Radioiodinated lipoproteins: absorption of $^{125}$I radioactivity by high density solutions
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Summary Concentrations of potassium bromide commonly used for separation of lipoproteins were shown to cause absorption of $^{125}$I and thus reduce the counting efficiency of the labeled lipoproteins. Chloroform was shown to cause a 50% reduction in counting efficiency of lipid from $^{131}$I-labeled lipoprotein. No reduction of counting efficiency was observed in the presence of high density solutions when $^{131}$I was used as label.
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Labeling of proteins with radioactive iodine is an accepted procedure for the study of the metabolism of plasma proteins. This procedure is now often applied to follow the fate of plasma lipoproteins in humans (1-3), animals (4-6), and tissue culture systems (7-9). The isotope most commonly used in these studies is $^{125}$I, which labels both lipoprotein protein and lipoprotein lipid. In most studies, labeled lipoproteins are separated according to density, and protein-bound radioactivity is calculated after lipid extraction and determination of radioactivity associated with the labeled lipids. Radioactivity is therefore measured in solutions of different salt concentration and composition and in various organic solvents. We report here our observations on the effects of various solutions on the counting efficiency of $^{125}$I compared with that of $^{131}$I.

Very low density lipoprotein (VLDL) and high density lipoprotein (HDL) of rat plasma were prepared by flotation in the Beckman L2-65B ultracentrifuge as described previously (4, 6). The lipoproteins were iodinated by a modification of McFarlane’s iodine monochloride technique (10). Unbound iodide was removed by dialysis. Lipids were extracted in chloroform-methanol 2:1 (v/v) and washed as described by Folch, Lees, and Sloane Stanley (11). Radioactivity was determined in a Packard Auto-Gamma scintillation spectrometer, model 578, at an optimal setting for counting $^{125}$I or $^{131}$I in 0.9% sodium chloride solution. The value thus obtained (counts per minute, cpm) was taken as 100% counting efficiency. Care was taken to count all samples exactly in the same tubes or vials, using the same geometry in the counter.

Potassium bromide caused a marked decrease in the efficiency of counting $^{125}$I-labeled VLDL (Table 1); at a salt concentration of density 1.21 g/ml, $^{125}$I-labeled VLDL was counted at an efficiency of only 33.1%. In the presence of sodium chloride solution of density 1.117 g/ml, the efficiency of counting $^{125}$I-labeled VLDL was also decreased, but to a lesser extent. With either salt, the efficiency of counting $^{131}$I-labeled VLDL remained essentially unchanged. Similar results were obtained when iodinated HDL was used.

The attenuation of radioactivity emission by ions is a function of their mass absorption coefficient, which is dependent on the electron density of the ion and the energy of the radioactive source. The mass absorption coefficients for $^{125}$I (energy of 27 keV) as calculated from standard tables (12) are 3.14 for chlorides and 23.5 for bromides; the corresponding figures for $^{131}$I (energy of 364 keV) are 0.100 and 0.105. Therefore, with either cylindrical or globular sources, the absorption of $^{131}$I irradiation is negligible even when using a high bromide concentration (13). The absorption of $^{125}$I, however, is apparent with chlorides and is very pronounced with bromides. Moreover, the absorption of $^{125}$I will vary considerably with the geometry and diameter of the radioactive source.

The effects of organic solvents on the counting efficiency of dry samples of labeled VLDL and HDL lipids were determined in Packard counting vials, at a volume of 2 ml.

---

**Table 1. Effects of salts on efficiency of radioactive iodine counts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salt</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>$^{125}$I-labeled VLDL cpm</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$^{131}$I-labeled VLDL cpm</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NaCl</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>13,040 194</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>36,860 235</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaBr</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>12,060 187</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>35,450 340</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBr</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>11,730 206</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>36,880 860</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBr</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>9,440 217</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>34,160 290</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBr</td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td>4,650 250</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>36,200 290</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are means ± SE of six determinations. Radioactivity was determined in Packard counting vials, at a volume of 2 ml.

**Table 2. Effects of organic solvents on efficiency of radioactive iodine counts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solvent</th>
<th>$^{125}$I-labeled Lipid cpm</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>$^{131}$I-labeled Lipid cpm</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dry samples</td>
<td>30,250 ± 525</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>35,100 ± 311</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloroform</td>
<td>15,320 ± 274</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>35,420 ± 242</td>
<td>100.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloroform–methanol 2:1 (v/v)</td>
<td>18,730 ± 680</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>36,380 ± 172</td>
<td>103.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methanol</td>
<td>32,160 ± 1360</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>36,400 ± 217</td>
<td>103.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values are means ± SE of six determinations. Radioactivity was determined in Packard counting vials, at a volume of 5 ml.

**Abbreviations:** VLDL, very low density lipoprotein; HDL, high density lipoprotein.
Chloroform caused a decrease of $^{125}$I-labeled lipid counts to about 50% of that of the dry sample (Table 2), whereas methanol did not affect the efficiency of counting. Neither solvent changed markedly the counting efficiency of $^{131}$I-labeled lipid.

These results emphasize the necessity of careful determination of counting conditions as a prerequisite in studies using $^{125}$I for labeling of lipoproteins, especially if valid conclusions are to be drawn from double-label experiments.
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