

*Faculty of Science*  
*Faculty of Science - Papers*

---

*University of Wollongong*

*Year 2004*

---

Comparison of solvent regimes for the  
extraction of photosynthetic pigments  
from leaves of higher plants

J. L. Dunn\*      J. D. Turnbull†  
S. A. Robinson‡

\*University of Wollongong

†University of Wollongong

‡University of Wollongong, sharonr@uow.edu.au

This article was originally published as Dunn, JL, Turnbull, JD and Robinson, SA, Comparison of solvent regimes for the extraction of photosynthetic pigments from leaves of higher plants, *Functional Plant Biology* 31, 2004, 195-202. Original journal available <a href="http://www.publish.csiro.au/nid/102.htm">here</a>. Copyright CSIRO.

This paper is posted at Research Online.

<http://ro.uow.edu.au/scipapers/41>

1 **Research note:**

2 **Comparison of solvent regimes for the extraction of photosynthetic pigments from**  
3 **leaves of higher plants**

4 *Jodie L. Dunn<sup>A</sup>, Johanna D. Turnbull<sup>A</sup> and Sharon A. Robinson<sup>A,B</sup>*

5 <sup>A</sup>Institute for Conservation Biology, Department of Biological Sciences, University of Wollongong,  
6 Wollongong, NSW 2522, Australia.

7 <sup>B</sup>Corresponding author; email: sharonr@uow.edu.au

8 *Abstract.* The relative efficiency of methanol- and acetone-based solvents for the extraction of pigments from  
9 photosynthetic tissues of plant was compared, together with the advantages of multiple versus single extractions.  
10 The two commonly employed triple acetone extractions (100:80:80% and 85:100:100%) performed comparably  
11 for most pigments and for all plant species tested. Single extractions with either 96% methanol or 85% acetone  
12 failed to extract the more hydrophobic pigments, especially  $\beta$ -carotene. We conclude that multiple extractions  
13 that combine pure and aqueous (80–85%) acetone are preferable for extraction of the full range of pigments.  
14 These results suggest that previous studies that have utilised aqueous methanol (especially in a single extraction)  
15 have probably underestimated the concentration of  $\beta$ -carotene relative to other pigments.

16 FP03162

17 *Running head:* Comparison of solvents for extraction of photosynthetic pigments

18 J. L. Dunn *et al.*

19 *Keywords:*  $\beta$ -carotene, carotenoids, chlorophylls, cycle pigments, HPLC, pigment extraction, xanthophylls.

20 *Abbreviations used:*  $\beta$ -car,  $\beta$ -carotene; CAM, Crassulacean acid metabolism; chl, chlorophyll; HPLC, high-  
21 performance liquid chromatography; L, lutein; N, neoxanthin.

22 **Introduction**

23 Methodology for extraction of plant photosynthetic pigments lacks consistency despite the growing  
24 number of studies in this area. Traditional methods for analysis of photosynthetic pigments employed  
25 spectroscopy and extinction coefficients that had been calculated for a range of solvents (Davies 1976;  
26 Lichtenthaler 1987; Lichtenthaler and Wellburn 1983; Porra *et al.* 1989). For whole-leaf extracts these  
27 methods allowed for the accurate calculation of chlorophyll (chl) *a* and *b* concentration, but were  
28 limited to a pooling of the carotenoid pigments to give total carotenoid content. Although  
29 contemporary studies still use these simple, effective and cheaper methods for quantification of chl  
30 (Day and Vogelmann 1995; Gehrke 1999; Xiong and Day 2001), high-performance liquid  
31 chromatography (HPLC) is now the method of choice when individual carotenoid concentrations are  
32 required (Thayer and Björkman 1990; Gilmore and Yamamoto 1991; Wright *et al.* 1991, 1997; Jeffrey

1 et al. 1999). For chl extraction from leaves of higher plants several different extractions have been  
2 tested and optimal procedures established (Porra et al. 1989). However, this is not the case for  
3 extraction of the full range of carotenoid pigments. Therefore, we sought to determine if certain  
4 extraction procedures are preferable for efficient extraction of plant photosynthetic pigments. We  
5 believe that it is important to elucidate whether or not all commonly employed extraction procedures  
6 produce equivalent extraction of the range of pigments and thus allow comparisons between studies  
7 undertaken with different extraction procedures. We were concerned that some differences reported in  
8 the literature might reflect the extraction procedure rather than an intrinsic difference in the  
9 photosynthetic pigments (Robinson et al. 2003).

10 Since an efficient methodology for HPLC separation of the xanthophyll cycle pigments was  
11 developed by Gilmore and Yamamoto (1991), there have been several studies on the levels of  
12 photoprotective xanthophyll cycle pigments and the antioxidant carotenoid,  $\beta$ -carotene ( $\beta$ -car;  
13 representative list see Table 1). In the majority of these studies pure or aqueous acetone was used as  
14 the solvent, often with multiple extractions. Acetone was also traditionally used for extraction of chl  
15 for spectrophotometry (Porra et al. 1989). In 1997 Wright and co-workers published a study that  
16 investigated the best extraction technique for HPLC of algal pigments (Wright et al. 1997). Sonication  
17 with pure methanol was found to be the most effective and safe solvent. Some recent studies have  
18 subsequently used an aqueous methanol extraction regime, derived from Wright's methodology, for  
19 leaves of higher plants (Table 1).

20 The methodologies employed can be categorised into two main groups on the basis of the solvent  
21 used for extraction, methanol or acetone. The latter group can be divided into two subgroups, those  
22 that use pure acetone as the first solvent followed by aqueous acetone (80%; e.g. Lovelock and  
23 Robinson 2002), and those that use 85% acetone as the first solvent with subsequent extractions of  
24 pure acetone (after Thayer and Björkman 1992). In addition, most of the acetone extractions have been  
25 optimised to some extent and two or three extractions are usual. Initially single extractions with 80–  
26 85% acetone were used but problems with recovery of  $\beta$ -car led to the adoption of multiple  
27 extractions, employing a combination of pure and aqueous (80–85%) acetone (Thayer and Björkman  
28 1992). The main difference between these latter methods concerns the order of aqueous and pure  
29 acetone. Some authors use aqueous acetone followed by pure acetone (Adams and Demmig-Adams  
30 1992; Thayer and Björkman 1992) whereas others, including those in our laboratory, have used pure  
31 acetone as the first solvent. Previously we have found that an initial extraction with pure acetone was  
32 required when working with tissues with a high water content, such as Crassulacean acid metabolism  
33 (CAM) succulents (Robinson et al. 1993). With methanol-based solvents, a single extraction is often  
34 employed and these methods tend not to follow the comprehensive procedure used by Wright in the  
35 original paper (Wright et al. 1997). Although the latter method has been rigorously tested, and  
36 methanol confirmed as the solvent of choice for extraction of algal pigments, it has not been tested or  
37 optimised for higher plant tissues.

1 The pigments of concern to Wright and co-workers (Wright et al. 1991, 1997) were those  
2 characteristic of algal groups and therefore used in the identification of algal species, such as the  
3 fucoxanthins and chl *c*. In studies with higher plant tissues these pigments are absent and other  
4 pigments such as the xanthophyll cycle pigments and the carotenes are of most interest to researchers.  
5 We were concerned that the carotenes, which are the least polar carotenoids, might be less efficiently  
6 extracted by methanol- than acetone-based solvents. We have compared three published  
7 methodologies for extraction of photosynthetic pigments utilising methanol (96%) or acetone (85%  
8 and 100%) as solvents (Tables 1, 2). Since methods also varied in the number of subsequent  
9 extractions that were employed, we compared up to four extractions to determine the most appropriate  
10 regime for a range of plant tissues.

11 Different plant types were tested including examples with relatively simple cellular structure as well  
12 as herbaceous, succulent and sclerophyllous leaves. These were an alga (*Ulva* spp.), a moss  
13 (*Ceratodon purpureus*), a non-sclerophyllous tree (*Hymenosporum flavum*), a succulent CAM plant  
14 (*Cotyledon paniculata*) and a sclerophyllous tree (*Eucalyptus longifolia*). Since initial water content of  
15 tissues may be a factor in determining extraction efficiency we compared extraction with the different  
16 solvents from a very dry tissue, desiccated moss, and a succulent leaf with high water content.

## 17 **Materials and methods**

### 18 *Plant material*

19 The thalli or leaves of five different plant types, algae, moss, succulent, non-sclerophyllous and sclerophyllous  
20 trees, were collected between 1300 and 1600 h on a sunny day. All plant material was taken from an area on the  
21 plant with maximal sun exposure for at least 4 h before sampling, in order to promote conversion of violaxanthin  
22 to zeaxanthin. The plant material was immediately placed in liquid nitrogen and stored frozen until extraction.

23 Two plants of the alga, *Ulva* spp., were collected from a north facing depression at low tide on the rock  
24 platform at Wollongong Harbour, NSW, Australia. The uppermost 3 mm of the moss, *Ceratodon purpureus*, was  
25 harvested from a turf near the entrance to Wollongong University. Samples of this were also desiccated for 48 h  
26 over silica gel. Four leaves were collected from a tree of the non-sclerophyllous Australian native,  
27 *Hymenosporum flavum* in Wollongong Botanic Gardens, NSW, Australia. Another four leaves were taken from  
28 a sclerophyllous native Australian tree, *Eucalyptus longifolia*, and a succulent CAM plant, *Cotyledon paniculata*,  
29 growing in the grounds of Wollongong University.

30 For the wet moss and algae each sample consisted of 50 mg ( $\pm$  5 mg) of green, plant material while for *C.*  
31 *paniculata* 300 mg ( $\pm$  6 mg) of leaf tissue was used. For the dry moss each sample consisted of 5 mg ( $\pm$  0.1 mg)  
32 of plant material. Leaf discs (0.8 cm<sup>2</sup>) of *H. flavum* and *E. longifolia* were paired for different extraction  
33 regimes, with discs taken from each leaf on opposite sides of the midvein.

### 34 *Basic extraction methodology and quantification of pigments by HPLC*

35 Plant material (thalli or leaf disks) was weighed, then ground in a mortar and pestle with liquid nitrogen and  
36 sand. The first solvent A (1.5 ml; see below and Table 2) was added and the sample ground then transferred to

1 an eppendorf tube and allowed to stand on ice in the dark for approximately 20 min. After centrifugation  
2 (14 000 g, 4 min) the supernatant was removed and the pellet was re-extracted with the second solvent B (0.5  
3 ml) using a polypropylene tissue grinder (Crown Scientific, Sydney, Australia). After a further 10 min on ice and  
4 centrifugation, this second supernatant was removed and the pellet was re-extracted with solvent B (0.5 ml).  
5 Supernatants were combined and samples were made up to an equivalent volume with solvent B. Immediately  
6 before HPLC analysis samples were filtered (0.45 µm PTFE syringe filter, Alltech, Sydney, Australia) into  
7 amber vials. Samples were kept at -20°C before analysis and were quantified within 24 h of extraction.

8 Chlorophylls and carotenoids were quantified by HPLC using a method adapted from Gilmore and  
9 Yamamoto (1991). Samples extracted with different solvents were alternated to minimise error. Samples (40–  
10 100 µL) were injected into the Shimadzu HPLC system [Shimadzu Scientific Instruments (Oceania) Pty Ltd  
11 Rydalmere, NSW, Australia] by autosampler (Model SIL-10Ai, Shimadzu) at a flow rate of 2 ml min<sup>-1</sup>. Solvent  
12 A (acetonitrile : methanol : Tris HCL buffer 0.1 M pH 8.0; 79 : 8 : 3) ran isocratically from 0 to 4  
13 min, followed by a 3-min linear gradient to 100% solvent B (methanol : hexane; 4 : 1) which then ran  
14 isocratically from 7 to 14 min. Flow rate was decreased from 2 to 1.5 mL min<sup>-1</sup> from 7.5 to 12 min and then run  
15 at 1.5 mL min<sup>-1</sup> until 13 min to maintain stable pressure. The column was re-equilibrated with solvent A  
16 between samples. Pigments were separated on an Allsphere ODS1 column (Alltech, Sydney, Australia) and  
17 quantified by integration of peak areas, detected at 440 nm using a photo diode array detector (Model SPD-  
18 M10AVP; Shimadzu) using the Class VP software package (v 5.03, Shimadzu). Concentrations of pigments are  
19 expressed as absorbance units on a dry or fresh weight basis.

20 *Comparison of the efficiency of different solvents and numbers of sequential extractions required for extraction*  
21 *of photosynthetic pigments from various plant tissues*

22 Three common extraction regimes were compared, which used either aqueous methanol or acetone / aqueous  
23 acetone as solvents. In most cases the methanol extractions are performed as single extractions while the two  
24 acetone extraction regimes normally consist of three sequential extractions with various concentrations of  
25 pure / aqueous acetone (Table 1). For the purposes of this study, single extractions with 96% methanol, pure  
26 acetone and 85% aqueous acetone were compared (Table 2) for the wettest and driest tissues, namely *C.*  
27 *paniculata* leaves and desiccated *C. purpureus*. Triple extractions with either methanol (96% methanol: 4% 0.5  
28 M ammonium acetate pH 7.1) or two acetone / aqueous acetone regimes (100%, 80%, 80% and 85%, 100%,  
29 100%) were also performed for this succulent and the dry moss. The two triple acetone extraction regimes were  
30 also compared for the eucalypt, along with a fourth extraction with acetone. Finally the triple methanol and  
31 acetone (100%, 80%, 80%) extraction regimes were compared for the alga, wet moss, eucalypt and *H. flavum*  
32 leaves.

33 In order to compare sequential extractions the following protocol was used. After the first extraction with  
34 solvent A the supernatant was split equally between three tubes (four tubes, acetone regime, eucalypt only). The  
35 second supernatant (solvent B1) was split evenly between tubes 2–3 (and 4, acetone regime eucalypt only). The  
36 third supernatant (solvent B2) was added to tube 3 (and 4, as above). A fourth re-extraction with 80% acetone

1 (B3) was applied to the eucalypt acetone extraction to determine if the three extractions were sufficient, the  
2 supernatant from this was added to tube 4. Volumes in all tubes were then made up to 1mL with solvent B.

### 3 *Statistical analysis*

4 Four replicate samples of each plant tissue were extracted except for the desiccated moss where  $n = 3$ . Analysis  
5 of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the extraction efficiency of the three solvent regimes and the  
6 efficiency of single *v.* multiple extractions for each pigment (violaxanthin, neoxanthin (N), antheraxanthin, chl *b*,  
7 lutein (L), zeaxanthin, chl *a*,  $\alpha$ -carotene,  $\beta$ -car) for each plant species; [*Ulva* spp., *C. purpureus* (wet and dry), *C.*  
8 *paniculata*, *H. flavum* and *E. longifolia*]. Post hoc Tukey HSD tests were used to determine significantly  
9 different pairs. Statistical tests were performed using the JMP statistical package (v4.0 SAS Institute Inc. Cary,  
10 NC).

## 11 **Results**

### 12 *Comparison of the number of extraction steps*

13 Single extractions were less efficient than triple extractions for several pigments in both the succulent  
14 leaves (Fig. 1) and desiccated moss tissue (Fig. 2). For the succulent plant the chl (*a* and *b*) and the  
15 less polar carotenoids (L and  $\beta$ -car) had significantly higher concentrations in the third extraction than  
16 the first extraction (Table 3) for most solvents. The only exception to this was that a single extraction  
17 with pure acetone extracted  $\beta$ -car as well as the triple extractions with acetone (see interaction term,  
18 Table 3). For succulent tissues the triple methanol extraction improved the extraction of all pigments  
19 compared with the single extraction. For the acetone regimes there was little improvement between the  
20 first and third extractions when pure acetone was the first solvent, however if 85% acetone was  
21 applied first, then the subsequent extractions with 100% were required to remove the less polar  
22 pigments such as chl (*a* and *b*) and  $\beta$ -car. For the desiccated moss chl *a* and  $\beta$ -car were more  
23 efficiently extracted by the triple extraction regimes (Table 3). The efficiency of extraction from the  
24 eucalypt leaves was also tested using the acetone (100%, 80%, 80%, 80%) regime, in this case the  
25 main improvement was seen between the first and third extractions (Table 4) and the fourth extraction  
26 produced little improvement (data not shown) although the increased concentration of pigments in  
27 subsequent extractions (1–4) was not significant.

### 28 *Comparison of methanol- and acetone-based solvents*

29 Acetone is a better solvent for the least polar carotenoids and the chl (*a* and *b*; Figs 1, 2, Table 3). For  
30 the succulent leaves, aqueous methanol extracted less of both chl (*a* and *b*) and  $\beta$ -car (Fig. 1). For the  
31 desiccated moss, aqueous methanol extracted less chl *a*, L and  $\beta$ -car (Fig. 2). In most cases the two  
32 acetone extraction regimes worked with similar efficiency. The exception to this was with  $\beta$ -car,  
33 which was extracted better when 100% acetone was the first solvent (significantly for the first  
34 extraction in the succulent leaves, see above, and overall for the desiccated moss).

1 Triple extractions with acetone (100%, 80%, 80%) and methanol (96%) were also compared for  
2 four other plant tissues *Ulva* spp., *C. purpureus* (wet moss), *H. flavum* and *E. longifolia*. The only  
3 pigment that was significantly affected by extraction regime in this case was  $\beta$ -car which was lower  
4 with the triple methanol extraction for all the species tested (*Ulva* spp.,  $F_{1,6}=10.2135$ ,  $P=0.0187$ ; *C.*  
5 *purpureus*  $F_{1,6}=11.0062$ ,  $P=0.0161$ ; *H. flavum*  $F_{1,6}=4.6116$ ,  $P=0.0754$ ; *E. longifolia*  $F_{1,6}=12.4064$ ,  
6  $P=0.0125$ ; Fig. 3).

## 7 **Discussion**

8 The pigments that are most affected by solvent regime are the two chl and the less polar carotenoids,  
9 particularly  $\beta$ -car. The aqueous methanol and acetone do not appear to extract these hydrophobic  
10 pigments as efficiently as acetone. The polar carotenoids such as N showed very little response to  
11 either solvent regime or number of extractions.

12 Overall these results show that the least polar pigments, particularly  $\beta$ -car, are inefficiently  
13 extracted by aqueous methanol or acetone in a single extraction. Single extraction regimes for acetone  
14 are not common in the literature for higher plants but single methanol extractions are. Triple  
15 extractions involving 100% acetone were initially developed by Thayer and Björkman (1992) because  
16 extraction of  $\beta$ -car with aqueous acetone was inadequate. Our results show that methanol is an even  
17 poorer solvent for the hydrophobic pigments. If only single extractions are employed pure acetone is  
18 probably preferable to the other alternatives, especially for tissues with high water content.

19 These results show that triple extractions with aqueous methanol are effective for most pigments  
20 with the important exception of  $\beta$ -car. However, if we compare the commonly published methods  
21 (single aqueous methanol *v.* either of the triple acetone regimes) the results for the aqueous methanol  
22 extraction are very unsatisfactory and would underestimate the concentrations of several pigments  
23 especially the less polar chl and carotenoids. Regardless of solvent used, multiple extractions are  
24 preferable to achieve a representative extraction of the various pigments. For many tissues, two  
25 extractions will be sufficient (incorporating pure acetone and an aqueous acetone), but this should be  
26 tested when establishing a method for a new species. This study confirms that results obtained for  
27 single aqueous methanol extractions of higher plant tissues should be interpreted with caution  
28 especially in regard to the chl and less polar carotenoids.

29 Although the aqueous methanol extraction regime is loosely based on that devised by Wright et al.  
30 (1997), it differs in the way that it has been applied to higher plants. Wright and co-workers employed  
31 sonication in pure methanol to extract pigments from alga and this method was mainly used to  
32 separate the range of pigments for identification of different algal classes, or groups of species,  
33 occurring in field samples of phytoplankton populations. It should be noted that the pure methanol  
34 used in these algal studies would be expected to be more efficient than the 96–98% methanol used in  
35 the higher plant studies. In addition, sonication is not usually employed in the latter studies, a factor  
36 that could further reduce the efficiency of extraction. It is also likely that  $\beta$ -car concentration was less

1 important in these phytoplankton studies than it is with many higher plant studies. Finally,  
2 photosynthetic pigments of higher plants are generally found in complex multicellular, eukaryotic  
3 tissues that may require more stringent extraction techniques than single cells. Methanol was also  
4 preferred in the phytoplankton studies because it is less flammable than acetone and was therefore a  
5 safer solvent to use on board ship. This safety concern therefore needs to be weighed against  
6 extraction efficiency.

7 Although this study was concerned with the initial extraction of pigments from plant tissues, the  
8 subsequent storage and analysis of such solutions can also present problems. If samples are stored in  
9 vials at low temperature after filtration there is a danger of the pigments precipitating. This problem is  
10 easily identified since such aggregates and pigment particles do not bind to the column and will elute  
11 before N and violaxanthin. Also for accurate quantification it is obviously important not to overload  
12 the HPLC column. Chlorophyll concentrations of 20–40  $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$  and 5–50  $\mu\text{L}$  injection for a  
13 standard 25 cm ODS-1 column are advised. If in doubt serial dilutions can be performed to ensure that  
14 the carrying capacity of the column is not exceeded.

15 In conclusion, this study has shown that single and even triple aqueous methanol extractions fail to  
16 recover all  $\beta$ -car pigments.  $\beta$ -carotene is an important photosynthetic pigment, which often  
17 accumulates in leaves under excess light stress. For studies in which these hydrophobic carotenes are  
18 of interest, optimum extraction requires pure acetone, as shown by Thayer and Björkman (1992). Our  
19 results confirm that optimum extraction of all pigments requires a sequential extraction regime that  
20 includes both pure acetone and aqueous (80–85%) acetone.

## 21 **References**

- 22 Adams WW, Demmig-Adams B (1992) Operation of the xanthophyll cycle in higher plants in response to  
23 diurnal changes in incident sunlight. *Planta* 186, 390–398.
- 24 Ayari O, Samson G, Dorais M, Boulanger R, Gosselin A (2000) Stomatal limitation of photosynthesis in winter  
25 production of greenhouse tomato plants. *Physiologia Plantarum* 110, 558–564. doi:10.1034/J.1399-  
26 3054.2000.1100420.X
- 27 Brugnoli E, Cona A, Lauteri M (1994) Xanthophyll cycle components and capacity for non-radiative energy  
28 dissipation in sun and shade leaves of *Ligustrum ovalifolium* Hassk. exposed to conditions limiting  
29 photosynthesis. *Photosynthesis Research* 41, 451–463.
- 30 Close D, Davies N, Hovenden M (2001) Cold-induced photoinhibition and foliar pigment dynamics of  
31 *Eucalyptus nitens* seedlings during establishment. *Australian Journal of Plant Physiology* 28, 1133–1141.  
32 doi:10.1071/PP01039
- 33 Davies BH (1976) Carotenoids. In 'Chemistry and biochemistry of plant pigments'. (Ed. TW Goodwin).  
34 (Academic Press: London)

- 1 Day TA, Vogelmann TC (1995) Alterations in photosynthesis and pigment distributions in pea leaves following  
2 UV-B exposure. *Physiologia Plantarum* 94, 433–440. doi:10.1034/J.1399-3054.1995.940309.X
- 3 Gehrke C (1999) Impacts of enhanced ultraviolet-B radiation on mosses in a subarctic heath ecosystem. *Ecology*  
4 80, 1844–1851.
- 5 Gilmore AM, Yamamoto HY (1991) Resolution of lutein and zeaxanthin using a non-encapped, lightly carbon-  
6 loaded C18 high-performance liquid chromatographic column. *Journal of Chromatography* 543, 137–145.  
7 doi:10.1016/S0021-9673(01)95762-0
- 8 Jahns P, Mische B (1996) Kinetic correlation of recovery from photoinhibition and zeaxanthin epoxidation.  
9 *Planta* 198, 202–210.
- 10 Jeffrey S, Wright S, Zapata M (1999) Recent advances in HPLC pigment analysis of phytoplankton. *Marine and*  
11 *Freshwater Research* 50, 879–896.
- 12 Kyparissis A, Drilias P, Manetas Y (2000) Seasonal fluctuations in photoprotective (xanthophyll cycle) and  
13 photosensitive (chlorophylls) capacity in eight Mediterranean plant species belong to two different growth  
14 forms. *Australian Journal of Plant Physiology* 27, 265–272. doi:10.1071/PP99037
- 15 Krause GH, Gallé A, Gademann R, Winter K (2003) Capacity of protection against ultraviolet radiation in sun  
16 and shade leaves of tropical forest plants. *Functional Plant Biology* 30, 533–542. doi:10.1071/FP03047
- 17 Lichtenthaler H (1987) Chlorophylls and carotenoids — pigments of photosynthetic biomembranes. In ‘Methods  
18 in enzymology’. (Eds SP Colowick and NO Kaplan) pp. 350–382. (Academic Press: Sydney)
- 19 Lichtenthaler H, Wellburn A (1983) Determinations of total carotenoids and chlorophylls a and b of leaf extracts  
20 in different solvents. *Biochemical Society Transactions* 11, 591–592.
- 21 Llorens L, Aranda X, Abadía A, Fleck I (2002) Variations in *Quercus ilex* chloroplast pigment content during  
22 summer stress: involvement in photoprotection according to principal component analysis. *Functional Plant*  
23 *Biology* 29, 81–88. doi:10.1071/PP01080
- 24 Lovelock CE, Robinson SA (2002) Surface reflectance properties of Antarctic moss and their relationship to  
25 plant species, pigment composition and photosynthetic function. *Plant, Cell and Environment* 25, 1239–1250.  
26 doi:10.1046/J.1365-3040.2002.00916.X
- 27 Lud D, Buma A, van de Poll W, Moerdijk T, Huiskes A (2001) DNA damage and photosynthetic performance in  
28 the Antarctic terrestrial alga *Prasiola crispa* ssp. *antarctica* (Chlorophyta) under manipulated UV-B radiation.  
29 *Journal of Phycology* 37, 459–467. doi:10.1046/J.1529-8817.2001.037004459.X
- 30 Lud D, Huiskes A, Moerdijk T, Rozema J (2001) The effects of altered levels of UV-B radiation on an Antarctic  
31 grass and lichen. *Plant Ecology* 154, 87–99. doi:10.1023/A:1012987728343
- 32 Manetas Y, Petropoulou Y, Psaras GK, Drinia A (2003) Exposed red (anthocyanic) leaves of *Quercus coccifera*  
33 display shade characteristics. *Functional Plant Biology* 30, 265–270. doi:10.1071/FP02226

- 1 Matsubara S, Gilmore AM, Osmond CB (2001) Diurnal and acclimatory responses of violaxanthin and lutein  
2 epoxide in the Australian mistletoe *Amyema miquelii*. *Australian Journal of Plant Physiology* 28, 793–800.  
3 doi:10.1071/PP01031
- 4 Müller-Moulé P, Conklin PL, Niyogi KK (2002) Ascorbate deficiency can limit violaxanthin de-epoxidase  
5 activity in vivo. *Plant Physiology* 128, 970–977. doi:10.1104/PP.010924
- 6 Newsham K (2003) UV-B radiation arising from stratospheric ozone depletion influences the pigmentation of  
7 the moss *Andreaea regularis*. *Oecologia* 135, 327–331.
- 8 Newsham K, Hodgson D, Murray A, Peat H, Smith R (2002) Response of two Antarctic bryophyte to  
9 stratospheric ozone depletion. *Global Change Biology* 8, 972–983. doi:10.1046/J.1365-2486.2002.00509.X
- 10 Pogson BJ, Niyogi KK, Björkman O, DellaPenna D (1998) Altered xanthophyll compositions adversely affect  
11 chlorophyll accumulation and nonphotochemical quenching in *Arabidopsis* mutants. *Proceedings of the*  
12 *National Academy of Sciences USA* 95, 13324–13329. doi:10.1073/PNAS.95.22.13324
- 13 Porra RJ, Thompson WA, Kriedemann PE (1989) Determination of accurate extinction coefficients and  
14 simultaneous equations for assaying chlorophylls a and b extracted with four different solvents: verification of  
15 the concentration of chlorophyll standards by atomic absorption spectroscopy. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta*  
16 975, 384–394.
- 17 Robinson SA, Lovelock CE, Osmond CB (1993) Wax as a mechanism for protection against photoinhibition: a  
18 study of *Cotyledon orbiculata*. *Botanica Acta* 106, 307–312.
- 19 Robinson SA, Wasley J, Tobin AK (2003) Living on the edge — plants and global change in continental and  
20 maritime Antarctica. *Global Change Biology* 9, 1–37.
- 21 Russell AW, Critchley C, Robinson SA, Franklin LA, Seaton GGR, Chow WS, Anderson JM, Osmond CB  
22 (1995) Photosystem II regulation and dynamics of the chloroplast D1 protein in *Arabidopsis* leaves during  
23 photosynthesis and photoinhibition. *Plant Physiology* 107, 943–952.
- 24 Searles PS, Caldwell MM, Winter K (1995) The response of 5 tropical dicotyledon species to solar ultraviolet-B  
25 radiation. *American Journal of Botany* 82, 445–453.
- 26 Thayer SS, Björkman O (1992) Carotenoid distribution and deepoxidation in thylakoid pigment-protein  
27 complexes from cotton leaves and bundle-sheath cells of maize. *Photosynthesis Research* 33, 213–225.
- 28 Thayer SS, Björkman O (1990) Leaf xanthophyll content and composition in sun and shade determined by  
29 HPLC. *Photosynthesis Research* 23, 331–343.
- 30 Watling JR, Robinson SA, Woodrow IE, Osmond CB (1997) Responses of rainforest understorey plants to  
31 excess light during sunflecks. *Australian Journal of Plant Physiology* 24, 17–25.
- 32 Wright S, Jeffrey S, Mantoura R, Llewellyn C, Bjornland T, Repeta D, Welschmeyer N (1991) Improved HPLC  
33 method for the analysis of chlorophylls and carotenoids from marine phytoplankton. *Marine Ecology Progress*  
34 *Series* 77, 183–196.

1 Wright S, Jeffrey S, Mantoura R (1997) Evaluation of methods and solvents for pigment extraction. In  
2 'Phytoplankton pigments in oceanography: guidelines to modern methods'. (Eds SW Jeffrey, RFC Mantoura  
3 and SW Wright) pp. 261–282. (UNESCO: Paris)

4 Xiong F, Day T (2001) Effect of solar ultraviolet-B radiation during springtime ozone depletion on  
5 photosynthesis and biomass production of Antarctic vascular plants. *Plant Physiology* 125, 738–751.  
6 doi:10.1104/PP.125.2.738

7 Manuscript received 9 September 2003, accepted 4 December 2003

8 <http://www.publish.csiro.au/journals/fpb>

9 **Fig. 1.** Comparison of pigment concentrations in *C. paniculata* extracted using methanol (96%) and acetone  
10 (85% and 100%) in single (open bars) and triple (hatched bars) extractions, as in Table 2. A representative  
11 selection of pigments, covering a range of polarities, is shown. Abbreviations, Neoxanthin (N), chlorophylls *a*  
12 (chl *a*) and *b* (chl *b*), lutein (L) and  $\beta$ -carotene ( $\beta$ -car). Data represent mean ( $\pm$  s.e.m.,  $n = 4$ ).

13 **Fig. 2.** Comparison of pigment concentrations in desiccated *C. purpureus* extracted with methanol (96%) and  
14 acetone (85% and 100%) in single (open bars) and triple (hatched bars) extractions, as in Table 2. A  
15 representative selection of pigments, covering a range of polarities are shown, N is missing because low  
16 quantities were recovered from all samples. Abbreviations as in Fig. 1. Data represent mean ( $\pm$  s.e.m.,  $n = 3$ ).

17 **Fig. 3.** Comparison of pigment concentrations in *Ulva* spp., *C. purpureus*, *H. flavum* and *E. grandiflora*  
18 extracted with triple extractions of 96% methanol (open bars) and acetone (100 : 80 : 80%; hatched bars)  
19 as in Table 2. A representative selection of pigments, covering a range of polarities are shown. Abbreviations as  
20 in Fig. 1. Data represent mean ( $\pm$  s.e.m.,  $n = 4$ ), note different *Y*-axes.

**Table 1. Solvents used and number of extractions employed to extract photosynthetic pigments for HPLC analysis from a range of plant tissues**

Solvent	Number of extractions	Plant species studied	References
Methanol-based			
MeOH with 2–4% ammonium acetate buffer (0.5M, pH 7.1)	1	<i>Turgidosculum complicatulum</i> (lichen), <i>Prasiola crispa</i> (algae), <i>Deschampia antarctica</i>	(Lud et al. 2001; Lud et al. 2001)]
100% MeOH	4	<i>Lycopersicon esculentum</i> <i>Andreaea reularis</i> (moss)	(Ayari et al. 2000) (Newsham 2003)
MeOH:acetone:H <sub>2</sub> O (80 : 15 : 5)	1	<i>Cephaloziella varians</i> (liverwort), <i>Sanionia uncinata</i> (moss)	(Newsham et al. 2002)
Acetone -based			
Acetone	1	<i>Pisum sativum</i> <i>Quercus ilex</i>	(Jahns and Miede 1996) (Llorens et al. 2002)
Acetone 100%	1	Range of semi-deciduous and sclerophyll trees <i>Arabidopsis</i> 4 native Australian rainforest trees	(Kyparissis et al. 2000; Manetas et al. 2003) (Russell et al. 1995) (Watling et al. 1997)
Acetone 100%	2	<i>Anthurium andraenum</i> , <i>Lactuca sativa</i> <i>Arabidopsis</i> <i>Eucalyptus nitens</i>	(Gilmore and Yamamoto 1991) (Müller-Moulé et al. 2002) (Close et al. 2001)
Acetone 100%	3	<i>Cotyledon orbiculate</i> Range of sun and shade leaves	(Robinson et al. 1993) (Krause et al. 2003)
Acetone 100%	multiple	<i>Cecropia obtusifolia</i>	(Searles et al. 1995)
Acetone 100% then 80%	2	<i>Bryum pseudotriquetrum</i> , <i>Ceratodon purpureus</i> , <i>Grimmia antarctici</i> (mosses)	(Lovelock and Robinson 2002)
Acetone (90%) then 100% twice	3	<i>Ligustrum ovalifolium</i>	(Brugnoli et al. 1994)
Acetone 85% twice	2	Range of sun and shade leaves	(Thayer and Björkman 1990)
Acetone 85% twice then 100%	3	<i>Gossypium hirsutum</i> , <i>Zea mays</i>	(Thayer and Björkman 1992)
Acetone 85% twice then 100% twice	4	<i>Helianthus annuus</i> , <i>Cucurbita pepo</i> , <i>Cucumis sativus</i> , <i>Euonymus kiautschovicus</i> , <i>Malva neglecta</i>	(Adams and Demmig-Adams 1992)
Acetone 80% with 100% added	1	<i>Amyema miquelii</i>	(Matsubara et al. 2001)
N'N'-dimethylformamide	1	<i>Arabidopsis</i>	(Pogson et al. 1998)

**Table 2. Composition of solvents used to extract photosynthetic pigments from a variety of plant tissues**

\*solvents B1 and B2 are identical, number refers to sequential extractions

Method	Solvent A	Solvent B1	Solvent B2*	Reference
96% methanol	96% methanol with 4% ammonium acetate buffer (0.5 M, pH 7.1), thrice			(Lud et al. 2001)
85% acetone	85% acetone (1 : 1500 w / v NaHCO <sub>3</sub> )	100% acetone	100% acetone	(Adams and Demmig- Adams 1992; Thayer and Björkman 1992)
100% acetone	100% acetone (1 : 1500 w / v NaHCO <sub>3</sub> )	80% acetone	80% acetone	Lovelock and Robinson 2002

**Table 3. Summary table for the two-way ANOVA comparing the pigment extraction efficiency of the aqueous methanol and two acetone extraction regimes (solvent regime) and the number of consecutive extractions (extraction number) for *C. paniculata* (Fig. 1) and desiccated *C. purpureus* moss (Fig. 2)**

Pigments are shown only where significant effects were found (ns = not significant)

	Extraction number	Solvent regime	Extraction*solvent
<i>C. paniculata</i>			
Chlorophyll <i>b</i>	F <sub>1,18</sub> =9.19, <i>P</i> <0.0072	F <sub>2,18</sub> =6.10, <i>P</i> <0.0095	ns
Lutein	F <sub>1,18</sub> =5.78, <i>P</i> <0.0272	ns	ns
Chlorophyll <i>a</i>	F <sub>1,18</sub> =8.61, <i>P</i> <0.0089	F <sub>2,18</sub> =8.97, <i>P</i> <0.002	ns
β-carotene	F <sub>1,18</sub> =27.90, <i>P</i> <0.0001	F <sub>2,18</sub> =20.11, <i>P</i> <0.0001	F <sub>2,18</sub> =8.13, <i>P</i> <0.003
<i>C. purpureus</i>			
Lutein	ns	F <sub>2,12</sub> =7.73, <i>P</i> <0.0068	ns
Chlorophyll <i>a</i>	F <sub>1,12</sub> =4.26, <i>P</i> <0.061	F <sub>2,12</sub> =3.0173, <i>P</i> <0.0868	ns
β-carotene	F <sub>1,12</sub> =10.39, <i>P</i> <0.0073	F <sub>2,12</sub> =9.35, <i>P</i> <0.0036	ns

**Table 4. Concentration of chlorophylls and carotenoids extracted from *E. longifolia* leaves using the two acetone extraction regimes (see Table 2). Data represent mean ± s.e.m (*n* = 4)**

Solvent regime (acetone concentration)	Single extraction (100% acetone)	Triple extraction (100 : 80 : 80% acetone)	Triple extraction (85 : 100 : 100% acetone)
	Concentration of pigment (Au. g <sup>-1</sup> fw)		
Neoxanthin	2.117 ± 0.165	2.281 ± 0.159	2.367 ± 0.120
Chlorophyll <i>b</i>	5.212 ± 0.455	5.331 ± 0.463	5.574 ± 0.385
Lutein	6.736 ± 0.444	7.344 ± 0.454	7.447 ± 0.393
Chlorophyll <i>a</i>	17.724 ± 1.158	18.608 ± 1.140	19.353 ± 0.948
β-carotene	3.599 ± 0.203	3.518 ± 0.149	4.267 ± 0.194