Published in final edited form as:

Trends Pharmacol Sci. 2013 January ; 34(1): . doi:10.1016/j.tips.2012.11.001.

Molecular and cellular analysis of human histamine receptor subtypes

Roland Seifert¹, Andrea Strasser², Erich H. Schneider¹, Detlef Neumann¹, Stefan Dove², and Armin Buschauer²

¹Institute of Pharmacology, Medical School of Hannover, Carl-Neuberg-Straße 1, D-30625, Germany

²Department of Pharmaceutical/Medicinal Chemistry II, University of Regensburg, Regensburg, Germany

Abstract

The human histamine receptors hH₁R and hH₂R constitute important drug targets, and hH₃R and hH₄R have substantial potential in this area. Considering the species-specificity of pharmacology of H_xR orthologs, it is important to analyze hH_xRs. Here, we summarize current knowledge of hH_xRs endogenously expressed in human cells and hH_xRs recombinantly expressed in mammalian and insect cells. We present the advantages and disadvantages of the various systems. We also discuss problems associated with the use of hH_xR antibodies, an issue of general relevance for G-protein-coupled receptors (GPCRs). There is much greater overlap in activity of 'selective' ligands for other hH_xRs than the cognate receptor subtype than generally appreciated. Studies with native and recombinant systems support the concept of ligand-specific receptor conformations, encompassing agonists and antagonists. It is emerging that for characterization of hH_xR ligands, one cannot rely on a single test system and a single parameter. Rather, multiple systems and parameters have to be studied. Although such studies are time-consuming and expensive, ultimately, they will increase drug safety and efficacy.

Clinical relevance of drugs targeting human histamine receptors

Histamine plays an important role in diverse human diseases. In immediate-type (type I) allergies, massive IgE-triggered release of histamine from mast cells takes place; this results in activation of the H₁ receptor (H₁R) and contributes to the development of conjunctivitis and rhinitis with the lead symptoms pruritus (itching), erythema (reddening of the skin), and edema (accumulation of fluid in the skin) [1,2]. Accordingly, H₁R antagonists, specifically compounds of the second generation with low penetration into the central nervous system (CNS), are used for the local and systemic treatment of these ailments [1,2]. In human bronchial asthma, H₁R antagonists are ineffective, but the results of mouse studies suggest that H₄R antagonists could be useful in the treatment of asthma [3,4]. However, peer-reviewed clinical studies of H₄R antagonists in patients with asthma have not yet been published.

First-generation H₁R antagonists penetrate well through the blood–brain barrier (BBB) and are used for the treatment of sleep disorders and pruritus [5,6]. In a mouse pruritus model, the combination of a first-generation H₁R antagonist and a H₄R antagonist was more effective than either drug alone [7], but corresponding studies in humans have not yet been

published. Recently, the first H₃R antagonist, pitolisant, has been introduced as an orphan drug for the treatment of narcolepsy [8]. H₃R antagonists have also therapeutic potential for other CNS diseases such as Alzheimer's disease (AD) and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) [8].

H₂R antagonists were developed in the 1960s by Sir James Black, who has recently been honored by a series of articles in *Trends in Pharmacological Sciences* [9]. H₂R antagonists block H⁺ secretion in parietal cells of the stomach and provided the first effective drug for the treatment of gastroduodenal ulcer and gastroesophageal reflux disease [10]. These drugs have now been largely substituted by the irreversibly acting proton pump inhibitors that are more effective because of their longer duration of action and the fact that the proton pump constitutes the converging point of several GPCRs beyond H₂R that stimulate H⁺ secretion (i.e., muscarinic acetylcholine receptors and cholecystokinin/gastrin receptors) [10]. In myeloid cells, H₂R mediates inhibition of the superoxide anion (O₂⁻)-producing NADPH oxidase [11,12]. Through this effect, histamine facilitates T cell-mediated killing of tumor cells in acute myeloid leukemia (AML), specifically in monocytic forms M4/M5 (FAB classification) [13]. In conjunction with interleukin 2, histamine has been approved as an orphan drug for the maintenance treatment of AML [14]. H₂R agonists have also potential as positive inotropic drugs for the treatment of acute heart failure, but following some promising publications in the 1990s, this avenue of research has not been further pursued [15]. Numerous excellent reviews on the medicinal chemistry, pharmacology, and (patho)-physiology of H_xRs are available [8,16–22]. Considering the fact that there is substantial variability in the effects of H_xR ligands among H_xR species orthologs [23], it is particularly important for the treatment of human diseases to possess broad knowledge on the properties of hH_xRs. The purpose of this review is to fill this important gap in the literature and to provide strategies for productive and critical research on hH_xRs.

Challenges to the analysis of hH_xR subtypes in native human cells: the H₁ receptor

From an experimental point of view, it is not easy to comprehensively characterize H_xR ligands in human cells endogenously expressing hH_xRs. Table 1 summarizes the results of selected studies dealing with the characterization of hH_xRs in native human cells and critically analyzes these studies. We list several classic studies in the field, but clearly focus on the most recent data. Papers comprise studies on pharmacology, signal transduction, cell biology, and clinical relevance of hH_xRs. We aimed at showcasing the research of numerous groups and many experimental systems, some being popular, some having come out of fashion. Intentionally, we also included into Table 1 several papers that yielded controversial results to stimulate further research in these areas so that discrepancies will be ultimately resolved. Recently, a large number of papers dealing with hH_xR antibodies have been published. Representative studies dealing with hH_xR antibodies are listed in Table 1 because studies with these tools often made far-reaching conclusions regarding the possible pathophysiological roles of hH_xR subtypes in human diseases and corresponding therapeutic implications. Unfortunately, the use of hH_xR antibodies in particular and of GPCR antibodies in general is much more problematic than the community of histamine researchers often appreciates. To encourage a more critical use of hH_xR antibodies in future studies, problems and possible solutions regarding the application of GPCR antibodies are discussed in Box 1.

H₁R is expressed in lymphocytes and monocytes and mediates modulatory effects in the immune system [24]. In immune cells, H₁R is often expressed along with H₂R, complicating detailed pharmacological analysis [24], specifically in light of the fact that there is substantial overlap in interaction of certain ligands with hH₁R and hH₂R (Figure 1). In

HL-60 leukemia cells differentiated towards monocytes with $1\alpha,25$ -dihydroxycholecalciferol and in HL-60 cells differentiated towards neutrophils with dibutyryl-cyclic adenosine 3',5'-monophosphate (dibutyryl-cAMP), H_1R mediates increases in intracellular calcium concentration ($[Ca^{2+}]_i$) via pertussis toxin-sensitive G_i proteins and pertussis toxin-insensitive mechanisms [25,26]. The biological function of H_1R in HL-60 cells is not yet known. H_1R in HL-60 cells shows some unusual properties such as pronounced noncompetitive antagonism of first-generation H_1R antagonists, poor partial agonism of betahistine and lack of agonism of 2-phenylhistamines [25–27]. In marked contrast, at the recombinant hH_1R expressed in Sf9 insect cells, betahistine and 2-phenylhistamines are potent partial agonists [28]. It is not known whether this is due to low receptor expression in HL-60 cells [29] or due to ligand-specific receptor conformations (also referred to as functional selectivity) [30,31] that differentially direct hH_1R to pertussis toxin-sensitive and -insensitive G proteins.

Analysis of the H_2 receptor in human cells

Among all hH_xRs , hH_2R is the GPCR that can be studied most readily in human cells. Functionally, human neutrophils express H_2R but not H_4R , although at the mRNA level, H_4R is present [11,12,17,32]. The closely related eosinophils express both functional H_2R and H_4R [33]. Neutrophils can be easily obtained in large numbers from peripheral blood and from buffy coat preparations. Hence, in these cells, H_2R has been analyzed in considerable detail. In neutrophils and eosinophils, H_2R mediates increases in cAMP formation and an inhibition of chemotaxis, superoxide anion (O_2^-) formation, and release of cytotoxic enzymes [11,12,32]. The potencies and efficacies of various H_2R agonists with respect to cAMP formation do not match the profile for inhibition of O_2^- formation, suggesting that, in contrast to the general assumption, NADPH oxidase inhibition is not cAMP-mediated [11,12,32,34]. An implication of these data is that various H_2R ligands stabilize distinct active conformations that differentially activate various signaling pathways [30–32]. The existence of ligand-specific receptor conformations is further supported by data from HL-60 leukemia cells that also express H_2R . In these cells, H_2R mediates both an increase in cAMP and in $[Ca^{2+}]_i$, but the potencies and efficacies of various H_2R agonists for both responses are relatively different [35,36]. U937 promonocytes are a model system for AML forms M4/M5 and have been used to study the hH_2R in terms of structure/activity relationships of ligands [37,38], models of receptor activation [39], desensitization [40], gene expression [41], and myeloid differentiation [42].

Analysis of the H_3 receptor in human cells: an elusive goal

H_3R is a receptor exclusively expressed in neurons [43,44], and to the best of our knowledge there is currently no human cell culture model that expresses hH_3R endogenously at sufficient levels to allow for detailed pharmacological studies. To circumvent these methodological problems, hH_3R has to be expressed in mammalian or insect cell expression systems. Studies on hH_3R in mammalian expression systems have been reviewed elsewhere [8,20]. The pharmacological properties of representative hH_xR ligands at hH_3R expressed in mammalian cells are listed in Table 2. Studies on hH_3R in insect cell expression systems are summarized in Tables 3 and 4.

The human H_4 receptor can be studied in eosinophils, but it is a difficult task

The best-studied human cell type expressing H_4R is the eosinophil. Several independent groups have consistently reported on the functional expression of H_4R in human eosinophils [33,45–48]. H_4R mediates increases in $[Ca^{2+}]_i$ and a very moderate activation of chemotaxis

but no activation of O_2^- formation or release of cytotoxic enzymes. Thus, in contrast to other typical eosinophil GPCRs such as the eotaxin receptor and formyl peptide receptor, hH₄R mediates only incomplete eosinophil activation. Even blockade of inhibitory hH₂R [32] in eosinophils by famotidine does not largely enhance the stimulatory effect of hH₄R on chemotaxis [33]. These data raise questions regarding the (patho)physiological relevance of hH₄R in eosinophils. Perhaps hH₄R possesses greater functional relevance in eosinophils localized in inflamed tissue than in eosinophils isolated from peripheral blood. hH₄R is also expressed in mast cells. Thus, it is possible that in human mast cells, H₄R is of greater functional importance than in eosinophils, but detailed studies on H₄R in human mast cells have yet to come forward [49]. As for hH₂R ligands, there is evidence for functional selectivity of hH₄R ligands in eosinophils. This has been particularly well elaborated for the potent and selective hH₄R agonist UR-PI376 [33,50]. However, a serious drawback of studies with human eosinophils is the fact that it is difficult to obtain these cells in sufficient purity, quantity, and viability [33].

Peripheral human blood monocytes have also been suggested to express H₄R [51]. However, it is not certain how specific the H₄R antibody used for analysis of H₄R expression in these cells was (Box 1) [52–54]. Also, classic proximal H₄R-stimulated signaling pathways, specifically increases in $[Ca^{2+}]_i$, have only been incompletely studied so far in monocytes [51]. The signaling pathways leading to inhibition of chemokine CCL2 formation in monocytes also remain to be clarified. Moreover, the exceptionally high potency of clobenpropit (EC₅₀ ~ 3 pM) with respect to inhibition of CCL2 formation should be noted because this value is approximately four orders of magnitude lower than the corresponding EC₅₀ at recombinant hH₄R [51,55]. Even if one takes the concept of functional selectivity [33,56] into account, resulting in parameter-dependent differences of ligand potencies, this is an exceptionally large difference. Taken together, the expression of functionally active hH₄R in monocytes has to be corroborated in future studies.

Analysis of hH_xR subtypes in mammalian expression systems

Based on the limitations of hH_xR analysis in native human cells, recombinant systems are essential for comprehensive hH_xR characterization. hH_xRs have been expressed in classic mammalian expression systems, including HEK293 cells, CHO cells, NIH-3T3 cells, and COS-7 cells (Table 2) [57–61]. hH₃R and hH₄R have also been expressed in SK-N-MC cells (Table 2) [55]. In most studies, only one particular hH_xR was studied, and there are only a limited number of studies in which several or all hH_xRs were studied side-by-side in one laboratory [44,62]. Table 2 summarizes data on the pharmacological analysis of hH_xRs in mammalian expression systems with a set of selected ligands. There are still important gaps in the systematic characterization of ligands at hH_xRs expressed in mammalian cells. Another problem in the analysis of hH_xRs in mammalian expression systems is the fact that the functional parameters determined for any given hH_xR are relatively different and rather distal in the signal transduction cascade. For hH₁R, gene reporter assays are widely used [60,63]. In these assays, hH₁R exhibits high constitutive activity with most H₁R antagonists being inverse agonists [60,63]. However, when a more proximal parameter of the signal transduction cascade was determined in Sf9 insect cell membranes, namely high-affinity GTPase activity, most H₁R antagonists still displayed inverse agonistic activity, but the apparent constitutive activity of H₁R was very low [28,64], particularly in comparison to hH₃R and hH₄R [65,66]. This is an excellent illustration of the fact that constitutive activity of a receptor is highly parameter-dependent [67]. Specifically, when constitutive activity is determined at a level where the availability of a signal transduction component is limiting, constitutive activity appears to be very high [68].

hH₂R activity has been classically determined by the cAMP accumulation assay [58,61]. The cAMP accumulation assay is certainly of physiological relevance. With regard to the G_i/G_o-protein-coupled hH₃R and hH₄R, commonly determined parameters are the inhibition of forskolin-stimulated cAMP accumulation and cAMP-regulated gene expression [55,59,69,70], but because forskolin is not an endogenous constituent of the human body, the physiological relevance of these assay formats is unclear. Another parameter determined in mammalian expression systems is GPCR-mediated β -arrestin activation [71]. Because ligands may differ in their efficacy at activating G protein- and β -arrestin-dependent pathways [72], this assay is particularly important for studying the concept of functional selectivity. So far, the β -arrestin pathway has only been assessed for hH₄R [71] but not other hH_xRs. These studies revealed that the prototypical hH₄R antagonist JNJ7777120 behaves as a partial agonist with respect to β -arrestin activation [71]. The relevance of these data for the situation in native cells is still elusive [33,56]. One also has to keep in mind that the current focus on β -arrestin-dependent pathways in context with functional selectivity is driven, at least in part, by the availability of experimental techniques. Other pathways relevant for functional selectivity may be overlooked, introducing bias into data analysis.

Analysis of human histamine receptor subtypes in *Spodoptera frugiperda* Sf9 insect cells

In Sf9 cells, all hH_xRs were functionally reconstituted with G proteins, and unlike in mammalian expression systems, all hH_xRs could be studied using one and the same parameter, namely high-affinity GTPase activity. Table 3 summarizes the most important properties of hH_xR expression systems in Sf9 insect cells, and Table 4 summarizes the results of the pharmacological analysis of representative hH_xR ligands in this system. This analysis reveals that, despite intense research in this field for more than a decade, complete data sets for all hH_xRs are available only for a minority of ligands. Moreover, there is considerable overlap in the interactions of ligand classes with hH_xRs (Figure 1).

Although GTPase activity can be determined for all hH_xRs, nonetheless, the systems are not identical. Specifically, for hH₁R, coupling to insect cell G_q proteins is determined because mammalian G_q proteins cannot be expressed in functionally active form in Sf9 cells [73]. In addition, because the concentration of insect cell G_q proteins is low, GTP hydrolysis must be enhanced with regulator of G protein signaling (RGS) proteins RGS4 or RGS19, indicating that under these circumstances, GTP hydrolysis becomes the rate-limiting step of the G protein cycle [73]. For analysis of hH₂R at the GTPase level, fusion of the GPCR to the short splice variant of G_s α , G_s α _S, or the long splice variant of G_s α , G_s α _L, is necessary [74,75]. For hH₃R, coexpression of the GPCR with G_i α ₁, G_i α ₂, G_i α ₃, or G_o α ₁ in conjunction with G β ₁ γ ₂ was used. There is no evidence for functional selectivity of hH₃R ligands in these systems [66]. However, these ‘negative’ findings do not preclude functional selectivity of hH₃R ligands because several variables such as distinct $\beta_x\gamma_y$ complexes or different RGS proteins have yet to be examined. Lastly, for hH₄R, the most effective analysis system is represented by a fusion protein of hH₄R with RGS19, also referred to as GAIP, in coexpression with G α _{i2} and G β ₁ γ ₂ [76].

Overlap in interaction of ligands with human histamine receptor subtypes

As was already observed for native H₁R and H₂R in guinea pig organs [77], arpromidine and related imidazolylpropyl-guanidines bearing an H₁R antagonist-derived moiety at the guanidine group instead of the cimetidine-like portion of impromidine are dual hH₁R antagonists/hH₂R agonists [28,74] (Figure 1 and Table 4). Such a pharmacological profile may actually be clinically useful because H₂R activation results in anti-inflammatory effects

(Table 1). Hence, dual H₁R antagonists/H₂R agonists could be superior to H₁R antagonists in type I allergies.

Compared to arpromidine-derived guanidines, corresponding acylated imidazolylpropylguanidines (AIPGs) are considerably less basic, show better absorption following oral administration, and penetration of the BBB [78]. Although AIPGs are potent hH₂R agonists, some AIPG derivatives are also rather potent hH₁R agonists [79,80]. Moreover, AIPGs were the starting point for the development of a novel class of potent hH₄R agonists [81]. However, these compounds also exhibit agonistic activity at hH₃R (Figure 1 and Table 4) [81]. The selectivity of AIPG-derived compounds for H₂R was dramatically increased by bioisosteric replacement of the imidazole ring by a 2-aminothiazole moiety as in amthamine (cf. bivalent ligand **15** vs **14**, Figure 1, Table 4).

The 2-phenylhistamines and histaprodifens were originally designated as potent and selective H₁R agonists [82,83]. However, a more detailed analysis revealed that certain histaprodifens are also fairly potent partial hH₂R agonists [28]. Moreover, compounds of these two classes turned out to be either hH₄R agonists or hH₄R inverse agonists [3,84]. Along the same line, overlap in pharmacology between hH₁R and hH₄R is also an issue with first- and second-generation H₁R antagonists, although there is still unresolved controversy on this point [3,85]. Several of these compounds are low-potency hH₄R antagonists/inverse agonists (Figure 1 and Table 4).

The case of 5-methylhistamine is an informative example of the ambiguity of the term 'receptor subtype selectivity'. Originally, 5-methylhistamine (also designated as 4-methylhistamine) was one of the molecular tools used to pharmacologically define H₂R using the electrically stimulated rat uterus, rat gastric acid secretion, and the spontaneously beating isolated guinea pig atrium as biological systems [86]. At recombinant hH₄R expressed in Sf9 cells, 5-methylhistamine is ~15-fold more potent than at hH₂R (Table 4) [50,65]. In experiments with native cells, 5-methylhistamine is typically used at a concentration of 10 µM, assuming that hH₄R selectivity is preserved [51,87]. However, at this high concentration, considerable activation of hH₂R can take place (Table 4) so that rigorous discrimination between hH₂R and hH₄R is ambiguous unless inhibition studies of 5-methylhistamine effects with both H₂R antagonists and H₄R antagonists are performed. So far, in most studies, these important control studies combining supposedly selective agonists with antagonists have not been routinely performed. A suitable alternative for the use of 5-methylhistamine is the cyanoguanidine UR-PI376 that exhibits potent H₄R-agonistic effects at native hH₄R in eosinophils and at recombinantly expressed hH₄R [33,50]. However, because of the issue of functional selectivity, potencies of UR-PI376 can vary by up to 40-fold, depending on which specific parameter in which cell type is determined [33]. Hence, to exclude unexpected off-target interactions of UR-PI376 with hH_xRs other than hH₄R, other (biogenic amine) GPCRs than hH_xRs or even non-GPCR targets, specificity of the agonist was corroborated by blocking its effects with the H₄R antagonist JNJ7777120 [33]. To exclude off-target effects of ligands and data misinterpretation it is also highly advisable to examine antagonists from structurally distinct chemical classes. Taken together, these results show that characterization of hH₄R in native human cells with ligands is more challenging and requires much more experimental effort than it appears at first glance. Coexpression of multiple hH_xRs, lack of high receptor subtype-selectivity, and functional selectivity constitute potential confounding issues of ligands used.

Clozapine is an atypical antipsychotic with considerable affinity for numerous GPCRs [88]. Owing to its pleiotropic effects, the precise molecular mechanism of action in psychiatric diseases is still not known [88]. Clozapine is an antagonist at hH₁R and hH₂R and a partial hH₄R agonist (Figure 1) [55,89]. A comparison of the pK_b values of clozapine for hH₁R and

hH₂R and pEC₅₀ values for hH₄R with therapeutic plasma concentrations indicates that interaction of clozapine with all of the three mentioned hH_xR can occur under clinical conditions [89]. Obesity in clozapine-treated patients could be related to H₁R antagonism [90]. It remains to be determined if hH₂R antagonism of clozapine and partial hH₄R agonism is of relevance for agranulocytosis in clozapine-treated patients, constituting the most serious adverse effect of the drug [89,91].

Comparison of hH_xR ligand binding sites

Figure 2 shows an alignment of transmembrane (TM) regions and extracellular loops (ECLs) of hH_xR and hH_xR models docked with selected ligands from Figure 1. The alignment and phylogenetic trees indicate that hH_xRs are rather distantly related, with only H₃R and H₄R showing a high degree of sequence similarity. Nevertheless, the binding sites of all hH_xR are structurally and spatially similar, leading to overlaps in ligand interactions and complicating the design of selective agonists and antagonists.

A common hH_xR binding site may be defined, consisting of an identical negatively charged anchor (D3.32), a hydrophobic pocket (TM3, 6), subtype-specific residues in TM5 responsible for agonistic activity by selective interactions with the imidazole moiety of histamine and with other bioisosteric groups, and an affinity-conferring pocket mainly formed by amino acids of TM2, 3, and 7.

Nearly all known ligands interact with D3.32. However, a basic moiety is not required. The docking mode of thioperamide on hH₃R indicates that a salt bridge may be replaced by charge-assisted hydrogen bond(s). Hydrophobic interactions with Y3.33 (hH₂R: V) and Y6.51 occur in all subtypes. Position 6.55 probably contributes to H₃R/H₄R selectivity (M vs T). For some ligands, the hydrophobic pocket extends to residues 6.44, 6.48, 6.52, and 6.54. C3.36 (hH₁R: S) does also belong to the binding site, suggested to discriminate via *cis* and *trans* configuration between active and inactive states [92].

Supported by results from *in vitro* mutagenesis studies, it is assumed that imidazolyl and similar groups form bidentate hydrogen bonds with specific residues in partially different positions of TM5 – hH₁R: K5.39, N5.46; hH₂R: D5.42, T5.46 (or Y5.38, D5.42 [93]); hH₃R: S5.43 (not supported by binding to the S5.43A mutant), E5.46; hH₄R: T5.42 (and/or S5.43), E5.46. However, in the case of hH₃R and hH₄R, a ‘reverse’ binding mode of histamine may be proposed with a salt bridge between the protonated amino group and E5.46 [94]. Tricyclic hH_xR antagonists such as doxepin and imipramine (Figure 1) [89] do not form hydrogen bonds with hH₁R but penetrate into a lower hydrophobic pocket (I3.40, F5.47, F6.44, W6.48) and make additional unique interactions with W4.56. Owing to the high similarity of inactive and active state binding sites, further conclusions about different interactions of agonists, antagonists, and inverse agonists cannot be drawn.

‘Eastern’ ligand moieties (Figures 1 and 2, right-hand moieties) may interact with an affinity-conferring pocket mainly consisting of hydrophobic amino acids in positions 2.61, 3.28, 7.39, and 7.43. Unfortunately, the identity of hH₃R and hH₄R residues in these positions does not provide patterns of hH₃R- and hH₄R-selective interactions. Some ligands additionally interact with amino acids in different positions of the C-terminal part of ECL2, forming a cap of the common binding site (Figure 2).

Functional selectivity of agonists and antagonists

The pharmacological profile of hH₂R in terms of agonist potencies and efficacies is almost identical when the receptor is coupled to the long and short splice variants of G_sα [75]. However, when hH₂R coupling to insect cell G_s is studied measuring adenylyl cyclase

activity as parameter, the pharmacological profile is different from the profile of hH₂R coupled to mammalian G_s proteins, indicating that the various hH₂R conformations differ in their ability to couple to mammalian and insect cell G_sα [79]. Although, of course, the insect cell G_sα is not of physiological relevance, these data constitute an important case study showing that the impact of a given G protein isoform even within the same G protein family on functional selectivity of ligands cannot be predicted with certainty but needs to be evaluated experimentally. Analysis of the effects of agonists at recombinant hH₂R expressed in Sf9 cells (parameter: GTPase activity) and hH₂R in human neutrophils (parameters: stimulation of cAMP accumulation and inhibition of O₂⁻ formation) revealed several differences, which also supports the concept of functional selectivity [32]. It remains to be determined whether other G proteins than the two G_sα splice variants account for the parameter-dependent pharmacological profiles of ligands in native cells.

It is generally assumed that, in contrast to agonists, the effects of antagonists are system-independent [95]. However, at hH₁R and hH₄R expressed in Sf9 cells, there are dissociations between pK_i values (antagonist and agonist radioligand competition binding, respectively) and pK_b values (inhibition of histamine-stimulated GTP hydrolysis) [89,96]. Moreover, differences in the potencies of H₂R antagonists were observed at recombinant hH₂R relative to hH₂R in human neutrophils [32]. Along the same line, comparison of pK_b values of antagonists (inhibition of histamine-stimulated GTP hydrolysis) and pIC₅₀ values of these compounds (inverse agonist activity in the GTPase assay) revealed differences, suggesting that the histamine-bound active hH₄R conformation and the constitutively active agonist-free hH₄R conformation are functionally distinct from each other [96]. When comparing the affinities of agonists at hH₂R in the [³H]tiotidine (antagonist) competition binding assay with the potencies of agonists in the GTPase assay, additional discrepancies became apparent [74,79]. The B_{max} of [³H]tiotidine binding is much lower than the actual hH₂R expression level, indicating that only a small fraction of the available receptors binds [³H]tiotidine [74]. The majority of hH₂R molecules may either be inaccessible to tiotidine or exist in a low-affinity state for tiotidine. Hence, it will be important to document incomplete and/or biphasic antagonist inhibition curves in functional experiments.

At recombinant hH₄R expressed in Sf9 cells, JNJ7777120 exhibits the properties of a partial inverse agonist in the GTPase assay [65,96]. However, in U2OS osteosarcoma cells stably expressing hH₄R, JNJ7777120 exhibits the properties of a partial agonist with regard to β-arrestin activation [71]. It has been suggested that this β-arrestin activation is independent of G_i proteins [71], but the evidence for such an assumption is not fully convincing [56]. Specifically, the exclusion of the involvement of G_i proteins in a given signal transduction process by using the ADP-ribosylating pertussis toxin is much more difficult than is generally appreciated [56]. Also, a stimulatory effect of JNJ7777120 on extracellular ligand-regulated protein kinase (ERK) activation, assumed to be a downstream β-arrestin effect, was observed only with the exceedingly high concentration of 100 μM [71], at least four orders of magnitude above the K_i value of JNJ7777120 for hH₄R [62,96]. Thus, hH₄R-independent off-target effects of JNJ7777120 on ERK activation cannot be excluded. Currently, it is unclear whether the effects of JNJ7777120 on ERK activation in recombinant systems are of relevance in native cells, also in light of the fact that osteosarcoma cells as an expression system are only very distantly related to the physiological myeloid cell context of hH₄R. There is no evidence for inverse agonist activity of JNJ7777120 or paradoxical stimulatory effects of JNJ7777120 in human eosinophils, the maximum ligand concentration being 10 μM [33]. A recent study revealed that β-arrestin activation in U2OS cells is not restricted to JNJ7777120 but is also found for numerous other hH₄R ligands. Some ligands are biased towards G_i protein activation, and some ligands are biased towards β-arrestin activation, but there is no clear relationship between ligand structure and pharmacological

profile [97]. Similarly, it has been difficult to relate ligand structure and hH₄R inverse agonistic activity [96].

Unresolved questions and future studies

Both hH₃R and hH₄R exhibit high constitutive activity when expressed in Sf9 cells [65,66]. Na⁺ acts as an allosteric inverse agonist at hH₃R and reduces constitutive hH₃R activity [98]. The structural basis of allosteric modulation of GPCRs by Na⁺ has been resolved recently, (i.e., interaction of Na⁺ with a highly conserved aspartate residue in the second transmembrane domain plays a critical role [99]). In marked contrast to hH₃R [98], the constitutive activity of hH₄R is resistant to allosteric modulation by Na⁺ [65]. The molecular basis for this discrepancy between hH₃R and hH₄R is unknown; both GPCRs possess the highly conserved aspartate residue in the second TM domain (Figure 2). The reason for the discrepancy between high constitutive activity of hH₄R in terms of guanine nucleotide exchange in membranes and lack of constitutive activity of hH₄R in intact human eosinophils also needs to be clarified [33,65]. In contrast to H₄R, there is evidence for constitutive activity of H₃R in native systems [43].

As is evident from Figure 1 and Tables 2 and 4, the pharmacological profiles of ligands at hH_xRs in native cells and mammalian and insect cell expression systems are far from complete. In many cases, it has been taken for granted that compounds previously classified as being selective for a given H_xR subtype in animal organ or intact animal experiments [78,82,83,86] actually show the same behavior at hH_xRs. However, case studies for several compound classes including 2-phenylhistamines, histaprodifens, and imidazolypropylguanidines revealed that this is clearly not the case (Figure 1) [3,28,79,80,84]. Hence, it will be very important to generate complete pharmacological profiles of all available compounds at all hH_xRs, even though such studies may appear to be 'boring' at first glance. Compounds with a mixed pharmacological profile may be of therapeutic interest, too. For example, dual H₁R antagonists/H₂R agonists may exhibit superior anti-inflammatory properties compared with H₁R antagonists in type I allergies. Similarly, dual H₁R/H₄R antagonists may be more effective in this condition than H₁R antagonists, specifically with regard to the symptoms of pruritus and asthma [3,4]. Lastly, ligands with antagonistic activity at H₁R and H₄R plus agonistic activity at H₂R may be highly efficacious in various inflammatory conditions (Table 1). Owing to the overlap in pharmacophores binding to these GPCRs (Figure 1), the achievement of this goal is not elusive. Elucidation of the crystal structures of hH₂R and hH₄R, complementing the already available hH₁R structure [99], will constitute an important step towards this goal. In the field of psychiatric drugs, broad interaction profiles at GPCRs appear to be clinically important [100–102], and this concept may be extended to inflammatory conditions entailing hH_xRs.

H₂R agonists may be useful drugs for the treatment of the M4/M5 forms of AML [13,14,35,36,42]. These compounds can act by inhibiting O₂⁻ formation [13], and they exhibit some degree of cell type-specificity in their effects [32]. Thus, the introduction of highly potent and selective H₂R agonists activating physiological signal transduction pathways in defined cell types could constitute an important conceptual advance in current tumor therapy paradigms in terms of a targeted therapy based on GPCR-mediated signaling. The greatest concern in the implementation of H₂R agonists in AML therapy is the induction of gastroduodenal ulcers due to enhanced parietal cell H⁺ secretion. This problem could effectively be controlled by proton pump inhibitors [10], but the development of highly potent and effective H₂R agonists with selectivity for AML cells is the preferred long-term goal.

Concluding remarks

All four hH_xRs constitute established or promising drug targets, particularly for antagonists, and to a much more limited extent, for agonists. Human cell systems endogenously expressing hH₁R, hH₂R, and hH₄R but not hH₃R are available. Mammalian and insect cell expression systems exist for all hH₄Rs. In Sf9 cells, hH_xR ligands can be assessed using the same parameter for all hH_xRs, namely high-affinity GTPase activity. There is substantial overlap in the interactions of various chemical ligand groups with hH_xRs. This overlap in activity does not necessarily constitute a disadvantage but can also be exploited for future drug development. Studies on hH_xRs have revealed that functional selectivity does not only apply for agonists but also for antagonists/inverse agonists. Lastly, it has become clear that there is no single parameter that fully assesses the pharmacological properties of a ligand. Thus, any given ligand must be assessed in multiple dimensions, both with respect to the test cell systems and the particular parameters in any given system, yielding complex pharmacological profiles. The lessons learned from the comprehensive and systematic analysis of hH_xRs expressed in Sf9 cells can be applied to other GPCRs and can guide future GPCR ligand development in general.

Acknowledgments

R.S. is most grateful to Dr Brian Kobilka (Stanford University, CA, USA) for providing him the privilege to obtain postdoctoral training in his laboratory from 1995 to 1998. We acknowledge the collaboration with Drs H. Appl, S. Beermann, G. Bernhardt, T. Birnkammer, I. Brunscole, R. Burde, H. Burhenne, K. Burleigh, T. Bürckstümmer, K.-F. Deml, S. Elz, R. Geyer, P. Ghorai, L. Grünbaum, P. Igel, A. Höer, T. Holzammer, M.T. Kelley, T. Kottke, A. Kraus, M. Kunze, D. Neumann, D. Papa, H. Preuss, T.M. Reher, K. Sander, D. Schnell, G. Schultz, W. Schunack, I. Schwaner, H. Stark, B. Striegl, R.L. Thurmond, J. Trick, K. Wenzel-Seifert, S.-X. Xie, and Q.-Z. Ye in the hH_xR project. This work was supported by grants from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (GRK 760, GRK 1441, SFB 587, SE 529/1-1, SE 529/1-2, STR 1125/1-1), the EU (COST program BM0806; H4R network), and the National Institutes of Health (1 P20 RR15563).

Glossary

Anti-peptide antibody	antibody, which is generated by immunization of the host organism with a peptide, usually conjugated to a larger carrier protein such as keyhole limpet hemocyanin
Epitope	also known as antigen determinant, part of an antigen, which is recognized by molecules of the immune system
Fc receptor	receptor that recognizes the Fc part of the heavy chain of an antibody
Monoclonal antibody (mAb)	preparations of antibodies with identical epitope-directed specificity because all antibody-producing cells (usually hybridoma cells) are derivatives of a single precursor cell
Nanobody	antigen-binding domain derived from an antibody that naturally occurs in <i>Camelidae</i> (camel and llama) and consists of only a heavy chain without light chain
Polyclonal antibody (pAb)	preparations of antibodies recognizing the same antigen but at several epitopes, because antibody-producing cells are not derived from a single precursor cell.

References

1. del Cuvillo A, et al. Allergic conjunctivitis and H₁ antihistamines. J. Investig. Allergol. Clin. Immunol. 2009; 19(Suppl. 1):11–18.

2. Ortonne JP, et al. Urticaria and its subtypes: the role of the second-generation antihistamines. *Eur. J. Intern. Med.* 2006; 23:26–30. [PubMed: 22153526]
3. Dunford PJ, et al. The histamine H₄ receptor mediates allergic airway inflammation by regulating the activation of CD4⁺ cells. *J. Immunol.* 2006; 176:7062–7070. [PubMed: 16709868]
4. Deml KF, et al. Interactions of histamine H₁-receptor agonists and antagonists with the human histamine H₄-receptor. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 2009; 76:1019–1030. [PubMed: 19720730]
5. Greaves MW. Antihistamines in dermatology. *Skin Pharmacol. Physiol.* 2005; 18:220–229. [PubMed: 16015020]
6. Church MK, et al. Risk of first-generation H₁-antihistamines: a GA²LEN position paper. *Allergy.* 2010; 65:459–466. [PubMed: 20146728]
7. Dunford PJ, et al. Histamine H₄ receptor antagonists are superior to traditional antihistamines in the attenuation of experimental pruritus. *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* 2007; 119:176–183. [PubMed: 17208599]
8. Schwartz JC. The histamine H₃ receptor: from discovery to clinical trials with pitolisant. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* 2011; 163:713–721. [PubMed: 21615387]
9. Page CP, et al. The scientific legacy of Sir James W. Black. *Trends Pharmacol. Sci.* 2011; 32:181–182. [PubMed: 21458082]
10. Hershcovici T, Fass R. Pharmacological management of GERD: where does it stand now? *Trends Pharmacol. Sci.* 2011; 32:258–264. [PubMed: 21429600]
11. Burde R, et al. Histamine inhibits activation of human neutrophils and HL-60 leukemic cells via H₂-receptors. *Naunyn Schmiedeberg Arch. Pharmacol.* 1989; 340:671–678. [PubMed: 2559336]
12. Burde R, et al. Characterization of histamine H₂-receptors in human neutrophils with a series of guanidine analogues of impromidine. Are cell type-specific H₂-receptors involved in the regulation of NADPH oxidase? *Naunyn Schmiedeberg Arch. Pharmacol.* 1990; 341:455–461. [PubMed: 1694972]
13. Aurelius J, et al. Remission maintenance in acute myeloid leukemia: impact of functional histamine H₂ receptors expressed by leukemic cells. *Haematologica.* 2012; 97:1904–1908. [PubMed: 22689678]
14. Yang LP, Perry CM. Histamine dihydrochloride in the management of acute myeloid leukaemia. *Drugs.* 2011; 71:109–122. [PubMed: 21175244]
15. Felix SB, et al. Haemodynamic profile of new H₂-receptor agonists in congestive heart failure. *Eur. J. Clin. Invest.* 1995; 25(Suppl. 1):42–46. [PubMed: 7781676]
16. Parsons ME, Ganellin CR. Histamine and its receptors. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* 2006; 147:S127–S135. [PubMed: 16402096]
17. Haas HL, et al. Histamine in the nervous system. *Physiol. Rev.* 2008; 88:1183–1241. [PubMed: 18626069]
18. Thurmond RL, et al. The role of histamine H₁ and H₄ receptors in allergic inflammation: the search for new antihistamines. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* 2008; 7:41–53. [PubMed: 18172439]
19. Igel P, et al. Histamine H₄ receptor agonists. *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.* 2010; 20:7191–7199. [PubMed: 21044842]
20. Leurs R, et al. En route to new blockbuster anti-histamines: surveying the offspring of the expanding histamine receptor family. *Trends Pharmacol. Sci.* 2011; 32:250–257. [PubMed: 21414671]
21. Gutzmer R, et al. Pathogenetic and therapeutic implications of the histamine H₄ receptor in inflammatory skin diseases and pruritus. *Front. Biosci. (Schol. Ed.).* 2011; 3:985–994. [PubMed: 21622248]
22. Kiss R, Keserü GM. Histamine H₄ receptor ligands and their potential therapeutic applications: an update. *Expert Opin. Ther. Pat.* 2012; 22:205–221. [PubMed: 22385042]
23. Strasser A, et al. Species-dependent activities of G-protein-coupled receptor ligands: lessons from histamine receptor orthologs. *Trends Pharmacol. Sci.* 2013 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tips.2012.10.004> (in press).
24. Jutel M, et al. Histamine, histamine receptors and their role in immune pathology. *Clin. Exp. Allergy.* 2009; 39:1786–1800. [PubMed: 20085595]

25. Seifert R, et al. Histamine increases cytosolic Ca^{2+} in dibutyryl-cAMP-differentiated HL-60 cells via H_1 receptors and is an incomplete secretagogue. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 1992; 42:227–234. [PubMed: 1381043]
26. Seifert R, et al. Histamine H_1 -receptors in HL-60 monocytes are coupled to G_i -proteins and pertussis toxin-insensitive G-proteins and mediate activation of Ca^{2+} influx without concomitant Ca^{2+} mobilization from intracellular stores. *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch. Pharmacol.* 1994; 349:355–361. [PubMed: 8058107]
27. Seifert R, et al. The H_1 receptor agonist 2-(3-chlorophenyl)histamine activates G_i proteins in HL-60 cells through a mechanism that is independent of known histamine receptor subtypes. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 1994; 45:578–586. [PubMed: 7514261]
28. Seifert R, et al. Multiple differences in agonist and antagonist pharmacology between human and guinea pig histamine H_1 -receptor. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2003; 305:1104–1115. [PubMed: 12626648]
29. McDonald J, et al. Partial agonist behaviour depends upon the level of nociceptin/orphanin FQ receptor expression: studies using the ecdysone-inducible mammalian expression system. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* 2003; 140:61–70. [PubMed: 12967935]
30. Galandrin S, et al. The evasive nature of drug efficacy: implications for drug discovery. *Trends Pharmacol. Sci.* 2007; 28:423–430. [PubMed: 17659355]
31. Kenakin TP. Biased signalling and allosteric machines: new vistas and challenges for drug discovery. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* 2012; 165:1659–1669. [PubMed: 22023017]
32. Reher TM, et al. Evidence for ligand-specific conformations of the histamine H_2 -receptor in human eosinophils and neutrophils. *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 2012; 84:1174–1185. [PubMed: 22922404]
33. Reher TM, et al. Incomplete activation of human eosinophils via the histamine H_4 -receptor: evidence for ligand-specific receptor conformations. *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 2012; 84:192–203. [PubMed: 22516788]
34. Gespach C, Abita JP. Human polymorphonuclear neutrophils. Pharmacological characterization of histamine receptors mediating the elevation of cyclic AMP. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 1982; 21:78–85. [PubMed: 6127623]
35. Gespach C, et al. Identification and characterization of surface receptors for histamine in the human promyelocytic leukemia cell line HL-60. Comparison with human peripheral neutrophils. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 1982; 22:547–553. [PubMed: 6185835]
36. Seifert R, et al. Histamine increases cytosolic Ca^{2+} in HL-60 promyelocytes predominantly via H_2 receptors with an unique agonist/antagonist profile and induces functional differentiation. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 1992; 42:235–241. [PubMed: 1381044]
37. Gespach C, et al. Histamine H_2 receptor activity during differentiation of the human monocytic-like cell line U-937. Comparison with prostaglandins and isoproterenol. *FEBS Lett.* 1985; 184:207–213. [PubMed: 2581807]
38. Kim DC, et al. Isoliquiritigenin selectively inhibits H_2 histamine receptor signaling. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 2006; 70:493–500. [PubMed: 16675659]
39. Monczor F, et al. Tiotidine, a histamine H_2 receptor inverse agonist that binds with high affinity to an inactive G-protein-coupled form of the receptor. Experimental support for the cubic ternary complex model. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 2003; 64:512–520. [PubMed: 12869657]
40. Lemos Legnazzi B, et al. Rapid desensitization and slow recovery of the cyclic AMP response mediated by histamine H_2 receptors in the U937 cell line. *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 2000; 60:159–166. [PubMed: 10825460]
41. Shayo C, et al. Histamine modulates the expression of c-fos through cyclic AMP production via the H_2 receptor in the human promonocytic cell line U937. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 1997; 51:983–990. [PubMed: 9187264]
42. Copsel S, et al. Multidrug resistance protein 4 (MRP4/ABCC4) regulates cAMP cellular levels and controls human leukemia cell proliferation and differentiation. *J. Biol. Chem.* 2011; 286:6979–6988. [PubMed: 21205825]
43. Leurs R, et al. The histamine H_3 receptor: from gene cloning to H_3 receptor drugs. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* 2005; 4:107–120. [PubMed: 15665857]

44. Sander K, et al. Histamine H₃ receptor antagonists go to clinics. *Biol. Pharm. Bull.* 2008; 31:2163–2181. [PubMed: 19043195]
45. O'Reilly M, et al. Identification of a histamine H₄ receptor on human eosinophils – role in eosinophil chemotaxis. *J. Recept. Signal Transduct. Res.* 2002; 22:431–448. [PubMed: 12503632]
46. Raible DG, et al. Pharmacologic characterization of a novel histamine receptor on human eosinophils. *Am. J. Respir. Crit. Care Med.* 1994; 149:1506–1511. [PubMed: 8004306]
47. Buckland KF, et al. Histamine induces cytoskeletal changes in human eosinophils via the H₄ receptor. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* 2003; 140:1117–1127. [PubMed: 14530216]
48. Ling P, et al. Histamine H₄ receptor mediates eosinophil chemotaxis with cell shape change and adhesion molecule upregulation. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* 2004; 142:161–171. [PubMed: 15131002]
49. Lippert U, et al. Human skin mast cells express H₂ and H₄, but not H₃ receptors. *J. Invest. Dermatol.* 2004; 123:116–123. [PubMed: 15191551]
50. Igel P, et al. Synthesis and structure–activity relationships of cyanoguanidine-type and structurally related histamine H₄ receptor agonists. *J. Med. Chem.* 2009; 52:6297–6313. [PubMed: 19791743]
51. Dijkstra D, et al. Histamine downregulates monocyte CCL2 production through the histamine H₄ receptor. *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* 2007; 120:300–307. [PubMed: 17507084]
52. Beermann S, et al. Commercially available antibodies against human and murine histamine H₄-receptor lack specificity. *Naunyn Schmiedeberg's Arch. Pharmacol.* 2012; 385:125–135. [PubMed: 22071576]
53. Gutzmer R, et al. Well characterized antihistamine 4 receptor antibodies contribute to current knowledge of the expression and biology of the human and murine histamine 4 receptor. *Naunyn Schmiedeberg's Arch. Pharmacol.* 2012; 385:853–854. [PubMed: 22411357]
54. Neumann D, et al. Problems associated with the use of commercial and non-commercial antibodies against the histamine H₄ receptor. *Naunyn Schmiedeberg's Arch. Pharmacol.* 2012; 385:855–860.
55. Lim HD, et al. Evaluation of histamine H₁-, H₂-, and H₃-receptor ligands at the human histamine H₄ receptor: identification of 4-methylhistamine as the first potent and selective H₄ receptor agonist. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2005; 314:1310–1321. [PubMed: 15947036]
56. Seifert R, et al. Paradoxical stimulatory effects of the “standard” histamine H₄-receptor antagonist JNJ777120: the H₄ receptor joins the club of 7 transmembrane domain receptors exhibiting functional selectivity. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 2011; 79:631–638. [PubMed: 21266488]
57. De Backer MD, et al. Genomic cloning, heterologous expression and pharmacological characterization of a human histamine H₁ receptor. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* 1993; 197:1601–1608. [PubMed: 8280179]
58. Leurs R, et al. Pharmacological characterization of the human histamine H₂ receptor stably expressed in Chinese hamster ovary cells. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* 1994; 112:847–854. [PubMed: 7921611]
59. Morse KL, et al. Cloning and characterization of a novel human histamine receptor. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2001; 296:1058–1066. [PubMed: 11181941]
60. Bakker RA, et al. *In vitro* pharmacology of clinically used central nervous system-active drugs as inverse H₁ receptor agonists. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2007; 322:172–179. [PubMed: 17403993]
61. Fernandez N, et al. Roles of phosphorylation-dependent and -independent mechanisms in the regulation of histamine H₂ receptor by G protein-coupled receptor kinase 2. *J. Biol. Chem.* 2011; 286:28697–28706. [PubMed: 21705320]
62. Thurmond RL, et al. A potent and selective histamine H₄ receptor antagonist with anti-inflammatory properties. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2004; 309:404–413. [PubMed: 14722321]
63. Bakker RA, et al. Histamine H₁-receptor activation of nuclear factor- κ B: roles for G $\beta\gamma$ - and G $\alpha_q/11$ -subunits in constitutive and agonist-mediated signaling. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 2001; 60:1133–1142. [PubMed: 11641442]
64. Strasser A, et al. Pharmacological profile of histaprodifens at four recombinant histamine H₁-receptor species isoforms. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2008; 324:60–71. [PubMed: 17928567]
65. Schneider EH, et al. High constitutive activity and a G-protein-independent high-affinity state of the human histamine H₄-receptor. *Biochemistry.* 2009; 48:1424–1438. [PubMed: 19166345]

66. Schnell D, et al. No evidence for functional selectivity of proxyfan at the human histamine H₃ receptor coupled to defined G_i/G_o protein heterotrimers. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2010; 332:996–1005. [PubMed: 19959746]
67. Seifert R, Wenzel-Seifert K. Constitutive activity of G-protein-coupled receptors: cause of disease and common property of wild-type receptors. *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch. Pharmacol.* 2002; 366:381–416. [PubMed: 12382069]
68. Seifert R, et al. Reconstitution of β_2 -adrenoceptor-GTP-binding protein interaction in Sf9 cells – high coupling efficiency in a β_2 -adrenoceptor–G_{sα} fusion protein. *Eur. J. Biochem.* 1998; 255:369–382. [PubMed: 9716378]
69. Lovenberg TW, et al. Cloning and functional expression of the human histamine H₃ receptor. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 1999; 55:1101–1107. [PubMed: 10347254]
70. Oda T, et al. Molecular cloning and characterization of a novel type of histamine receptor preferentially expressed in leukocytes. *J. Biol. Chem.* 2000; 275:36781–36786. [PubMed: 10973974]
71. Rosethorne EM, Charlton SJ. Agonist-biased signaling at the histamine H₄ receptor: JNJ777120 recruits β -arrestin without activating G proteins. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 2011; 79:749–757. [PubMed: 21134907]
72. Rajagopal S, et al. Teaching old receptors new tricks: biasing seven-transmembrane receptors. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* 2010; 9:373–386. [PubMed: 20431569]
73. Houston C, et al. The human histamine H₂-receptor couples more efficiently to Sf9 insect cell G_s-proteins than to insect cell G_q-proteins: limitations of Sf9 cells for the analysis of receptor/G_q-protein coupling. *J. Neurochem.* 2002; 80:678–696. [PubMed: 11841575]
74. Kelley MT, et al. Distinct interaction of human and guinea pig histamine H₂-receptor with guanidine-type agonists. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 2001; 60:1210–1215. [PubMed: 11723228]
75. Wenzel-Seifert K, et al. Similar apparent constitutive activity of human histamine H₂-receptor fused to long and short splice variants of G_{sα}. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2001; 299:1013–1020. [PubMed: 11714890]
76. Schneider EH, Seifert R. Histamine H₄ receptor–RGS fusion proteins expressed in Sf9 insect cells: a sensitive and reliable approach for the functional characterization of histamine H₄ receptor ligands. *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 2009; 78:607–616. [PubMed: 19464266]
77. Buschauer A. Synthesis and *in vitro* pharmacology of arpromidine and related phenyl(pyridylalkyl)guanidines, a potential new class of positive inotropic drugs. *J. Med. Chem.* 1989; 32:1963–1970. [PubMed: 2569042]
78. Ghorai P, et al. Acylguanidines as bioisosteres of guanidines: *N*^G-acylated imidazolylpropylguanidines, a new class of histamine H₂ receptor agonists. *J. Med. Chem.* 2008; 51:7193–7204. [PubMed: 18950149]
79. Xie SX, et al. Probing ligand-specific histamine H₁- and H₂-receptor conformations with *N*^G-acylated imidazolylpropylguanidines. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2006; 317:139–146. [PubMed: 16394198]
80. Xie SX, et al. *N*¹-(3-Cyclohexylbutanoyl)-*N*²-[3-(1H-imidazol-4-yl)propyl]guanidine (UR-AK57), a potent partial agonist for the human histamine H₁- and H₂-receptors. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2006; 317:1262–1268. [PubMed: 16554355]
81. Igel P, et al. *N*^G-Acylated imidazolylpropylguanidines as potent histamine H₄ receptor agonists: selectivity by variation of the *N*^G-substituent. *J. Med. Chem.* 2009; 52:2623–2627. [PubMed: 19317445]
82. Leschke C, et al. Synthesis and histamine H₁ receptor agonist activity of a series of 2-phenylhistamines, 2-heteroarylhistamines, and analogues. *J. Med. Chem.* 1995; 38:1287–1294. [PubMed: 7731015]
83. Elz S, et al. Histaprodifens: synthesis, pharmacological *in vitro* evaluation, and molecular modeling of a new class of highly active and selective histamine H₁-receptor agonists. *J. Med. Chem.* 2000; 43:1071–1084. [PubMed: 10737740]
84. Wittmann HJ, et al. *N*^G-Methylated phenylhistamines exhibit affinity to the hH₄R – a pharmacological and molecular modelling study. *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch. Pharmacol.* 2011; 384:287–299. [PubMed: 21800095]

85. Hough LB. Genomics meets histamine receptors: new subtypes, new receptors. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 2001; 59:415–419. [PubMed: 11179433]
86. Black JW. Definition and antagonism of histamine H₂-receptors. *Nature.* 1972; 236:385–390. [PubMed: 4401751]
87. Gutzmer R, et al. The histamine H₄ receptor is functionally expressed on T_H2 cells. *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* 2009; 123:619–625. [PubMed: 19281909]
88. Fakra E, Azorin JM. Clozapine for the treatment of schizophrenia. *Expert Opin. Pharmacother.* 2012; 13:1923–1935. [PubMed: 22803789]
89. Appl H, et al. Interactions of recombinant human histamine H₁R, H₂R, H₃R, and H₄R receptors with 34 antidepressants and antipsychotics. *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch. Pharmacol.* 2012; 385:145–170. [PubMed: 22033803]
90. Reynolds GP, Kirk SL. Metabolic side effects of antipsychotic drug treatment – pharmacological mechanisms. *Pharmacol. Ther.* 2010; 125:169–179. [PubMed: 19931306]
91. Nooijen PM, et al. Haematological toxicity of clozapine and some other drugs used in psychiatry. *Hum. Psychopharmacol.* 2011; 26:112–119. [PubMed: 21416507]
92. Lim HD, et al. Molecular determinants of ligand binding to H₄R species variants. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 2010; 77:734–743. [PubMed: 20103609]
93. Nederkoorn PH, et al. The agonistic binding site at the histamine H₂ receptor. I. Theoretical investigations of histamine binding to an oligopeptide mimicking a part of the fifth transmembrane α -helix. *J. Comput. Aided Mol. Des.* 1996; 10:461–478. [PubMed: 8951654]
94. Joóárt B, et al. Activation mechanism of the human histamine H₄ receptor – an explicit membrane molecular dynamics simulation study. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* 2008; 48:1199–1210. [PubMed: 18572901]
95. Neubig RR, et al. International Union of Pharmacology Committee on Receptor Nomenclature and Drug Classification: XXXVIII. Update on terms and symbols in quantitative pharmacology. *Pharmacol. Rev.* 2003; 55:597–606. [PubMed: 14657418]
96. Schneider EH, et al. Structural requirements for inverse agonism and neutral antagonism of indole-, benzimidazole-, and thienopyrrole-derived histamine H₄ receptor ligands. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2010; 334:513–521. [PubMed: 20484153]
97. Nijmeijer S, et al. Analysis of multiple histamine H₄ receptor compound classes uncovers Gq_i and β -arrestin2 biased ligands. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 2012; 82:1174–1182. [PubMed: 22973061]
98. Schnell D, Seifert R. Modulation of histamine H₃ receptor function by monovalent ions. *Neurosci. Lett.* 2010; 472:114–118. [PubMed: 20132865]
99. Liu W, et al. Structural basis for allosteric regulation of GPCRs by sodium ions. *Science.* 2012; 337:232–236. [PubMed: 22798613]
100. Kuroki T, et al. Neuropharmacology of second-generation antipsychotic drugs: a validity of the serotonin-dopamine hypothesis. *Prog. Brain Res.* 2008; 172:199–212. [PubMed: 18772034]
101. Lieberman JA, et al. Antipsychotic drugs: comparison in animal models of efficacy, neurotransmitter regulation, and neuroprotection. *Pharmacol. Rev.* 2008; 60:358–403. [PubMed: 18922967]
102. Newman-Tancredi A, Kleven MS. Comparative pharmacology of antipsychotics possessing combined dopamine D₂ and serotonin 5-HT_{1A} receptor properties. *Psychopharmacology (Berl.).* 2011; 216:451–473. [PubMed: 21394633]
103. Tilly BC, et al. Histamine as a growth factor and chemoattractant for human carcinoma and melanoma cells: action through Ca²⁺-mobilizing H₁ receptors. *J. Cell Biol.* 1990; 110:1211–1215. [PubMed: 2182646]
104. Miller TR, et al. Analysis of apparent noncompetitive responses to competitive H₁-histamine receptor antagonists in fluorescent imaging plate reader-based calcium assays. *J. Biomol. Screen.* 1999; 4:249–258. [PubMed: 10838445]
105. Diks SH, et al. Activation of the canonical β -catenin pathway by histamine. *J. Biol. Chem.* 2003; 278:52491–52496. [PubMed: 14563838]
106. Das AK, et al. Stimulation of histamine H₁ receptor upregulates histamine H₁ receptor itself through activation of receptor gene transcription. *J. Pharmacol. Sci.* 2007; 103:374–382. [PubMed: 17409634]

107. Mizuguchi H, et al. Involvement of protein kinase C α / extracellular signal-regulated kinase/ poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase-1 (PARP-1) signaling in histamine-induced up-regulation of histamine H₁ receptor gene expression in HeLa cells. *J. Biol. Chem.* 2011; 286:30542–30551. [PubMed: 21730054]
108. Smit MJ, et al. Short-term desensitization of the histamine H₁ receptor in human HeLa cells: involvement of protein kinase C dependent and independent pathways. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* 1992; 107:448–455. [PubMed: 1422591]
109. Hishinuma S, et al. Ca²⁺/calmodulin-mediated regulation of agonist-induced sequestration of G_q protein-coupled histamine H₁ receptors in human U373 MG astrocytoma cells. *J. Neurochem.* 1998; 71:2626–2633. [PubMed: 9832164]
110. Wong MP, et al. Characteristics of the Ca²⁺-dependent inhibition of cyclic AMP accumulation by histamine and thapsigargin in human U373 MG astrocytoma cells. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* 2000; 130:1021–1030. [PubMed: 10882386]
111. Aria-Montañón JA, et al. Calcium-dependence of histamine-and carbachol-induced inositol phosphate formation in human U373 MG astrocytoma cells: comparison with HeLa cells and brain slices. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* 1994; 111:598–608. [PubMed: 8004403]
112. Hishinuma S, et al. Intact cell binding for in vitro prediction of sedative and non-sedative histamine H₁-receptor antagonists based on receptor internalization. *J. Pharmacol. Sci.* 2008; 107:66–79. [PubMed: 18446005]
113. Hishinuma S, et al. The affinity of histamine for G_q protein-coupled histamine H₁-receptors is predominantly regulated by their internalization in human astrocytoma cells. *J. Pharmacol. Sci.* 2012; 119:233–242. [PubMed: 22786583]
114. Hernández-Angeles A, et al. Histamine H₁ receptor activation stimulates mitogenesis in human astrocytoma U373 MG cells. *J. Neurooncol.* 2001; 55:81–89. [PubMed: 11817705]
115. Raveendran VV, et al. Lipopolysaccharide induces H₁ receptor expression and enhances histamine responsiveness in human coronary artery endothelial cells. *Immunology.* 2011; 132:578–588. [PubMed: 21255012]
116. Kim HM, et al. Histamine regulates mucin expression through H₁ receptor in airway epithelial cells. *Acta Otolaryngol.* 2012; 132(Suppl. 1):S37–S43. [PubMed: 22582780]
117. Grimm M, et al. Prognostic value of histamine H₁ receptor expression in oral squamous cell carcinoma. *Clin. Oral Investig.* 2012 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00784-012-0784-3>.
118. Nagai Y, et al. Histamine reduces susceptibility to natural killer cells via down-regulation of NKG2D ligands on human monocytic leukaemia THP-1 cells. *Immunology.* 2012; 136:103–114. [PubMed: 22304689]
119. Triggiani M, et al. Differentiation of monocytes into macrophages induces the upregulation of histamine H₁ receptor. *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* 2007; 119:472–481. [PubMed: 17125827]
120. Mitsuhashi M, et al. Multiple signaling pathways of histamine H₂ receptors. Identification of an H₂ receptor-dependent Ca²⁺ mobilization pathway in human HL-60 promyelocytic leukemia cells. *J. Biol. Chem.* 1989; 264:18356–18362. [PubMed: 2553705]
121. Burde R, Seifert R. Stimulation of histamine H₂- (and H₁)-receptors activates Ca²⁺ influx in all-trans-retinoic acid-differentiated HL-60 cells independently of phospholipase C or adenylyl cyclase. *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch. Pharmacol.* 1996; 353:123–129. [PubMed: 8717151]
122. Sawutz DG, et al. Histamine H₂ receptor desensitization in HL-60 human promyelocytic leukemia cells. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 1984; 231:1–7. [PubMed: 6208354]
123. Idzko M, et al. Expression and function of histamine receptors in human monocyte-derived dendritic cells. *J. Allergy Clin. Immunol.* 2002; 109:839–846. [PubMed: 11994709]
124. Botturi K, et al. Histamine induces Th2 activation through the histamine receptor 1 in house dust mite rhinitic but not asthmatic patients. *Clin. Exp. Allergy.* 2010; 40:755–762. [PubMed: 20184607]
125. Nemeth K, et al. Characterization and function of histamine receptors in human bone marrow stromal cells. *Stem Cells.* 2012; 30:222–231. [PubMed: 22045589]
126. Von Rahden BH, et al. Allergic predisposition, histamine and histamine receptor expression (H₁R, H₂R) are associated with complicated courses of sigmoid diverticulitis. *J. Gastrointest. Surg.* 2012; 16:173–182. [PubMed: 21956435]

127. Seligmann BE, et al. Histamine modulation of human neutrophil oxidative metabolism, locomotion, degranulation, and membrane potential changes. *J. Immunol.* 1983; 130:1902–1909. [PubMed: 6131922]
128. Busse WW, Sosman J. Decreased H₂ histamine response of granulocytes of asthmatic patients. *J. Clin. Invest.* 1977; 59:1080–1087. [PubMed: 193871]
129. Busse WW, Sosman J. Histamine inhibition of neutrophil lysosomal enzyme release: an H₂ histamine receptor response. *Science.* 1976; 194:737–738. [PubMed: 185696]
130. Vannier E, Dinarello CA. Histamine enhances interleukin (IL)-1-induced IL-6 gene expression and protein synthesis via H₂ receptors in peripheral blood monocytes. *J. Biol. Chem.* 1994; 269:9952–9956. [PubMed: 7511596]
131. Vannier E, Dinarello CA. Histamine enhances interleukin (IL)-1-induced IL-1 gene expression and protein synthesis via H₂ receptors in peripheral blood mononuclear cells. Comparison with IL-1 receptor antagonist. *J. Clin. Invest.* 1993; 92:281–287. [PubMed: 8325995]
132. Kohka H, et al. Histamine is a potent inducer of IL-18 and IFN- γ in human peripheral blood mononuclear cells. *J. Immunol.* 2000; 164:6640–6646. [PubMed: 10843724]
133. Menez I, et al. Irreversible and specific inactivation by AH 22216 of histamine H₂ receptors in the human gastric cancer cell line HGT-1. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* 1983; 116:251–257. [PubMed: 6315003]
134. McKenna P, et al. Protein kinase C inhibits cyclic adenosine monophosphate generation by histamine and truncated glucagon like peptide 1 in the human gastric cancer cell line HGT-1. *Gut.* 1993; 34:953–957. [PubMed: 8393830]
135. Emami S, Gespach C. Pharmacology of histamine H₂ receptor antagonists in the human gastric cancer cell line HGT-1. Structure–activity relationship of isocytosine-furan and imidazole derivatives related to cimetidine. *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 1986; 35:1825–1834. [PubMed: 2872895]
136. Prost A, et al. Desensitization by histamine of H₂ receptor-mediated adenylate cyclase activation in the human gastric cancer cell line HGT-1. *FEBS Lett.* 1984; 177:227–230. [PubMed: 6094245]
137. Laboisie CL, et al. Characterization of a newly established human gastric cancer cell line HGT-1 bearing histamine H₂-receptors. *Cancer Res.* 1982; 42:1541–1548. [PubMed: 6277484]
138. Raible DG, et al. Mast cell mediators prostaglandin-D₂ and histamine activate human eosinophils. *J. Immunol.* 1992; 148:3536–3542. [PubMed: 1588043]
139. Yu, Fetal. Pharmacological characterization of oxime agonists of the histamine H₄ receptor. *J. Receptor Ligand Channel Res.* 2010; 3:37–49.
140. Ezeamuzie CI, Philips E. Histamine H₂ receptors mediate the inhibitory effect of histamine on human eosinophil degranulation. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* 2000; 131:482–488. [PubMed: 11015298]
141. Geng S, et al. Potential role of store-operated Ca²⁺ entry in Th2 response induced by histamine in human monocyte-derived dendritic cells. *Int. Immunopharmacol.* 2012; 12:358–367. [PubMed: 22212353]
142. Gantner F, et al. Histamine H₄ and H₂ receptors control histamine-induced interleukin-16 release from human CD8⁺ T cells. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2002; 303:300–307. [PubMed: 12235264]
143. Gutzmer R, et al. Histamine H₄ receptor stimulation suppresses IL-12p70 production and mediates chemotaxis in human monocyte-derived dendritic cells. *J. Immunol.* 2005; 174:5224–5232. [PubMed: 15843518]
144. Damaj BB, et al. Functional expression of H₄ histamine receptor in human natural killer cells, monocytes, and dendritic cells. *J. Immunol.* 2007; 179:7907–7915. [PubMed: 18025238]
145. Mommert S, et al. Human memory Th17 cells express a functional histamine H₄ receptor. *Am. J. Pathol.* 2012; 180:177–185. [PubMed: 22063299]
146. Fang Z, et al. Attenuated expression of HRH₄ in colorectal carcinomas: a potential influence on tumor growth and progression. *BMC Cancer.* 2011; 11:195. [PubMed: 21609450]
147. Petit-Bertron AF, et al. H₄ histamine receptors mediate cell cycle arrest in growth factor-induced murine and human hematopoietic progenitor cells. *PLoS ONE.* 2009; 4:e6504. [PubMed: 19662098]

148. Sugata Y, et al. Histamine H₄ receptor agonists have more activities than H₄ agonism in antigen-specific human T-cell responses. *Immunology*. 2007; 121:266–275. [PubMed: 17346280]
149. Cernecka H, et al. Specificity evaluation of antibodies against human β_3 -adrenoceptors. *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch. Pharmacol.* 2012; 385:875–882. [PubMed: 22688595]
150. Jositsch G, et al. Suitability of muscarinic acetylcholine receptor antibodies for immunohistochemistry evaluated on tissue sections of receptor gene-deficient mice. *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch. Pharmacol.* 2009; 379:389–395. [PubMed: 18974978]
151. Pradidarcheep W, et al. Lack of specificity of commercially available antisera against muscarinic and adrenergic receptors. *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch. Pharmacol.* 2009; 379:397–402. [PubMed: 19198807]
152. Michel MC, et al. How reliable are G-protein-coupled receptor antibodies? *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch. Pharmacol.* 2009; 379:385–388. [PubMed: 19172248]
153. Burde R, et al. Receptor-independent G protein activation may account for the stimulatory effects of first-generation H₁-receptor antagonists in HL-60 cells, basophils, and mast cells. *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 1996; 51:125–131. [PubMed: 8615880]
154. Hagelüken A, et al. Histamine receptor-dependent and/or -independent activation of guanine nucleotide-binding proteins by histamine and 2-substituted histamine derivatives in human leukemia (HL-60) and human erythroleukemia (HEL) cells. *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 1995; 49:901–914. [PubMed: 7741762]
155. Hagelüken A, et al. Cationic-amphiphilic arpromidine-derived guanidines and a histamine trifluoromethyl-toluidine derivative may activate pertussis toxin-sensitive G-proteins by a receptor-independent mechanism. *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch. Pharmacol.* 1995; 351:305–308. [PubMed: 7609785]
156. Takahashi HK, et al. Cimetidine induces interleukin-18 production through H₂-agonist activity in monocytes. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 2006; 70:450–453. [PubMed: 16723495]
157. Davies DR, Cohen GH. Interactions of protein antigens with antibodies. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 1996; 93:7–12. [PubMed: 8552677]
158. Van Regenmortel MHV. Mapping epitope structure and activity: from one-dimensional prediction to four-dimensional description of antigenic specificity. *Methods*. 1996; 9:465–472. [PubMed: 8812702]
159. Rapberger R, et al. Identification of discontinuous antigenic determinants on proteins based on shape complementarities. *J. Mol. Recognit.* 2007; 20:113–121. [PubMed: 17421048]
160. Trier NH, et al. Production and characterization of peptide antibodies. *Methods*. 2012; 56:136–144. [PubMed: 22178691]
161. Hamdani N, van der Velden J. Lack of specificity of antibodies directed against human β -adrenergic receptors. *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch. Pharmacol.* 2009; 379:403–407. [PubMed: 19156400]
162. Jensen BC, et al. Ten commercial antibodies for α_1 -adrenergic receptor subtypes are nonspecific. *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch. Pharmacol.* 2009; 379:409–412. [PubMed: 18989658]
163. Bodei S, et al. Should we be cautious on the use of commercially available antibodies to dopamine receptors? *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch. Pharmacol.* 2009; 379:413–415. [PubMed: 19096766]
164. Kobilka BK, Deupi X. Conformational complexity of G-protein-coupled receptors. *Trends Pharmacol. Sci.* 2007; 28:397–406. [PubMed: 17629961]
165. Allard B, et al. Electroporation-aided DNA immunization generates polyclonal antibodies against the native conformation of human endothelin B receptor. *DNA Cell Biol.* 2011; 30:727–737. [PubMed: 21688998]
166. Harmsen MM, De Haard HJ. Properties, production, and applications of camelid single-domain antibody fragments. *Appl. Microbiol. Biotechnol.* 2007; 77:13–22. [PubMed: 17704915]
167. Durant GJ, et al. Impromidine (SF&F 92676) is a very potent and specific agonist for histamine H₂ receptors. *Nature*. 1978; 276:403–405. [PubMed: 714166]
168. Igel P, et al. Tritium-labeled N^1 -[3-(1*H*-imidazol-4-yl)propyl]- N^2 -propionylguanidine ([³H]UR-PI294), a high-affinity histamine H₃ and H₄ receptor radioligand. *ChemMedChem*. 2009; 4:225–231. [PubMed: 19101971]

169. Eriks JC, et al. Histamine H₂-receptor agonists. Synthesis, in vitro pharmacology, and qualitative structure–activity relationships of substituted 4- and 5-(2-aminoethyl)thiazoles. *J. Med. Chem.* 1992; 35:3239–3246. [PubMed: 1507209]
170. Kraus A, et al. *N*^G-Acylated aminothiazolylpropylguanidines as potent and selective histamine H₂ receptor agonists. *ChemMedChem.* 2009; 4:232–240. [PubMed: 19072936]
171. Birnkammer T, et al. The bivalent ligand approach leads to highly potent and selective acylguanidine-type histamine H₂ receptor agonists. *J. Med. Chem.* 2012; 55:1147–1160. [PubMed: 22216892]
172. Hüls A, et al. Novel histamine H₃-receptor antagonists with benzyl ether structure or related moieties: synthesis and structure–activity relationships. *Arch. Pharm. (Weinheim).* 1996; 329:379–385. [PubMed: 8915097]
173. Gbahou F, et al. Protean agonism at histamine H₃ receptors *in vitro* and *in vivo*. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 2003; 100:11086–11091. [PubMed: 12960366]
174. Lim HD, et al. Discovery of S-(2-guanidylethyl)-isothiourea (VUF 8430) as a potent nonimidazole histamine H₄ receptor agonist. *J. Med. Chem.* 2006; 49:6650–6651. [PubMed: 17154494]
175. Smits RA, et al. Characterization of the histamine H₄ receptor binding site. Part 1. Synthesis and pharmacological evaluation of dibenzodiazepine derivatives. *J. Med. Chem.* 2006; 49:4512–4516. [PubMed: 16854056]
176. Smits RA, et al. Discovery of quinazolines as histamine H₄ receptor inverse agonists using a scaffold hopping approach. *J. Med. Chem.* 2008; 51:7855–7865. [PubMed: 19053770]
177. Liu H, et al. cis-4-(Piperazin-1-yl)-5,6,7a, 8,9,10,11,11a-octahydrobenzofuro[2,3-h]quinazolin-2-amine (A-987306), a new histamine H₄R antagonist that blocks pain responses against carrageenan-induced hyperalgesia. *J. Med. Chem.* 2008; 51:7094–7098. [PubMed: 18983139]
178. Preuss H, et al. Constitutive activity and ligand selectivity of human, guinea pig, rat, and canine histamine H₂ receptors. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2007; 321:983–995. [PubMed: 17332265]
179. Preuss H, et al. Mutations of Cys-17 and Ala-271 in the human histamine H₂ receptor determine the species selectivity of guanidine-type agonists and increase constitutive activity. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2007; 321:975–982. [PubMed: 17347323]
180. Schneider EH, et al. Impact of the DRY motif and the missing ‘ionic lock’ on constitutive activity and G-protein coupling of the human histamine H₄ receptor. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2010; 333:382–392. [PubMed: 20106995]
181. Strasser A, et al. Ligand-specific contribution of the N terminus and E2-loop to pharmacological properties of the histamine H₁-receptor. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2008; 326:783–791. [PubMed: 18577700]
182. Wittmann HJ, et al. Influence of the N-terminus and the E2-loop onto the binding kinetics of the antagonist mepyramine and the partial agonist phenoprodifen to H₁R. *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 2011; 82:1910–1918. [PubMed: 21933664]
183. Brunskole I, et al. Role of the second and third extracellular loops of the histamine H₄ receptor in receptor activation. *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch. Pharmacol.* 2011; 384:301–317. [PubMed: 21800093]
184. Seifert R, et al. Different effects of G_sα splice variants on β₂-adrenoreceptor-mediated signaling. The β₂-adrenoreceptor coupled to the long splice variant of G_sα has properties of a constitutively active receptor. *J. Biol. Chem.* 1998; 273:5109–5116.
185. Harteneck C, et al. The Drosophila cation channel trpl expressed in insect Sf9 cells is stimulated by agonists of G-protein-coupled receptors. *FEBS Lett.* 1995; 358:297–300. [PubMed: 7531160]
186. Kühn B, et al. G proteins of the G_q family couple the H₂ histamine receptor to phospholipase C. *Mol. Endocrinol.* 1996; 10:1697–1707. [PubMed: 8961278]
187. Leopoldt D, et al. G proteins endogenously expressed in Sf 9 cells: interactions with mammalian histamine receptors. *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch. Pharmacol.* 1997; 356:216–224. [PubMed: 9272728]
188. Schnell D, et al. Comparison of the pharmacological properties of human and rat histamine H₃-receptors. *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 2010; 80:1437–1449. [PubMed: 20688049]

189. Moguilevsky N, et al. Stable expression of human H₁-histamine-receptor cDNA in Chinese hamster ovary cells. Pharmacological characterisation of the protein, tissue distribution of messenger RNA and chromosomal localisation of the gene. *Eur. J. Biochem.* 1994; 224:489–495. [PubMed: 7925364]
190. Hattori Y, et al. Identification and characterization of histamine H₁- and H₂-receptors in guinea-pig left atrial membranes by [³H]-mepyramine and [³H]-tiotidine binding. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* 1991; 103:1573–1579. [PubMed: 1909203]
191. Gantz I, et al. Molecular cloning of the human histamine H₂ receptor. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* 1991; 178:1386–1392. [PubMed: 1714721]
192. Arima N, et al. Presence of histamine H₂-receptors on human gastric carcinoma cell line MKN-45 and their increase by retinoic acid treatment. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* 1991; 176:1027–1032. [PubMed: 1674864]
193. Ligneau X, et al. Distinct pharmacology of rat and human histamine H₃ receptors: role of two amino acids in the third transmembrane domain. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* 2000; 131:1247–1250. [PubMed: 11090094]
194. Gbahou F, et al. Compared pharmacology of human histamine H₃ and H₄ receptors: structure–activity relationships of histamine derivatives. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* 2006; 147:744–754. [PubMed: 16432504]
195. Xie SX, et al. Effects of impromidine- and arpromidine-derived guanidines on recombinant human and guinea pig histamine H₁ and H₂ receptors. *Arch. Pharm. (Weinheim)*. 2007; 340:9–16. [PubMed: 17206612]
196. Preuss H, et al. Point mutations in the second extracellular loop of the histamine H₂ receptor do not affect the species-selective activity of guanidine-type agonists. *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch. Pharmacol.* 2007; 376:253–264. [PubMed: 17999052]
197. Sutor S, et al. Impact of fusion to Gα_{i2} and co-expression with RGS proteins on pharmacological properties of human cannabinoid receptors CB₁R and CB₂R. *J. Pharm. Pharmacol.* 2011; 63:1043–1055. [PubMed: 21718288]
198. Schneider EH, Seifert R. Sf9 cells: a versatile model system to investigate the pharmacological properties of G protein-coupled receptors. *Pharmacol. Ther.* 2010; 128:387–418. [PubMed: 20705094]
199. Schneider EH, Seifert R. Fusion proteins as model systems for the analysis of constitutive GPCR activity. *Methods Enzymol.* 2010; 485:459–480. [PubMed: 21050932]
200. Schneider EH, Seifert R. Coexpression systems as models for the analysis of constitutive GPCR activity. *Methods Enzymol.* 2010; 485:527–557. [PubMed: 21050935]
201. Strasser A, et al. Molecular basis for the selective interaction of synthetic agonists with the human histamine H₁-receptor compared with the guinea pig H₁-receptor. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 2009; 75:454–465. [PubMed: 19047480]
202. Wittmann HJ, et al. Contribution of binding enthalpy and entropy to affinity of antagonist and agonist binding at human and guinea pig histamine H₁-receptor. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 2009; 76:25–37. [PubMed: 19346300]
203. Wagner E, et al. Mepyramine-JNJ777120-hybrid compounds show high affinity to hH₁R, but low affinity to hH₄R. *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.* 2011; 21:6274–6280. [PubMed: 21944853]
204. Ballesteros JA, Weinstein H. Analysis and refinement of criteria for predicting the structure and relative orientations of transmembrane helical domains. *Biophys. J.* 1992; 62:107–109. [PubMed: 1600090]
205. Wieland K, et al. Mutational analysis of the antagonist-binding site of the histamine H₁ receptor. *J. Biol. Chem.* 1999; 274:29994–30000. [PubMed: 10514483]
206. Leurs R, et al. Lysine200 located in the fifth transmembrane domain of the histamine H₁ receptor interacts with histamine but not with all H₁ agonists. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* 1995; 214:110–117. [PubMed: 7669031]
207. Leurs R, et al. Site-directed mutagenesis of the histamine H₁-receptor reveals a selective interaction of asparagine207 with subclasses of H₁-receptor agonists. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* 1994; 201:295–301. [PubMed: 8198587]

208. Ohta K, et al. Site-directed mutagenesis of the histamine H₁ receptor: roles of aspartic acid107, asparagine198 and threonine194. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* 1994; 203:1096–1101. [PubMed: 8093027]
209. Gantz I, et al. Molecular basis for the interaction of histamine with the histamine H₂ receptor. *J. Biol. Chem.* 1992; 267:20840–20843. [PubMed: 1356984]
210. Uveges AJ, et al. The role of transmembrane helix 5 in agonist binding to the human H₃ receptor. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2002; 301:451–458. [PubMed: 11961043]
211. Shin N, et al. Molecular modeling and site-specific mutagenesis of the histamine-binding site of the histamine H₄ receptor. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 2002; 62:38–47. [PubMed: 12065753]
212. Lim HD, et al. Phenylalanine 169 in the second extracellular loop of the human histamine H₄ receptor is responsible for the difference in agonist binding between human and mouse H₄ receptors. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* 2008; 327:88–96. [PubMed: 18635748]
213. Shimamura T, et al. Structure of the human histamine H₁ receptor complex with doxepin. *Nature.* 2011; 475:65–70. [PubMed: 21697825]
214. Cherezov V, et al. High-resolution crystal structure of an engineered human β_2 -adrenergic G protein-coupled receptor. *Science.* 2007; 318:1258–1265. [PubMed: 17962520]
215. Rasmussen SGF, et al. Structure of a nanobody-stabilized active state of the β_2 adrenoceptor. *Nature.* 2011; 469:175–180. [PubMed: 21228869]
216. Wang J, et al. Development and testing of a general amber force field. *J. Comput. Chem.* 2004; 25:1157–1174. [PubMed: 15116359]
217. Clark M, et al. Validation of the general purpose tripos 5.2 force field. *J. Comput. Chem.* 1989; 10:982–1012.

Box 1. Problems associated with the use of GPCR antibodies

Antibodies are the most widely used tools for the analysis of proteins. Since the establishment of hybridoma technology, honored by the Nobel Prize in physiology or medicine to Milstein, Köhler, and Jerne in 1984, antibodies have become most valuable for the highly specific detection of a given protein. The portion of a protein recognized by an antibody, the epitope (see Glossary), may consist of only approximately 15–20 linear amino acids of the primary structure of the protein [157]. For optimal reactivity of the antibody, the epitope-determining sequence should be of high hydrophilicity and possibly in a linear conformation [158,159]. A very well-established technique to develop specific antibodies is the immunization of animals with a carrier protein-coupled peptide composed of the amino acid sequence deduced from the protein of interest [160]. When designing such peptides, considerations such as the predicted peptide solubility, antigenicity, surface exposure, and homologies have to be taken into account. Because this method generates antibodies that typically recognize a linear peptide, a differing secondary structure in the target protein could, at worst, prevent any interaction between the antibody and the protein.

Currently, antibodies are generated against virtually every known protein, including GPCRs such as H_XR_s. Because H_XR_s do not bear extensive homologies, specifically in the extracellular and intracellular domains (see Figure 2a in main text), the identification of specific, nonhomologous sequences is not difficult. Indeed, the sequences with highest homology are located in the membrane-integral portions of the receptors (see Figure 2a in main text), and the designated epitopes are in either the extracellular or the intracellular loops. This, however, also constitutes a problem, because these loops, with the exception of the third intracellular loop, of the H_XR_s are rather short, reducing the probability of finding linear peptides with sufficient solubility and antigenicity. Nonetheless, anti-peptide antibodies using peptides comprising sequences deduced from H_XR sequences have been generated and are available, commercially or noncommercially, to the histamine research community. Because of the above-mentioned reasons, such antibodies, although they perfectly recognize the immunizing peptide, have to be carefully evaluated for their ability to recognize the holo-protein. Concerns regarding the specificity of GPCR antibodies are the subject of current discussion [52–54], going beyond H_XR_s [150,161–163]. Therefore, four different criteria, of which at least one has to be fulfilled to document the specificity of a GPCR antibody, have been published recently (Table I) [151,152]. Moreover, this issue is also of higher complexity, because the specificity of an antibody is not only determined by the antigen–antibody combination but also depends on the method used to detect the protein [149]; most basically by whether a protein is detected in its native form (e.g., by flow cytometry) or in a denatured form (e.g., by western blot). In addition, for GPCRs, there is good evidence that these receptors do not exist in a single conformation, but that their conformation changes, tightly regulated by interaction with a specific ligand [30,31,43,164]. Thus, identifying a feasible sequence for peptide antibody generation is even more difficult. A strategy to overcome these difficulties is not to use a peptide from the receptor sequence for immunization but to use the entire protein inserted in the plasma membrane (e.g., as in genomic immunization) [165]. Alternatively, the generation of GPCR-specific nanobodies in the llama may become a useful strategy to obtain truly selective GPCR antibodies [166].

In considering the above-mentioned criteria for antibody specificity, at the time being, none of the available H_XR antibodies, polyclonal or monoclonal ones, can be recommended. All antibodies that we have studied were raised as ‘anti-peptide antibodies’. If reported at all, mostly they were validated by the supplier for their

reactivity against the immunizing peptide only. This, however, as discussed above, does not prove their reactivity against the holo-protein. Also, isotype-matched antibodies are commonly used to demonstrate specificity of an antibody. However, this control only excludes unspecific binding mediated via Fc receptors, at best providing a hint for specificity, but certainly not conclusively proving it. A notable exception from this generally unsatisfying situation is the publication by Petit-Bertron *et al.* [147], who evaluated an H₄R antibody by small interfering RNA (siRNA)-mediated knockdown and applied at least one of the criteria required for antibody specificity.

Figure 1.

Structures and agonistic/antagonistic activities of selected compounds determined in the GTPase assay on human histamine receptors (hH_xRs) expressed in Sf9 insect cells. Investigations performed in Sf9 cells on the respective H_xR subtype are indicated by the color-coded filled circles. Range of agonistic (red lines) and antagonistic activities (black lines) are indicated as follows: pEC₅₀ or pK_B value >8, bold line; 6.5–8.0, thin line; 5.0–6.5, broken line; <5.0, gray broken line. Thickness of lines is based on the data shown in Table 4. Note that within the Sf9 cell system, the pharmacological profiles of several important ligands including dimaprit, amthamine, impromidine, arpromidine, JNJ777120, thioperamide, proxyfan, famotidine, and mepyramine are still incomplete. However,

completion is urgently needed because there is precedence for surprising pharmacological effects of hH_xR ligands [4,28,81]. At hH₁R and hH₂R, the endogenous ligand, histamine (1), is approximately 10 and 100 times less potent, respectively, than at hH₃R and hH₄R. Substitution in position 2 of the imidazole ring was described as a key modification to shift the selectivity of histamine towards H₁R compared with H₂R [82,83,86]. As for other known H_xR ligands, the selectivity issue was revisited after the discovery of hH₃R and hH₄R. For instance, studying recombinant hH_xRs expressed in Sf9 cells the 2-phenylhistamines (**5**, **6**) and 2-(diphenylpropyl) histamines (**2–4**) turned out to be less selective than previously assumed [4]. Compounds **2–6** also possess remarkable activities at H₄R and/or H₂R. The same holds for other amine-type agonists such as betahistamine (**7**), although to a smaller extent. (*R*)- α -Methylhistamine (**22**) and imetit (**23**) are agonists at both hH₃R and hH₄R [55,65]. 5-Methylhistamine (**10**), a molecular tool used by Black *et al.* to define H₂R [86], turned out to be more potent as an agonist at hH₄R [50,55]. The H₂R-agonistic potency of **10** may be of relevance in other species [23], in particular, when **10** is used at high concentrations. Guanidine derivatives such as impromidine (**11**) [167] and arpromidine (**12**) [77] were used as standard H₂R agonists in numerous studies. Meanwhile, imidazolylpropylguanidine moiety was identified as a structural motif also conferring high affinity to hH_xR subtypes other than hH₂R [78,168]. The selectivity profile can be shifted towards H₃R and H₄R by attaching small acyl residues at guanidine-N (**13**). Linkage of two imidazolylpropylguanidine molecules by diacyl spacer groups yielded bivalent ligands with high agonistic potency at hH₂R, hH₃R, and hH₄R. H₂R selectivity was achieved according to the same bioisosteric approach as in the case of amthamine (**9**) [169] compared with histamine: replacement of 4-imidazolyl by 2-amino-5-thiazolyl residue resulted in highly potent and subtype selective H₂R agonists (e.g., **15**) [170,171]. Starting from acylguanidines, H₄R selective agonists such as UR-PI376 [50] were obtained through replacement of guanidine by a cyanoguanidine group, which is completely uncharged at physiological pH. As also demonstrated by proxyfan (**24**) [172], a basic side chain appears to be dispensable in H₃R agonists. Proxyfan has been described to exhibit protean agonism, that is, dependent on the constitutive activity of a given system, the ligand may exhibit agonistic or inverse agonistic activity [173]. At hH₃R expressed in Sf9 cells, there is no evidence for protean agonism or functional selectivity of proxyfan when coupling to G_i/G_o proteins is considered [66]. Owing to the high degree of homology of H₃R and H₄R, numerous H₃R ligands were identified to interact with H₄R as well. Among these ligands are, for example, (*R*)- α -methylhistamine (**22**), imetit (**23**), and thioperamide (**25**) [55,65]. Moreover, H₁R antagonist mepyramine (**17**) was reported to exhibit weak H₄R antagonistic activity [4], and antidepressant or antipsychotic drugs such as imipramine (**18**) [89], clozapine (**19**) [70], and loxapine (**20**) [89] were identified as antagonists or agonists (19: H₄R agonist) at hH_xRs with highest activity at hH₁R.

Figure 2.

Alignment of human histamine receptors, hH_xRs, and models of binding sites with docked ligands. (a) Alignment of transmembrane (TM) regions and extracellular loops (ECLs) of hH_xRs. N- and C-termini, intracellular loops, and parts of ECL2 are only represented by their lengths (count of amino acids). TM residues are numbered according to Ballesteros and Weinstein [204] with no. 50 for the most conserved residue in each TM. The order is always hH₁R, hH₂R, hH₃R, hH₄R from left to right (TM) and from top to bottom (ECL), respectively. Green bars represent identical residues in all hH_xRs, yellow bars additional identities of hH₃R and hH₄R. Amino acids belonging to the ligand binding sites are in bold red if verified by *in vitro* mutagenesis (hH₁R [205–208], hH₂R [209], hH₃R [210], hH₄R

[211,212]) or bold blue if proven by X-ray structure (hH₁R [213]) or suggested by homology models (other receptor subtypes). Residues where mutants did not affect ligand binding are in italics. The vertical arrangement of the TMs is based on a horizontal line through D3.32 parallel to the membrane, resulting from comparison of the 3D structures. The identities of TM residues amount to 35.7% for hH₁R versus hH₂R, 32.4% for hH₁R versus hH₃R, 29.5% for hH₁R versus hH₄R, 31.0% for hH₂R versus hH₃R, 26.7% for hH₂R versus hH₄R, and 53.3% for hH₃R versus hH₄R. **(b–e)** Models of hH_xR binding sites with docked ligands, presented in stereo view (parallel mode). Source of the models: hH₁R – X-ray structure [213], hH₂R, hH₃R, hH₄R – X-ray structures of the inactive [214] or active [215] β₂-adrenergic receptor in the case of antagonists and agonists, respectively. The ligands were manually docked and the models in turn minimized with Amber-FF99 [216] (receptor with fixed ligand) and Tripos force field [217] (ligand and a ‘hot’ receptor region of amino acids up to 3 Å around) using the modeling suite Sybyl 8.0 (Tripos, L.P., St Louis, MO, USA). Shown are the side chains and Cα atoms of all amino acids of the binding sites as sticks and the Cα trace of the TM regions as lines. The backbone and the carbon atoms of the amino acids are individually drawn in spectral colors (cf. panel a): TM2, orange; TM3, yellow; ECL2, cyan; TM4, green; TM5, green–blue; TM6, blue; TM7, magenta. Labels correspond to the Ballesteros and Weinstein nomenclature (except ECL2 residues). The ligands are presented as ball and stick models with gray C atoms. Other ligand and receptor atom colors: nitrogen, blue; oxygen, red; sulfur, yellow; chlorine, green. (b) hH₁R in complex with imipramine. (c) hH₂R in complex with arpromidine. (d) hH₃R in complex with thioperamide. (e) hH₄R in complex with UR-PI294.

Table 1
Summary of representative publications on human cells endogenously expressing hH₁Rs^a

hH ₁ Rs studied	Biological system	Parameters determined	Most important findings	Comments	Refs
hH ₁ R	HeLa cervix carcinoma cells	Increase in [Ca ²⁺] _i [³ H]inositol phosphate accumulation, cell proliferation assays, cell migration, gene expression, phosphorylation cascades (e.g., protein kinase C, β -catenin) receptor desensitization studies	hH ₁ R couples positively to the phospholipase C-Ca ²⁺ pathway and activates protein kinase C and the β -catenin pathway. As a result, migration, proliferation, and gene expression are activated. Noncompetitive effects of H ₁ R antagonists are explained by nonequilibrium conditions.	HeLa cells are a classic and widely used cell culture model to study the pharmacology, signal transduction, and function of hH ₁ R. In this system, hH ₁ R can be studied at many different levels. The cells have been used for hH ₁ R analysis for three decades and are still popular.	[103–108]
hH ₁ R	U373 MG astrocytoma cells	Increase in [Ca ²⁺] _i [³ H]inositol phosphate accumulation, [³ H]mepyramine binding, cAMP accumulation, cell proliferation, endocytosis, and internalization	hH ₁ R couples positively to the phospholipase C-Ca ²⁺ signaling pathway and inhibits cAMP accumulation. hH ₁ R is mitogenic in U373 cells. hH ₁ R internalization can be well studied. The cells have been used as a model to predict the sedative and non-sedative properties of H ₁ R antagonists.	U373 MG cells are a classic cell culture model to study the pharmacology and signal transduction of hH ₁ R. The cells have been used for hH ₁ R analysis for more than two decades.	[109–114]
hH ₁ R	Differentiated HL-60 promyelocytes	Increase in [Ca ²⁺] _i [³ H]inositol phosphate accumulation	hH ₁ R couples positively to the phospholipase C-Ca ²⁺ signaling pathway. Effects are partially or completely mediated via G _i proteins. Coupling of hH ₁ R to G _i proteins is not commonly observed in other systems. Rather, coupling to G _q is typical. The functional role of hH ₁ R in HL-60 cells is unknown. Classic phagocyte effector functions are not activated via hH ₁ R, i.e., histamine is only an incomplete activator of these cells.	HL-60 cells have to be differentiated with dibutyl-1,2,25-dihydroxycholesterol towards monocytes to reveal good hH ₁ R responses. In undifferentiated cells, H ₁ R responses are small compared with H ₂ R responses. However, human neutrophils do not express functional hH ₁ R. HL-60 cells have been rarely used as an hH ₁ R model during the past years. A reason for this may be the fact that HL-60 cell clones are not stable and differ among various laboratories, rendering data reproduction difficult.	[25,26,36]
hH ₁ R	Human coronary artery endothelial cells (HCAECs)	FACS analysis of hH ₁ R expression with antibody, RT-PCR, [³ H]mepyramine binding, synthesis of prostaglandins and IL-6, siRNA studies	Lipopolysaccharide (LPS) enhances expression and function of hH ₁ R in HCAECs. LPS has no effect on hH ₂ R mRNA expression, but hH ₂ R antibody was not tested.	Combination of expression studies and functional studies. Specificity of commercial hH ₁ R antibody is a concern (Box 1).	[115]

hH ₂ Rs studied	Biological system	Parameters determined	Most important findings	Comments	Refs
hH ₁ R?	Pulmonary mucopidermoid carcinoma cell NCL-H292 and colon adenocarcinoma HM3-MUC2 cells	Mucin gene expression	Histamine differentially regulates gene expression in a partially fexofenadine-sensitive manner. High ligand concentrations and only partial blockade of histamine signals by fexofenadine are of concern so that off-target effects cannot be excluded.	No antagonists for other H ₂ Rs were studied. Evidence for hH ₁ R not fully convincing.	[116]
hH ₁ R?	Archived paraffin-embedded tissue specimen from patients with oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC), OSCC cell lines BICR56, and BICR3	Immunohistochemical analysis of hH ₁ R expression	Immunohistochemical reactivity with hH ₁ R antibodies is enhanced in several specimens of patients with advanced OSCC. Thus, high hH ₁ R expression is suggested to point to poorer prognosis.	Validation of hH ₁ R and hH ₂ R antibodies is a concern; nonspecific binding effects cannot be ruled out (Box 1). No functional experiments showing, e.g., increased proliferation of malignant cells in the presence of histamine were performed.	[117]
hH ₁ R, hH ₂ R	THP-1 monocytic leukemia cells	RT-PCR, TNF- α release, phagocytosis, cytotoxicity assay	2-Pyridylethylamine (classified by authors as H ₁ R agonist) and dimaprit (classified by authors as H ₂ R agonist) downregulate a key ligand for natural killer cell activation (NKG2D) via the ubiquitin-proteasome pathway.	Studies with H ₂ R antagonists were not performed; hH ₄ R was not studied. Thus, contribution of individual receptors to the response remains ambiguous, specifically in light of the fact that these cells were also reported to express hH ₄ R.	[118]
hH ₁ R, hH ₂ R?	Monocytes, monocyte-derived macrophages (MDMs), and dendritic cells (DCs)	RT-PCR, FACS and western blot analysis of hH ₁ R expression with antibody, increase in [Ca ²⁺] _i , IL-8 release	No evidence for functional expression of hH ₁ R in monocytes. However, in MDMs, hH ₁ R increases [Ca ²⁺] _i and stimulates IL-8 release. hH ₂ R is present at mRNA level but apparently with no functional role.	Validation of commercial hH ₁ R antibodies is a concern; nonspecific binding effects cannot be ruled out. Bands in western blots do not have the appearance of glycosylated proteins. Control western blots with recombinant hH ₂ Rs would have been useful to assess band appearance and occurrence of possible dimers and atypically migrating receptors (Box 1 and Table 1).	[119]
hH ₂ R, (hH ₁ R)	HL-60 promyelocytes	cAMP accumulation, increase in [Ca ²⁺] _i , myeloid (neutrophilic) differentiation	hH ₂ R mediates both increases in cAMP and [Ca ²⁺] _i . In promyelocytes and retinoic acid-differentiated cells, a minor component of the increase in [Ca ²⁺] _i is hH ₁ R-mediated. There is evidence for functional selectivity of hH ₂ R in this system. In promyelocytes, H ₂ R activation induces functional and morphological differentiation.	HL-60 cells are a classic cell culture model system for hH ₂ R analysis. However, results regarding hH ₂ R expression and function with different differentiation procedures vary between laboratories, probably due to cell clone variability.	[35,36,42, 120–122]

hH ₃ Rs studied	Biological system	Parameters determined	Most important findings	Comments	Refs
hH ₁ R, hH ₂ R, hH ₃ R?	Monocyte-derived DCs	Detection of hH ₃ Rs by RT-PCR, increase in [Ca ²⁺] _i , actin polymerization, chemotaxis, IL-10 and IL-12 secretion, cAMP accumulation	Histamine differentially regulates various functional parameters during DC maturation. In immature cells, increases in [Ca ²⁺] _i , actin polymerization, and chemotaxis are seen. In mature cells, cAMP increases and modulation of interleukin release are observed.	H ₃ R is claimed to be functionally expressed, but selective H ₄ R antagonists were not studied, only the dual H ₃ R/H ₄ R antagonist thioperamide. Concentrations of R- α -methylhistamine and betahistidine in the calcium assay are very high so that specificity of effects is a concern. Expression of hH ₃ R in blood cells is highly unlikely. Probably, hH ₄ R is present but RT-PCR for hH ₄ R was not performed.	[123]
hH ₁ R, hH ₂ R?	CD4 ⁺ cells, CD8 ⁺ cells, peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) from healthy subjects and patients with allergic asthma or rhinitis	FACS analysis of hH ₁ R and hH ₂ R expression with antibody, IL-4, IL-13, and IFN- γ secretion	House dust mite, one of the most important allergens, supposedly increases hH ₁ R expression in patients with allergic asthma and rhinitis. In patients with rhinitis, the H ₁ R mediates an increase in Th2 cytokine production via the H ₁ R, whereas in control subjects and patients with asthma, histamine exerts an inhibitory effect on cytokine production, most likely via the H ₂ R.	Specificity of commercial hH ₁ R and hH ₂ R antibodies is a concern; nonspecific binding effects cannot be ruled out (Box 1). Substantial interindividual variability in cytokine responses.	[124]
hH ₁ R, hH ₂ R?, hH ₄ R?	Bone marrow stromal cells (BMSCs) from healthy volunteers	Immunofluorescence staining with hH ₁ R antibodies, RT-PCR analysis of hH ₃ R expression, IL-6 secretion, neutrophil function assays	Histamine stimulates IL-6 production via hH ₁ R and exhibits antiapoptotic effects in neutrophils. No evidence for functional role of hH ₂ R and hH ₄ R.	Specificity of commercial hH ₁ R and hH ₂ R antibodies is a concern; nonspecific binding effects cannot be ruled out (Box 1). Subcellular localization of immunostaining of hH ₃ Rs apparently not confined to plasma membrane.	[125]
hH ₁ R?, hH ₂ R?	Formalin-fixed tissue from patients with complicated sigmoid diverticulitis	Immunohistochemical analysis of hH ₁ R and hH ₂ R expression, immunodetection of histamine	Complicated diverticulitis is associated with increased immunoreactivity against hH ₁ R, hH ₂ R, and histamine.	Specificity of commercial hH ₁ R and hH ₂ R antibodies is a concern; nonspecific binding effects cannot be ruled out (Box 1). Histamine would be expected to be washed out by the staining procedure, also pointing to methodological problems.	[126]
hH ₂ R	Neutrophils	cAMP accumulation, superoxide (O ₂ ⁻) formation, lysosomal enzyme release	hH ₂ R mediates inhibition of formyl peptide-stimulated O ₂ ⁻ formation and lysosomal enzyme release. In bronchial asthma, hH ₂ R function is decreased and may contribute to inflammation. There is evidence for functional selectivity of hH ₂ R. It is discussed	The human neutrophil is a classic model system for the analysis of hH ₂ R. Large numbers of cells can be easily obtained from peripheral blood or buffy coat preparations. There is no evidence for functionally active hH ₁ R and hH ₄ R in human neutrophils. Early clinical	[11,12,32, 34,127–129]

hH ₂ Rs studied	Biological system	Parameters determined	Most important findings	Comments	Refs
			whether or not H ₂ R responses are cAMP-mediated.	studies on changes in H ₂ R function in asthma were not followed up.	
hH ₂ R	U937 promonocytes	cAMP accumulation, cAMP export via MR P4, [³ H]thiotidine binding, c-fos gene expression, monocytic differentiation	hH ₂ R induces robust cAMP accumulation and monocytic differentiation. Because of the robust responses, the cells have been used to study receptor models and desensitization in a native system.	U937 cells serve as a classic model system for M4/M5 AML in which histamine is used as an orphan drug for remission therapy.	[37-42]
hH ₂ R	M4/M5 AML cells	Analysis of hH ₂ R expression with antibody in FACS, reactive oxygen species (ROS) formation, apoptosis of natural killer cells	In M4/M5 cells, hH ₂ R inhibits ROS formation and, thereby, promotes survival of natural killer cells which then destroy tumor cells. This mechanism is suggested to contribute to the clinical effects of histamine in AML. Substantial inter-individual differences in ROS formation responses are noted.	Validation of commercial hH ₂ R antibody is a concern, and nonspecific binding effects cannot be ruled out (Box 1). Probably, owing to limited availability of AML cells for functional experiments, hH ₂ R in these cells has so far only been characterized to a very small extent. However, this is a very promising model for translational research. AML is the only disease in which histamine has been used as a drug.	[13, 14]
hH ₂ R	PBMCs	Accumulation of mRNA for IL-1 and IL-6 and synthesis of interleukins	Histamine stimulates IL-1- and IL-6 expression in a cimetidine- but not diphenhydramine-sensitive manner, indicating H ₂ R involvement.	The precise cell type mediating the histamine response was not defined. At the time when the study was performed, hH ₄ R was not yet known, but the studies provide no evidence for H ₄ R involvement as the inhibition by cimetidine is complete.	[130, 131]
hH ₂ R	PBMCs	Production of IL-18, IFN- γ , IL-2, and IL-10	Histamine activates production of IL-18 and IFN- γ and inhibits production of IL-2 and IL-10 in a H ₂ R antagonist sensitive manner. Chlorpheniramine and thioperamide are without effect, ruling out hH ₁ R, hH ₃ R and hH ₄ R involvement.	Dimaprit and 5-methylhistamine mimic the effects of histamine. This is a classic study showing that 5-methylhistamine cannot be considered as selective H ₄ R agonist but is also a potent H ₂ R agonist.	[132]
hH ₂ R	HGT-1 gastric cancer cells	cAMP accumulation, adenylyl cyclase activity in membranes	hH ₂ R increases cAMP in intact cells and activates adenylyl cyclase in membranes. The cells have been extensively used to characterize hH ₂ R antagonists and hH ₂ R desensitization.	Since the early 1990s, the cell line has not been used very much anymore for hH ₂ R analysis. However, it cannot be excluded that the cells are useful for analysis of functional selectivity if hH ₂ R, like in other cells such as HL-60 cells, also activates other signaling pathways. This remains to be studied.	[133-137]

hH ₁ Rs studied	Biological system	Parameters determined	Most important findings	Comments	Refs
hH ₂ R, hH ₄ R	Eosinophils	Increase in [Ca ²⁺] _i , chemotaxis, cAMP accumulation, superoxide anion (O ₂ ⁻) formation, cell shape change, adhesion molecule regulation, actin polymerization, eosinophil peroxidase (EPO) release	hH ₄ R induces only incomplete eosinophil activation compared with other activators such as eotaxin, i.e., there are only moderate increases in [Ca ²⁺] _i and no O ₂ ⁻ formation and EPO release. hH ₂ R inhibits chemotaxis, EPO release, and O ₂ ⁻ formation. There is evidence for functional selectivity of hH ₂ R and hH ₄ R.	Purity of eosinophil preparations varies considerably in various studies. Eosinophils are very difficult to obtain in large numbers and high purity from healthy volunteers. Nonetheless, eosinophils are the best-studied human cell system for hH ₄ R. Despite some data variability, the presence of hH ₄ R in eosinophils has been confirmed by several groups. We have been unable to purify viable eosinophils from buffy coat preparations so that the low number of available cells constitutes a major obstacle for extensive pharmacological studies.	[32,33, 45–48, 138–140]
hH ₁ R, hH ₄ R	DCs (obtained by differentiation with GM-CSF and IL-4)	Increase in [Ca ²⁺] _i , CD86 expression, polarization of naïve CD4 ⁺ cells to TH2 cells	Histamine increases [Ca ²⁺] _i , and CD86 expression in DCs and TH2 polarization both via H ₁ R and H ₄ R as assessed by the inhibitory effects of nepyramine and JNJ777120.	The effects of histamine on [Ca ²⁺] _i is mediated both via Ca ²⁺ mobilization from intracellular stores and Ca ²⁺ influx from the extracellular space via store-operated Ca ²⁺ entry that is inhibited by imidazole SK&F 96365.	[141]
hH ₂ R, hH ₄ R	CD8 ⁺ T cells	Analysis of hH ₄ R expression by RT-PCR, IL-6 secretion	Histamine inhibits IL-6 release in a partially thiopentamide- and cimetidine-sensitive manner. (R)-α-Methylhistamine, dimaprit, and clobenpropit mimic the effects of histamine. At a concentration of 10 μM, all ligands are equipotent, but they differ from each other in potency. Pertussis toxin partially inhibits the effects of histamine, (R)-α-methylhistamine, and clobenpropit but not of dimaprit.	The study provides complete concentration–response curves for relevant H ₄ R agonists and antagonists. The study shows that selective H ₄ R ligands were not yet available, a comprehensive characterization of H ₄ R subtypes could be accomplished. The effect of pertussis toxin points to the involvement of G _i proteins in the signaling pathway of H ₄ R.	[142]
hH ₂ R, hH ₄ R, hH ₃ R?	Monocyte-derived DCs (obtained by incubation with GM-CSF and IL-4)	Analysis of xH ₄ R expression with RT-PCR and BODIPY-FL-histamine FACS analysis, cAMP accumulation, IL-12p70 production, AP-1 transcription factor activation, actin polymerization, chemotaxis	Activation of hH ₂ R increases cAMP formation and decreases IL-12p70 production. Clobenpropit inhibits IL-12p70 production in a partially JNJ777120-sensitive manner, pointing to H ₄ R involvement. The H ₄ R signaling pathway remains unclear and does not involve cAMP, Ca ²⁺ , or ERK activation. The paper also discusses controversies in the literature	FACS analysis with BODIPY-FL-histamine is ambiguous because high concentrations of the fluorescent ligand and competing nonfluorescent ligands were used, and because the ligands used have considerable affinities for various hH ₄ Rs. Suitability of BODIPY-FL-histamine as fluorescent ligand for hH ₄ Rs remains to be validated. Functional experiments are not easy to interpret with respect to differentiation between H ₃ R and	[143]

hH ₄ R _s studied	Biological system	Parameters determined	Most important findings	Comments	Refs
hH ₄ R	TH2 cells	Analysis of hH ₄ R expression by RT-PCR and FACS with antibody, activation of transcription factor AP-1, expression of IL-31 mRNA	regarding the function of H ₄ R in monocytes and monocyte-derived DCs. Heterogeneity in cell culture conditions in various studies could account for discrepancies.	H ₄ R. The authors encountered difficulties with the use of commercial antibodies against H ₃ R and H ₄ R in western blot and FACS experiments and, therefore, did not include data with these tools into their paper (Box 1).	
hH ₄ R	TH2 cells	Analysis of hH ₄ R expression by RT-PCR and FACS with antibody, activation of transcription factor AP-1, expression of IL-31 mRNA	Histamine, 5-methylhistamine, and clobenpropit (10 μM each) activate AP-1 in a JNJ777120-sensitive manner. Histamine and 5-methylhistamine also increase IL-31 mRNA. In some assays, clobenpropit and 5-methylhistamine far exceed the effects of histamine.	Specificity of the commercial hH ₄ R antibody is a concern; nonspecific binding effects cannot be ruled out (Box 1). Other hH ₄ R _s cannot be ruled out because antagonists for H ₁ R and H ₂ R were not studied. The molecular basis for the 'superagonism' of clobenpropit and 5-methylhistamine in some assays remains to be determined. It could reflect that histamine but not the former ligands also activate inhibitory hH ₄ R _s . Accordingly, H ₁ R and/or H ₂ R antagonists should enhance the effect of histamine. This remains to be studied.	[87]
hH ₄ R	Natural killer cells	Analysis of hH ₄ R expression with antibodies by FACS, chemotaxis, increase in [Ca ²⁺] _i , and cytotoxicity assays	Histamine induces chemotaxis in a thioperamide-sensitive manner, but does not increase [Ca ²⁺] _i or induce cytotoxicity. Lack of effect of histamine on [Ca ²⁺] _i in the case of H ₄ R involvement is rather unexpected. In fact, Ca ²⁺ is a classic intracellular mediator of hH ₄ R effects. The basis for this striking negative result remains to be determined as holds for the actual signal mediating activation of chemotaxis.	Specificity of commercial antibodies is a concern (Box 1). The lack of effects of histamine on [Ca ²⁺] _i indicates that calcium is not an essential signal for activation of chemotaxis. Other hH ₄ R _s cannot be ruled out because H ₁ R and H ₂ R antagonists were not studied. The study also examined monocytes and dendritic cells. In these cells, chemotaxis was induced as well, but a Ca ²⁺ influx was only seen in dendritic cells.	[144]
hH ₄ R	TH17 cells	Analysis of hH ₄ R expression by RT-PCR, FACS with antibody and immunohistochemistry, IL-17 production (mRNA and secretion), activation of transcription factor AP-1	Histamine and 5-methylhistamine (10 μM each) induce IL-17 mRNA production, IL-17 secretion, and AP-1 activation. The effects of histamine on IL-17 mRNA (and to a lesser extent on IL-17 secretion) are inhibited by JNJ777120. H ₁ R and H ₂ R antagonists are not inhibitory.	Specificity of the commercial hH ₄ R antibody is of concern; nonspecific binding effects cannot be ruled out (Box 1). Large variability between various experiments is noted too. hH ₄ R may enhance the inflammatory response in psoriasis via Th17 cells.	[145]
hH ₄ R?	Colorectal carcinoma and adjacent control tissue	Analysis of hH ₄ R expression by western blotting,	Decreased signals in western blot, immunohistochemistry, and RT-	Specificity of commercial hH ₄ R antibodies is a concern; nonspecific binding effects cannot be ruled out	[146]

hH _x Rs studied	Biological system	Parameters determined	Most important findings	Comments	Refs
hH ₄ R?	CD34-positive umbilical cord hematopoietic progenitor cells	immunohistochemistry, and RT-PCR	PCR signals in colorectal carcinoma.	(Box 1). Molecular mass and specificity of immunoreactive bands in western blot remain to be clarified.	
		Analysis of hH ₄ R expression with antibody in FACS, cell cycle analysis	Inhibitory effect of clobenpropit at a single concentration (10 µM) on cell proliferation; data for JNJ777120 not shown.	Specificity of commercial hH ₄ R antibody is a concern; nonspecific binding effects cannot be ruled out (Box 1). However, some effort was undertaken to document specificity of the antibody. Pharmacological characterization of hH ₄ R is very preliminary, probably due to the limited availability of umbilical cord progenitor cells. Involvement of other hH ₄ Rs cannot be excluded.	[147]
Unknown H _x R?, off-target? (other GPCR or non-GPCR target)	PBMCs	Inhibition of IFN-γ release in the presence of a Mycobacterium tuberculosis protein	Histamine, dimaprit, clobenpropit, and clozapine (100 µM each) inhibit IFN-γ release in the presence of a combination of chlorpheniramine + famotidine + thioripamide. These data indicate that known hH _x Rs are not involved in the response.	The data are difficult to interpret. The concentrations of histamine, dimaprit, clobenpropit, and clozapine used are very high so that off-target effects of these ligands cannot be ruled out. It is important to assess the effects of hH _x R antagonists in the presence of histamine, dimaprit, clobenpropit, and clozapine at low micromolar concentrations.	[148]

^aTable 1 summarizes representative studies on hH_xRs in native systems. Some data on hH_xRs expressed in mammalian cells, with special emphasis on pharmacological key parameters are presented in Table 2, and a comprehensive analysis of hH_xRs expressed in Sf9 insect cells is presented in Tables 3 and 4. The aim of Table 1 is to summarize key properties and unresolved problems of native hH_xR systems ranging from cell culture systems to isolated blood cells and human tissues. Studies with blood cells and tissues have become a focus of recent research and often entail the extensive use of antibodies [13,51,117,119,124–126,87,144–147]. However, the proper use of antibodies against biogenic amine GPCRs in general and hH_xR antibodies in particular is not trivial and requires extensive and rigorous validation of antibody quality [52–54,149–152]. Hence, caution must be exerted when interpreting studies with hH_xR antibodies (for more details, see Box 1). The best approach to study hH_xRs in native human cells and tissues is to combine well-validated antibodies fulfilling all of the criteria listed in Box 1, RT-PCR studies, and extensive pharmacological studies that entail complete concentration–response curves for multiple ligands and not only single concentrations of supposedly hH_xR-selective ligands. It should also be kept in mind that mRNA expression studies involving RT-PCR are prone to false-positive results due to the presence of contaminating mRNA from other cells than the cells of particular interest. Table 1 does not list all studies on hH_xRs in native human systems but rather provides representative research of various groups across basic and clinical science disciplines. An emerging field is the analysis of hH_xRs in human diseases [13,117,124,146]. There are only a few systems in which a single hH_xR is expressed functionally, for example, HeLa cells, U373 cells, human neutrophils, and HGT-1 cells. In most cells, multiple hH_xRs are expressed, complicating analysis, specifically because of the overlap in pharmacology (Figure 1 and Table 4). Specifically, the use of agonists can be fairly ambiguous (Figure 1). The use of first-generation H₁R antagonists at reasonably low concentrations (up to 1–10 µM), a potent H₂R antagonist such as famotidine or tiotidine (up to 1–10 µM), and the use of dual H₃/H₄R antagonist thioripamide (up to 1–10 µM), and H₄R antagonist JNJ777120 (up to 1–10 µM), all being commercially available, is the best approach to assign hH_xR subtypes to specific signaling pathways and cell functions. Table 1 lists studies covering receptor pharmacology, signaling pathways, cell functions, and diseases. The signaling pathways of hH₁R and hH₂R are well defined, although new details are still emerging, specifically for hH₁R [107]. In case of hH₄R, there are still several unresolved and controversial issues with respect to signaling pathways [143,144]. With regard to expression and functions of hH_xRs in PBMCs and cell populations derived therefrom, there is substantial controversy [119,123,124,130–132,141–143,87,144,145]. This is, at least in part, due to the use of different cell populations, their purity and the different activation states of the cells. Also, the presence of multiple hH_xRs in these cells renders analysis difficult. The situation regarding PBMCs is further complicated because in some studies, expression of hH₃R has been

postulated [123,143]. However, one should keep in mind that hH₃R and hH₄R are pharmacologically similar [16,18,20] (Figure 1 and Table 4). Although well-defined native human cell systems for hH₁R, hH₂R, and hH₄R are available, this is not the case for hH₃R. In some cases, specifically when data for a given cell system are coherent, multiple papers were summarized in one entry. However, in other cases, it was more appropriate to discuss papers individually. Some limitations of papers include unavailability of tools or limited knowledge about specificity of pharmacological and immunological tools at the time of study performance. We hope that Table 1 will assist future studies in the hH_XR field to use the available pharmacological and immunological tools critically and to be aware of potential pitfalls. With respect to hH_XR ligands, one should always aim at constructing complete concentration–response curves for multiple ligands and check agonist effects with appropriate antagonists. High ligand concentrations (10 μ M or higher) should be generally avoided, specifically in the case of lipophilic ligands. Such ligands are prone to off-target effects. Off-target effects have been observed for several hH_XR ligands at high concentrations including clozapine, clobenpropit, first-generation H₁R antagonists, guanidine-type H₂R agonists, and phenylhistamines [27,148,153–155]. A further complication in the pharmacological analysis of hH_XRs in native systems is functional selectivity, that is, potencies and efficacies of ligands may be parameter-dependent [32–36]. Even for ligands that are exceedingly well characterized in the literature such as H₂R antagonist cimetidine, surprising findings can be obtained. Specifically, this compound behaves as a partial agonist in human monocytes and dendritic cells with respect to IL-18 production [156]. Accordingly, it is also very important to examine even ‘inactive’ control compounds such as classic H_XR antagonists by themselves in native cells.

Table 2
Pharmacological properties of ligands at hH_xRs expressed in mammalian expression systems^a

Compound	Structure		pK _i	Expression system	Radioligand for competition binding assay	Refs
1, histamine		hH ₁ R	4.2		[³ H]Mepyramine	[55]
		hH ₂ R	4.3		[³ H]Iodoaminopotentidine	
		hH ₃ R	8.0	Transfected SK-N-MC cells		
		hH ₄ R	7.8			
27, diphenhydramine		hH ₁ R	7.9			[18]
		hH ₂ R	<5			
		hH ₃ R	<5			
		hH ₄ R	<5			
28, ranitidine		hH ₁ R	<4			[18]
		hH ₂ R	7.1			
		hH ₃ R	<5			
		hH ₄ R	<5			
29, cimetidine		hH ₁ R	<5			[18]
		hH ₂ R	6.2			
		hH ₃ R	<5			
		hH ₄ R	<5			
24, proxyfan		hH ₁ R	n.d.			[55]
		hH ₂ R	n.d.			
		hH ₃ R	7.9	Transfected SK-N-MC cells	[³ H]N ^α -Methylhistamine	
		hH ₄ R	7.3		[³ H]Histamine	
30, VUF8430		hH ₁ R	<4	Transfected COS-7 cells	[³ H]Mepyramine	[174]
		hH ₂ R	<4	Transfected CHO cells	[³ H]Iodoaminopotentidine	

Compound	Structure		p <i>K</i> _i	Expression system	Radioligand for competition binding assay	Refs
25, thioperamide		hH ₃ R	6.0	Stably transfected SK-N-MC cells	[³ H]N ^α -Methylhistamine	[18]
		hH ₄ R	7.5		[³ H]Histamine	
		hH ₁ R	<5			
		hH ₂ R	<4			
		hH ₃ R	7.3			
31		hH ₁ R	8.11	Transiently transfected COS-7 cells	[³ H]Mepyramine	[175]
		hH ₂ R	5.05		[³ H]Iodoaminopotentidine	
		hH ₃ R	5.04	Transfected SK-N-MC cells	[³ H]N ^α -Methylhistamine	
		hH ₄ R	7.55		[³ H]Histamine	
32		hH ₁ R	7.70		[³ H]Mepyramine	[176]
		hH ₂ R	n.d.	–	–	
		hH ₃ R	n.d.	–	–	
		hH ₄ R	8.12	Transiently transfected HEK293T cells	[³ H]Histamine	
33		hH ₁ R	5.45			[177]
		hH ₂ R	<5.04			
		hH ₃ R	6.03			
		hH ₄ R	8.24	Transiently transfected HEK293T cells	[³ H]Histamine	

Compound	Structure		p <i>K</i> _i	Expression system	Radioligand for competition binding assay	Refs
26		hH₁R	6.01 (<i>n</i> = 1), >5 ^b	<i>b</i> _T Transfected SK-N-MC cells	<i>b</i> [³ H]Mepyramine	
		hH₂R	5.07 (<i>n</i> = 1)	<i>b</i> _T Transfected CHO cells		<i>b</i> [18]
		hH₃R	5.65, 5.29 ^b	Transiently transfected HEK293T cells,	<i>b</i> [³ H]N ^ε -Methylhistamine	[177]
		hH₄R	7.92, 8.39 ^b	<i>b</i> _T Transfected SK-N-MC cells	<i>b</i> [³ H]Histamine	
34		hH₁R	<5	Transfected SK-N-MC cells	[³ H]Mepyramine	[139]
		hH₂R	<6	Transfected CHO cells	[³ H]iodoaminopotentidine	
		hH₃R	<5	Transfected SK-N-MC cells	[³ H]N ^ε -Methylhistamine	
		hH₄R	7.51	MC cells	[³ H]Histamine (10 nM)	

^aTable 2 summarizes the pharmacological profiles of selected ligands at hH_XR_s expressed in mammalian cells. The basis of the comparisons includes radioligand competition binding studies. In this assay, no assessment of ligand efficacies and potencies can be made. It is not trivial to compare potencies and efficacies of ligands in functional assays when mammalian expression systems are considered because the parameters determined for the various receptors are often very different, for example, gene reporter assays versus second messenger accumulation or coupling to a cognate G protein versus coupling to a chimeric G protein [55,58,60,63,69–71]. Also, stoichiometry of signaling components constitutes an issue in determining potencies and efficacies in functional assays [68,89,178]. These problems are addressed in the Sf9 insect cell system, using an identical parameter for all hH_XR_s (Tables 3 and 4), although even in this system caution has to be exerted in comparisons [89]. Both in the mammalian expression systems and the Sf9 expression system, pharmacological characterization of ligands at hH_XR_s is still incomplete.

^bAll data labeled with b were reported in Ref. [18].

Table 3

Summary of the most important properties of hH₃R_s expressed in Sf9 cells^a

Parameter	hH ₁ R	hH ₂ R	hH ₃ R	hH ₄ R
Most sensitive system(s)	hH ₁ R + RGS4/GAIP + insect cell Gα _q [28]	hH ₂ R-Gsα _s fusion protein [74]	hH ₃ R + Gα _{i2} + Gβ _{1/2} [66,98]	S1 ^b ; hH ₄ R + Gα _{i2} + Gβ _{1/2} [65] S2 ^b hH ₄ R – GAIP + Gα _{i2} + Gβ _{1/2} [76,168]
High-affinity agonist binding	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
GTPγS binding	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Steady-state GTPase	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Effector regulation	No	AC ^b ↑	No	No
Constitutive activity	Low (steady-state GTPase assay)	Low (steady-state GTPase assay and [³⁵ S]GTPγS binding) High in AC assay	High (steady-state GTPase assay)	High (steady-state GTPase assay and [³⁵ S]GTPγS binding)
Regulation by Na⁺	Not determined in Sf9 cells	Not determined in Sf9 cells	Yes, dependent on the coexpressed Gα subunit [98]	No: S1 [65], S2 [76]
Radioligands	<i>Antagonist</i> : [³ H]mepyramine $K_d = 4.49 \pm 0.35$ nM [28] $B_{max} = 5.85 \pm 1.67$ pmol/mg [28] nonspecific binding: 10–15% (5 nM) [89]	<i>Antagonist</i> : [³ H]tiotidine $K_d = 32.0 \pm 4.6$ nM [74] $B_{max} = 0.43 \pm 0.02$ pmol/mg [74] nonspecific binding: 50–60% (20 nM) [89]	<i>Agonist</i> : [³ H]N ⁶ -methylhistamine $K_d = 0.60 \pm 0.07$ nM [98] $B_{max} = 0.62 \pm 0.02$ pmol/mg [98] nonspecific binding: 20–30% (3 nM) [89]	<i>Agonist</i> : [³ H]histamine [65] (S1) $K_d = 9.7 \pm 1.7$ [65] (S1) $B_{max} = 1.6 \pm 0.3$ pmol/mg [65] (S1) nonspecific binding: 30% (10 nM) [89] <i>Agonist</i> : [³ H]UR-PI294 [168] (S2) $K_d = 5.1 \pm 1.9$ nM [168] (S2) $B_{max} = 2.0 \pm 0.1$ pmol/mg [168] (S2) nonspecific binding: 5–10% (5 nM) [168]
All binding assays were performed with GF/C filters. In the case of hH ₃ R and hH ₄ R binding assays, the filters were pretreated with 0.3% (m/v) polyethyleneimine solution				
Evidence for ligand-specific receptor conformations (examples)	Yes N ⁶ -Acylated imidazolypropylguanidines, but not guanidines, stabilize a partially active state of hH ₁ R [79]	Yes Apromidine-derived guanidines and N ⁶ -acylated imidazolypropylguanidines show substantial differences in ternary complex formation and guanine nucleotide sensitivity of ternary complex formation relative to GTPase activation [74,79]	No No ligand-specific conformations detected for proxifan and other imidazole compounds [66]	Yes Discrepancies between potency in the GTPase assay and affinity in competition binding observed, e.g., for astemizole and dimerc histaprodifen [4]
Summary of mutagenesis studies	Phe ¹⁵³ and Ile ⁴³³ : critical for proper folding	• Ala ²⁷¹ (hH ₂ R) and Asp ²⁷¹ (gphH ₂ R) are responsible for	Asp80 ^{2,50} is a key residue for hH ₃ R-mediated Gα _{i3} activation. Charge-	• hH ₄ R-R3.50 Mutant represents an inactive

Parameter	hH ₁ R	hH ₂ R	hH ₃ R	hH ₄ R
	and expression of hH ₁ R [28]	species differences in potency of guanidines [74,179] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> H-bond between Tyr¹⁷ and Asp²⁷¹ (not present in hH₂R) stabilizes active gpH₂R receptor conformation [179] 	neutralizing mutation to Asn reduces hH ₃ R/G protein interaction [98]	state with increased inverse agonist and reduced agonist affinity, showing that R 3.50 is crucial for hH ₄ R-G protein coupling [180] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> hH₄R-A6.30E mutant did not show a significant reduction of constitutive activity and G protein coupling efficiency, suggesting limited applicability of the traditional 'tonic lock' model [180]
Summary of chimeric studies	Exchange of hH ₁ R E2 loop plus N terminus against the corresponding gpH ₁ R sequence ligand specifically influence H ₁ R pharmacology. Increased similarity of hH ₁ R mutants with gpH ₁ R was not reflected by pK _i and pEC ₅₀ values of phenoprodifens [181] The mutant receptors show an alteration of extracellular receptor surface, which changes ligand binding kinetics and affinity [182]	Chimeras of N-terminal half of hH ₂ R or gpH ₂ R and C-terminal half of gpH ₂ R or hH ₂ R, fused to Gsα ₈ confirm the role of position 271 for the pharmacological differences between hH ₂ R and gpH ₂ R [74]	No chimeric studies in Sf9 cells performed	The hH ₄ R N-terminus was replaced with the corresponding canine H ₄ R (cH ₄ R) sequence to yield h _{cNT} H ₄ R. A replacement of the hH ₄ R extracellular loops E1, E2 and E3 by the canine sequences resulted in h _{cE1} H ₄ R, h _{cE2} H ₄ R and h _{cE3} H ₄ R, respectively. Exchange of E3 reduced the potency of histamine and 5-methylhistamine (S1). Alteration of E2 or E3 reduced the efficacy of thioperamide and converted the partial inverse agonist JNJ7777120 to a partial agonist (GTPase assay, System S1), indicating a role of E2- and E3 in H ₄ R activation induced by specific ligands [183].
Structural stability	Not determined in Sf9 cells	Not determined in Sf9 cells	Not determined in Sf9 cells	Structurally unstable: 45 min incubation at 37 °C leads to a loss of ~60% of binding sites. The receptor is stabilized by histamine and

Parameter	hH ₁ R	hH ₂ R	hH ₃ R	hH ₄ R	hH ₄ R to an even larger extent by thiopramide [65]
Impact of G protein on pharmacology	Interaction of hH ₁ R with Gα _i or Gα _s not investigated in Sf9 cells; effective coupling to Sf9 cell Gα _i ; mammalian Gα _q expression in Sf9 cells failed [73]	Unlike β ₂ AR ^b [184], hH ₂ R does not show differences in constitutive activity, when fused to Gα _s or Gα _i [75]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coexpression of hH₃R and Gα_{i3} shows the highest NaCl sensitivity compared with Gα_{i1}, Gα_{i2}, or Gα_o (GTPase assays) [98] No substantial influence of G protein isoform (Gα_{i1-3} or Gα_o) on histamine stimulation or thiopramide inhibition of steady- state GTPase signals [66] Pharmacological profile of hH₃R for imidazole ligands is similar when coexpressed with Gα_{i1-3} or Gα_o [66] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> hH₄R activates Gα_{i10} proteins in the steady-state GTPase assay with the following specificity: Gα_{i2} > Gα_{i1} ~ Gα_{i3} > Gα_o. Fusion of hH₄R to GAIP increases signal-to-noise ratio without changing G protein specificity [76] A weak interaction with insect cell Gα_q is unmasked in hH₄R-GAIP fusion protein (system S2), compared with system S1 [76] 	
K_i values for prototypical ligands	Histamine 2.06 ± 0.18 μM [28] Methylhistaprodifen 0.37 ± 0.07 μM [28] Triprolidine 3.01 ± 0.54 μM [28]	Histamine Not determined Impromidine 64 nM (low affinity state) [74] Aprimidine 11 nM (high affinity state), 461 nM (low affinity state) [74]	Histamine 6.31 nM [188] ^c (R)-α-Methylhistamine 1.23 nM [188] ^c Inetit 0.63 nM [188] ^c Thiopramide 45.7 nM [188] ^c	Histamine K _i = 9.7 ± 1.7 nM [65] (S1) JNJ 7777120 32 ± 7 nM [65] (S1) Thiopramide 106 ± 21 nM [65] (S1)	
K_i values in mammalian systems (for comparison)	CHO-hH ₁ R cells, [³ H]mepyramine [189] Histamine 1.26 μM ^c Triprolidine 1.0 nM ^c	Owing to extremely high nonspecific binding (up to 60%) → [³ H]tiotidine was only rarely used in binding studies. [³ H]Trimipramine showed even higher nonspecific binding [89] Examples: membranes from left guinea pig	CHO-K1-hH ₃ R cells, [¹²⁵ I]iodoproxyfan binding [193]: Histamine 13 ± 2 nM	HEK 293-hH ₄ R cells, [³ H]histamine [194]: Histamine 4.7 ± 0.3 nM Thiopramide 43 ± 3 nM	

Parameter	hH ₁ R	hH ₂ R	hH ₃ R	hH ₄ R
		atrium [190], H ₂ R transfected Colo-320DM cells [191], or MKN-45 human gastric carcinoma cells [192]. U937-promonocytes [39] There is no comparison of H ₂ R ligand affinity with [³ H]tiotidine in mammalian systems versus Sf9 cells in the literature	(R)- α -Methylhistamine Thiopramide	SK-N-MC-hH ₄ R cells, [³ H]histamine [55] JNJ777120 15.8 nM
K_i versus K_B	K _i and K _B are very similar in most cases. Exception: K _i is 5- to 7-fold higher than K _B for BU-E-84 and Bu-E-82 [195]	No Sf9 cell data available	No Sf9 cell data available	Subset of JNJ 777120-related partial inverse agonists: large differences between K _i ([³ H]-histamine binding) and EC ₅₀ values (steady-state GTPase). K _i and K _B values are similar [96]
Impact of fusion coexpression on pharmacology	Increased steady-state GTPase signal after coexpression with RGS proteins (unmasking of hH ₁ R/insect cell G α_q interaction), RGS4 > GAIP [73]	Fusion to Gs α_s increases AC ^d activation [73], compared with coexpression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coexpression systems: large differences in hH₃R/Gα coupling stoichiometry: Gα_{o1} (1:1) > Gα_{i2} (1:6) > Gα_{i3} (1:3) > Gα_{i1} (1:2) [66] Similar pharmacological profiles of standard ligands at hH₃R-Gα_{i2} and hH₃R-Gα_{o1} fusion proteins in the GTPase assay $\rightarrow$ stoichiometry differences in the coexpression system have no impact on the pharmacological profile of hH₃R [66] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> hH₄R-GAIP fusion protein shows increased agonist signal-to-noise ratio in the GTPase assay, compared with hH₄R coexpressed with Gα_{i2} and G$\beta_1\gamma_2$ [76] hH₄R-Gα_{i2} fusion protein shows no improvement of agonist signal-to-noise ratio in the GTPase assay, compared with the coexpression system
Running behavior of receptor protein on western blots	Two glycosylation sites at the N terminus and one in the E2 loop, band appears at ~85 kDa [181] (predicted M _w ~56 kDa)	hH ₂ R-Gs α_s runs at ~80 kDa. Predicted M _w : 86 kDa (40 kDa for hH ₂ R and 46 kDa for Gs α_s). Diffuse bands indicate differently glycosylated forms [196]	The hH ₃ R band appears exactly at the predicted size of ~49 kDa. Doublets probably represent differently glycosylated forms [187]	Different glycosylation states or conformations at 43 and 46 kDa. Additional weak bands between 26 and 35 kDa may represent atypically migrating species [65] Predicted M _w : ~44.5 kDa
Additional comments advantages, and disadvantages of the system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> hH₁R cannot be reconstituted with mammalian Gα_q in Sf9 cells. RGS proteins have to be coexpressed that unmask the interaction of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fusion of hH₂R with Gsα_s increases signal intensity in AC assays, compared with coexpression systems [73] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High constitutive activity causes reduced relative intensity of agonist signals in GTPase assays [66] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High constitutive activity leads to low signal-to-noise ratio (histamine-induced relative signal in GTPase assays ~25%)

Parameter	hH ₁ R	hH ₂ R	hH ₃ R	hH ₄ R
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> hH₁R with insect cell Gα_q [73] Specifically in the case of cannabinoid CB₂R, fusion to Gα_{i2} and coexpression with RGS4 can alter the pharmacological properties of ligands [197] Effector coupling to PLC/Ca²⁺ signaling cannot be reconstituted (this is controversially discussed in the literature [73,185–187]). For more information on Gα_q coupling of hH₁R and hH₂R, cf. [73] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [³H]Tiotidine binding shows low signal-to-noise ratio, requiring high protein amounts (>200 µg) [74,75] [³H]Trimipramine showed up to 90% nonspecific binding [89] → No optimal radioligand available AC coupling of hH₂R shows only poor efficiency, because the number of AC molecules is the limiting factor and hH₂R has not yet been reconstituted with mammalian ACs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ternary complex of hH₃R is GTP7S-insensitive ([³H]M⁺-methylhistamine binding, [188]) Membranes expressing hH₃R without mammalian G proteins were not characterized in radioligand binding assays 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> G protein-independent high-affinity state precludes determination of ternary complex formation in high-affinity agonist binding [65]
	No reconstitution of effector coupling achieved for hH ₃ R and hH ₄ R in insect cells			
	Advantage of all systems: under optimized conditions, a very proximal parameter (G protein activation) can be investigated before signal amplification occurs in the signaling cascade This enables the quantification of fine differences in ligand efficacies not visible in other systems			

^a It is difficult to conduct a comprehensive pharmacological characterization of hH_XRs in native human cells (Table 1). In principle, a comparison of hH_XRs can be conducted in mammalian expression systems, radioligand competition binding being the most feasible parameter (Table 2). However, comparison of hH_XRs in mammalian cells at the functional level already becomes more difficult because the parameters and G proteins are fairly different, introducing bias into the analysis. The Sf9 cell system is suitable for the comparison of hH_XRs both at the level of radioligand competition binding and at the functional level, steady-state GTPase activity being a common parameter determined for all hH_XRs. A general discussion on the usefulness and specific advantages and disadvantages of Sf9 cells as an expression system for GPCRs and the transfer of data from this system to mammalian cells has recently been presented [198]. The purpose of Table 3 is to compare the specific properties of hH_XRs expressed in Sf9 cells. Epitope-tagged hH_XRs expressed in Sf9 cells have also been most helpful for unmasking the lack of specificity of commercial H₄R antibodies [52,54] (Box 1). Protocols of pharmacological methods that can be applied for analysis of hH_XRs expressed in Sf9 cells have recently been reviewed [199,200]. The pharmacological data for selected ligands obtained in this expression system are listed in Table 4.

^b Abbreviations: AC, adenylyl cyclase; β_2 AR, β_2 -adrenoceptor; **S1**, System 1; **S2**, System 2.

^c Calculated from the pK_i values given in this publication.

Table 4

Pharmacological properties of ligands at hH_xRs expressed in Sf9 cells in the GTPase assay and radioligand competition binding assays^a

Compound	Compound name (Refs)	hH ₁ R + RGS4				hH ₂ R–G _{αs}				hH ₃ R + G _{αi2} + G _{βiγ2}				hH ₄ R–GAIP + G _{αi2} + G _{βiγ2}			
		pEC ₅₀ (pK _B)	E _{max}	pK _i	pEC ₅₀ (pK _B)	E _{max}	pK _i	pEC ₅₀ (pK _B)	E _{max}	pK _i	pEC ₅₀ (pK _B)	E _{max}	pK _i	pEC ₅₀ (pK _B)	E _{max}	pK _i	
1	Histamine [28,64,66,74,81,183,188,196]	6.92 [64] 6.74 [28]	1.00	5.62 [64] 5.69 [28]	6.00 [64] 5.90 [74]	1.00	n.d.	7.60 [81] 7.90 [66]	1.00	8.20	7.92 [81] 7.60 [183]	1.00	7.89				
2	Histaprodifen [64,84]	6.95	0.62	6.47	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	4.44	−0.48	4.56				
3	Suprabistaprodifen [4,28,64,178]	6.62	0.84	6.33	6.24 [28] 6.62 [178]	0.39 [28] 0.54 [178]	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	5.82	0.25	5.77				
4	Phenoprodifen [28,84]	6.67	0.52	6.60	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	4.60	−0.63	4.95				
5	Phenylhistamine [4,28,201]	6.06 [28] 6.14 [201]	0.79 [28] 0.72 [201]	5.36	4.41	0.20	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	4.92	0.32	4.79				
6	2-(3-Trifluoromethylphenyl)histamine [4,28,201]	6.61 [28] 6.71 [201]	0.74 [28] 0.61 [201]	5.83	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	5.83	0.51	5.91				
7	Betahistine [4,28,74]	5.84	0.86	n.d.	4.47	0.73	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	<4	0.37	4.09				
8	Dimaprit [28,74,196]	n.d.	0.06	n.d.	5.71 [74] 6.04 [196]	0.85	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.				
9	Anthamine [28,74,196]	n.d.	0.01	n.d.	6.35 [74] 6.72 [196]	0.90 0.91	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.				
10	5-Methylhistamine [50,65,183]	4.80	0.90	n.d.	5.54	1.01	n.d.	n.d.	No agonistic activity up to a concentration of 1 mM	n.d.	7.15 [50] 7.49 [65] 7.11 [183]	0.90 [50] 0.87 [65] 1.03 [183]	7.61				
11	Impromidine [74,196]	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	6.70 [74] 6.80 [196]	0.84 [74] 0.82 [196]	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.				
12	Arpromidine [28,74,196]	(6.48)	n.d.	6.45	6.72 [74] 7.14 [196]	0.79 [74] 0.84 [196]	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.				
13	UR-PI294 [84]	5.46	0.30	n.d.	6.43	0.83	n.d.	8.80	0.39	n.d.	8.52	0.90	n.d.				
14	UR-AK381 [171]	(6.32)	n.d.	n.d.	8.21	0.81	n.d.	8.75	0.63	n.d.	8.07	0.44	n.d.				
15	UR-AK480 [171]	(6.01)	n.d.	n.d.	8.11	0.53	n.d.	(<5)	n.d.	n.d.	(<6)	n.d.	n.d.				

Compound	Compound name (Refs)	hH ₁ R + RGS4			hH ₂ R-G _{qs}			hH ₃ R + G _{α12} + G _{β12}			hH ₄ R-GAIP + G _{α12} + G _{β12}		
		pEC ₅₀ (pK _B)	E _{max}	pK _i	pEC ₅₀ (pK _B)	E _{max}	pK _i	pEC ₅₀ (pK _B)	E _{max}	pK _i	pEC ₅₀ (pK _B)	E _{max}	pK _i
16	UR-PI376 [50]	<5	0.07	4.59	<5	0.08	5.39	(6.00)	-0.28	6.28	7.47	0.93	7.24
17	Mepyramine [4,28,202]	(8.25)	n.d.	8.35	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	5.17	-0.21	<4
18	Imipramine [89]	(8.25)	-0.10	8.12	(6.10)	-0.13	6.26	<4 (pIC ₅₀)	-0.54	<4	<4	-0.78	4.62
19	Clozapine [89]	(8.36)	-0.04	8.58	(6.28)	-0.09		<4 (pIC ₅₀)	-0.49	<4	5.78	0.66	5.93
20	Loxapine [89]	(8.14)	-0.07	8.65	(5.91)	-0.10		<4 (pIC ₅₀)	-0.71	4.26	<4	Ineffective	5.06
21	Famotidine [74,178]	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	7.32 [178] 7.53 [74]	-0.10 [178] -0.07 [74]		n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
22	(R)-α-Methylhistamine [65,188]	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	8.91	6.56	0.92	n.d.
23	Imetit [65,188]	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	9.20	8.17	0.69	n.d.
24	Proxifyfan [188]	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	7.87	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
25	Thioperamide [50,65,81,183,188]	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	7.01	-0.71	7.34	6.96 [81] 7.01 [65] 6.87 [183]	-0.95 [81] -1.00 [65] -0.87 [183]	6.94
26	JNJ777120 [65,183,203]	n.d.	n.d.	4.33	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	7.42 [65] 8.25 [183]	-0.31 [65] -0.16 [183]	7.49

^aTable 4 summarizes the pharmacological data for selected hH₄R ligands at hH₄R ligands expressed in Sf9 cells. The structures of ligands are depicted in Figure 1. It should be noted that even in this system, data sets are far from complete. In some cases, the incompleteness is due to the fact that when a specific study was performed, the other relevant hH_xRs were not yet available. In other cases, data are incomplete because of the tacit assumption that data regarding receptor selectivity of ligands in standard test systems (often animal organ experiments) can be transferred to Sf9 cells. Now, we are aware of the fact that this assumption is incorrect, and we aim at completing the data sets for all ligands at all hH_xRs. In several studies, data for key ligands were reproduced to avoid making reference to 'historic data'. The data obtained from independent analyses are listed separately with the corresponding reference, and no mean values are calculated to allow an estimate of data variability over a period of up to several years. Data reproducibility is very good. Hence, the Sf9 cell system is very robust at serving as a reference system for ligand analysis at hH_xRs. By contrast, in native systems, for example, neutrophils, data variability for hH₂R characterization over a long period of time has been greater, different isolation methods of cells being one possible variable [11,12,33].

Abbreviation: n.d., not determined.

Table I

Four criteria to evaluate the specificity of an antibody

Criterion	Description
Knockout cells	Reactivity of a specific antibody, observed in wild type cells, must be lost upon analysis of cells obtained from animals genetically deficient in expression of the receptor of interest. This method, however, is not applicable to antibodies recognizing human antigens.
siRNA	Reactivity of a specific antibody must distinctly decrease after genetic knockdown of the expression of the receptor of interest.
Related GPCR subtypes	Reactivity of a specific antibody must be present when analyzing cells recombinantly expressing the receptor of interest, but must be absent when analyzing closely related receptor subtypes.
Additional antibodies	Reactivity of a specific antibody must be comparable to that of other antibodies recognizing different epitopes of the same receptor or that of an epitope-tag antibody following recombinant expression of the tagged receptor protein.