Peer-reviewed version available at *Magnetochemistry* **2018**, *4*, 23; doi:10.3390/magnetochemistry4020023

Magnetic Characterization of Hypervalent Chromium Intermediates in the Reduction of Chromium(VI) by Glutathione in Acidic Solutions

Roberto A. Marín,[a]* Stanislaw Kolesnik[b]
[a]Chemistry and Biochemistry Department & [b]Department of Physics
Northern Illinois University, Faraday Hall, DeKalb, IL 60115, USA
* Correspondence: rmarincordoba@icloud.com

Abstract

Chromium (VI) is carcinogenic through intermediates formed in the cellular milieu by reduction with small reductants like glutathione (GSH), ascorbate (As), cysteine (Cys) and NADPH. Although the reduction of chromate by thiols have been investigated, the participation of Cr(IV) intermediates has been inferred only indirectly due to its refractive behavior towards EPR spectroscopy and the lack of true chromium (IV) complexes for comparative studies. Biological data from numerous reports indicate that Cr(IV) is the species most likely responsible for the carcinogenicity of Cr(VI). Our kinetic studies suggested that in acidic solutions the reduction of chromate with GSH affords mostly a chromium(IV) intermediate. As a step towards the full characterization of the paramagnetic species involved in the reduction of chromate by thiols at neutral pH, we embarked in the investigation of this reaction using the Superconducting QUantum Interference Device (SQUID) Magnetic Property Measuring System®. Our results indicate a strong influence of the temperature. At 2K, the saturation magnetization method was applied to the frozen reaction when it reached the peak of formation of intermediates. Contrary to our expectations, the contributions were calculated to be 30 % of Cr(IV) and 69 % of Cr(V) at this pH. When the Curie-Weiss method was utilized, the effective magnetic moment was dependent on the portion of the data utilized and generally higher proportion of Cr(IV) was found when the fitting is performed with data from higher temperature.

Keywords: chromium carcinogenesis; Cr(III); Cr(IV); Cr(V); Cr(VI); glutathione; SQUID; Magnetic Property Measuring System

Introduction

Chromium is known to cause lung cancer in workers of several industries[1]. The mechanism of carcinogenesis is associated with DNA damage through transient chromium species produced during the reduction of chromate. Indeed, DNA strand breaks and DNA oxidation catabolites[2-8] have been detected in *in vivo* studies with chromate, Cr(V) and Cr(IV) model compounds.

Glutathione, cystein and ascorbate are thought to be the main *in vivo* reductants. And, each produces a distinct combination of paramagnetic species, Cr(III), Cr(IV) and Cr(V)[9-11].

The carcinogenicity of Cr(VI) has been recently reviewed[12]. Besides affecting the lung in workers exposed to dust carrying Cr(VI) compounds, evidence mounts indicating that Cr(VI) causes cancers in the digestive track upon oral exposure. Cr(IV) appears to be the primary reactive species as it is now accepted that reduction probably starts during

transport within the cell membrane, where chromate uptake is mediated by the CLIC carrier proteins. CLIC1 is a monomeric protein that belongs to the GST superfamily. The redox active site of CLIC1 is occupied by GSH. Glutathione is not only found in relatively high concentrations in the cellular milieu (0.8-8.0mM),[13] its concentration is 10-1000 times higher than other biological thiols that react faster with Cr(VI).[13] It has been hypothesized that hexavalent Cr enters the cell and reacts with GSH in the CLIC within the cellular membrane, forming Cr(IV) and some Cr(V). Biological evidence also points towards Cr(IV) instead of Cr(V) being the true carcinogen as Cr(V) but not Cr(IV), triggers cellular defense mechanisms including cell death and DNA repair processes[12].

Ultimately, Cr(VI) is fully reduced to Cr(III) products within the cellular milieu[12]. It has been argued that ligand exchange of these products with DNA and proteins cause primary, secondary and tertiary adducts responsible for the carcinogenicity of Cr(VI)[14]. We have studied the Cr(V)/Cr(IV) and Cr(IV)/Cr(III) reduction processes[15]. Cr(IV) is more oxidizing than Cr(V); however the reduction of Cr(IV) is slower. Therefore, we hypothesize that Cr(IV) intermediates accumulate and react with DNA and proteins forming adducts in which the metal is further reduced. Consistent with this framework, recently we reported the detection of a wide (peak-to-peak separation = 260 G) EPR signal at g 1.975[16]. This species was detected during the reaction of the complex aquaethylenediaminebis(peroxo)chromium(IV) hydrate (**I**) with GSH at neutral pH. Interestingly, the signal was observed when nearly all of the Cr(V) species were depleted. Not surprisingly, Luo and Dalal[6] have also reported very broad Cr(IV) EPR signals.



I **II**

Several groups[9, 17-22] have studied the reaction between Cr(VI) and glutathione or related thiols. One common feature is that regardless of the pH, the reaction proceeds through sequential one electron transfers with formation of one or more intermediates. At high pH various Cr(V) signals are detected by EPR indicating sluggishness and the involvement of parallel mechanisms. In order to gain insights into the involvement of Cr(IV) in these reactions, Bose *et al*[9] studied the reaction between GSH and chromate at low pH. Under the conditions of this study, the intermediate was characterized as mostly Cr(IV). Because at ambient temperature Cr(IV) is usually refractive to EPR spectroscopy, the study involved measurements of magnetic susceptibility using an NMR method developed by the author.[22-23]

Here we present a report concerning our investigation of the reaction between chromate and glutathione at low pH using the Superconducting QUantum Interference Device (SQUID) Magnetic Property Measuring System®. Both the temperature-dependent magnetization (via Curie Law) and the low-temperature isothermal magnetization (via saturation magnetization) curves were used to determine the oxidation state of the chromium intermediates. Our vision is double, provide a clearer picture of the most likely carcinogen in chromium mediated DNA damage and, learn the chemical properties that

differentiate the elusive Cr(IV) from the better known Cr(V) state. As a corollary, we expect to utilize the knowledge learned to develop catalytic systems and even chromium anti-cancer drugs.

Materials and Methods

Reagents: Deuterated water (D_2O), chromium potassium sulfate [$CrK(SO_4)_2.12H_2O$], anhydrous potassium chromate (K_2CrO_4), reduced glutathione (GSH) and glycine (Gly) were purchased from Aldrich and used as received.

Kinetic profiles: The absorbance *vs* time data of a mixture containing 1.02 ± 0.05 mM Cr, 15.0 ± 0.8 mM GSH and 100 ± 5 mM Gly (pH 2.8), was measured at 460 nm with a Shimadzu UV160U spectrophotometer at room temperature and subjected to iterative non linear computer fitting using Sigma Stat for Windows Version 3.5.

Magnetic Susceptibility Measurements: The Magnetic Property Measurement System (MPMS-7, Quantum Design) was employed. The sample, 100 µL, was carried in a cuvette made from a 200µL PCR polypropylene tube. The Quantum Design MPMS magnetometer is calibrated by direct comparison of reference palladium samples originally purchased from the National Bureau of Standards (NBS Standard Reference Material 765) and provided by the manufacturer of the instrument; and the method was tested against known $CrK(SO_4)_2$ samples.[24] In a typical experiment, the chromium stock solution and the mixture of glycine and fresh glutathione were bubbled separately with Ar for ten minutes in a glove box. Then the glutathione glycine mixture was pipette into the cuvette and mixed with enough chromium stock solution to make 100 µL. Once the cuvette was capped the reaction was allowed to run until the peak of the biphasic kinetic profile was reached and at this time the sample was submerged in liquid nitrogen and quickly placed in the airlock of the magnetometer, purged the airlock to remove air and hence oxygen, then lowered into the sample chamber, where a temperature of 70 K was maintained and centered inside a superconducting magnet to get the most accurate measurements. The same cuvette used to measure the sample was used to measure the control. When the control was measured, the solution was added with a micro syringe until its weight matched the weight of the sample. All solutions were prepared in D_2O to reduce the paramagnetic contribution of the proton nuclei of water whose nuclear paramagnetism expressed as concentration of spins ½ accounts for about 0.26 mM; the deuteron's contribution is only 0.02 mM.[25] A similar reason motivated the removal of oxygen from the samples. Initially, a M(H) curve was measured at 2 K to determine the saturation magnetization and right after that a temperature dependence of magnetization was measured in the temperature range of 2-300 K to determine material parameters according to the Curie-Weiss law. The same sequence of measurements was performed on the control solution and the results of the control measurements were subtracted from the results of the Cr containing solutions.

Results

The kinetic profile of the reaction between 1.0 mM Cr(VI) and 15 mM GSH in 100 mM glycine buffer (pH 2.8) is shown in Figure 1. As previously noticed[9, 22] this reaction is best described by a biphasic process:

$$Cr(VI) + GSH \xrightarrow{k_1} Intermediate \xrightarrow{k_2} Products \quad (1)$$

The concentration of the three absorbing components of the mixture can be represented by the following set of differential equations:

$$d[Cr(VI)]/dt = -k_1[Cr(VI)] \quad (2)$$
$$d[Intermediate]/dt = k_1[Cr(VI)]-k_2[Intermediate] \quad (3)$$
$$d[Products]/dt = k_2[Intermediate] \quad (4)$$

Assuming that the initial concentration of Cr is $[Cr(VI)]_o$ and that at time zero [intermediate] = [Products] = 0, the equations can be integrated to give expressions for the concentration of each component over time:

$$[Cr(VI)] = [Cr(VI)]_o\, e^{-k_1 t} \quad (5)$$
$$[Intermediate] = [k_1/(k_2-k_1)][Cr(VI)]_o(e^{-k_1 t}-e^{-k_2 t}) \quad (6)$$
$$[Products] = [Cr(VI)]_o-[Cr(VI)]-[Intermediate]$$
$$[Products] = [Cr(VI)]_o\{1-[k_1/(k_2-k_1)](e^{-k_1 t}-e^{-k_2 t})-e^{-k_1 t}\} \quad (7)$$

The time at the top of the curve of Figure 1 is given by $t_{top}= \ln(k_2/k_1)/(k_2-k_1)$ (8)
To obtain the rate constants equation (9) was fitted to the absorbance vs. time trace shown in Figure 1. In equation (9) the first exponential corresponds to the raise of the Intermediate and the second exponential to its decay:

$$A = a + be^{-k_1 t} + ce^{-k_2 t} \quad (9)$$

Because $[Cr(VI)]_0$ is known and from the computer fitting of equation (9) the rate constants were obtained, the concentrations and the mole fractions of the components of the mixture were calculated by substitution in the above expressions. The results are given in Table 1:

Table 1. Distribution of chromium in the reaction between Cr(VI) and glutathione in 100 mM glycine at the time when [Intermediate] is at maximum concentration (t_{top}).

[GSH]/[Cr(VI)]	**15**	
T_{top}/s	200	
$[Cr(VI)]_o$/mM	1.02	Mole Fraction
$[Cr(VI)]_{top}$/mM	0.128	0.12
$[Intermediate]_{top}$/mM	0.74	0.72
$[Products]_{top}$/mM	0.155	0.15

Figure 2 shows the magnetization of the frozen reaction of Cr(VI) and glutathione. The saturation magnetic moment of the reacted solution was 3.04 μ_B, in agreement with the products being Cr(III). The saturation magnetic moment at the top of the kinetic profile was 1.39 μ_B. To this value each paramagnetic component of the mixture contributes according to their mole fractions at the time of measurement. In this respect Cr(VI) is diamagnetic and negligibly contributes to the magnetic moment of the mixture. For the

Intermediate, there is a contribution of 2 μ_B per atom of Cr(IV) and 1 μ_B per atom of Cr(V) while Products contribute with 3 μ_B per Cr(III).

The expected saturation magnetic moment of the mixture at the top of the kinetic curve is calculated below using the mole fractions ($f_{Intermediate}$, $f_{Products}$) of the intermediate and products in two limiting cases: the hypothetical case in which the intermediate is exclusively Cr(IV) and the hypothetical case in which the intermediate is exclusively Cr(V):

			[Cr(VI)]/[GSH] = 15	
Intermediate	is	M=	$f_{Intermediate}\ M_{Cr(IV)} + f_{Products}\ M_{Cr(III)}$	
only Cr(IV)		M=	$0.72 \times 2\ \mu_B + 0.15 \times 3\ \mu_B =$	$1.9\ \mu_B$
Intermediate	is	M=	$f_{Intermediate}\ M_{Cr(V)} + f_{Products}\ M_{Cr(III)}$	
only Cr(V)		M=	$0.72 \times 1\ \mu_B + 0.15 \times 3\ \mu_B =$	$1.2\ \mu_B$

Because the experimental value of the saturation magnetization of the reaction was 1.39 μ_B, the intermediate was neither Cr(IV) or Cr(V) alone and the contribution of Cr(IV) and Cr(V) was calculated to be 30 % of Cr(IV) and 69 % of Cr(V).
The Curie-Weiss curves of the frozen reaction and of the reaction after it was allowed to react at room temperature for twelve hours are shown in **Figure 3**. Using the expression $\chi = \chi_0 + \mu_{eff}^2/8(T-\theta)$, computer fittings of the experimental data were performed to estimate the effective magnetic moment. As it is customarily done with pure and non reactive samples, the fitting of the experimental data corresponding to the products was performed within the linear portion of the curve, name it from 100 to 200 K, and the effective magnetic moment was 3.87 μ_B. This value of 3.87 μ_B is in agreement with the expected value predicted by the spin only formula for a sample composed of Cr(III). To estimate the effective magnetic moments of the reacting sample the fittings were performed using the data bellow the temperature of liquid nitrogen (77K) and the effective magnetic moment was 2.75 μ_B. We calculated that if the intermediate was only Cr(IV) the effective magnetic moment would be 2.8 μ_B while if the intermediate were only Cr(V), the effective magnetic moment would be 2.1 μ_B. Clearly this value of 2.75 μ_B corresponds to a sample of only Cr(IV). If the fitting is performed within the high temperature range as it was done with the reacted sample, the effective magnetic moment is 2.55 μ_B, which corresponds to 58 % Cr(IV) and 42 % of Cr(V).



Figure 1. Observed (Circles) and simulated (solid line) absorbance-time trace at 460 nm of a mixture of 1.02 ± 0.05 mM Cr(VI), 15.0 ± 0.8 mM glutathione in 100 mM glycine (pH 2.8). The calculated absorbances are based on equation (9). The parameters used to plot the simulated curve are: $a = 2.4 \times 10^{-2}$, $b = -1.4$, $k_1 = (1.0 \times 10^{-1})\ s^{-1}$, $c = 1.6$, $k_2 = (1.5 \times 1^{-3})\ s^{-1}$.



Figure 2. Isothermal (2 K) magnetization curves of the reaction of 1.02 ± 0.05 mM Cr(VI) and 15.0 ± 0.8 mM GSH in 100 mM glycine, pH 2.8, in D_2O.



Figure 3. Observed (markers) and simulated (solid lines) magnetic susceptibility at 10 kOe of the reaction of 1.02 ±0.05 mM Cr(VI) and 15 ± 0.8 mM glutathione in 100 mM glycine. The simulation was done using the equation $\chi = \chi_0 + \mu_{eff}^2/8(T-\theta)$. The calculated parameters are $\chi_0 = 7.44 \times 10^{-3}$ emu/mol, $\mu_{eff} = 2.75\mu_B$ and $\theta = -0.276$ K for the Intermediates and 2.075×10^{-2} emu/mol, $\mu_{eff} = 3.87\mu_B$ and $\theta = 12.88$ K for the products.

Discussion

In the original study[9], in excess of oxidized glutathione at pH 2.7, the chromium(VI) *vs* glutathione reaction showed two chromatographic peaks that grew and then decayed. The two peaks showed a maximum absorption at 460 nm; at this wavelength none of the reagents or products absorbed and these peaks were assigned to intermediates.[9] The reaction produced only Cr(III) as evidenced by the UV-VIS spectrum of the mixture at the end of the reaction. The main bands were centered at 572 (ε = 33 M^{-1} cm^{-1}) and 408 nm (ε = 26 M^{-1} cm^{-1}). The EPR of the reaction mixture showed a weak peak with g value of 1.989. When compared with an authentic Cr(V) complex (bis(2-hydroxy-2-ethylbutyrato)oxochromate(V), g = 1998), this complex produced an intense signal even at 0.5 mM concentration in acidic solution. Using the intensity of this complex as a calibration point, it was estimated that among the intermediates less than 3% of the total chromium was Cr(V). When the same reaction was performed in the absence of excess oxidized glutathione and in glycine buffer, only one intermediate was detected by HPLC and the EPR experiments did not show evidence of Cr(V) at pH lower than 3.4.[22] In order to further characterize the EPR silent intermediate, time course magnetic susceptibility measurements by NMR were performed. These experiments gave effective magnetic moments of 2.6 μ_B for the intermediates and 4.3 μ_B for the products; which led to conclude that the intermediates were exclusively Cr(IV). This result have been disputed and the argument is that a mixture of Cr(VI) and Cr(III) can produced the same magnetic moments. However, the kinetic profile of this reaction clearly indicates the presence of an intermediate that decays slowly, then the magnetic properties of the mixture cannot be attributed to a combination of starting materials and products. One possibility is that the intermediate is a Cr(VI)-GSH complex as Lay[26] *et al* proposed. This would be consistent with the lack of detection of Cr(V) EPR signals. However if the intermediate were a Cr(VI)-GSH complex, the saturation magnetic moment would be 0.45 μ_B instead of the 1.4 μ_B that we measured and the expected effective magnetic moment would be 1.5 μ_B. The values of the saturation magnetic moment and the effective magnetic moment obtained in this work are helpful to clarify one fact, that the intermediate in this reaction is not a Cr(VI)-GSH complex. A larger effective magnetic moment than the saturation magnetic moment is consistent with a larger proportion of Cr(IV) at temperatures higher than 2K. This is evidence that the reduction of chromate by glutathione progresses in steps of one electron, Cr(VI) $\rightarrow$ Cr(V) $\rightarrow$ Cr(IV) $\rightarrow$ Cr(III). However, the lack of detection of Cr(V) signals with EPR is only indicative of how fast the process goes from Cr(VI) to Cr(IV) because Cr(IV) normally does not give EPR signals at room temperature. In brief, the reaction proceeds in one electron steps with a long-lived Cr(IV) intermediate as originally proposed.

Conclusions

We have shown that the magneto-chemical technique is suitable for the characterization of the reduction of chromate by biological reductants. The worthiness of this instrumental approach is evident when it is considered that Cr(IV) is typically not EPR active at ambient temperature. Moreover, the UV spectroscopy technique is not specific enough, especially when it is noted that these reactions produce more than one intermediate. In fact, in our[27] ESI-MS, cyclic voltammetry, EPR and HPLC studies of the reaction between aquaethylenediaminebis(peroxo)chromium(IV) hydrate (**I**) with GSH at neutral pH, we detected multiple intermediates of Cr(IV) and Cr(V) (mono and multi- ligated Cr-GSH species). Few workers, Bose[9], Marin[27], Liu[28] and Ramsey[29], have paid attention to the possible essential role of

Cr(IV) in chromium carcinogenesis. Considering that DNA damage by Cr(IV) does not trigger cellular defense mechanisms as it occurs with Cr(V) and Cr(IV), Cr(IV) is likely the most potent carcinogen through altered survivor cells leading to cancer[12].

In this work, the difference between magneto-chemical measurements at 2 K and higher temperatures opens two questions, at what temperature and what mechanism(s) is responsible for the advancement of the reaction in the frozen mixture. Performing the reaction at various pH's and measuring the magnetism at various times over the kinetic profile is a next step in further magneto-chemical investigations of this system.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Northern Illinois University for the financial support.

References

1. IARC, Chromium, nickel and welding. *Monographs on the Evaluation of Carcinogenic Risks in Humans* **1990,** *49*, 1-648.
2. Bose, R. N.; Fonkeng, B. S.; Moghaddas, S.; Stroup, D., Mechanisms of DNA damage by chromium(V) carcinogens. *Nucleic Acids Res* **1998,** *26* (7), 1588-1596.
3. Bose, R. N.; Moghaddas, S.; Mazzer, P. A.; Dudones, L. P.; Joudah, L.; Stroup, D., Oxidative damage of DNA by chromium(V) complexes: relative importance of base versus sugar oxidation. *Nucleic Acids Res* **1999,** *27* (10), 2219-26.
4. Joudah, L.; Moghaddas, S.; Bose, R. N., DNA oxidation by peroxo-chromium(V) species: oxidation of guanosine to guanidinohydantoin. *Chemical Communications* **2002**, 1742-1743.
5. Hai, L.; Youngde, L.; Xianglin, S.; Yan, M.; Nar, S. D., Chromium (IV)-Mediated Fenton-like Reaction Causes DNA Damage: Implication to Genotoxicity of Chromate. *Annals of Clinical and Laboratory Science* **1996,** *26* (2), 185-191.
6. Hai, L.; Youngde, L.; Yan, M.; Xianglin, S.; Nar, S. D., Role of Chromium(IV) in the Chromium(VI)-Related Free Radical Formation, dG Hydroxylation, and DNA Damage. *Journal of Inorganic Biochemistry* **1996,** *64*, 25-35.
7. Casadevall, M.; Da Cruz Fresco, P.; Kortemkamp, A., Chromium(VI)-Mediated DNA damage: oxidative pathways resulting in the formation of DNA breaks and abasic sites. *Chemico-Biological Interactions* **1999,** *123*, 117-132.
8. Slade, P. G.; Hailer, M. K.; Martin, B. D.; Sugden, K. D., Guanine-Specific Oxidation of Double-Stranded DNA by Cr(VI) and Ascorbic Acid Forms Spiroiminodihydantoin and 8-Oxo-2'-deoxyguanosine. *Chemical Research in Toxicology* **2005,** *18*, 1140-1149.
9. Bose, R. N.; Moghaddas, S.; Gelerinter, E., Long-Lived Chromium(IV) and Chromium(V) Metabolites in the Chromium(VI)-Glutathione Reaction: NMR, ESR, HPLC, and Kinetic Characterization. *Inorganic Chemistry* **1992,** *31*, 1987-1994.
10. Stearns, D. M.; Wetterhahn, K. E., Reaction of Chromium(VI) with Ascorbate Produces Chromium(V), Chromium(IV), and Carbon-Based Radicals. *Chemical Research in Toxicology* **1994,** *7*, 219-230.
11. Chiu, A.; Chiu, N.; Shi, X.; Beaubier, J.; Dalal, N., Activation of a Procarcinogen by Reduction: Cr(VI)-Cr(V)-Cr(IV)-Cr(III) A Case Study by Electron Spin Resonance (ESR/PMR). *Journal of Environmental Science and Health. Part C: Environmental Carcinogenesis & Ecotoxicology Reviews* **1999,** *16* (2), 135-148.
12. Chiu, A.; Shi, J.; Lee, W. K. P.; Hill, R.; Wakeman, T. P.; Katz, A.; Xu, B.; Dalal, N. S.; Robertson, J. D.; Chen, C.; Chiu, N.; Donehower, L., Review of Chromium (VI) Apoptosis, Cell-Cycle-Arrest, and Carcinogenesis. *Journal of environmental science and health. Part C, Environmental carcinogenesis & ecotoxicology reviews* **2010,** *28* (3), 188-230.
13. Connett, P. H.; Wetterhahn, K. E., Metabolism of the Carcinogen Chromate by Cellular Constituents. *Structure and Bonding* **1983,** *54*, 93-124.
14. Macfie, A.; Hagan, E.; Zhitkovich, A., Mechanism of DNA−Protein Cross-Linking by Chromium. *Chemical Research in Toxicology* **2010,** *23* (2), 341-347.
15. Bose, R. N.; Fonkeng, B.; Barr-David, G.; Farrell, R. P.; Judd, R. J.; Lay, P. A.; Sangster, D. F., Redox Potentials of Chromium(V)/(IV), -(V)/(III), and -(IV)/(III) Complexes with 2-Ethyl-2-hydroxybutanoato(2-/1-) Ligands. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **1996,** *118*, 7139-7144.

16. Marin, R.; Ahuja, Y.; Jackson, G. P.; Laskay, U.; Bose, R. N., Potentially Deadly Carcinogenic Chromium Redox Cycle Involving Peroxochromium(IV) and Glutathione. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **2011,** *133* (43), 17519-17519.
17. McAuley, A.; Olatunji, M. A., Metal-ion oxidations in solutions. Part XVIII. Characterization, rates and mechanism of formation of the intermediates in the oxidation of thiols by chromium(VI). *Canadian Journal of Chemistry* **1977,** *55*, 3328-3334.
18. Connett, P. H.; Wetterhahn, K. E., In Vitro Reaction of the Carcinogen Chromate with Cellular Thiols and Carboxylic Acids. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **1985,** *107*, 4282-4288.
19. O'Brien, P.; Wang, G.; Wyatt, P. B., Studies of the Kinetics of the Reduction of Chromate by Glutathione and Related Thiols. *Polyhedron* **1992,** *11*, 3211-3216.
20. Kwong, D. W. J.; Pennington, D. E., Stoichiometry, Kinetics, and Mechanisms of the Chromium(VI) Oxidation of L-Cysteine at Neutral pH. *Inorganic Chemistry* **1984,** *23*, 2528-2532.
21. Lay, P. A.; Levina, A., Kinetics and Mechanism of Chromium(VI) Reduction to Chromium(III) by L-Cysteine in Neutral Aqueous Solutions. *Inorganic Chemistry* **1996,** *35*, 7709-7717.
22. Moghaddas, S.; Gelerinter, E.; Bose, R. N., Mechanisms of Formation and Decomposition of Hypervalent Chromium Metabolites in the Glutathione-Chromium (VI) Reaction. *Journal of Inorganic Biochemistry* **1995,** *57* (2), 135-46.
23. Bose, R. N.; Li, D.; Moghaddas, S., Kinetic Method Based on Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Measurements. *Analytical Chemistry* **1991,** *63*, 2757-2762.
24. Warren, H. E., Spin Paramagnetism of Cr+++, Fe +++, and Gd+++ at Liquid Helium Temperatures and in Strong Magnetic Fields. *Physical Review* **1952,** *88* (3), 559-562.
25. Day, E. P.; Kent, T. A.; Lindahl, P. A.; Munck, E., Squid Measurement of Metalloprotein Magnetization. *Biophysical Journal* **1987,** *52*, 837-853.
26. Levina, A.; Lay, P. A., Solution Structures of Chromium(VI) Complexes with Glutathione and Model Thiols. *Inorganic Chemistry* **2004,** *43*, 324-335.
27. Marin, R.; Ahuja, Y.; Jackson, G. P.; Laskay, U.; Bose, R. N., Potentially Deadly Carcinogenic Chromium Redox Cycle Involving Peroxochromium(IV) and Glutathione. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **2010,** *132*, 10617–10619.
28. Liu, K. J.; Shi, X.; Dalal, N. S., Synthesis of Cr(IV)-GSH, Its Identification and Its Free Hydroxyl Radical Generation: A Model Compound for Cr(VI) Carcinogenicity. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications* **1997,** *235*, 54-58.
29. Ramsery, C. M.; Dalal, N. S., Crystalline and water soluble Cr(4+) and Cr(5+) model compounds for chromium toxicity studies. *Molecular and Cellular Biochemistry* **2004,** *255* (1-2), 113-118.