



**HAL**  
open science

## Formate dehydrogenases reduce CO<sub>2</sub> rather than HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>: an electrochemical demonstration

Marta Meneghello, Ana Rita Oliveira, Aurore Jacq-bailly, Inês A.C. Pereira,  
Christophe Léger, Vincent Fourmond

► **To cite this version:**

Marta Meneghello, Ana Rita Oliveira, Aurore Jacq-bailly, Inês A.C. Pereira, Christophe Léger, et al.. Formate dehydrogenases reduce CO<sub>2</sub> rather than HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>: an electrochemical demonstration. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, 2021, 10.1002/anie.202101167 . hal-03181024

**HAL Id: hal-03181024**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03181024>**

Submitted on 25 Mar 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Formate dehydrogenases reduce CO<sub>2</sub> rather than HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>: an electrochemical demonstration

Marta Meneghello<sup>a</sup>, Ana Rita Oliveira<sup>b</sup>, Aurore Jacq-Bailly<sup>a</sup>, Inês A. C. Pereira<sup>b</sup>, Christophe Léger<sup>a</sup>, Vincent Fourmond<sup>\*a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>CNRS, Aix-Marseille Université, BIP UMR 7281, IMM, IM2B, 31 Chemin J. Aiguier, CS70071, F-13402 Marseille Cedex 20, (France)

<sup>b</sup>Instituto de Tecnologia Química e Biológica António Xavier (ITQB NOVA), Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Oeiras (Portugal)


---

## Abstract


Mo/W formate dehydrogenases catalyze the reversible reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> species to formate. It is thought that the substrate is CO<sub>2</sub> and not a hydrated species like HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, but there is still no indisputable evidence for this, in spite of the extreme importance of the nature of the substrate for mechanistic studies. We devised a simple electrochemical method to definitely demonstrate that the substrate of formate dehydrogenases is indeed CO<sub>2</sub>.

---

The reduction of carbon dioxide is an important reaction both in biology and technology, since it converts a highly stable compound into more reactive and useful organic compounds[1]. In nature, only two classes of enzymes are able to catalyze the direct reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> (as opposed to reductive carboxylation): formate dehydrogenases (FDHs), members of the family of molybdenum/tungsten enzymes[2], which reversibly convert CO<sub>2</sub> to formate (HCO<sub>2</sub><sup>-</sup>)[3–5]:




and CO dehydrogenases (CODHs), which reversibly convert CO<sub>2</sub> to CO[6–8]:



A great incentive in understanding their catalytic mechanism is that both these enzymes are fast (hundreds to thousands of turnovers per second) and able to work with very little driving force[9], which has so far never been achieved by synthetic catalysts[1, 10, 11]. A specific difficulty in the studies of these enzymes is to identify the actual substrate in aqueous solutions, which may either be dissolved CO<sub>2</sub> or hydrated species like H<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub>, HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> or CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup>. In the biologically relevant pH range,

the only species present to a significant extent are CO<sub>2</sub> and HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, which interconvert with an apparent *pK<sub>a</sub>* of 6.4:



As CO<sub>2</sub> and HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> are very different molecules, one must first determine which is the substrate before trying to understand the catalytic mechanism for reactions (1) or (2). For CODH (equation (2)), there is little doubt that CO<sub>2</sub> is the substrate from a variety of experimental evidence, including a high resolution CO<sub>2</sub>-bound structure[6] and the observation that COS (carbonyl sulfide) is an alternative slow substrate[12].

The case of FDH (equation (1)) is more ambiguous. Many molybdo-enzymes catalyze oxygen atom transfers, like the DMSO reductases, nitrate reductases, or arsenate oxidases[2, 13, 14]. Nap, the molybdo-enzyme that is the closest to FDH in terms of sequence and structure[15], catalyzes the reduction of nitrate to nitrite[16]. Rather than the direct reduction of CO<sub>2</sub>, one could imagine that FDH catalyzes the abstraction of an oxygen atom from HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>. It is thus somewhat surprising that there have been very few results in the last four decades concerning the nature of the substrate of FDH.

Yu and co-workers recently concluded that CO<sub>2</sub> is the substrate of FDH based on the observed difference in the steady-state rate of oxidation of the co-substrate NADH, depending on

---

URL: [vincent.fourmond@imm.cnrs.fr](mailto:vincent.fourmond@imm.cnrs.fr) (Vincent Fourmond\*)

whether carbonate or  $\text{CO}_2$  was added to the reaction mixture[17]. However, under steady-state conditions, starting from carbonate or  $\text{CO}_2$  should make no difference since the two equilibrate, and the observed differences could result from insufficient buffer concentration in these experiments (100 mM potassium phosphate at pH 7 for 100 mM bicarbonate).

Khangulov and co-workers in 1998[18] used mass spectrometry to characterize the product of  $^{13}\text{C}$ -formate oxidation in  $^{18}\text{O}$ -enriched water at pH 7. The reaction was started by adding the unlabeled enzyme to the  $^{18}\text{O}$ -labelled solution. No information was given about the amount of  $\text{CO}_2$  produced, but the authors detected no  $^{18}\text{O}$ -labelled  $\text{CO}_2$  in the first 10 s of the reaction, deducing that  $\text{CO}_2$ , rather than carbonate, is the initial product of formate oxidation. However, this strategy relies on the assumption that the water molecules in the enzyme exchange quickly with labelled water, which may not be true, as discussed by Cooper et al[19].

Other demonstrations of  $\text{CO}_2$  being the substrate (or product) of a number of enzymes, including pyruvate carboxylase, P-enolpyruvate carboxykinase and CODH, date back to the 70s[19–23]. These experiments took advantage of the relative slowness[24] of reaction (3): for a short time after an injection of either  $\text{CO}_2$  or carbonate, only the species that has just been added is present. Examining the transient change in catalytic rate as reaction (3) reaches equilibrium allows one to identify the substrate. These experiments required low temperatures (below 10 °C) to slow reaction (3), and fast sampling of the turnover frequency. This is difficult in solution assays, but very easy in protein film electrochemistry, as illustrated below.

Here, we propose a simple, inexpensive and fast method to discriminate whether  $\text{CO}_2$  or  $\text{HCO}_3^-$  is the substrate of any catalyst interacting with an electrode, and we demonstrate that  $\text{CO}_2$  rather than  $\text{HCO}_3^-$  is the substrate of both FDH and CODH. The procedure is based on protein film electrochemistry (PFE)[25, 26]. It consists in immobilizing the enzyme onto a rotating disc electrode, injecting  $\text{CO}_2$  or carbonate in the presence or absence in solution of carbonic anhydrase (CA, an enzyme that catalyzes the interconversion between  $\text{CO}_2$  and  $\text{HCO}_3^-$ , reac-

tion (3))[27], and following the evolution of activity over time.

Both FDH[4] and CODH[28] can be immobilized on electrodes in a configuration in which the enzymes catalyze their respective reactions, producing an electrical current proportional to the turnover frequency[25, 26]. We used chronoamperometry, which consists in applying a constant potential to this electrode and monitoring the resulting catalytic current as a function of time. We sampled the current (thus the activity) every 0.1 s, which is much shorter than the  $\text{CO}_2/\text{HCO}_3^-$  equilibration time under our conditions (around 20 s at pH 7), and also much shorter than the time for measuring activity in traditional solution assays.

We performed the measurements at pH 7 and at a potential of  $-660$  mV vs. SHE. Under these conditions, “ $\text{CO}_2$ ” reduction occurs for both CODH and FDH, since the  $\text{CO}_2/\text{CO}$  and  $\text{CO}_2/\text{HCOO}^-$  couples have apparent equilibrium potentials of  $-530$  and  $-430$  mV, respectively, at pH 7[29, 30]. We used a highly concentrated buffer (0.2 M HEPES) to avoid pH changes following the injection of mM concentrations of carbonate or  $\text{CO}_2$ . At pH 7, once equilibrium (3) is established, we expect a 20:80 ratio of  $\text{CO}_2$  to bicarbonate in solution, irrespective of whether  $\text{CO}_2$  or carbonate has been injected.

Figure 1A shows the experiments performed with FDH. For the experiment plotted as a blue solid line, sodium carbonate was injected in the cell at the time  $t = 0$ , instantly becoming bicarbonate at pH 7. Following the injection, a reduction current appears, which slowly increases, reaches a maximum after 25 s, and then slowly decreases.

When the same carbonate-injection experiment is repeated in the presence of CA, the increase in current after the injection is instantaneous (light blue dashed line). This suggests that the initial slow increase in current observed in the absence of CA (blue solid line) is due to the slow transformation of bicarbonate into  $\text{CO}_2$ , which is the actual substrate of the enzyme.

The latter conclusion is supported by the results of experiments in which a solution containing  $\text{CO}_2$  is injected: irrespective of the presence of CA, an instant increase in reduction current is always observed. The current of the  $\text{CO}_2$ -injection




Figure 1: Chronoamperometric measurements of  $\text{CO}_2$  reduction current following injection of carbonate or  $\text{CO}_2$ . The electrode was modified with a film of (A) W-dependent *Desulfovibrio vulgaris* FdhAB[5] (co-adsorbed with polymyxin), and (B) *Thermococcus sp. AM4* CODH 2[28]. Experimental conditions:  $T = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , pH 7 (0.2 M HEPES buffer), electrode rotation rate  $\omega = 3000$  rpm,  $E = -0.66$  V vs. SHE. The measurements were performed by injecting in the cell at  $t = 0$  s: 5 mM  $\text{Na}_2\text{CO}_3$  (blue lines) or 3.7 mM  $\text{CO}_2$  (red lines) in the absence (solid lines) and presence (dashed lines) of 5  $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$  carbonic anhydrase. The current has been normalized with respect to the current at 70 s (when the  $\text{CO}_2/\text{HCO}_3^-$  equilibrium is fully established and the concentrations of  $\text{CO}_2$  and  $\text{HCO}_3^-$  should be the same in all experiments).

experiment performed in the presence of CA (light red dashed line) is indistinguishable from that of the carbonate+CA experiment. But if  $\text{CO}_2$  is injected in the absence of CA (red solid line), the current is initially larger than in any of the other three experiments, and then relaxes to the same value as in the other experiments: this is due to the concentration of  $\text{CO}_2$  decaying from 100 % to 20 % of the total  $\text{CO}_2/\text{HCO}_3^-$  species as reaction

(3) reaches equilibrium.

In all four cases, the final slow decrease in current, in the timescale of minutes, results from the exponential decrease in  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration in the cell solution, which slowly equilibrates with the  $\text{N}_2$  atmosphere of the glove box[28, 31].

The experiments above clearly demonstrate that  $\text{CO}_2$  (not bicarbonate) is the substrate of FDH. As a confirmation, we have performed the same series of experiments with CODH adsorbed on the electrode surface, which gave the exact same results (Figure 1B), consistent with the previous knowledge that  $\text{CO}_2$  is the substrate of CODH.

To further confirm that the relaxations on the blue and red solid curves of Figure 1 are due to reaction (3), we used carbonate injections to a CODH-modified electrode to determine the kinetics of relaxation for different pH values between 5.2 and 7.2. We systematically observed a slow initial evolution like in Figure 1 (blue solid curves), whose rate was determined by fitting a monoexponential function (Figure 2A). Figure 2B shows that these experimentally determined rates match the values calculated from the data in ref. 24 for the relaxation of equilibrium (3) (see SI section S2 for details).




Figure 2: Chronoamperometric determination of the time constant of the  $\text{CO}_2/\text{HCO}_3^-$  equilibrium at different pH using a CODH-modified electrode. A) Example of chronoamperometric traces recorded at pH 5.2, 6.3 and 7.2 upon injecting 5 mM  $\text{Na}_2\text{CO}_3$  at  $t = 0$ . The dashed lines represents the monoexponential fits. B) The resulting rate constant of the  $\text{CO}_2/\text{HCO}_3^-$  equilibration as a function of pH: experimental (point) and values predicted from the data in ref. 24 (line). Experimental conditions:  $T = 25^\circ\text{C}$ , electrode rotation rate  $\omega = 4000$  rpm,  $E = -0.66$  V vs. SHE, buffer: 0.2 M MES.

In a final confirmation, we used chronoamperometric experiments to determine the effects of the concentration of carbonic anhydrase on the rate of reaction (3). We injected carbonate to a CODH-modified electrode in a cell containing different concentrations of CA. Figure 3 shows that the rate constant of the  $\text{CO}_2/\text{HCO}_3^-$  equilibrium is proportional to the concentration of carbonic anhydrase. The slope in Figure 3 ( $570 \text{ mL s}^{-1} \text{ mg}^{-1}$ ) gives a second order catalytic rate constant of  $2 \times 10^7 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ M}^{-1}$  at pH 7, 25 °C, consistent with published values in the range  $10^7$  to  $10^9 \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ M}^{-1}$ , obtained by stopped-flow measurements of the pH changes resulting from the hydration of  $\text{CO}_2$ [32, 33].




Figure 3: Determination of the rate constant ( $k$ ) of the  $\text{CO}_2/\text{HCO}_3^-$  equilibrium at different concentrations of carbonic anhydrase (CA) using a CODH-modified electrode. Rate constants were determined by fitting an exponential function to the initial current increase recorded after injection of 5 mM  $\text{Na}_2\text{CO}_3$  at  $t = 0$  (like in Figure 2A). The red dashed line is a linear fit. Experimental conditions:  $T = 25 \text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ , electrode rotation rate  $\omega = 4000 \text{ rpm}$ ,  $E = -0.66 \text{ V vs. SHE}$ , pH 7 (0.2 M HEPES).

In conclusion, we have devised a simple electrochemical method to discriminate between  $\text{CO}_2$  and  $\text{HCO}_3^-$  as the substrate of the reductive reactions of FDH and CODH. This technique is very sensitive and does not require labelling of the substrates or the biocatalysts. We used it to conclusively prove that formate dehydrogenase reduces  $\text{CO}_2$  and to confirm that NiFe CODHs also uses  $\text{CO}_2$  as substrate. This method could also be employed to learn about synthetic catalysts, or even to measure

the activity of carbonic anhydrase.

#### Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge support from CNRS, Agence Nationale de la Recherche (grants ANR-14-CE05-0010, ANR-15-CE05-0020, ANR-17-CE11-002) and Region PACA. The project leading to this publication has received funding from Excellence Initiative of Aix-Marseille University - A\*Midex, a French “Investissements d’Avenir” program. MM, AB, CL and VF are members of the French Bioinorganic Chemistry group (<http://frenchbic.cnrs.fr>). The authors also thank Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (Portugal) for fellowship SFRH/BD/116515/2016, grant PTDC/BBB-EBB/2723/2014, and R&D unit MOSTMICRO-ITQB (UIDB/04612/2020 and UIDP/04612/2020). European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (Grant agreement no. 810856) is also acknowledged.

The authors have no conflicts to declare.

#### References

- [1] Aaron M. Appel, John E. Bercaw, Andrew B. Bocarsly, Holger Dobbek, Daniel L. DuBois, Michel Dupuis, James G. Ferry, Etsuko Fujita, Russ Hille, Paul J. A. Kenis, Cheryl A. Kerfeld, Robert H. Morris, Charles H. F. Peden, Archie R. Portis, Stephen W. Ragsdale, Thomas B. Rauchfuss, Joost N. H. Reek, Lance C. Seefeldt, Rudolf K. Thauer, and Grover L. Waldrop. *Chem. Rev.*, 113(8):6621–6658, 2013.
- [2] Stéphane Grimaldi, Barbara Schoepp-Cothenet, Pierre Ceccaldi, Bruno Guigliarelli, and Axel Magalon. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*, 1827(8-9):1048–1085, 2013.
- [3] Arnau Bassegoda, Christopher Madden, David W. Wakerley, Erwin Reisner, and Judy Hirst. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 136(44):15473–15476, 2014.
- [4] Melanie Miller, William E Robinson, Ana Rita Oliveira, Nina Heidary, Nikolay Kornienko, Julien Warnan, Inês A C Pereira, and Erwin Reisner. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.*, 58(14):4601–4605, March 2019.
- [5] Ana Rita Oliveira, Cristiano Mota, Cláudia Mourato, Renato M. Domingos, Marino F. A. Santos, Diana Gesto, Bruno Guigliarelli, Teresa Santos-Silva, Maria João Romão, and Inês A. Cardoso Pereira. *ACS Catalysis*, 10(6):3844–3856, March 2020.
- [6] Jae-Hun Jeoung and Holger Dobbek. *Science*, 318(5855):1461–1464, November 2007.
- [7] Mehmet Can, Fraser A. Armstrong, and Stephen W. Ragsdale. *Chem. Rev.*, 114(8):4149–4174, 2014.

- [8] Jessica Hadj-Saïd, Maria-Eirini Pandelia, Christophe Léger, Vincent Fourmond, and Sébastien Dementin. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*, 1847(12):1574–1583, December 2015.
- [9] Vincent Fourmond, Eric S Wiedner, Wendy J Shaw, and Christophe Léger. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 141(28):11269–11285, July 2019.
- [10] Cyrille Costentin, Marc Robert, and Jean-Michel Saveant. *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 42(6):2423–2436, 2013.
- [11] Jenny Y Yang, Tyler A Kerr, Xinran S Wang, and Jeffrey M Barlow. *J Am Chem Soc*, 142(46):19438–19445, November 2020.
- [12] Scott A. Ensign. *Biochemistry*, 34(16):5372–5381, 1995.
- [13] Russ Hille, James Hall, and Partha Basu. *Chem. Rev.*, 114(7):3963–4038, 2014.
- [14] M. Jake Pushie, Julien J. Cotelesage, and Graham N. George. *Metalomics*, 6(1):15–24, 2014.
- [15] Richard A. Rothery, Gregory J. Workun, and Joel H. Weiner. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*, 1778:1897–1929, 2008.
- [16] Pascal Arnoux, Monique Sabaty, Jean Alric, Bettina Frangioni, Bruno Guigliarelli, Jean-Marc Adriano, and David Pignol. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.*, 10(11):928–934, November 2003.
- [17] Xuejun Yu, Dimitri Niks, Ashok Mulchandani, and Russ Hille. *J. Biol. Chem.*, 292(41):16872–16879, 10 2017.
- [18] S.V. Khangulov, V.N. Gladyshev, G.C. Dismukes, and T.C. Stadtman. *Biochemistry*, 37(10):3518–3528, March 1998.
- [19] T. G. Cooper, T. T. Tchen, Harland G. Wood, and C. R. Benedict. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 243(14):3857–3863, July 1968.
- [20] R K Thauer, B Käufer, and G Fuchs. *Eur. J. Biochem.*, 55(1):111–117, June 1975.
- [21] J A Vorholt and R K Thauer. *Eur. J. Biochem.*, 248(3):919–924, September 1997.
- [22] U Ruschig, U Müller, P Willnow, and T Höpner. *Eur. J. Biochem.*, 70(2):325–330, November 1976.
- [23] M Bott and R K Thauer. *Z. Naturforsch., C, J. Biosci.*, 44(5-6):392–396, 1989.
- [24] Chien Ho and Julian M. Sturtevant. *J. Biol. Chem.*, 238(10):3499–3501, October 1963.
- [25] Christophe Léger and Patrick Bertrand. *Chem. Rev.*, 108(7):2379–2438, July 2008.
- [26] Melisa del Barrio, Matteo Sensi, Christophe Orain, Carole Baffert, Sébastien Dementin, Vincent Fourmond, and Christophe Léger. *Acc. Chem. Res.*, 51(3):769–777, 2018.
- [27] Claudiu T Supuran. *Biochem. J.*, 473(14):2023–2032, 07 2016.
- [28] Martino Benvenuti, Marta Meneghello, Chloé Guendon, Aurore Jacq-Bailly, Jae-Hun Jeoung, Holger Dobbek, Christophe Léger, Vincent Fourmond, and Sébastien Dementin. *Biochim Biophys Acta Bioenerg*, 1861(7):148188, July 2020.
- [29] Eric E. Benson, Clifford P. Kubiak, Aaron J. Sathrum, and Jonathan M. Smieja. *Chem. Soc. Rev.*, 38(1):89–99, 2009.
- [30] Torsten Reda, Caroline M. Plugge, Nerilie J. Abram, and Judy Hirst. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, 105(31):10654–10658, 2008.
- [31] Christophe Léger, Sébastien Dementin, Patrick Bertrand, Marc Rousset, and Bruno Guigliarelli. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 126(38):12162–72, Sep 2004.
- [32] Mika Hilvo, Lina Baranauskiene, Anna Maria Salzano, Andrea Scaloni, Daumantas Matulis, Alessio Innocenti, Andrea Scozzafava, Simona Maria Monti, Anna Di Fiore, Giuseppina De Simone, Mikaela Lindfors, Janne Jänis, Jarkko Valjakka, Silvia Pastoreková, Jaromir Pastorek, Markku S Kulomaa, Henri R Nordlund, Claudiu T Supuran, and Seppo Parkkila. *J Biol Chem*, 283(41):27799–27809, October 2008.
- [33] Raja G. Khalifah. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 246(8):2561–2573, April 1971.