\max}) are noisier and thus less suitable for dim-light detection. Although qualitatively validated (9–14), Barlow’s seminal hypothesis lacks a mechanistic underpinning. First, no prior relation exists between λ_{\max} and thermal activation, which impedes any quantitative prediction of pigment noise. Second, controversy continues about whether the pigment noise originates from an isomerization reaction and, if so, whether it is canonical isomerization (i.e., governed by the same ground-state isomerization energy barrier as in photoisomerization) (15–17). Finally, despite the rhodopsin noise measured long ago (7), noise measurements for cone pigments have begun to emerge only recently (10, 11, 13, 14), thus making any comprehensive pigment-noise theory untestable until now. We report here final success in understanding this fundamental problem in vision.

The involvement of thermal energy in pigment excitation by long-wavelength photons is implicit in the characteristic descent of a pigment’s spectrum at such wavelengths (3–5) and is directly revealed by an increase in relative absorption of these photons at a higher temperature (6). From the critical wavelength (λ_c) above which a temperature effect begins to appear, the photoactivation energy, E_a^P , can be obtained (fig. S1) (18). In this way, Ala-Laurila *et al.* (19, 20) have used microspectrophotometry and electroretinography to show that an E_a^P change is well correlated with a λ_{\max} shift produced by a chromophore switch from 11-*cis*-retinal (A_1) to 11-*cis*-3-dehydroretinal (A_2) in a pigment (18), but that this correlation is otherwise weak across pigments with different opsins. We reexamined this question, with the more precise suction-pipette recording (18), on diverse rod and cone pigments spanning phyla and A_1 and A_2 chromophores.

Figure 1A shows flash responses from dissociated goldfish red-, green- and blue-sensitive cones. Fitting their action spectra (Fig. 1B) with the A_2 -pigment spectral template (21) gave λ_{\max} values of 620, 537, and 447 nm, respectively. When logarithmic normalized sensitivity (i.e.,

response per incident photon) was plotted against reciprocal normalized wavelength (λ_{\max}/λ), the three spectral-sensitivity curves superposed well and showed a linear descent toward long wavelengths (Fig. 1B, inset), consistent with previous work (3–5, 22). Raising the temperature increased the relative sensitivity at long wavelengths, but not near λ_{\max} or at shorter wavelengths (Fig. 1C) (18). From the difference in sensitivity between the two temperatures plotted against λ_{\max}/λ (Fig. 1D) (19, 23), we obtained, by interpolation, a λ_{\max}/λ_c ratio of 0.843, 0.826, and 0.838, respectively, for the three cone types. The same experiment on *Bufo* and larval salamander red rods, as well as mouse rods, gave a λ_{\max}/λ_c ratio of 0.843, 0.830, and 0.840, respectively (Fig. 2, A and B) (18). We also measured mouse S [ultraviolet (UV)-sensitive] cone pigment, which has an unusual, unprotonated Schiff base (24) and thus

potentially different photoisomerization energetics. Because a UV pigment is typically coexpressed in native cones with a longer- λ_{\max} pigment (25, 26), we used an engineered mouse line in which the rods express only the UV cone pigment (18, 27). Again, we found a λ_{\max}/λ_c value of 0.841 (Fig. 2C).

From the above data, the mean λ_{\max}/λ_c value is 0.837 (± 0.007 , SD). Separately, a λ_{\max}/λ_c of 0.842 (± 0.009 , SD) (table S1) was obtained by directly estimating E_a^P (hence λ_c) from the same data (18). The overall mean λ_{\max}/λ_c from both methods is 0.84. Thus, $E_a^P = hc/\lambda_c \approx 0.84hc/\lambda_{\max}$ (h , Planck’s constant; c , speed of light), regardless of whether it is an A_1 or A_2 , a UV- or non-UV-sensitive, or a rod or cone pigment. This general relation allows us to deduce E_a^P for any pigment of known λ_{\max} . The constancy of λ_{\max}/λ_c no doubt contributes to the stereotypic




Fig. 1. Effect of temperature on spectral sensitivity of goldfish cone pigments. **(A)** Flash responses from a single cell (averaged responses, 10-msec flash at time zero, 23°C). **(B)** Logarithmic normalized sensitivity [obtained from dim-flash responses as illustrated in (A)] plotted against wavelength. Average \pm SEM (8, 6, and 5 cells, respectively); the SEMs were too small to be discernible at most wavelengths. The dotted curves are fits with the A_2 pigment spectral template (21) with λ_{\max} of 620, 537, and 447 nm, respectively. The inset at right is an overlay of the three action spectra (with colors corresponding to respective cone types), plotted in this case against the reciprocal of normalized wavelength (λ_{\max}/λ), to show the common shape (5, 22). **(C)** Logarithmic normalized sensitivity plotted against λ_{\max}/λ at two temperatures. Average \pm SEM. Cold temperature (black) was 14°C for red- (7 cells), 13°C for green- (11 cells) and 13°C for blue-sensitive cones (12 cells). Warm temperature (red) was 28°C for all three cone types (8, 7, and 8 cells, respectively). **(D)** Difference in logarithmic sensitivity against λ_{\max}/λ between the two temperatures calculated from (C). Horizontal dashed line represents essentially no temperature dependence. Linear regression from the temperature dependence at long wavelengths (solid line) intersects the horizontal line at 0.843, 0.826, and 0.838, respectively.

¹Solomon H. Snyder Department of Neuroscience, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD 21205, USA. ²Department of Ophthalmology, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD 21205, USA. ³Center for Sensory Biology, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD 21205, USA. ⁴Biochemistry, Cellular and Molecular Biology Graduate Program, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD 21205, USA. ⁵Howard Hughes Medical Institute and Department of Physiology and Biophysics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195, USA. ⁶Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Helsinki, Helsinki FI-00014, Finland.

*To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: dgluo@jhmi.edu (D.-G.L.); kwyau@mail.jhmi.edu (K.-W.Y.)

descent of the action spectra at long wavelengths when plotted against λ_{\max}/λ (Fig. 1B, inset).

To predict the thermal noise of visual pigments, we adhered to the parsimonious notion that thermal activation reflects canonical isomerization of the pigment—that is, it is dictated by the same ground-state energy barrier for isomerization, E_a^T , as in photoisomerization (fig. S2). We adopted the following statistical-mechanical distribution (6, 28–30)

$$f_{\geq E_a^T} = e^{-\frac{E_a^T}{RT}} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(m-1)!} \left(\frac{E_a^T}{RT}\right)^{m-1} \quad (1)$$

which describes a pigment molecule's probability, $f_{\geq E_a^T}$, of having relevant thermal energy $\geq E_a^T$, and thus being able to isomerize thermally. Here, R is the universal gas constant, T is absolute temperature, and m is the number of molecular vibrational modes contributing thermal energy to pigment activation (18). The Boltzmann

distribution, $f_{\geq E_a^T} = e^{-\frac{E_a^T}{RT}}$, corresponds to the special case of $m = 1$ in Eq. 1, and, strictly speaking, applies only to an ideal gas. Equation 1 is thus a more general distribution, allowing the possibility of thermal energy coming from multiple vibrational modes in a complex molecule but without requiring knowledge of the molecular details of the modes or the nature of their energy transfer. E_a^T is an unknown but should be >35 kcal mol⁻¹ for rhodopsin [~ 40 kcal mol⁻¹ or more (31–34)], because an early photoisomerized state, bathorhodopsin, is already at ~ 35 kcal mol⁻¹ above dark rhodopsin (fig. S2) (31). We let $E_a^T = \alpha E_a^P$, where α is a proportionality constant ≤ 1 ; the initial possibility of $\alpha > 1$ (31) has been disfavored (32–34).

We began calculations with $\alpha = 1$; thus, $E_a^T = E_a^P = 0.84hc/\lambda_{\max}$. For rhodopsin with $\lambda_{\max} = 500$ nm, we obtain $E_a^T = 48.03$ kcal mol⁻¹. Previously, an apparent thermal activation energy [$E_a^{T(\text{app})}$] of 21.9 kcal mol⁻¹ was found for rho-

dopsin (7), based on the Arrhenius equation, in which the Boltzmann distribution is implicit. This discrepancy between the E_a^T and $E_a^{T(\text{app})}$ values has prompted the suggestion (15–17) that thermal activation somehow bypasses the energy barrier E_a^T associated with photoisomerization. This ad hoc assumption becomes unnecessary with $m > 1$ in Eq. 1. The m value can be obtained from the relation $E_a^T - E_a^{T(\text{app})} = (m-1)RT$ (6, 28, 29), giving $m = 45$ at 23°C (18). This m value is nominal, based on each vibrational mode of the molecule contributing a nominal energy of kT (where Boltzmann's constant $k = R/N_A$, with N_A as Avogadro's number).

With Eq. 1, we predicted the relative thermal noise rates for diverse pigments at 23°C (our reference temperature) by using the respective E_a^T values calculated from their λ_{\max} values, as described above, and keeping $m = 45$ across pigments because their chromophore is essentially the same, whether A_1 or A_2 . The absolute rate is




Fig. 2. Effect of temperature on spectral sensitivity of rhodopsins and S (UV-sensitive) cone pigment. (A) Temperature effects on the action spectra of the three rhodopsins, displayed in same format as in Fig. 1C. Cold temperature (black) was 14°C for *Bufo* (9 cells), 13°C for salamander (11 cells), and 25°C for mouse (8 cells). Warm temperature (red) was 25°C (10 cells), 25°C (11 cells), and 37.5°C (9 cells), respectively. (B) Difference spectrum between the two temperatures obtained from (A), giving λ_{\max}/λ_c of 0.843, 0.830, and 0.840, respectively. (C) Temperature effect on the action spectrum of mouse S cone

pigment. (Left) Flash responses of a transgenic mouse rod expressing S cone pigment but no rhodopsin. (Left inset) Corresponding normalized flash response-intensity relation, with the curve being $R/R_{\max} = 1 - \exp(-I_F/K)$, where R and R_{\max} are response and saturated response, respectively, I_F is flash intensity, and K is a sensitivity constant. Half-saturating flash intensity, σ , is 101 photons μm^{-2} (360 nm). (Middle) Temperature effect on spectrum. Same format as in (A), with temperatures at 37.5°C (red, 8 cells) and 25°C (black, 13 cells). (Right) Difference spectrum between the two temperatures, giving λ_{\max}/λ_c of 0.841.

given by $A \times f_{\geq E_a^T}$, where A is the preexponential factor (35) representing the frequency of spontaneous-activation attempts by the molecule. We began with A being the same for all pigments, but let the comparison with measurements indicate otherwise. Thus, the predicted thermal-rate ratio between two pigments is simply their $f_{\geq E_a^T}$ ratio. Five pairwise comparisons were made, allowing us to: (i) examine the change in pigment noise due to an A_1/A_2 -chromophore switch, (ii) compare rod and cone pigments containing the same chromophore, and (iii) cover pigments across the full visible spectrum. Consistent with Barlow's hypothesis (8), a longer λ_{\max} is indeed associated with a higher predicted noise rate constant (Table 1).

Considering that $E_a^T < E_a^P$ is a more plausible situation (32–34), we repeated the above calculations with $\alpha < 1$ (within a realistic range) in $E_a^T = \alpha E_a^P$ —thus, $m < 45$ —but we found the $f_{\geq E_a^T}$ ratios to be hardly affected (table S2).

We compared the above predictions ($\alpha = 1$) with direct measurements, either previous measurements or new ones—all based on individually resolvable spontaneous events (measured electrophysiologically) for reliability (Table 1, but see also table S3). We repeated some measurements for consistency or for extrapolating them to 23°C (figs. S3 to S5) (18). We also measured the thermal noise of blue-cone pigment, naturally expressed in amphibian “green rods” besides blue cones (figs. S6 and S7) (18). Figure 3A shows sample re-

sponses of a *Bufo* green rod to repeated, identical dim flashes (440 nm), with the flash intensity sufficiently dim to elicit no response in most trials, thus allowing individual single-photon responses to be observed. The successful responses were quantized (Fig. 3B), with a unit amplitude of ~1 pA and an amplitude histogram matching the Poisson distribution as expected (Fig. 3C, dashed profile) (18). The green rod was rather quiet in darkness (Fig. 3D), but dim steady light elicited events similar to the single-photon responses (Fig. 3, E and F), indicating that the dark quiescence reflected low spontaneous activity instead of undetectably small events. In altogether 830 min of dark recordings from 42 cells, we observed only 15 events (Fig. 3, G and H) that




Fig. 3. Thermal pigment activity in blue-cone pigment (*Bufo* green rod). (**A** to **C**) Single-photon–response analysis. (**A**) Sample responses from 100 identical dim-flash trials (440 nm). Flash timings are indicated by vertical bars at bottom. (**B**) All 100 dim-flash responses superposed, showing quantized amplitudes. 10-msec flashes were centered at time zero. (**C**) Amplitude histogram from (**B**) measured at the transient peak of the averaged response. Bin-width is 0.1 pA. The dashed curve is a fit with the Poisson distribution blurred by Gaussian functions [eq. S3 in (18)], with a mean single-photon–response amplitude of 1.1 pA. (**D**) 10-min dark continuous recording from a different cell. (**E** and **F**) 10-min recordings from the same cell as in (**D**), with dim steady light of 5.36×10^{-4} and 1.07×10^{-3} photons $\mu\text{m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ (440 nm), respec-

tively, expected to give 6 and 12 photoisomerization events, respectively, based on an effective collecting area (41) of $19.1 \mu\text{m}^2$, calculated from cell dimensions (table S5). These expected numbers closely match the 6 (**E**) and 11 (**F**) discrete events marked by stars. (**G** and **H**) 10-min dark recordings from two other cells showing one and two spontaneous events, respectively. The latter case is an extremely rare occurrence. (**I**) Poisson analysis of the dark spontaneous events collected from all cells (see text). The probability of zero, one, two, and three events observed, in a total of 83 trials of 10-min dark recording each, is plotted as the square symbols. The solid line shows the very good fit by the Poisson distribution (18) with a mean event rate of 0.00031 s^{-1} . All recordings in this figure were low-pass filtered at 3 Hz.

likewise obeyed Poisson statistics over all cells (Fig. 3I) (18). These values gave an average spontaneous rate of $0.00031 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ cell}^{-1}$, which is literally at the lower limit of measurement. A previous estimate from salamander blue cones with indirect noise analysis only limited the rate to $<2 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ cell}^{-1}$ (10), whereas an early report (36) on *Bufo* green rods inexplicably gave a rate of $0.065 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ cell}^{-1}$, a value that is 200-fold higher than what we report here (table S3). Correlating the rate trend with λ_{max} , we expect the mouse UV pigment to be too quiet for noise measurement, as appears to be the case (27).

From Table 1, the predicted rate ratio between A_1 and A_2 rhodopsins, as well as that between A_1 and A_2 red cone pigments, is either equal to or within a factor of 2 of the measured ratios. On the other hand, the predicted rate ratio between A_1 rhodopsin and an A_1 cone pigment, whether red or blue, underestimates the measured ratio by about one order of magnitude. The simplest explanation would be that the preexponential factor, A , is actually an order of magnitude higher for cone pigments, consistent with their more open chromophore-binding pocket (37–39). After adjusting for this difference (table S4), the remaining prediction/measurement discrepancy (~fivefold) in the comparison between A_2 rhodopsin and A_2 red cone pigment may stem from a measurement uncertainty and/or minor differences in, for example, m values across pigments. Overall, however,

the agreements are substantial. The comparison between A_1 blue cone pigment ($\lambda_{\text{max}} = 432 \text{ nm}$) and A_2 red cone pigment ($\lambda_{\text{max}} = 617 \text{ nm}$), which have the largest λ_{max} separation among non-UV visual pigments and cover a $\sim 10^7$ -fold difference in rate constants, gives a mere 15-fold discrepancy between prediction and measurement. In contrast, the commonly used Boltzmann distribution gave predictions drastically different from measurements (fig. S8).

Our theory, developed to explain thermal activation of pigments, should also apply to photoactivation at $\lambda > \lambda_c$, where thermal energy contributes to photoisomerization. Interestingly, with A_1 rhodopsin as an example, the spectral template (21) over an experimentally validated 10-log-unit descent at long wavelengths can be described by our theory (18), but requires a very small m value varying between 1 and 4 (Fig. 4A; see similar results for cone pigments in fig. S9). The large difference in m value between photoisomerization and thermal isomerization (nominally ~ 45 , see above) probably reflects different molecular time windows in recruiting vibrational energy. In photoexcitation, only a few vibrational modes can be recruited, presumably due to instantaneous Franck-Condon excitation (35). Thermal activation, on the other hand, has an open time window, happening when, and only when, the requisite energy is recruited from a large number of collaborative vibrational modes. With the high E_a^T

(ground-state isomerization energy barrier), thermal isomerization happens with an exceedingly low probability, thus explaining the low rate constants (Table 1).


The visual pigment with the longest λ_{max} known so far in nature is the A_2 red cone pigment ($\lambda_{\text{max}} \sim 620 \text{ nm}$). Is there any physical or biological reason why pigments with longer λ_{max} values are evolutionarily disfavored? On the physical side, Fig. 4B shows a hypothetical A_1 pigment template with λ_{max} at 698 nm, the long-wavelength descent of which matches predictions with $m = 1$ (the Boltzmann limit) (18). Superficially, no pigment can have $\lambda_{\text{max}} > 698 \text{ nm}$ because no molecule, however small, could have $m < 1$ (5). For example, a pigment with a hypothetical λ_{max} of 1000 nm would give $m < 1$ (Fig. 4B). In reality, however, m is a nominal number (see earlier); thus, $m < 1$ is possible provided that one or more vibrational modes contribute an energy less than the nominal value of kT . Thus, at least in principle, $\lambda_{\text{max}} > 698 \text{ nm}$ is still physically possible. How about biological considerations? In Fig. 4C, we extrapolate with our theory the measured noise rate constants to hypothetical pigments with λ_{max} values in the infrared. The rate constant for cone pigments approaches an asymptote of $\sim 1.1 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1}$ in the infrared, or 360 times higher than that of the 620-nm A_2 red cone pigment. If a pigment with such an asymptotic rate constant were present in a salamander red cone

Table 1. Comparison between theoretical predictions and measurements of relative thermal-activation rate constants of visual pigments. For theoretical predictions, see text. For experimental measurements, *Bufo* red rods and green rods were at 23°C (this study), *Xenopus* rods [wild type (WT) and transgenics expressing human red cone pigment] were at 21° to 23°C (11), and mouse rods (WT and transgenics expressing human red cone pigment) were at 37°C (14) and 29°C (this study) and were extrapolated to 23°C, as described in (18) and fig. S4. This extrapolation is not

perfect because of margins of error in the measured thermal rates. This issue, together with the approximations in cell dimensions (table S5) and λ_{max} determinations, may explain the order-of-magnitude discrepancy between the rate constants for *Bufo* red rod and mouse rod (both with A_1 -rhodopsin) at 23°C. In principle, the two values would be expected to be identical according to our theory.

Cell/pigment	λ_{max} (nm)	E_a^T (kcal mol ⁻¹)	$f_{\geq E_a^T}$	Predicted rate-constant ratio	Measured rate constant (s ⁻¹)	Measured rate-constant ratio
<i>Bufo</i> red rod/ A_1 <i>Bufo</i> rhodopsin	500	48.03	3.65×10^{-6}	$\frac{1}{4.6}$	4.18×10^{-12}	$\frac{1}{8.9}$
<i>Xenopus</i> rod/ A_2 <i>Xenopus</i> rhodopsin	521	46.10	1.67×10^{-5}	$\frac{1}{16}$	3.70×10^{-11}	$\frac{1}{16}$
Transgenic mouse rod/ A_1 human red cone pigment	557	43.12	1.52×10^{-4}	$\frac{1}{42}$	4.14×10^{-8}	$\frac{1}{623}$
Transgenic <i>Xenopus</i> rod/ A_2 human red cone pigment	617	38.93	2.44×10^{-3}	$\frac{1}{146}$	6.70×10^{-7}	$\frac{1}{18,000}$
Mouse rod/ A_1 mouse rhodopsin	500	48.03	3.65×10^{-6}	$\frac{1}{706}$	6.64×10^{-11}	$\frac{1}{45}$
Transgenic mouse rod/ A_1 human red cone pigment	557	43.12	1.52×10^{-4}		4.14×10^{-8}	
<i>Xenopus</i> rod/ A_2 <i>Xenopus</i> rhodopsin	521	46.10	1.67×10^{-5}		3.70×10^{-11}	
Transgenic <i>Xenopus</i> rod/ A_2 human red cone pigment	617	38.93	2.44×10^{-3}		6.70×10^{-7}	
<i>Bufo</i> green rod/ A_1 <i>Bufo</i> blue cone pigment	432	55.59	5.17×10^{-9}		9.39×10^{-14}	
<i>Bufo</i> red rod/ A_1 <i>Bufo</i> rhodopsin	500	48.03	3.65×10^{-6}		4.18×10^{-12}	

Fig. 4. Predictions from our theory. **(A and B)** Predictions of spectral descent at wavelengths longer than λ_c . **(A)** Spectral descent for A_1 rhodopsin ($\lambda_{\max} = 500$ nm) template matches predictions (dashed curves) drawn from eq. S7 (18) with $m = 1$ through 9. **(B)** Spectral template for hypothetical A_1 pigment with $\lambda_{\max} = 698$ nm has a long-wavelength descent matching predictions throughout with $m = 1$, whereas that with $\lambda_{\max} = 1000$ nm requires predictions with $m < 1$. Dashed curves (with one completely overshadowed by the red template) are predictions with $m = 1$. **(C and D)** Pigment noise prediction and its impact on photosensitivity. **(C)** Predicted thermal-noise rate constant as a function of λ_{\max} (data from Table 1). Black circles, rhodopsins; red squares, cone pigments. Curves are $A \times f_{\geq E_1}$ at 23°C, $m = 45$, with $A = 7.19 \times 10^{-6} \text{ s}^{-1}$ for rhodopsins and $1.88 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1}$ for cone pigments. **(D)** Effect of thermal activity on photosensitivity. The solid curve denotes the Weber-Fechner relation describing the reduction in flash sensitivity by background light, $S_F/S_F^D = I_o/(I_o + I_B)$, where S_F and S_F^D are flash sensitivities in background light of intensity I_B and in darkness, respectively. The background intensity (I_o) that reduces the sensitivity in darkness by half is 1200 isomerizations per second for salamander red cones (10), used here as a reference. The asymptotic thermal-noise rate for cone pigments from (C) is 29,700 s^{-1} , which would reduce light sensitivity of salamander red cones by 26-fold. In this estimate, we have ignored the relatively low $\sim 200 \text{ s}^{-1}$ noise rate intrinsic to the salamander red cone.



[with $\sim 2.7 \times 10^8$ pigment molecules (39)], the noise rate would be 29,700 $\text{s}^{-1} \text{ cell}^{-1}$, which would reduce the cell's already low sensitivity by another 26-fold, according to its adaptation behavior to background light (Fig. 4D) (10). Furthermore, the standard deviation of the background noise would increase by $(360)^{1/2} = 19$ -fold. Such signaling detriments are undesirable. Perhaps for this reason, the viper pit organ detects infrared radiation with a heat-sensing ion channel rather than a visual pigment (40). For a short-wavelength-sensitive pigment, although its noise literally disappears at $\lambda_{\max} < 400$ nm (Fig. 4C), nonspecific light absorption by proteins, peaking at ~ 280 nm, becomes a limiting factor. These considerations probably explain, at least partially, why the λ_{\max} values of native visual pigments are confined to the narrow bandwidth of ~ 360 to 620 nm, limiting color vision accordingly.

In summary, our work strongly suggests that thermal activation of visual pigments, like photoisomerization, involves a canonical isomerization reaction. If not for the discrepancy between the electrophysiological and photochemical measurements on rhodopsin, the inadequacy of Boltzmann statistics (i.e., involving only one vibrational mode) for understanding the thermal behavior of pigments would not have been obvious (for example, within a limited temperature range, Eq. 1 also gives an almost linear relation in an Arrhenius plot, as Boltzmann statistics does; see fig S5). Because

all biological molecules, like visual pigments, are polyatomic and thus have many vibrational modes, our success here hopefully will stimulate the same approach to other biomolecules.

References and Notes

1. S. Hecht, S. Shlaer, M. H. Pirenne, *J. Gen. Physiol.* **25**, 819 (1942).
2. D. G. Luo, T. Xue, K.-W. Yau, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **105**, 9855 (2008).
3. C. F. Goodeve, *Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. A* **155**, 664 (1936).
4. W. S. Stiles, in *Transactions of the Optical Convention of the Worshipful Company of Spectacle Makers* (Spectacle Makers' Company, London, 1948), pp. 97–107.
5. T. D. Lamb, *Vision Res.* **35**, 3083 (1995).
6. R. C. C. St. George, *J. Gen. Physiol.* **35**, 495 (1952).
7. D. A. Baylor, G. Matthews, K.-W. Yau, *J. Physiol.* **309**, 591 (1980).
8. H. B. Barlow, *Nature* **179**, 255 (1957).
9. K. Donner, M. L. Firsov, V. I. Govardovskii, *J. Physiol.* **428**, 673 (1990).
10. F. Rieke, D. A. Baylor, *Neuron* **26**, 181 (2000).
11. V. Kefalov, Y. Fu, N. Marsh-Armstrong, K.-W. Yau, *Nature* **425**, 526 (2003).
12. P. Ala-Laurila, K. Donner, R. K. Crouch, M. C. Cornwall, *J. Physiol.* **585**, 57 (2007).
13. K. Sakurai et al., *J. Gen. Physiol.* **130**, 21 (2007).
14. Y. Fu, V. Kefalov, D.-G. Luo, T. Xue, K.-W. Yau, *Nat. Neurosci.* **11**, 565 (2008).
15. R. B. Barlow, R. R. Birge, E. Kaplan, J. R. Tallent, *Nature* **366**, 64 (1993).
16. A. P. Sampath, D. A. Baylor, *Biophys. J.* **83**, 184 (2002).

17. V. A. Lórenz-Fonfría, Y. Furutani, T. Ota, K. Ido, H. Kandori, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **132**, 5693 (2010).
18. Materials and methods are available as supporting material on Science Online.
19. P. Ala-Laurila, R.-J. Albert, P. Saarinen, A. Koskelainen, K. Donner, *Vis. Neurosci.* **20**, 411 (2003).
20. P. Ala-Laurila, J. Pahlberg, A. Koskelainen, K. Donner, *Vision Res.* **44**, 2153 (2004).
21. V. I. Govardovskii, N. Fyhrquist, T. Reuter, D. G. Kuzmin, K. Donner, *Vis. Neurosci.* **17**, 509 (2000).
22. R. J. W. Mansfield, in *The Visual System*, A. Fein, J. S. Levine, Eds. (Alan Liss, New York, 1985), pp. 89–106.
23. P. Ala-Laurila, P. Saarinen, R. Albert, A. Koskelainen, K. Donner, *Vis. Neurosci.* **19**, 781 (2002).
24. A. Dukkipati et al., *Biochemistry* **41**, 9842 (2002).
25. C. L. Makino, R. L. Dodd, *J. Gen. Physiol.* **108**, 27 (1996).
26. S. S. Nikonov, R. Kholodenko, J. Lem, E. N. Pugh Jr., *J. Gen. Physiol.* **127**, 359 (2006).
27. G. Shi, K.-W. Yau, J. Chen, V. J. Kefalov, *J. Neurosci.* **27**, 10084 (2007).
28. P. Ala-Laurila, K. Donner, A. Koskelainen, *Biophys. J.* **86**, 3653 (2004).
29. C. N. Hinshelwood, in *The Kinetics of Chemical Change* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1940), pp. 39 and 79.
30. K. A. Holbrook, M. J. Pilling, S. H. Robertson, in *Unimolecular Reactions* (Wiley, Chichester, UK, ed. 2, 1996), pp. 1–38.
31. A. Cooper, *Nature* **282**, 531 (1979).
32. R. R. Birge, *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **1016**, 293 (1990).
33. T. Okada, O. P. Ernst, K. Palczewski, K. P. Hofmann, *Trends Biochem. Sci.* **26**, 318 (2001).
34. R. A. Mathies, *Novartis Found. Symp.* **224**, 70, discussion 84 (1999).
35. P. Atkins, J. de Paula, *Physical Chemistry* (Freeman, New York, ed. 8, 2006).
36. G. Matthews, *J. Physiol.* **349**, 607 (1984).
37. H. Matsumoto, F. Tokunaga, T. Yoshizawa, *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **404**, 300 (1975).
38. F. Crescitelli, *Vision Res.* **24**, 1551 (1984).
39. V. J. Kefalov et al., *Neuron* **46**, 879 (2005).
40. E. O. Gracheva et al., *Nature* **464**, 1006 (2010).
41. D.-G. Luo, K.-W. Yau, *J. Gen. Physiol.* **126**, 263 (2005).

Acknowledgments: This work was supported by a U.S. NIH grant (EY06837) and the António Champalimaud Vision Award (Portugal) to K.-W.Y. and a grant (123231) from the Academy of Finland to P.A.-L. We thank R. S. Molday and J.-X. Ma for the antibodies against rhodopsin and blue cone pigment, respectively; J. Chen for the transgenic mouse line expressing mouse S-cone opsin in the rods; X. Lin for mathematical help; M. T. H. Do for critique; T. Xue and Y. P. Wang for computational help; and V. S. Batista, R. R. Birge, P. J. Dagdigian, T. Ebrey, B. Honig, M. Karplus, J. E. Kim, B. E. Knox, C. L. Makino, R. A. Mathies, J. Nathans, T. P. Sakmar, J. L. Schnapf, K. Schulten, T. G. Wensel, T. B. Woolf, and E. C. Y. Yan for discussions. D.-G.L. and K.-W.Y. designed the experiments, did the data analysis, developed the theory, and wrote the paper; D.-G.L. performed all of the electrophysiological experiments; W.W.S.Y. did the retinal immunolabeling and participated in the measurement of thermal activity of *Bufo* red rods as well as writing; and P.A.-L. contributed to the theory and participated in discussion.

Supporting Online Material

www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/332/6035/1307/DC1
Materials and Methods
Figs. S1 to S9
Tables S1 to S5
References

8 November 2010; accepted 6 May 2011
10.1126/science.1200172