Volume 1 | Number 1 | Jan 2013 | Pages 1–100

Analytical Methods

www.rsc.org/methods

ROYAL SOCIETY OF CHEMISTRY

ROYAL SOCIETY OF CHEMISTRY

www.rsc.org/methods

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

A new method for screening glutathione reductase inhibitors using square wave voltammetry

Mehmet Sayım Karacan[a]*, Turgay Tunç[b], Hatice Oruç[a], Serhat Mamaş[a], Nurcan Karacan[a]

[a]Gazi University, Science Faculty, Chemistry Department, 06500, Ankara, Turkey

[b]Ahi Evran University, Science Faculty, Chemistry Department, Kirsehir, Turkey

A square wave voltammetric method was developed for the detection of glutathione reductase (GR) activity. The method is based upon the direct determination of glutathione (GSH) produced by nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide phosphate (NADPH)-dependent reduction of glutathione disulfide (GSSG). Enzyme activity was represented by the increase in steady-state reduction current of GSH and this current was monitored voltammetrically. At the optimized working condition, reduction potential of GSH was found at -0.44 V with hanging mercury drop electrode versus a Ag/AgCl electrode. The reduction current is directly proportional to GSH concentration in the range $2.63 - 800$ μM with a lower detection limit of 0.79 μM and lower quantification limit of 2.63 μM. Inhibitory activity of four antimony(III) compounds were determined by this method, and obtained IC_{50} values were compared with previous data. In addition, electrochemical study of the compounds showed that their reduction have EC mechanism; the current is diffusion controlled, and $E_{p/2}$ values are proportional to the inhibitor activity.

*Corresponding author. Tel.: +90 312 2021128; fax: +90 90 312 2122279; e-mail: mkaracan@gazi.edu.tr

Introduction

Glutathione reductase, a flavoprotein, is an important enzyme in the cell and plays a critical role in the staying of the redox states of the intracellular species, cleansing of free radicals and reactive oxygen species, intracellular signal transduction and gene regulation[1-4] by maintaining a high ratio of GSH/GSSG.[5] Under normal conditions, glutathione exists mainly in the reduced form (GSH), nonetheless it may be quickly oxidized to GSSG in react to the oxidative stress of the cell. Though, glutathione reductase reduces GSSG to GSH with NADPH and maintains the intracellular mol ratio of GSH/GSSG above 99% .

$$GSSG + NADPH + H^+ \rightarrow 2\ GSH + NADP^+$$

Owing to the key function of GSH in numerous cellular processes, GSH levels and the GSH/GSSG ratio have been related to numerous human illnesses, for instance Alzheimer, AIDS, diabetes, alcoholic liver, cardiovascular disease and cancer.[6-14] GSH is also utilized for detoxification of heme[15-17] and the increase in intracellular GSH quantity was responsible for the development of Chloroquine resistance.[18, 19] On the other hand, glutathione reductase inhibitors are found to possess antimalarial and anticancer activity.[20] Therefore, the sensitivity of any method used in the determination of glutathione reductase activity is important. The classic methods[21], still widely used for the determination of glutathione reductase activity, based on measuring the concentration of NADPH at 340 nm spectrometrically. However, this method may prove to be inadequate due to interferences by absorption peaks of the inhibitors. For this reason, new methods and sensors such as high-performance liquid chromatography with electrochemical detection,[22] fluorometric assay,[23] amperometric sensor[24], fluorescent probes[25] and quantum dots[26] have been developed to detect the glutathione reductase activity.

Many other methods have been developed and improved for determining GSH and GSSG content on different samples. These include chromatography[27-30,31], LCMS/MS[32,33], capillary electrophoresis/electrochemiluminescence[34], HPLC/UV[35], luminescence[36] and voltammetric[37-39] techniques.

Corrêa-da-Silva et.al[38] were the first to use the hanging mercury electrode to quantify GSH in biological samples buffered with phosphates (pH 7.5) and their work inspired several other

attempts. In this context electrochemical methods based on modified electrodes[39,40,41] and modified glassy carbon electrode[38] were reported.

In this study, we use a square wave voltammetric (SWV) method for the first time to measure *in vitro* the GR inhibitory activity; so as to develope a simple and low-cost system. With the aid of the method deviced, IC_{50} values of four different antimony (III) complexes were determined and the results were compared with those obtained spectrophotometrically.[42] The electrochemical properties of the complexes were also investigated by using voltammetric methods.

Experimental

Reagents and solutions

Glutathione Reductase (GR) from baker's yeast (S. cerevisiae) and other chemicals (GSSG, GSH, NADPH, NaH_2PO_4, Na_2HPO_4, DMSO) were purchased from Sigma–Aldrich (USA). All chemicals were of HPLC reagent grade and used without additional purification. All solutions were prepared with ultrapure water. Glutathione reductase stock solution was prepared by dissolving 500 units of GR in 50 mL of phosphate buffer (0.02 M, pH 7.2) and stored at 4 °C. Stock solution of 0.01 mol L^{-1} Sb(III) complexes were freshly prepared by dissolving in minimum amount of DMSO and diluting with water to a volume of 10 mL. Antimony complexes (Fig.1) were synthesized according to the procedure reported elsewhere[42].

Figure 1

1   **2**

3   **4**

Apparatus

All the voltammetric determinations were performed on a CHI 760d potentiostat. A three-electrode configuration with a hanging mercury drop electrode as the working electrode; Ag/AgCl electrode as the reference electrode, and a platinum wire as the auxiliary electrode were employed. Carbon ultramicro disc electrode (10 μm in diameter) was used in the chronoamperometric measurements as working electrode. A standard one-compartment three-electrode cell with a volume of 10 mL (CGME cell and other electrodes were purchased from BAS Co., Ltd) was used in all electrochemical research. Ultrapure water (18.3 MΩ x cm resistivity) was obtained from a Milli-Q purification system (Merck, KGaA, Darmstadt, Germany). An Orion 5-Star Benchtop Multimeter was used for pH measurements (Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc., US). Prior to the analysis, solution was purged with high purity N_2 gas (99.999 %) for about 10 min to remove oxygen.

Measurement of GR activity

The assay mixture (total volume, 10 mL) was prepared with 0.5 U of GR, 0.05 μmole NADPH and 0.02 M phosphate buffer (pH 7.2). After 2 min, the reaction is initiated by the addition of 0.01 μmole of GSSG to assay mixture. Inhibition of GR was studied in the presence of varying concentrations of Sb(III) compounds which were added to mixture before GSSG.

Square wave voltammograms were recorded at 25 mVs^{-1} scan rate in the potential range of 0.0 −(−1.8) V (vs Ag/AgCl) at every 20 s for 3 min. The degree of inhibition (as % activity) was calculated as the relative decrease of the GSH reduction peak current using the formula[43].

% activity = 100 − I %

I % = [($i_0 − i_1$)/i_0] x100

% activity = 100 − [($i_0 − i_1$)/i_0] x100

Where I % is the degree of inhibition, i_0 is the steady-state current obtained in the absence of the inhibitor and i_1 is the steady-state current obtained in the presence of the inhibitor. A steady-state response was obtained after 60 s. The percent activity values were determined by use of the peak currents obtained without and with the inhibitor (the last equation above). These values were plotted against the inhibitor concentration and the IC$_{50}$ values were found thereof (Fig.5). Each experiment was performed in triplicate at five different inhibitor concentrations with a constant GSSG concentration.

Electrochemical properties of the complexes

All voltammetric measurements were performed at room temperature and aqueous media. Phosphate buffer (0.02 M, pH 7.2) was used as supporting electrolyte. Diffusion coefficients and number of electrons transferred was found from the chronoamperometric Cottrell slopes of the 1 mM Sb(III) compounds with 1mM ferrocene as standard (a reversible transfer of 1 electron) on C ultramicro disc electrode. Baransky equations were used to calculate the number of electrons transferred and the diffusion coefficients[45].


Results and discussion

Optimization of GSH diffusion current measurement

Optimized working parameters of SWV with hanging mercury drop electrode versus Ag/AgCl electrode were given in Table 1.

The SW voltammograms recorded at increasing GSH concentrations in phosphate buffer (pH 7.2) was given in Fig.2.

Table 1 Optimized working parameters for SWV

Parameters	Value
Initial potential	0.0 V
Final potential	−1.8 V
Current range	10 μA
Frequency	10 Hz
Resting time	2 s
Puls amplitude	25 mV
Purge time	30 s

Figure 2

Reduction peak potential of GSH at optimized conditions was found at − 0.44 V (vs Ag/AgCl). This peak potential is slightly different from those reported in previous studies.[39,44] The differences may be due to the use of different electrodes and experimental conditions. Mladenov et al. reports that the electrochemical activity of the thiol-including substances at the mercury electrode is chiefly caused by the biochemical interactions of the thiol with the electrode material[44]. They assert that upon anodic polarization of the electrode, an insoluble complex of GSH forms and gets deposited onto electrode surface. At the cathodic potential scan, the complex was reduced. Electrode reaction was given as follows.[44]

$$Hg(GS)_2 + 2e^- + 2H^+ (aq) \rightarrow Hg\ (l) + 2GSH$$

Analytical characteristics of the SWV method for GSH were given in Table 2. The calibration graphs of the peak current versus GSH concentration were found to be linear in the range of 2.63− 800 μM. The limit of detection (LOD) and the limit of quantitation (LOQ) were calculated as follows: LOD = 3s/m, LOQ = 10s/m; (m is the slope of the calibration line and s is the standard deviation of the current of the blank solution with N=10).

The precision of the method was checked by taking 5 replicate measurements of GSH. The accuracy was checked by estimating the relative error between the measured by adding known concentrations.

Table 2 Analytical characteristics of the SWV method for GSH

| Parameters	Value
Reduction potential	-0.44 V (vs Ag/AgCl)
Range of linearity	2.63– 800 μM
Calibration graph slope	0.0046 (A/M)
Correlation coefficient (R^2)	0.998
Blank standard deviation	1.21×10^{-3} μA
Limit of quantification (LOQ)	2.63 μM
Limit of detection (LOD)	0.79 μM
Relative error	2.5
Methods RSD (N=5)	8.8

Determination of GR activity

Activity of GR was evaluated by monitoring the production rate of GSH by SW voltammetry. SW voltammograms of enzymatic reaction was recorded at 50 mVs^{-1} scan rate in the potential range of 0.0 – (−1.8) V with increasing enzyme concentration from 0.2 U/mL to 1.0 U/mL (Fig.3). As the enzyme reaction proceeds, the concentration of GSH increases and the result is an increase in the peak current. Obviously, the increasing current of GSH for a given period is directly proportional to the GR enzymatic reaction rate; therefore it can be used to probe the glutathione reductase activity. The optimized working conditions of the enzymatic reaction are listed in Table 3.

Table 3 Optimized study conditions for GR activity

Parameters	Optimized value
Substrate concentration (GSSG)	1 μM
Substrate concentration (NADPH)	2 μM
Enzyme units	0.5 U
Enzymatic reaction time	60 s
pH	7.2

Peak currents of GSH (inset of Fig. 3) reach a stable state at 0.5 U/mL of GR concentration. At the 0.5 U/mL GR concentration, current of GSH shows a gradual increase up to 60 s, after that a plateau is reached, then there is no significant change in the current (Fig. 4). These optimized parameters were employed in the later investigations of antimony(III) compounds.

Figure 3

Figure 4

Determination of IC$_{50}$ values of the antimony (III) compounds

IC$_{50}$ values were obtained from percent activity versus inhibitor concentration plots (Fig. 5). The data are shown in Table 4. In our previous study, we determined the IC$_{50}$ values of the same compounds with spectrochemical method by measuring the absorbances at 340 nm. IC$_{50}$ values so obtained are also given in Table 4. It is apparent that the voltammetric IC$_{50}$ values and their standard deviations are slightly better than the UV-based data. We attribute the difference to the relatively better sensitivity of the voltammetric method. Interferences in spectrophotometric analysis are likely to cause an increase in the UV absorbance.

The RSD values of the IC$_{50}$ obtained by this voltammetric method is small than those relating to UV absorption method.

The type of inhibition mechanism was assessed by plotting 1/V versus 1/[S] (Lineweaver–Burk[46] plot) with four different GSSG concentrations at constant NADPH concentration (Fig. 6), and initial velocity data is analyzed. It is seen that compounds act as a competitive inhibitor with respect to GSSG. Binding affinities of the inhibitors (K$_i$ values) were also calculated from Lineweaver–Burk plots and equation of $K_i = \dfrac{IC_{50}}{1+\frac{S}{K_m}}$ (Table 4).

Table 4 IC$_{50}$ and K$_i$ values and of the antimony(III) compounds

| Compounds	IC$_{50}$ (μM) (with SWV)	RSD	IC$_{50}$ (μM) (with UV*)	RSD	Ki (μM) (with SWV)
1	11.65 ± 0.08	0.68	14.10 ± 0.13	0.92	2.60 ± 0.46
2	10.82 ± 0.13	1.2	12.10 ± 0.22	1.8	2.04 ± 0.31
3	7.34 ± 0.12	1.6	10.50 ± 0.21	2	1.56 ± 0.18
4	4.81 ± 0.18	3.7	5.37 ± 0.28	5.2	1.09 ± 0.08

* Taken from our previous study.[42]

Figure 5

Figure 6

Electrochemical properties of antimony(III) compounds

Cyclic voltammetric analysis of the antimony(III) compounds were performed in a mixture, containing 100 μL of stock solution and 10 mL phosphate buffer (0.02 M, pH 7.2) at various scan rates (10, 50, 100, 500, 1000 mV s^{-1}) in the potential range 0.0 V – (–1.65) V (vs Ag/AgCl), under a nitrogen atmosphere. Cyclic voltammograms were depicted in Fig. 7. Electrochemical data of the compounds were summarized in Table 5. The fact that the cathodic and anodic peaks are asymmetrical (peak separation is large) and the ratios of reverse to forward peak currents (i_a/i_c) range between 1.8 and 3.2 (at the scan rate at 0.05 V/s), the reduction observed is likely to reflect the Sb(III) in the complexes to Sb(0). Sb(III) in the

complexes have reduced at $- 0.345V$, $- 0.336V$, $- 0.332V$,$- 0.278V$ respectively in the pH:7.2, this values are consistent with literature.[47].

 The linearity in the plot of ip $- t^{-1/2}$ indicates that current is "diffusion controlled". In addition, decreasing slope in the plot of the $i_{pc}/v^{1/2}$ versus scan rate indicates the EC (electrochemical and chemical) mechanism (Fig.8). The potential $E_{p/2}$ (half peak potential of the complex) varies with the nature of the ligands in the following order: **1** > **2** > **3** > **4** (Table 5). The comparison of this order with GR inhibition activity series indicates that potential $E_{p/2}$ is directly proportional to the inhibition activity. According to Table 4, inhibitory activity of the compounds increases as follows: 1< 2 < 3 <4. Based on this series we inferred that (a) more N donor atom on aromatic ring increases the activity (b) guanidinobenzimidazole group has more activity than 2-benzyl-2-thiopseudeourea.

The compound **4,** the best inhibitor (Table 4) , has the least negative potentials that is, the easiest to reduce (Table 4,5).


Figure 7

Table 5 Some electrochemical data of the antimony (III) compounds

	1	2	3	4
$E_{p_c} - E_{p_a}$ (mV)	333	281	266	47
$E_{p/2}$ (V) (vs Ag/AgCl)	$- 0.345$	$- 0.336$	$- 0.332$	$- 0.278$
ip_a/ip_c	1.864	1.406	2.825	3.240
Cotrell slope (S)	9.03×10^{-7}	8.33×10^{-7}	3.87×10^{-7}	7.65×10^{-7}

Limiting current (A)	3.47×10^{-10}	2.58×10^{-10}	5.88×10^{-11}	2.20×10^{-10}
Diffusion coefficient (D, m^2/s)	5.14×10^{-5}	3.34×10^{-5}	8.05×10^{-6}	2.88×10^{-5}
Transferred electron number	2.68	3.06	2.90	3.03

Figure 8

Conclusions

In this paper, we reported a comparatively simple procedure for measurement of GR activity and screening of GR inhibitors *in vitro*. This method is based primarily on the fact that the amount of GSH was directly detected using SWV. Working parameters for determining GR inhibitory activity were optimized with hanging mercury drop electrode versus Ag/AgCl electrode. IC$_{50}$ values of four antimony(III) complexes were determined and compared with spectroscopic values. Obtained data showed that E$_{p/2}$ potential of the compounds are directly proportional to the GR inhibitory activity. Best inhibitor gain electrons to reduce easily.

The RSD values of the data obtained by proposed voltammetric method is small than relating to UV absorption measurements.

Acknowledgment

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1   R. H. Schirmer, J. G. Müller, R. L. Krauth-Siegel, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 1995, **34**, 141−154.

2   R. L. Krauth-Siegel, H. Bauer, R. H. Schirmer, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2005, **44**, 690−715.

3   S. Biswas, A. S. Chida, and I. Rahman, *Biochem. Pharmaco*l. 2006, **71,** 551–564.

4   S. M. Kanzok, R. H. Schirmer, I. Turbachova, R. Iozef, K. Becker, *J. Biol. Chem*. 2000, **275,** 40180−40186.

5   J. L. Rendon, I. P. Arenal, A. G. Flores, A. Uribe, A. Plancarte, G. M. Hernandez, *Mol. Biochem. Parasitol.* 2004, **133**, 61-69.

6   A. Pastore, G. Federici, E. Bertini, F. Piemonte, *Clin. Chim. Acta,* 2003, **333**, 19−39.

7   J. Navarro, E. Obrador, J. Carretero, I. Petschen, J. Avino, P. Perez, J. M. Estrela, *Free Radical Biol. Med.* 1999, **26**, 410−418.

8   D. M. Townsend, V. J. Findlay, F. Fazilev, M. Ogle, J. Fraser, J. E. Saavedra, X. Ji, L. K. Keefer, K. D. Tew, *Mol. Pharmacol.* 2006, **69**, 501−508.

9   J. M . Estrela, A. Ortega, E. Obrador, *Crit. Rev. Clin. Lab. Sci.* 2006, **43**, 143−181.

10 M. Kemp, Y. M. Go, D. P. Jones, *Free Radical Biol. Med.* 2008, **44,** 921−937.

11 C. Perricone, C. De Carolis, R. Perricone, *Autoimmun. Rev.* 2009, **8,** 697−701.

12 E. Dursun, M. Timur, B. Dursun, G. Suleymanlar, and T. Ozben, *J. Diabetes Complications* 2005,**19**, 142–146.

13 L. Cesaratto, C. Vascotto, C. D'Ambrosio, A. Scaloni, U. Baccarani, I. Paron, G. Damante, S. Calligaris, F. Quadrifoglio, C. Tiribelli, and G. Tell, *Free Radic. Res.* 2005, **39**, 255–268.

14 M. Valko, C. J. Rhodes, J. Moncol, M. Izakovic, and M. Mazur, *Chem. Biol. Interact.* 2006, **160**, 1–40.

15 S. Müller, T. W. Gilberger, Z. Krnajski, K. Lüersen, S. Meierjohann, R. D. Walter, *Protoplasma,* 2001, **217**, 43-49.

16 H. Ginsburg, O. Famin, J. Zhang, M. Krugliak, *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 1998, **56**, 1305-1319.

17 O. Famin, M. Krugliak, H. Ginsburg, *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 1999,**58** , 59-68.

18 V. L. Dubois, D. F. N. Platel, G. Pauly, J. Tribouley-Duret, *Exp. Parasitol.* 1995, **81**, 117-124.

19 P. Srivastava, S. K. Puri, K. K. Kamboj, V. C. Pandey, *Trop. Med. Int. Health* 1999,**4,** 251-254.

20 C. Biot, H. Bauer, R.H. Schirmer, E. Davioud-Charvet, J. Med. Chem. 2004, **47**, 5972–5983.

21 I. Carlberg, B. Mannervik, *Methods Enzymol,* 1985, **113**, 484–490.

22 T. Ohkuwa, Y. Sato, and M. Naoi, *J. Chromatogr. B,* 1998, **705**, 23–28.

23 A.M. Piggott, P. Karuso, *Anal. Chem.* 2007,**79**, 8769–8773.

24 A.A. Alves, L. Pereira da Silva, D.V. Macedo, and L.T. Kubota, *Anal. Biochem.* 2003,**323**, 33–38.

25 L. Yi, H. Li, L. Sun, L. Liu, C. Zhang, Z. Xi, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2009, **48,** 4034–4037.

26 G. Garai-Ibabe, L. Saa, and V. Pavlov, *Anal. Chem.* 2013, **85**, 5542−5546.

27 T. Santa, *Drug Discov Ther.* 2013, **7,** 172-177.

28 E. Camera and M. Picardo, J. *Chromatogr. B,* 2002, **781**, 181–206.

29 J. P. Steghens, F. Flourie, K. Arab, C. Collombel, *J. Chromatogr. B.,* 2003, **798,** 343−349.

30 K. Z. Constantinos, D. T. Paraskevas, D. K. Theano, G. T. Demetrius, *Anal. Chim. Acta,* 2013, **795**, 75-81.

31 R.R. Alvarez, L. E. Hernandez, J. Abadia, A. A. Fernandez, *Anal. Biochem.* 2006, **356**, 254–264.

32 G. Hermann, K. Kryeziu and W. Berger, *Anal. Methods*, 2014, **2**, 3086–3094.

33 J. Reinbold, P. Koehler, M.Rychlik, *Anal. Biochem.* 2014, **445**, 41–48.

34 Y. Ji, Y. Ma and X. Sun, *Anal. Methods,* 2013, **5,** 1542–1547.

35 G. Chwatko, E. Kuzniak, P. Kubalczyk, K. Borowczyk, M. Wyszczelska-Rokiela and R. Głowacki, *Anal. Methods,* 2014, **6**, 8039–8044.

36 B. K. McMahon, T. Gunnlaugsson, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2012, **134**, 10725−10728.

37 J. B. Raoof, R. Ojani, H. Karimi-Maleh, M. R. Hajmohamadi and P. Biparva, *Anal. Methods,* 2011, **3**, 2637–2643.

38 M. V. Correa da Silva, A. A. Pigoso, B. F. Ribeiro, L. O. Barbosa, C. A. Rosado Miloch and A. A. Alves, *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 2013, **4**, 1-6.

39 B.Q. Yuan, X. Zeng, D. Deng, C. Xu, L. Liu, J. Zhang, Y. Gaoa and H. Pang, *Anal. Methods,* 2013, **5**, 1779–1783.

40. B.Q. Yuan, R. Zhang, X. Jiao, J. Li, H. Shi, D. Zhang, *Electrochemistry Communications* 2014, **40,** 92–95.

41. B.Q. Yuan, X. Zeng, C. Xu, L Liu, Y. Ma, D. Zhang, Y. Fan, *Sensors and Actuators,* 2013, **B 184,** 15– 20.

42 T. Tunc,Y. Koc, L. Açik, M. S. Karacan, N. Karacan, *Spectrochimica Acta Part (A),* accepted

43 E. Wilkins, M. Carter, J. Voss, D. Ivnitski, *Electrochem. Commun.* 2000, **2,** 786–790.

44 M. Mladenov, V. Mirceski, I. Gjorgoski, B. Jordanoski, *Bioelectrochem.* 2004, **65**, 69-76.

45 A.S., Baranski, W.R. Fawcett, and C.M., Gilbert, *Analytical Chemistry*, 1985, **57**, 166-170.

46 H. Lineweaver, and D. Burk, *Journal of the American Chemical Society,* 1934, **56,** 658–666.

47   M. S. El-Shahawi, A. S. Bashammakh, A. A. Al-Sibaai, S. O. Bahaffi,a E. H. Al-Gohani , *Electroanalysis* ,2011, 23:3, 747 – 754.

Figure Caption

Figure 1 Chemical structure of the antimony (III) complexes used in this study.

Figure 2 SW voltammograms of GSH with increasing concentration in phosphate buffer (0.02 M, pH 7.2). Top to bottom curves: 12×10^{-4}, 5×10^{-4}, 3×10^{-4}, 1×10^{-4} mole/L

Figure 3 GSH square wave voltammograms of consisting of increased enzyme concentrations in pH:7.2, at HMDE, vs Ag/AgCl and (inset) GSH current- GR concentration curve.

.

Figure 4 Current-time graph of enzyme reaction in the presence of 0.5 U/mL GR

Figure 5 % Activity – concentration graphs of the compounds in the presence of three different GSSG concentrations.

Figure 6 Line-weaver-Burk plots of GR activity against varying GSSG concentrations

Figure 7 Cyclic voltammograms of the compounds at different scan rates (**1**: 0.01; **2**: 0.05; **3**:0.1; **4**:0.5; **5**:1; **6**:5 v/s) in the phosphate buffer (0.02 M, pH 7.2)

Figure 8 Plot of the $i_{pc} / v^{1/2}$ versus scan rate

Table of contents entry

A novel square wave voltammetric method was developed for the detection of GR activity by measurement of diffusion current of GSH.

Figure 2