predecessor faced during the last two decades.

2) Research-laboratory managements and their supporting organizations face a new challenge and opportunity, that of making full and proper use of the increasing flow of mature and capable scientists of age 40 and over.

3) Business, education, and government should be alerted that this flow of mature talent is at hand and that tremendous advantages could come from attracting some of it into their activities.

References

1. J. B. Parrish, *Res. Develop. Mag.* **15**, 32 (May 1964).
2. W. R. Brode, *Science* **143**, 313 (1964).
3. *Statistical Abstract of the United States* (Govt. Printing Office, Washington, D. C., (1964), p. 22; *The Economic Almanac* (National Industrial Conference Board, New York, 1964), pp. 2–3.
4. S. Barisch, *Phys. Today* **17** (No. 4), 48 (1964).

Enzyme Nomenclature

Report on the Recommendations (1964) of the International Union of Biochemistry on Nomenclature and Classification of Enzymes.

Commission of Editors of Biochemical Journals

The Commission of Editors of Biochemical Journals, appointed by the International Union of Biochemistry (IUB), wishes to draw attention to the recently published *Enzyme Nomenclature* (*1*), which is the report of the IUB Standing Committee on Enzymes.

The draft of this report was considered by a joint meeting of the Standing Committee and the IUB Commission of Editors of Biochemical Journals in Rome in February 1964. The version agreed to by that joint meeting was adopted by the Council of the IUB at its meeting in New York on 27 July 1964, and designated *Recommendations (1964) of the IUB on the Nomenclature and Classification of Enzymes.*

The report of the Standing Committee of Enzymes is based on the report of the IUB Commission on Enzymes (*2*), adopted by the General Assembly of the IUB in Moscow on 16 August 1961. The changes made by the Standing Committee in the report of the Commission on Enzymes are of four types: (i) additions of new enzymes, and, where necessary, new subgroups to accommodate them; (ii) correction of definite errors in the first edition; (iii) changes in the nomenclature itself to meet criticisms which had been put forward; and (iv) addition of systematic names in some cases where the original Commission put forward only trivial names.

The chapter on the nomenclature of the cytochromes was revised by a special committee set up for this purpose. The chapter in the new report includes proposals for the nomenclature of heme compounds and hemoproteins in general.

Since the publication of the Report of the Commission on Enzymes in 1961, many of its recommendations have been widely used in scientific journals and textbooks. Most biochemical journals urge authors to follow most of the recommendations even if they do not insist on all. Some journals already require the procedure suggested in chapter 6, page 29, that, when an enzyme is the main subject of a paper or abstract, its code number (preceded by the letters EC), systematic name, and source should be given at its first mention; thereafter the trivial name may be used. Enzymes that are not the main subject of the paper or abstract should be identified at their first mention by their code numbers. When the paper deals with an enzyme that is not yet in the Enzyme Commission's list, the authors may introduce a new systematic name or a new trivial name, or both, each formed only according to the recommended rules, but a number should be assigned only by the IUB.

An addition to the new report that will be very welcome to editors and authors is the inclusion in the index of names which have been in frequent use but which are no longer recommended. It was often difficult to find in the old report the new name of an enzyme known to the reader only by its old name. Many enzymologists may note with regret that the name by which they have long known a favorite enzyme is printed in italics in the index, indicating that it is not recommended. For example, fumarase (EC 4.2.1.2) is replaced by fumarate hydratase as trivial name (systematic name, L-malate hydro-lyase). Those who are irritated by this change should perhaps pause to think how many students first coming across the name fumarase might legitimately think that it catalyzes the hydrolytic splitting of fumaric acid. Those who shed muramidase-containing tears on reading the first report may now rejoice that the old name lysozyme has been restored, whereas *muramidase* is now relegated to the list of disapproved names.

The chapter on enzyme units has received only one alteration. In the first report a standard temperature of 25°C was suggested, but this is now changed to 30°C because of the prevailing laboratory temperatures in many countries. No biochemical journal insists on the use of the Enzyme Commission's unit (U) of enzyme activity (the amount which will catalyze the transformation of 1 μmole of the substrate per minute under standard conditions). However, this unit is to be strongly recommended, and some journals suggest conversion of data in terms of the new unit when the paper has to be returned to the author for other revisions. The derived unit *specific activity* (U/mg) and *molecular activity* (U/μmole enzyme) are also recommended. Where inconvenient numbers would otherwise be involved, terms such as milliunit (mU), kilounit (kU), or, for those who specialize in small activities, nanounit (nU) or picounit (pU) may be used.

The members of the commission are J. T. Edsall (president), W. V. Thorpe (secretary), A. Dillmann, W. A. Engelhardt, Y. Raoul, and E. C. Slater.

The IUB Commission of Editors of Biochemical Journals would particularly like to draw to the attention of authors the recommendation that enzyme assays be based wherever possible upon measurements of *initial* rates of reaction in order to avoid complications due, for instance, to reversibility of reactions or to the formation of inhibitory products. Many papers are submitted in which kinetic parameters are calculated on the basis of data in which the initial rate was not measured. The substrate concentration should be, wherever possible, sufficient for saturation of the enzyme, so that the kinetics in the standard assay approach zero order. Where a distinctly suboptimal concentration of substrate must be used, the Michaelis constant should be determined where feasible so that the observed rate may be converted into that which could be obtained on saturation with substrate.

The chapter on the symbols of enzyme kinetics is unchanged. The recommended symbols v (velocity), V (v at infinite substrate concentration), K_m (*Michaelis constant*, that is, the substrate concentration where $v = V/2$), K_s (*substrate constant*, that is, the dissociation constant of the reaction $E + S \rightleftharpoons ES$), K_i (*inhibition constant*, that is, the dissociation constant of the reaction $E + I \leftrightharpoons EI$), and k for rate constant are widely used. The recommended numbering of rate constants for enzyme systems involving consecutive steps, such as,

$$E + S \underset{k_{-1}}{\overset{k_{+1}}{\rightleftharpoons}} ES \underset{k_{-2}}{\overset{k_{+2}}{\rightleftharpoons}} EP \underset{k_{-3}}{\overset{k_{+3}}{\rightleftharpoons}} E + P$$

has not been widely adopted, and editors are still reluctant to request authors to make the extensive alterations to the typescript which would often be necessary.

The chapter on the classification and nomenclature of cytochromes has been completely rewritten. The term cytochromoid, introduced in the previous report to describe hemoproteins with hemoglobin-like structure and a reactivity with ligands which do not react with cytochrome *c*, has been set aside. It is now proposed that these nonhemochrome hemoproteins should be considered as variant *c*-type cytochromes. To indicate that a heme *c* prosthetic group is not in a hemochrome linkage, a dashed symbol, c_1', is recommended. This chapter also defines a number of heme compounds and contains much useful information on the chemistry of these compounds and of hemoproteins. The individual cytochromes are now described in greater detail, and some cytochromes appearing in the previous list have been dropped. Cytochromes c_4 and c_5 are now brought under cytochrome c_2. Cytochrome *f* is given the name cytochrome c_6, although no doubt it will continue to be called cytochrome *f* as well. Cytochrome d_1 (a_4) and a number of *c* cytochromes have been dropped. Indeed the capital letters, introduced in the first report to describe a cytochrome at a certain stage of the investigation, have been dropped.

The chapter on the terminology of enzyme formation does not appear in the new report. Part of the chapter (formation from precursors) has been added to the chapter on classification and nomenclature of enzymes.

The chapter on the nomenclature of the nicotinamide nucleotide coenzymes is an abbreviated version of part of the chapter on the nomenclature of coenzymes in the first report. The sections on ubiquinone or coenzyme Q and on coenzyme A have been omitted, since these compounds have been considered by the IUPAC (International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry)–IUB Joint Commission on Biochemical Nomenclature, which maintains close contacts with the IUB Commission of Editors of Biochemical Journals. Ubiquinone (coenzyme Q) has been considered in a report on the nomenclature of quinones with isoprenoid side chains (see, for example, ref. *3*). This report makes two alternative recommendations for the naming of ubiquinone (coenzyme Q), namely, (i) the name be ubiquinone-*n* and the abbreviation Q-*n*, where *n* is the number of isoprenoid units in the side chain (ii) the name be ubiquinone Q_n and the abbreviation Q_n. No changes in the name coenzyme A (CoA, CoASH) are proposed.

One of the more controversial recommendations of the Enzyme Commission was the use of the name nicotinamide-adenine dinucleotide (NAD) and nicotinamide-adenine dinucleotide phosphate (NADP) instead of DPN and TPN. Many criticisms were received by the Standing Committee on Enzymes. These received careful consideration, but the Committee decided that the original arguments as set out in chapter 4 of the Report of the Commission on Enzymes were sufficient to warrant no interference being made with their decision.

The editorial boards of some biochemical journals have encountered strong opposition from their authors to the replacement of the DPN-TPN nomenclature. Although the IUB Commission of Editors of Biochemical Journals has endorsed the new nomenclature, two of the larger journals represented in the Commission have been unable to enforce it and have permitted the two systems to stand side-by-side.

In the first report, the Commission on Enzymes recommended two alternative systems of designating the reduced forms of NAD and NADP acting as substrates for enzyme reactions. The two systems were formulated $NAD^+ \rightarrow NADH + H^+$, and $NAD \rightarrow NADH_2$. The latter formulation was used in the enzyme list. In the new report the two forms are referred to simply as "NAD" and "reduced NAD" in the enzyme names and in the chemical equations illustrating the reaction catalyzed by the enzyme in question. On the other hand, the IUPAC–IUB Commission on Biochemical Nomenclature has recommended that the abbreviations NAD and NADP should be used only when the state of oxidation of the compounds need not be specified. The oxidized and reduced forms of the coenzymes should be designated by NAD^+ ($NADP^+$) and NADH (NADPH), respectively. These may be used in an equation as follows:

$$NAD^+ + XH_2 \leftrightharpoons NADH + H^+ + X$$

For this reason, some journals will permit and even prefer the designation of an enzyme such as EC 1.6.99.3 by NADH: (acceptor) oxidoreductase (systematic name) and NADH dehydrogenase (trivial name) rather than by the names "reduced-NAD : (acceptor) oxidoreductase" and "reduced NAD dehydrogenase," respectively, which appear in the new report. This is in conformity with current practice.

Because of difficulties with indexing, the use of chemical formulas in enzyme names has been prohibited, for example EC 1.11.1.6 (catalase)—which was given the systematic name $H_2O_2 : H_2O_2$ oxidoreductase in the first edition—has now been changed to "hydrogen-peroxide : hydrogen-peroxide oxidoreductase." Some journals may object to placing a hyphen between the two parts of a chemical name, which, according to the conventions of chemical nomenclature do not have a hyphen in the English language.

On the other hand, standard abbre-

viations for compounds of importance in biochemistry, as accepted by the IUPAC-IUB Commission on Biochemical Nomenclature, have been used in enzyme names, for example, ATPase (EC 3.6.1.3 and 3.6.1.8). Indeed more use could possibly have been made of standard abbreviations, and editors will not object when these are used in enzyme names. For instance, "glutathione : hydrogen-peroxide oxidoreductase" (EC 1.11.1.9) could be written GSH : hydrogen-peroxide oxidoreductase, and the systematic name of glutathione reductase (EC 1.6.4.2) can, in the opinion of the Commission of Editors, be legitimately written NAD(P)H : GSSG oxidoreductase instead of the longer name, "reduced NAD(P) : oxidized-glutathione oxidoreductase."

The new report repeats the statement of the first report that abbreviations for names of enzymes, such as GDH, should be strongly discouraged. While the Commission of Editors endorses this statement, and many journals rigorously enforce the prohibition of abbreviations for the names of enzymes, it must be recognized that such abbreviations are widely used, especially in clinical chemistry. It may soon be necessary to rationalize and standardize this practice rather than to ban it.

The most important change in the enzyme list is the reclassification of hydrogenases (group 1.12), oxygenases (group 1.13), and hydroxylases (group 1.14). Errors in the first list have been corrected and many new enzymes have been added. The list now contains 875 enzymes.

It is obvious that the further purification of enzymes and advances in our knowledge of the mechanism of reactions catalyzed by specific enzymes may soon make the recommended nomenclature no longer acceptable in certain cases. The present basis of classification is functional because sufficient chemical knowledge is absent. When more becomes known about the nature of active sites and amino acid sequences, a chemical classification may become possible.

It is also clear that not everyone will agree with the classification and nomenclature of each of the 875 enzymes. Editors of biochemical journals will carefully and sympathetically consider a reasoned request by an author to depart from the recommended nomenclature and will forward it to Professor E. C. Webb, who has been designated by the Council of the IUB to assemble such comments. Indeed, the Standing Committee on Enzymes received and considered many criticisms from authors that were transmitted by the editorial boards of various biochemical journals. If the editorial board agrees with the arguments brought forward by an author, it will allow him to depart from the recommendations of the enzyme report. The reasons for this departure could be stated in the text of the paper or in a footnote.

It should be added, however, that the experience of editors is that many authors have not grasped the basis of the nomenclature recommended by the Commission on Enzymes, namely that an enzyme should be named according to the reaction that it catalyzes. Since the specificity of enzymes is not absolute, some arbitrariness in naming the substrate is inevitable. The principles followed by the Commission on Enzymes in choosing among different possibilities are given in rule 14, page 32 of the new report. Since it appears that few authors are fully aware of the implications of this rule, it might be useful to consider it in more detail. The long-known enzyme succinate dehydrogenase (EC 1.3.99.1) is given the systematic name "succinate : (acceptor) oxidoreductase," even though it also catalyzes the oxidation of a number of α-monosubstituted succinates. On the other hand, alcohol dehydrogenase (EC 1.1.1.1) is named "alcohol : NAD oxidoreductase," because it acts on a wide range of alcohols. Lactate dehydrogenase (EC 1.1.1.27) is named L-lactate: NAD oxidoreductase," even though it reacts quite rapidly with NADP as well as with NAD. However, the most commonly occurring glutamate dehydrogenase (EC 1.4.1.3) is named "L-glutamate : NAD(P) oxidoreductase (deaminating)," because it reacts readily with both NAD and NADP (see rule 16). The aldehyde dehydrogenases present special difficulties. No less than 18 are listed in group 1.2.1 (with NAD or NADP as acceptor). Of these, 14 are named in terms of a specific hydrogen donor, while in the others the donor is given simply as aldehyde. This should not be taken to mean that the 14 are absolutely specific for a single aldehyde. Of the 18 enzymes, NAD is given as acceptor for 8, NADP for 6, and both nucleotides for 4.

There are many discrete enzymes, differing in amino acid composition, physical properties, and enzyme kinetics, all of which have to be named "aldehyde : NAD oxidoreductase" (EC 1.2.1.3). At present these must be distinguished by source, such as organism, tissue, and cell component. The IUB Commission of Editors of Biochemical Journals has set up a subcommittee to consider the problems of nomenclature posed by recent research on the nature of isoenzymes and enzyme subunits.

References

1. *Enzyme Nomenclature. Recommendations (1964) of the International Union of Biochemistry on the Nomenclature and Classification of Enzymes, together with their Units and the Symbols of Enzyme Kinetics* (Elsevier, New York, 1965).
2. *Report of the Commission on Enzymes of the International Union of Biochemistry, 1961* (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1961).
3. IUPAC–IUB Commission on Biochemical Nomenclature: Tentative Rules for the Nomenclature of Quinones with Isoprenoid Side Chains, *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **107**, 5 (1965).