



HAL
open science

Histamine H receptor-RGS fusion proteins expressed in Sf9 insect cells: A sensitive and reliable approach for the functional characterization of histamine H receptor ligands

Erich H. Schneider, Roland Seifert

► **To cite this version:**

Erich H. Schneider, Roland Seifert. Histamine H receptor-RGS fusion proteins expressed in Sf9 insect cells: A sensitive and reliable approach for the functional characterization of histamine H receptor ligands. *Biochemical Pharmacology*, 2009, 78 (6), pp.607. 10.1016/j.bcp.2009.05.015 . hal-00506794

HAL Id: hal-00506794

<https://hal.science/hal-00506794>

Submitted on 29 Jul 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Accepted Manuscript

Title: 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

Authors: Erich H. Schneider, Roland Seifert

PII: S0006-2952(09)00406-7
DOI: doi:10.1016/j.bcp.2009.05.015
Reference: BCP 10186

To appear in: *BCP*

Received date: 6-4-2009
Revised date: 8-5-2009
Accepted date: 11-5-2009

Please cite this article as: 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, *Biochemical Pharmacology* (2008), doi:10.1016/j.bcp.2009.05.015

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

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

Erich H. Schneider^a, Roland Seifert^b

^aUniversity of Regensburg, Dept. of Pharmacology and Toxicology, Universitätsstr.
31, D-93053 Regensburg, Germany

^bInstitute of Pharmacology, Medical School of Hannover, Carl-Neuberg-Str. 1, D-30625
Hannover, Germany; e-mail: seifert.Roland@mh-hannover.de

^aTo whom correspondence should be addressed: E.S.: Dept. of Pharmacology and
Toxicology, Institute of Pharmacy, University of Regensburg, Universitätsstr. 31, D-93053
Regensburg, Germany; Phone: +49-941-4786; Fax: +49-941-4772; e-mail:
erich.schneider@chemie.uni-regensburg.de

Abstract

1
2 The human histamine H₄ receptor (hH₄R), co-expressed with G α_{i2} and G $\beta_1\gamma_2$ in Sf9 cells, is
3
4 highly constitutively active. In the steady-state GTPase assay, the full agonist histamine (HA)
5
6 induces only a relatively small signal (~20-30%), resulting in a low signal-to background
7
8 ratio. In order to improve this system for ligand screening purposes, the effects of the
9
10 regulator of G-protein signaling (RGS) proteins RGS4 and RGS19 (GAIP) were investigated.
11
12 RGS4 and GAIP were fused to the C-terminus of hH₄R or co-expressed with non-fused hH₄R,
13
14 always combined with G α_{i2} and G $\beta_1\gamma_2$. The non-fused RGS proteins did not significantly
15
16 increase the relative effect of HA. With the hH₄R-RGS4 fusion protein the absolute GTPase
17
18 activities, but not the relative HA-induced signal were increased. Fusion of hH₄R with GAIP
19
20 caused a selective increase of the HA signal, resulting in an enhanced signal-to-noise ratio. A
21
22 detailed characterization of the hH₄R-GAIP fusion protein (co-expressed with G α_{i2} and
23
24 G $\beta_1\gamma_2$) and a comparison with the data obtained for the non-fused hH₄R (co-expressed with
25
26 G α_{i2} and G $\beta_1\gamma_2$) led to the following results: (i) The relative agonist- and inverse agonist-
27
28 induced signals at hH₄R-GAIP are markedly increased. (ii) Compared to the wild-type hH₄R,
29
30 standard ligands show unaltered potencies and efficacies at hH₄R-GAIP. (iii) Like hH₄R,
31
32 hH₄R-GAIP shows high and NaCl-resistant constitutive activity. (iv) hH₄R-GAIP shows the
33
34 same G-protein selectivity profile as the non-fused hH₄R. Collectively, hH₄R-GAIP provides
35
36 a sensitive test system for the characterization of hH₄R ligands and can replace the non-fused
37
38 hH₄R in steady-state GTPase assays.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

Keywords:

54
55 histamine H₄ receptor, fusion protein, RGS protein, steady-state GTPase assay, constitutive
56
57 activity, G_i-proteins
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1. Introduction

1
2 Histamine exerts its physiological effects via binding at four different receptor
3
4 subtypes. The H₁-receptor mediates e.g. the increase of vascular permeability and NO
5
6 production associated with inflammatory and allergic reactions [1]. The H₂-receptor regulates
7
8 gastric acid secretion and shows a positive inotropic effect on the heart [1]. The presynaptic
9
10 H₃-receptor negatively modulates neurotransmitter release in the CNS [1]. The fourth HA
11
12 receptor was first pharmacologically characterized on human eosinophils [2] and was later
13
14 identified as a GPCR with 390 amino acids [3], sharing 43% overall homology with the H₃-
15
16 receptor [4].
17
18
19
20

21
22 The human histamine H₄ receptor (hH₄R) is expressed e.g. in spleen and bone marrow
23
24 [5, 6] and mediates HA-induced chemotaxis e.g. of eosinophils [7] and mast cells [8],
25
26 suggesting a role in inflammatory and immunological processes. Recently, the hH₄R was also
27
28 detected in the brain and may be involved in the regulation of central neurotransmission [9].
29
30

31
32 In animal models, H₄R antagonists were effective in the treatment of itch [10], colitis
33
34 [11] or allergic airway inflammation [12]. Since pruritus, colitis or asthma still lack a curative
35
36 or at least an optimized alleviating therapy, it is vitally important to investigate the potential
37
38 of hH₄R antagonists for the treatment of these widespread diseases. Thus, reliable test
39
40 systems are required to characterize compounds that could serve as potential candidates for
41
42 new hH₄R-antagonizing anti-inflammatory drugs. To obtain a most reliable readout of
43
44 receptor activation or inhibition, it is necessary to determine the functional signal as proximal
45
46 to the receptor activation event as possible. Assays that determine a signal more downstream
47
48 from receptor activation (e.g. adenylyl cyclase or reporter gene assays), may suffer from
49
50 unclear and complicated stoichiometry of the involved proteins or from interfering side-
51
52 processes in the signal transduction cascade. For example, it is reported for S49 cells that G-
53
54 proteins exist in stoichiometric excess compared to the effector adenylyl cyclase (AC), which
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 limits the agonist-induced stimulation of AC activity [13]. This may hamper the
2 determination of small efficacy differences between different partial agonists in AC assays.
3
4 Moreover, as reported for the hH₄R antagonist JNJ-7777120, cAMP reporter gene assays can
5 eliminate the effect of partial inverse agonists, which, in contrast, are still detectable by
6
7 steady-state GTPase assays [14].
8
9

10
11 The steady-state GTPase assay with receptors and G-proteins expressed in baculovirus-
12 infected Sf9 cells provides a reliable and sensitive test system with a very proximal readout.
13
14 In general, the steady state GTPase assay, when used as readout for G α_i -coupled receptors,
15
16 shows a higher sensitivity than cAMP accumulation- or AC assays [15]. When GPCR-G α
17
18 fusion proteins are used, steady-state GTPase assays can be performed with a defined 1:1
19
20 stoichiometry of receptor and G-protein [16].
21
22

23
24 Steady state GTPase assays with Sf9 cell membranes were successfully employed for
25
26 the investigation of the formyl peptide receptor clone 26 [17], the chemokine receptor
27
28 CXCR4 [18] or the cannabinoid receptor subtypes CB₁ and CB₂ [19]. Recently, we also
29
30 reported on the characterization of the hH₄R in Sf9 cells [14]. However, the hH₄R system
31
32 showed a very weak relative agonist-induced signal (20-30%). This resulted in a low signal-
33
34 to-noise ratio. Fusion of the hH₄R to G α_{i2} did not improve the relative intensity of the agonist-
35
36 induced signal, since it resulted in an increase of the constitutive activity in steady-state
37
38 GTPase assays [14].
39
40

41
42 An interesting possibility to increase signal intensity in steady-state GTPase assays is
43
44 the co-expression of regulators of G-protein signaling (RGS). RGS proteins form a large
45
46 group of proteins that are classified in eight subfamilies, showing high structural diversity
47
48 [20]. A common feature of all RGS proteins is the RGS-domain, which consists of 120 amino
49
50 acids and is of central importance for binding G α subunits and accelerating their GTPase
51
52 activity [20]. It has also been reported that the effect of RGS4 on the GTPase activity induced
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 by the α_{2A} adrenoceptor was enhanced by fusing the C-terminus of the GPCR to the N-
2 terminus of the RGS protein. Despite the covalent binding of the RGS protein to the receptor,
3 there was no interference with receptor-mediated activation of the G-protein [21].
4
5

6
7 In this paper we report on the co-expression of the RGS proteins RGS4 and RGS19
8 (GAIP) with hH₄R, G α_{i2} and G $\beta_1\gamma_2$ in Sf9 cells by performing quadruple infections with
9 genetically modified baculoviruses. Moreover, we adopted the approach from ref. [21] to the
10 H₄R and generated fusion proteins with RGS-4 and GAIP that were co-expressed with G α_{i2}
11 and G $\beta_1\gamma_2$.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 RGS4 belongs to the R4 sub-family of RGS-proteins and accelerates the GTPase
21 activity of G α_i [22, 23] and G α_q [24] proteins. Two conserved cysteines in the RGS4 N-
22 terminus act as potential palmitoylation sites [25]. GAIP (RGS19) belongs to the RZ sub-
23 family and interacts with members of the G α_i class, but not with G α_q [26]. Membrane-bound
24 GAIP is highly palmitoylated in its cysteine string region, containing 8 cysteines [26].
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 We chose these two RGS proteins, because they belong to the structurally simplest
33 sub-families and do not possess additional functional domains. Their stimulating effect on
34 GPCR-activated G α_q and G α_i proteins was previously demonstrated for the human H₁R [27]
35 and the chemokine receptor CXCR4 [18]. Thus, RGS4 and GAIP should be promising
36 candidates for enhancing the GTPase activity in the co-expression system of the hH₄R with
37 G α_{i2} and G $\beta_1\gamma_2$.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **2. Materials and Methods**

51 *2.1. Materials*

52 The pcDNA 3.1 plasmids containing the sequences encoding RGS-4 and GAIP were
53 obtained from the UMR cDNA Resource Center at the University of Missouri-Rolla (Rolla,
54 MO, USA). The DNA primers for PCR were synthesized by MWG Biotech (Ebersberg,
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Germany). The *Pfu* polymerase was obtained from Stratagene (La Jolla, CA, USA).
2 Restriction enzymes were purchased from New England Biolabs (Ipswich, MA, USA).
3
4 Recombinant baculovirus encoding the unmodified versions of the $G\beta_1\gamma_2$ subunits was a kind
5 gift of Dr. P Gierschik (Dept. of Pharmacology and Toxicology, University of Ulm,
6
7 Germany). Recombinant baculoviruses for $G\alpha_{i1}$, $G\alpha_{i2}$, and $G\alpha_{i3}$ were donated by Dr. A. G.
8
9 Gilman (Dept. of Pharmacology, University of Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX,
10
11 USA) and the baculovirus encoding rat $G\alpha_o$ was generously provided by Dr. J. C. Garrison
12
13 (University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA). Baculoviruses for mammalian RGS4 and GAIP
14
15 (N-terminally His-tagged) were kindly donated by Dr. E. Ross (Dept. of Pharmacology,
16
17 University of Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX, USA).
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 The anti- $G\alpha_o$ antibody was purchased from Calbiochem (San Diego, CA,
25
26 USA); the M1 anti-FLAG antibody was obtained from Sigma (St. Louis, MO, USA). The
27
28 antibody recognizing the $G\alpha_i$ subunits (anti- $G\alpha_{\text{common}}$) was generously provided by Dr. B.
29
30 Nürnberg (Institute for Pharmacology, University of Tübingen, Germany). The antibodies
31
32 selective for RGS4 and GAIP were purchased from Santa Cruz (Santa Cruz, CA, USA). The
33
34 H_4R antagonist 1-[(5-Chloro-1*H*-indol-2-yl)carbonyl]-4-methyl-piperazine (JNJ-7777120)
35
36 was kindly provided by Dr. Robin Thurmond (Department of Immunology, Johnson &
37
38 Johnson Pharmaceutical R&D, San Diego, CA, USA). Immapip, imetit, iodophenpropit, R- α -
39
40 methylhistamine, 5-methylhistamine and THIO were obtained from Tocris (Avonmouth,
41
42 Bristol, UK). HA was purchased from Sigma (St. Louis, MO, USA). The 10 mM stock
43
44 solution of JNJ-7777120 was prepared in dry Me_2SO , the stock solutions (10 mM) and
45
46 dilutions of all other H_4R agonists and antagonists described in this paper were prepared in
47
48 distilled water.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 $[^3H]HA$ (specific activities 14-18 Ci/mmol) and $[^3H]$ dihydroalprenolol (97.4 Ci/mmol)
57
58 were obtained from Perkin Elmer (Boston, MA, USA). $[\gamma\text{-}^{32}P]GTP$ was purchased from
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Perkin Elmer or was prepared in our laboratory using GDP and [32 P] (orthophosphoric acid,
2 150 mCi/ml, obtained from Perkin Elmer) according to a previously described enzymatic
3 labeling procedure [28]. MgCl₂ was purchased from Merck (Darmstadt, Germany) and Tris
4 base was obtained from usb (Cleveland, OH, USA). Radioactive samples were counted in a
5 PerkinElmer Tricarb 2800TR liquid scintillation analyzer.
6
7
8
9
10

11 2.2. Construction of pVL-1392 plasmids encoding FLAG-hH₄R-His₆, FLAG-hH₄R-His₆- 12 Gα_{i2}, FLAG-hH₄R-His₆-RGS-4 and FLAG-hH₄R-His₆-GAIP 13 14 15 16 17 18

19 The generation of FLAG-hH₄R-His₆ as well as of FLAG-hH₄R-His₆-Gα_{i2} was
20 previously described [14]. The hexahistidine tagged C-terminus of the histamine H₄ receptor
21 was fused to the N-terminus of RGS-4 or GAIP by overlap extension PCR using *Pfu*
22 polymerase as follows:
23
24
25
26
27

28 For preparation of the FLAG-hH₄R-His₆-RGS4 fusion protein, two fusion primers were
29 synthesized. The sense primer s6H-RGS4 (5'-CAC CAT CAT CAC CAT CAC ATG TGC
30 AAA GGG CTT GC-3') contained an 18 bp sequence encoding a hexahistidine tag followed
31 by the first 17 bp of the RGS4 cDNA. The antisense primer a6H consisted only of the 18 bp
32 sequence encoding the hexahistidine tag (5'-GTG ATG GTG ATG ATG GTG-3'). In PCR 1a
33 the sequence between the *sEcoRI*-hH₄ primer (5'-GCC ATC ACA TCA TTC TTG GAA TTC
34 GTG ATC CCA GTC-3') and the a6H fusion primer was amplified using the pGEM-3Z-SF-
35 hH₄R-His₆ plasmid as template. In PCR 1b the RGS4 sequence between the s6H-RGS4 fusion
36 primer and the antisense primer aRGS4-*XbaI* (5'-TCT AGA CTC GAG TTA GGC ACA CTG
37 AGG GAC C-3') was amplified using a pcDNA 3.1-RGS4 plasmid as template yielding a
38 product with an extra *XbaI* site 3' of the stop codon of RGS4. In PCR 2, the products of PCR
39 1a and 1b were used as templates together with the primers *sEcoRI*-hH₄ and aRGS4-*XbaI*.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 This resulted in a fragment encoding a part of the hH₄R, followed by a hexahistidine tag and
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 the RGS4 sequence with an *XbaI* site 3' of the stop codon. Since not only the hH₄R sequence,
2 but also the RGS4 DNA contain an *EcoRI* site, it was not possible to use this site for cloning.
3
4 Thus, the fragment obtained in PCR2 was digested with *PshAI* and *XbaI* and cloned into
5
6 pGEM-3Z-SF-hH₄R-His₆ digested with the same enzymes to obtain the full-length fusion
7
8 protein DNA sequence.
9
10

11 For preparation of the hH₄R-GAIP fusion protein, as fusion primers the sense primer
12
13 s6H-GAIP (5'-CAC CAT CAT CAC CAT CAC ATG CCC ACC CCG CAT GAG-3')
14
15 containing an 18 bp sequence encoding a hexahistidine tag followed by the first 18 bp of the
16
17 GAIP cDNA and the antisense primer a6H were used. PCR 1a was performed as described
18
19 above for the generation of the hH₄R-RGS-4 fusion protein. In PCR 1b the GAIP sequence
20
21 between the s6H-GAIP fusion primer and an antisense primer aGAIP-*XbaI* (5'-TCT AGA
22
23 CTC GAG CTA GGC CTC GGA GGA GG-3') was amplified using a pcDNA 3.1-GAIP
24
25 plasmid as template and yielding a product with an extra *XbaI* site 3' of the stop codon of
26
27 GAIP. In PCR 2 the products of PCR 1a and 1b were used as templates together with the
28
29 primers *sEcoRI*-hH₄ and aGAIP-*XbaI*. This resulted in a fragment encoding a part of the
30
31 hH₄R, followed by a hexahistidine tag and the GAIP sequence with an *XbaI* site 3' of the stop
32
33 codon. This fragment was digested with *EcoRI* and *XbaI* and cloned into pGEM-3Z-SF-
34
35 hH₄R-His₆ digested with the same enzymes to obtain the full-length fusion protein DNA
36
37 sequence.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 PCR-generated DNA sequences were confirmed by the sequencing service of
46
47 Entelechon (Regensburg, Germany). All fusion protein sequences were cloned into the
48
49 baculovirus expression vector, pVL1392.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

2.3. *Generation of recombinant baculoviruses, cell culture and membrane preparation*

Sf9 cells were cultured in 250 or 500 ml disposable Erlenmeyer flasks at 28°C under rotation at 150 r.p.m in SF 900 II medium (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA, USA) supplemented with 5% (v/v) fetal calf serum (Biochrom, Berlin, Germany) and 0.1 mg/ml gentamicin (Cambrex Bio Science, Walkersville, MD, USA). Cells were maintained at a density of $0.5 - 6.0 \times 10^6$ cells/ml. Recombinant baculoviruses were generated in Sf9 cells using the BaculoGOLD transfection kit (BDPharmingen, San Diego, CA, USA) according to the manufacturer's instructions. After initial transfection, high-titer virus stocks were generated by two sequential virus amplifications. The supernatant fluid from the second amplification was stored under light protection at 4°C and used as routine virus stock for membrane preparations.

Infection of the cells with baculoviruses was performed as previously described [29]. The virus stocks were combined as described in the Results section. Sf9 membranes were prepared as described [30], using 1 mM EDTA (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany), 0.2 mM phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride (Sigma, St. Louis, MO, USA), 10 µg/ml benzamidine (Sigma, St. Louis, MO, USA) and 10 µg/ml leupeptin (Calbiochem, San Diego, CA, USA) as protease inhibitors. Membranes were suspended in binding buffer (12.5 mM MgCl₂, 1 mM EDTA and 75 mM Tris/HCl, pH 7.4). All membrane preparations were stored at -80°C until use.

2.4. *[³H]HA binding experiments*

Prior to the experiments, membranes were sedimented by a 10 min centrifugation at 4°C and 13,000 r.p.m. and resuspended in binding buffer (12.5 mM MgCl₂, 1 mM EDTA and 75 mM Tris/HCl, pH 7.4). For determination of B_{\max} values, Sf9 membranes (75 µg per tube) were suspended in 250 µl of binding buffer supplemented with [³H]HA (100 nM) and 0.2% (mass/vol.) bovine serum albumin (Sigma, St. Louis, MO, USA). Non-specific binding was

1 determined in the presence of THIO (10 μ M). Incubations were performed for 60 min at 25°C
2 and shaking at 250 rpm. Bound radioligand was separated from free radioligand by filtration
3 through GF/C filters (Whatman, Maidstone, UK) pretreated with 0.3% (mass/vol.)
4 polyethyleneimine (Sigma, St. Louis, MO, USA) and washed three times with 2 ml of ice-
5 cold binding buffer (4°C). Filter-bound radioactivity was determined by liquid scintillation
6 counting.

17 2.5. *Steady-state GTPase assay.*

19 Steady-state GTPase assays were essentially performed as previously described [29],
20 but with 5.0 mM MgCl₂, 1.2 mM creatine phosphate (Sigma, St. Louis, MO, USA) and 1 μ g
21 of creatine kinase (Roche, Indianapolis, IN, USA) in the samples. The reaction temperature
22 was 25°C - 27°C. If not indicated otherwise, each tube additionally contained 100 mM NaCl
23 (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany). The samples for the determination of G α enzyme kinetics
24 were prepared with a higher amount of [γ -³²P]GTP (0.4-0.5 μ Ci/tube). Unlabelled GTP
25 (Roche, Indianapolis, IN, USA) was added in increasing concentrations from 0 – 1500 nM.
26 Due to the displacement of [γ -³²P]GTP from the G α subunit, the signal-to-noise ratio of the
27 GTPase signal is reduced by unlabeled GTP. Therefore, unlabeled GTP was not used at
28 concentrations higher than 1.5 μ M.

47 2.6. *SDS-PAGE and immunoblot analysis*

49 Membrane proteins were separated on SDS polyacrylamide gels containing 10 or 12 %
50 (mass/vol.) acrylamide (Sigma, St. Louis, MO, USA). Proteins were transferred onto Trans-
51 Blot nitrocellulose membranes (Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA) and reacted with M1 anti-FLAG and
52 anti-G α_o antibody solution (1:1000 each). The antibodies anti-G α_{common} , anti-RGS4 and anti-
53 GAIP were used in a 1:500 dilution. Protein bands were visualized by enhanced
54

1 chemoluminescence (Pierce Chemical, Rockford, IL) using goat anti-mouse IgG (Sigma, St.
2 Louis, MO, USA), donkey anti-rabbit IgG (GE Healthcare, Little Chalfont, Buckinghamshire,
3 UK) or donkey anti goat IgG (Santa Cruz, CA, USA), all coupled to horseradish peroxidase.
4
5 The expression level of proteins was roughly estimated by using appropriate dilutions of
6
7 reference membranes expressing a defined level of FLAG- β_2 AR protein. The FLAG- β_2 AR
8
9 expression level was determined by radioligand binding with [3 H]dihydroalprenolol
10
11 ([3 H]DHA). Immunoblots were scanned with a GS-710 calibrated imaging densitometer (Bio-
12
13 Rad, Hercules, CA, USA). The intensity of the bands was analyzed with the Quantity One
14
15 4.0.3 software (Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA, USA).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 2.7. *Miscellaneous*

25 Protein concentrations were determined with the Bio-Rad DC protein assay kit.
26
27 Saturation and competition experiments were analyzed by non-linear regression with the
28
29 Prism 5.01 software (GraphPad, San Diego, CA, USA). All values are given as means \pm SD.
30
31 If not stated otherwise, significance was always calculated using one-way ANOVA, followed
32
33 by Dunnett's multiple comparison test (all columns vs. control column). For the discussion of
34
35 the apparent K_m values in section 3.4., one-way ANOVA was followed by Bonferroni's
36
37 multiple comparison test (comparison of all pairs of columns). Significance was always
38
39 defined as $p < 0.05$ (confidence interval 95%).
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 3. **Results and Discussion**

50 3.1. *Investigation of protein expression by immunoblotting*

51 We co-expressed hH₄R, hH₄R-RGS4 and hH₄R-GAIP with $G\alpha_{i2}$ and $G\beta_1\gamma_2$ in Sf9
52
53 insect cells. Expression of the proteins was confirmed by immunoblotting. As shown in Fig.
54
55 1A, the M1 anti-FLAG antibody stained the hH₄R protein as well as the fusion proteins. The
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 hH₄R signal consisted of three bands in the range between 37 and 44 kDa (Fig. 1A, lane 1).
2 As previously reported [14, 31], these multiple bands are due to receptor glycosylation, which
3 most likely occurs at the potential glycosylation sites in the receptor N-terminus (Asn-5 and
4 Asn-9). H₄R-RGS4 and H₄R-GAIP show also very broad and diffuse bands, indicating
5 differently glycosylated species. The expression levels of hH₄R, hH₄R-RGS4 and hH₄R-GAIP
6 were roughly assessed by comparison with a dilution series of a standard membrane
7 expressing 7.5 pmol/mg FLAG-β₂AR. The B_{max} value of this reference membrane was
8 determined by saturation binding with 10 nM of the β₂AR antagonist [³H]dihydroalprenolol
9 ([³H]DHA). We determined a B_{max} value of ~1.8 pmol/mg for hH₄R and an increased B_{max}
10 value of ~3.1 and ~3.0 pmol/mg for hH₄R-RGS4 and hH₄R-GAIP (Fig. 1A). We also co-
11 expressed hH₄R with Gα_{i2}, Gβ₁γ₂ and non-fused RGS4 or GAIP. In these membranes we
12 detected RGS4 and GAIP with specific anti-RGS4 (Fig. 1B, left lane) and anti-GAIP
13 antibodies (Fig. 1B, right lane), respectively. As expected, the molecular mass of GAIP was
14 by about 0.5 – 1 kDa higher compared to RGS4. Moreover, GAIP formed a more diffuse
15 band. This may be explained by a higher degree of palmitoylation, especially in the N-
16 terminal cysteine string region, which is a characteristic feature of the RZ sub-family of RGS
17 proteins [32].
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 - Fig. 1 -
42
43
44
45

46 3. 2. Quantification of B_{max} values by radioligand binding with [³H]HA

47 As shown in Fig. 1A, the quantification of receptor expression levels by
48 immunoblotting showed increased B_{max} values for the hH₄R-RGS fusion proteins compared to
49 the non-fused hH₄R. To confirm this difference, we also determined expression levels by
50 radioligand binding experiments with [³H]HA (100 nM). We determined 1.6 ± 0.4 pmol/mg
51 and 1.7 ± 0.6 pmol/mg for hH₄R-RGS4 and hH₄R-GAIP, respectively, but a significantly (p <
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

0.05) lower expression of only 0.7 ± 0.1 pmol/mg for hH₄R in the standard co-expression system (means \pm SD, n = 2 in triplicates).

Interestingly, when the wild-type hH₄R was co-expressed with the non-fused RGS proteins (+ G α_{i2} and G $\beta_{1\gamma 2}$), the B_{max} value was not significantly different from the expression level of hH₄R in the RGS protein-free standard co-expression system (hH₄R + G α_{i2} + G $\beta_{1\gamma 2}$). The B_{max} values were 0.7 ± 0.3 pmol/mg and 0.7 ± 0.1 pmol/mg for hH₄R in the presence of RGS4 and GAIP, respectively (means \pm SD, n = 2 in triplicates, membranes from two different preparations).

There are three possible explanations for the enhanced expression levels of the fusion proteins. First, fusion of RGS4 or GAIP to the hH₄R may lead to conformational stabilization of the hH₄R. The hH₄R was previously reported to be constitutively active and structurally instable [14]. Second, hH₄R-RGS fusion proteins may prevent the receptor protein from proteolytic degradation. Third, the fusion of RGS4 or GAIP to hH₄R may facilitate the formation of a signaling complex with G α_{i2} . Such signaling complexes with participation of RGS proteins have been previously described [32, 33]. Thus, RGS proteins incorporated in hH₄R-RGS fusion proteins may act as “scaffolding proteins” for the receptor-G-protein complex, leading to an imitation of an hH₄R-G α_{i2} fusion protein. A similar enhancing effect on the hH₄R expression level was previously reported for the fusion of hH₄R with G α_{i2} [14].

- Table 1 -

3.3. HA-stimulation, THIO-inhibition and baseline activity in the steady-state GTPase assay

We performed steady-state GTPase assays with all membranes in the presence of 100 nM of GTP (standard conditions) and determined the maximum stimulatory effect of the

agonist HA (10 μ M) and the maximum inhibitory effect of the inverse agonist THIO (10 μ M). All results were compared to the properties of the standard co-expression system (hH₄R + G α _{i2} + G β ₁ γ ₂). When GAIP was co-expressed with hH₄R, G α _{i2} and G β ₁ γ ₂, no significant alteration of the relative HA and THIO effects (related to baseline) and of the baseline activity was found (Table 1). RGS4, co-expressed with hH₄R, G α _{i2} and G β ₁ γ ₂, significantly ($p < 0.01$, Table 1) increased the relative effect of THIO, but did not significantly influence the relative effect of HA and the baseline activity. The low or even lacking effect of RGS proteins co-expressed with hH₄R, G α _{i2} and G β ₁ γ ₂ is surprising, since we previously found marked GTPase-stimulating effects of RGS proteins, when co-expressed with the chemokine receptor CXCR4, G α _{i2} and G β ₁ γ ₂. Both RGS4 and GAIP increased the effect of the CXCR4 agonist SDF-1 α (stroma-derived cell factor 1) in steady-state GTPase assays by ~50% [18]. Maybe, these different effects of RGS proteins co-expressed with hH₄R or CXCR4 are due to differing RGS-GPCR interactions. It is conceivable that the signaling complex consisting of the GPCR, the RGS-protein and the heterotrimeric G-protein is not only stabilized by RGS-G α interactions, but also by binding of the RGS protein to the GPCR. In fact, it was previously reported that the N-terminal domain of RGS4 interacts with G_q-coupled receptors, resulting in a receptor-selective inhibition of G-protein signaling [34].

The most pronounced effects were observed with the fusion proteins (Table 1). Compared to the standard co-expression system (hH₄R + G α _{i2} + G β ₁ γ ₂), there was a significant ($p < 0.01$) increase in baseline GTPase activity, when hH₄R-RGS4 was co-expressed with G α _{i2} and G β ₁ γ ₂ (Table 1). Since hH₄R-RGS4 increased both the absolute constitutive GTPase activity and the absolute HA-stimulated signal, there was no significant increase of the relative HA-effect. Thus this system shows no improved signal-to-noise ratio compared to the standard co-expression system (Table 1). However, hH₄R-RGS4 could be

1
2 advantageous for the testing of inverse agonists, since a significant increase ($p < 0.01$) of the
3 relative THIO effect was found (Table 1).
4

5 The most interesting results were found with the hH₄R-GAIP fusion protein (+ G α_{i2}
6 and G $\beta_1\gamma_2$). The hH₄R-GAIP fusion protein caused a significant ($p < 0.001$) increase of the
7 relative HA- and THIO effects. Surprisingly, compared to the RGS protein-free standard co-
8 expression system (hH₄R + G α_{i2} + G $\beta_1\gamma_2$), the relative stimulatory effect of HA was increased
9 by ~ 70%. This was caused by a selective increase of agonist-stimulated absolute GTPase
10 activity without a significant alteration of baseline GTPase activity.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 This differential effect of RGS4 and GAIP could be due to a differing G-protein
20 selectivity. RGS4 accelerates the GTPase activity of both G-protein families, G α_i [22, 23] and
21 G α_q [24]. By contrast, GAIP shows preference for G α_i proteins [25]. Interestingly, GAIP
22 shows additional selectivity within the G α_i class. In the literature, a rather weak effect of
23 GAIP on G α_{i2} was reported [26, 35]. According to the UniProtKN/Swiss-Prot section of the
24 UniProt knowledgebase [36] (entry P49795) GAIP binds to G α proteins with the order of
25 preference G α_{i3} > G α_{i1} > G α_o >> G α_{i2} . Thus, the GAIP effect on G α_{i2} proteins may only
26 become visible at very high concentrations of activated GTP-bound G α_{i2} , e.g. when the
27 system is activated by the agonist-stimulated hH₄R. By contrast, RGS4 shows a higher
28 affinity for G α_{i2} and therefore the GTPase activating effect of RGS4 is already visible in the
29 constitutively active system. This would explain why hH₄R-GAIP enhances selectively the
30 HA-stimulated GTPase activity and therefore improves the signal-to-noise ratio. The hH₄R-
31 RGS4 fusion protein, however, accelerates both constitutive and HA-stimulated GTPase
32 activity and does not increase the relative HA signal.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- Fig. 2, Table 2 -

3.4. Influence of RGS proteins on $G\alpha_{i2}$ enzyme kinetics (K_m and V_{max})

We investigated the GTPase enzyme kinetics of $G\alpha_{i2}$ by determination of steady-state GTPase activity in the presence of increasing concentrations of the substrate GTP. Due to the high inter-experimental and inter-membrane variability of absolute GTPase activities (cf. range of V_{max} given in Table 2) we normalized all enzyme kinetic curves to a range between 0 and 100 %. The V_{max} of the HA-stimulated (10 μ M) system (determined by non-linear regression) was set to 100 %. After subtraction of the control curve (solvent) and fitting the curves according to a hyperbolic function (one-site binding), “apparent” K_m values were calculated, similarly to the calculation of K_d values previously reported for GTP γ S saturation bindings [14, 37]. The results are shown in Table 2.

To visualize the K_m effects of the RGS proteins, Eadie-Hofstee plots for every system are shown in Fig. 2. For these plots the normalized data (% of V_{max} in the presence of HA (10 μ M), instead of absolute GTPase activity) were used without subtraction of the control curves. In Eadie-Hofstee plots the slope of the regression line represents $-K_m$. In the standard co-expression system the three linear regression lines representing THIO-inhibition, control conditions and HA-stimulation are in parallel, indicating that THIO and HA do not alter the K_m value of $G\alpha_{i2}$ in the absence of RGS proteins (Fig. 2A). However, when RGS4 or GAIP were co-expressed together with hH₄R (+ $G\alpha_{i2}$ and $G\beta_1\gamma_2$), the slope of the regression line representing the HA-stimulated system was slightly increased, indicating an RGS-induced increase of the K_m value (Fig. 2C and D). This effect was also reported in the literature, where the addition of purified RGS4 to membranes expressing α_{2A} -adrenoceptor-Ile³⁵²- $G\alpha_{i2}$ resulted in an increased K_m value, when the system was stimulated with the agonist UK-14304 (5-bromo-6-[2-imidazolin-2-ylamine]-quinoxaline) [23].

Despite the slightly increased slope of the HA-regression line in the Eadie-Hofstee plots, the apparent K_m value of the system co-expressing RGS4 with hH₄R, $G\alpha_{i2}$ and $G\beta_1\gamma_2$,

1 was not significantly different from the RGS-protein free system. Only when GAIP was co-
2 expressed with hH₄R, G α_{i2} and G $\beta_{1\gamma 2}$, the increase of the apparent K_m value reached
3
4 significance (Table 2). Maybe, GAIP is more effectively integrated into the membrane *via* its
5
6 palmitoylated cysteine-string domain, which is not present in RGS4.
7
8

9
10 When RGS4 was fused to hH₄R (Fig. 2E, Table 2), the apparent K_m was significantly
11 (p<0.05) increased compared to the co-expression system with non-fused RGS4 (Fig. 2C,
12
13 Table 2). This suggests that the fusion protein facilitates integration of RGS4 into the
14
15 membrane and the formation of a signaling complex with G α_{i2} . An increase of the G α K_m
16
17 value by a GPCR-RGS4 fusion protein was previously also shown for α_{2A} -adrenoceptor-
18
19 RGS4, co-expressed with Cys351Ile G α_{o1} , in the presence of the agonist UK-14304 [21].
20
21
22
23

24
25 By contrast, fusion of GAIP to hH₄R (hH₄R-GAIP) did not significantly alter the K_m
26
27 value in comparison to non-fused GAIP (Table 2, Fig. 2F) or to the RGS-protein-free standard
28
29 co-expression system (Table 2, Fig. 2A). It is surprising that the hH₄R-GAIP fusion protein
30
31 did not significantly increase the apparent K_m estimate under agonist stimulation, whereas
32
33 either the H₄R + GAIP co-transfection or the H₄R-RGS4 fusion protein did. Maybe, when co-
34
35 transfected with H₄R, the number of GAIP proteins located at the membrane is higher than in
36
37 case of the hH₄R-GAIP fusion protein. When hH₄R-GAIP is expressed, the number of GAIP
38
39 molecules at the membrane does never exceed the number of receptor molecules. However,
40
41 when GAIP is co-transfected with H₄R, possibly more GAIP is recruited to the membrane,
42
43 because it can be anchored in the membrane via the palmitoylated cysteine string motif [26].
44
45
46
47 By contrast, a large amount of co-transfected RGS4 may be located in the cytoplasm. RGS4
48
49 lacks a cysteine-string motif and is recruited from a cytosolic pool mainly by interaction with
50
51 membrane-associated G-proteins [38]. In our system, membrane localization of RGS4 may be
52
53 increased, when hH₄R-RGS4 is expressed, since RGS4 is then anchored to the membrane by
54
55 connection with the receptor protein. However, this is only speculation and it should also be
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

considered that the non-significant increase of the agonist-stimulated K_m value in case of hH₄R-GAIP could only be caused by the high inter-experimental and inter-membrane variability of our data. Thus, these results should not be over-interpreted. A comparison of hH₄R-RGS4 with hH₄R-GAIP shows a significantly ($p < 0.05$) lower apparent K_m in the presence of hH₄R-GAIP. This may reflect the lower affinity of GAIP for G α_{i2} , which was discussed in section 3.3.

For comparison, in Fig. 2B also the Eadie-Hofstee plot for hH₄R-G α_{i2} co-expressed with G $\beta_1\gamma_2$ is shown. The data were taken from a previous publication [14]. Compared to the standard co-expression system (Fig. 2A), in case of hH₄R-G α_{i2} (Fig. 2B) the slope of all three regression lines is reduced, which is reflected by significantly lower apparent K_m values in Table 2. However, similarly to the standard co-expression system (Fig. 2A), also in the hH₄R-G α_{i2} fusion protein system all three regression lines are in parallel (Fig. 2B), as is expected in the absence of RGS proteins.

In the inverse agonist (THIO)-inhibited system, RGS4 and GAIP showed no significant effect on the K_m values, neither when fused to hH₄R nor when co-expressed with the receptor (Fig. 2 and Table 2).

- Table 3 -

3.5. *Characterization of standard ligands at hH₄R, hH₄R-RGS4 and hH₄R-GAIP*

As described above, co-expression of the hH₄R with RGS4 or GAIP did not result in a significant increase of the signal-to-noise ratio. By contrast, fusion of RGS4 or GAIP with hH₄R resulted in marked effects on absolute GTPase activities, with GAIP leading to a selective enhancement of the agonist-stimulated signal. Thus, the hH₄R-RGS fusion proteins

1 are interesting candidates for a test system with improved sensitivity, compared to the
2 standard co-expression system (hH₄R + Gα_{i2} + Gβ₁γ₂).
3

4
5 In order to ensure that the pharmacological properties of hH₄R-RGS4 and hH₄R-GAIP
6 are comparable with those of the wild-type hH₄R, we characterized several hH₄R standard
7 ligands in the steady-state GTPase assay. In Table 3, the results from hH₄R-RGS4 and hH₄R-
8 GAIP are compared with the data previously reported for the non-fused hH₄R [14]. In case of
9 the hH₄R-GAIP fusion protein the EC₅₀ values and efficacies did not significantly differ from
10 the wild-type hH₄R data. However, significant differences were found for hH₄R-RGS4. 5-
11 Methylhistamine, which showed an efficacy of 0.87 at the non-fused hH₄R is a full agonist
12 (efficacy = 1.08) at the hH₄R-RGS4 fusion protein. The potencies of both HA and JNJ-
13 7777120 were significantly reduced. The reduced potency of HA at the hH₄R-RGS4 fusion
14 protein fits well to data from the literature [23]. It is reported that addition of purified RGS4
15 (100 nM) to membranes expressing the α_{2A}AR-Val³⁵¹-Gα_{o1} fusion protein caused a more than
16 3-fold increase of the EC₅₀ value of UK-14304 [23]. However, in our test system the
17 expression level of hH₄R-RGS4 was only ~3 pmol/mg. This is more than 10 000-fold lower
18 than the 100 nM of RGS4 that were added to the system in ref [23]. This explains the much
19 weaker effect of RGS4 in our system, where the EC₅₀ value of HA, was increased by only
20 ~60%.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Taken together, our results show that the hH₄R-RGS fusion proteins maintain the
45 pharmacology of the wild-type hH₄R to a large extent. Since the hH₄R-GAIP fusion protein,
46 compared to the standard co-expression system (hH₄R + Gα_{i2} + Gβ₁γ₂), resulted in an
47 increased signal-to-noise ratio with unchanged ligand potencies and efficacies, we decided to
48 use hH₄R-GAIP (+ Gα_{i2} + Gβ₁γ₂) as a standard test system for the characterization of hH₄R
49 ligands in our medicinal chemistry program [39, 40].
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- Fig. 3 -

3.6. *Na⁺ sensitivity of the hH₄R-GAIP fusion protein*

According to the two-state model of receptor activation [15, 41], GPCRs exist in an equilibrium of an active G-protein-coupling conformation (R*) and an uncoupled inactive state (R). R* promotes GDP/GTP exchange at the G α subunit and shows a higher affinity for agonists than R. Thus, agonists activate the receptor by stabilizing an R* state. Neutral antagonists bind to R and R* states with the same affinity and do not alter the equilibrium. Some receptor molecules, e.g. the hH₄R, spontaneously adopt the R* state and promote G-protein signaling in the absence of agonists, which is referred to as constitutive activity. Inverse agonists bind preferentially to the R state and reduce the basal activity. Na⁺ stabilizes the inactive R-state of many GPCRs and reduces the basal activity. This was described e.g. for the formyl peptide receptor clone 26 and the α_2 -adrenergic receptor [42, 43].

In all systems described in this paper, the constitutive activity of the hH₄R was resistant to NaCl, independent of the presence of RGS proteins. All steady-state GTPase assays with the co-expression systems as well as with hH₄R-RGS4 and hH₄R-GAIP were performed in the presence of 100 mM of NaCl. The data shown in Table 2, 3 and 4 as well as in Fig. 2 clearly demonstrate that the effect of inverse agonists is preserved even in the presence of NaCl.

However, to completely characterize the hH₄R-GAIP fusion protein (+ G α_{i2} + G $\beta_1\gamma_2$) and to ensure that this new test system can fully replace the standard co-expression system with the hH₄R (+ G α_{i2} + G $\beta_1\gamma_2$), we also investigated the Na⁺ effect for the whole range of Na⁺ concentrations between 0 and 125 mM in steady-state GTPase assays. For each NaCl concentration the constitutive activity (control), the effect of HA (10 μ M) and of THIO (10 μ M) were determined. In Fig. 3, the results for hH₄R-GAIP are compared with the results

1 recently published for the non-fused hH₄R [14]. Both systems behave very similar and show
2 Na⁺-resistant constitutive activity, even at Na⁺ concentrations >100 mM (Fig. 3A and C).
3
4 When the effects of HA and THIO are expressed as a percentage of total ligand-regulated
5 steady-state GTPase activity (Fig. 3B and D), in both cases the relative effects of HA and
6
7 THIO are around 50 % in the presence of Na⁺. Interestingly, compared to the non-fused
8
9 hH₄R, the hH₄R-GAIP fusion protein shows a significantly (unpaired two-tailed t-test,
10
11 p<0.05) higher relative agonist signal and reduced constitutive activity in the absence of
12
13 sodium. Thus, unlike the standard co-expression system with the non-fused hH₄R, the hH₄R-
14
15 GAIP fusion protein could also be used for the characterization of ligands under Na⁺-free
16
17 conditions.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 - Fig. 4 -
28
29
30

31 3.7. *G-protein coupling specificity of the hH₄R-GAIP fusion protein*

32
33 As already discussed in section 3.3, GAIP shows selectivity for G α proteins in the
34 order G α_{i3} > G α_{i1} > G α_0 >> G α_{i2} . Thus, it is to be expected that fusion of GAIP to hH₄R
35
36 alters the G-protein coupling specificity of the receptor. Therefore, we co-expressed hH₄R-
37
38 GAIP with G α_{i1} , G α_{i2} , G α_{i3} and G α_0 in combination with G $\beta_1\gamma_2$. The expression of G-proteins
39
40 was determined by using an anti-G α_{common} and an anti-G α_0 antibody (data not shown). To
41
42 assess the background signal, the hH₄R was also expressed without mammalian G-proteins.
43
44 We determined the constitutive activity and the effects of HA (10 μ M) or THIO (10 μ M) in
45
46 the steady-state GTPase assay. The results are shown in Fig. 4B and compared with the
47
48 previously reported data for the non-fused hH₄R (Fig. 4A). Both data sets were determined
49
50 with membranes prepared at the same day under the same conditions.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Surprisingly, the G-protein specificity profile of hH₄R-GAIP (Fig. 4B) was very
2 similar to the profile of the non-fused hH₄R (Fig. 4A). Specifically, considering the HA signal
3 there was a clear preference of hH₄R-GAIP for G α_{i2} . Thus, the G-protein specificity of hH₄R-
4 GAIP is governed by the properties of the GPCR, whereas the GAIP part just interacts with
5 the G α subunit that is bound by the receptor.
6
7
8
9
10

11 Moreover, Fig. 4 clearly demonstrates that hH₄R-GAIP shows a significantly higher
12 relative HA stimulation than the non-fused hH₄R when co-expressed with G α_{i1} or G α_{i2}
13 (unpaired two-tailed t-test, $p < 0.05$). In the presence of G α_{i3} and G α_o the difference between
14 the relative HA signal induced at hH₄R and hH₄R-GAIP did not reach significance. When
15 hH₄R was expressed without mammalian G-proteins, there was a very weak HA-induced
16 stimulation of GTPase activity (Fig. 4A, first triplet of bars). Interestingly, this stimulation
17 was markedly increased with hH₄R-GAIP (Fig. 4B, first triplet). Most likely, this is a weak
18 but hardly productive interaction of hH₄R with insect cell G-proteins that becomes unmasked
19 in the presence of GAIP. Since RGS proteins do not interact with G α_s , the observed
20 interaction can only be due to G α_q - or G α_i -like proteins that both are present in Sf9 cells [44].
21 We previously observed a similar effect, when hH₁R or gpH₁R were co-expressed with the
22 regulators of G-protein signaling RGS4 and GAIP in Sf9 cell membranes [27].
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 3.8. Conclusion

46 Compared to the standard system (hH₄R + G α_{i2} + G $\beta_1\gamma_2$), co-expression of the hH₄R-GAIP
47 fusion protein with G α_{i2} and G $\beta_1\gamma_2$ resulted in an increase of both the relative agonist-
48 stimulated and inverse-agonist-inhibited signal. Compared to the non-fused hH₄R, the hH₄R-
49 GAIP fusion protein shows unchanged G-protein selectivity. The NaCl insensitivity of the R-
50 state, which was previously reported for the hH₄R [14], was retained with the hH₄R-GAIP
51 fusion protein. With respect to the pharmacological properties of several standard ligands,
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 hH₄R-GAIP did not significantly differ from the non-fused hH₄R. Thus, hH₄R-GAIP, co-
2 expressed with G α_{i2} and G $\beta_1\gamma_2$, turned out to be a very sensitive test system for the screening
3 of potential hH₄R ligands and can readily replace the standard co-expression system (hH₄R +
4 G α_{i2} + G $\beta_1\gamma_2$) in steady-state GTPase assays.
5
6
7
8
9

10 11 **Acknowledgements**

12 We would like to thank Mrs. Gertraud Wilberg and Mrs. Astrid Seefeld for their excellent
13 technical assistance. Thanks are also due to the reviewers for their helpful critique. This work
14 was supported by the Research Training Program (Graduiertenkolleg) GRK 760 “Medicinal
15 Chemistry – Ligand-Receptor Interactions” of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **References**

- 25
26 [1] Hill SJ, Ganellin CR, Timmerman H, Schwartz JC, Shankley NP, Young JM, et al.
27 International Union of Pharmacology. XIII. Classification of histamine receptors.
28 Pharmacol Rev 1997;49:253-78.
29
30
31 [2] Raible DG, Lenahan T, Fayvilevich Y, Kosinski R, Schulman ES. Pharmacologic
32 characterization of a novel histamine receptor on human eosinophils. Am J Respir Crit
33 Care Med 1994;149:1506-11.
34
35
36 [3] Oda T, Morikawa N, Saito Y, Masuho Y, Matsumoto S. Molecular cloning and
37 characterization of a novel type of histamine receptor preferentially expressed in
38 leukocytes. J Biol Chem 2000;275:36781-6.
39
40
41 [4] Morse KL, Behan J, Laz TM, West RE, Jr., Greenfeder SA, Anthes JC, et al. Cloning
42 and characterization of a novel human histamine receptor. J Pharmacol Exp Ther
43 2001;296:1058-66.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- [5] Liu C, Ma X, Jiang X, Wilson SJ, Hofstra CL, Blevitt J, et al. Cloning and pharmacological characterization of a fourth histamine receptor (H₄) expressed in bone marrow. *Mol Pharmacol* 2001;59:420-6.
- [6] Nakamura T, Itadani H, Hidaka Y, Ohta M, Tanaka K. Molecular cloning and characterization of a new human histamine receptor, HH₄R. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* 2000;279:615-20.
- [7] O'Reilly M, Alpert R, Jenkinson S, Gladue RP, Foo S, Trim S, et al. Identification of a histamine H₄ receptor on human eosinophils--role in eosinophil chemotaxis. *J Recept Signal Transduct Res* 2002;22:431-48.
- [8] Hofstra CL, Desai PJ, Thurmond RL, Fung-Leung WP. Histamine H₄ receptor mediates chemotaxis and calcium mobilization of mast cells. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 2003;305:1212-21.
- [9] Strakhova MI, Nikkel AL, Manelli AM, Hsieh GC, Esbenshade TA, Brioni JD, et al. Localization of histamine H₄ receptors in the central nervous system of human and rat. *Brain Res* 2009;1250:41-8.
- [10] Dunford PJ, Williams KN, Desai PJ, Karlsson L, McQueen D, Thurmond RL. Histamine H₄ receptor antagonists are superior to traditional antihistamines in the attenuation of experimental pruritus. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2007;119:176-83.
- [11] Varga C, Horvath K, Berko A, Thurmond RL, Dunford PJ, Whittle BJ. Inhibitory effects of histamine H₄ receptor antagonists on experimental colitis in the rat. *Eur J Pharmacol* 2005;522:130-8.
- [12] Dunford PJ, O'Donnell N, Riley JP, Williams KN, Karlsson L, Thurmond RL. The histamine H₄ receptor mediates allergic airway inflammation by regulating the activation of CD4⁺ T cells. *J Immunol* 2006;176:7062-70.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- [13] Alousi AA, Jasper JR, Insel PA, Motulsky HJ. Stoichiometry of receptor-G_s-adenylate cyclase interactions. *Faseb J* 1991;5:2300-3.
- [14] Schneider EH, Schnell D, Papa D, Seifert R. High constitutive activity and a G-protein-independent high-affinity state of the human histamine H₄-receptor. *Biochemistry* 2009;48:1424-38.
- [15] Seifert R, Wenzel-Seifert K. Constitutive activity of G-protein-coupled receptors: cause of disease and common property of wild-type receptors. *Naunyn Schmiedeberg's Arch Pharmacol* 2002;366:381-416.
- [16] Seifert R, Wenzel-Seifert K, Kobilka BK. GPCR-G α fusion proteins: molecular analysis of receptor-G-protein coupling. *Trends Pharmacol Sci* 1999;20:383-9.
- [17] Wenzel-Seifert K, Hurt CM, Seifert R. High constitutive activity of the human formyl peptide receptor. *J Biol Chem* 1998;273:24181-9.
- [18] Kleemann P, Papa D, Vigil-Cruz S, Seifert R. Functional reconstitution of the human chemokine receptor CXCR4 with G_i/G_o-proteins in Sf9 insect cells. *Naunyn Schmiedeberg's Arch Pharmacol* 2008;378:261-74.
- [19] Nickl K, Gardner EE, Geiger S, Heilmann J, Seifert R. Differential coupling of the human cannabinoid receptors hCB₁R and hCB₂R to the G-protein G $\alpha_{i2}\beta_1\gamma_2$. *Neurosci Lett* 2008;447:68-72.
- [20] Willars GB. Mammalian RGS proteins: multifunctional regulators of cellular signalling. *Semin Cell Dev Biol* 2006;17:363-76.
- [21] Bahia DS, Sartania N, Ward RJ, Cavalli A, Jones TL, Druey KM, et al. Concerted stimulation and deactivation of pertussis toxin-sensitive G proteins by chimeric G protein-coupled receptor-regulator of G protein signaling 4 fusion proteins: analysis of the contribution of palmitoylated cysteine residues to the GAP activity of RGS4. *J Neurochem* 2003;85:1289-98.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- [22] Berman DM, Kozasa T, Gilman AG. The GTPase-activating protein RGS4 stabilizes the transition state for nucleotide hydrolysis. *J Biol Chem* 1996;271:27209-12.
- [23] Cavalli A, Druey KM, Milligan G. The regulator of G protein signaling RGS4 selectively enhances α_{2A} -adreoreceptor stimulation of the GTPase activity of $G_{o1}\alpha$ and $G_{i2}\alpha$. *J Biol Chem* 2000;275:23693-9.
- [24] Xu X, Zeng W, Popov S, Berman DM, Davignon I, Yu K, et al. RGS proteins determine signaling specificity of G_q -coupled receptors. *J Biol Chem* 1999;274:3549-56.
- [25] Wieland T, Mittmann C. Regulators of G-protein signalling: multifunctional proteins with impact on signalling in the cardiovascular system. *Pharmacol Ther* 2003;97:95-115.
- [26] De Vries L, Elenko E, Hubler L, Jones TL, Farquhar MG. GAIP is membrane-anchored by palmitoylation and interacts with the activated (GTP-bound) form of $G\alpha_i$ subunits. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1996;93:15203-8.
- [27] Houston C, Wenzel-Seifert K, Bürckstümmer T, Seifert R. The human histamine H_2 -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;80:678-96.
- [28] Walseth TF, Johnson RA. The enzymatic preparation of [α - ^{32}P]nucleoside triphosphates, cyclic [^{32}P] AMP, and cyclic [^{32}P] GMP. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 1979;562:11-31.
- [29] Preuss H, Ghorai P, Kraus A, Dove S, Buschauer A, Seifert R. Constitutive activity and ligand selectivity of human, guinea pig, rat, and canine histamine H_2 receptors. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 2007;321:983-95.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- [30] Gether U, Lin S, Kobilka BK. Fluorescent labeling of purified β_2 adrenergic receptor. Evidence for ligand-specific conformational changes. *J Biol Chem* 1995;270:28268-75.
- [31] van Rijn RM, Chazot PL, Shenton FC, Sansuk K, Bakker RA, Leurs R. Oligomerization of recombinant and endogenously expressed human histamine H_4 receptors. *Mol Pharmacol* 2006;70:604-15.
- [32] Abramow-Newerly M, Roy AA, Nunn C, Chidiac P. RGS proteins have a signalling complex: interactions between RGS proteins and GPCRs, effectors, and auxiliary proteins. *Cell Signal* 2006;18:579-91.
- [33] Benians A, Nobles M, Hosny S, Tinker A. Regulators of G-protein signaling form a quaternary complex with the agonist, receptor, and G-protein. A novel explanation for the acceleration of signaling activation kinetics. *J Biol Chem* 2005;280:13383-94.
- [34] Zeng W, Xu X, Popov S, Mukhopadhyay S, Chidiac P, Swistok J, et al. The N-terminal domain of RGS4 confers receptor-selective inhibition of G protein signaling. *J Biol Chem* 1998;273:34687-90.
- [35] De Vries L, Mousli M, Wurmser A, Farquhar MG. GAIP, a protein that specifically interacts with the trimeric G protein $G\alpha_{i3}$, is a member of a protein family with a highly conserved core domain. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1995;92:11916-20.
- [36] The Universal Protein Resource (UniProt) 2009. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2009;37:D169-74.
- [37] Wenzel-Seifert K, Seifert R. Molecular analysis of β_2 -adrenoceptor coupling to G_s -, G_i -, and G_q -proteins. *Mol Pharmacol* 2000;58:954-66.
- [38] Roy AA, Lemberg KE, Chidiac P. Recruitment of RGS2 and RGS4 to the plasma membrane by G proteins and receptors reflects functional interactions. *Mol Pharmacol* 2003;64:587-93.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- [39] Igel P, Schneider E, Schnell D, Elz S, Seifert R, Buschauer A. N^G-acylated imidazolylpropylguanidines as potent histamine H₄ receptor agonists: selectivity by variation of the N^G-substituent. *J Med Chem* 2009.
- [40] Ghorai P, Kraus A, Keller M, Gotte C, Igel P, Schneider E, et al. Acylguanidines as bioisosteres of guanidines: N^G-acylated imidazolylpropylguanidines, a new class of histamine H₂ receptor agonists. *J Med Chem* 2008;51:7193-204.
- [41] Leff P. The two-state model of receptor activation. *Trends Pharmacol Sci* 1995;16:89-97.
- [42] Seifert R, Wenzel-Seifert K. Unmasking different constitutive activity of four chemoattractant receptors using Na⁺ as universal stabilizer of the inactive (R) state. *Receptors Channels* 2001;7:357-69.
- [43] Tian WN, Deth RC. Differences in efficacy and Na⁺ sensitivity between α_{2B} and α_{2D} adrenergic receptors: implications for R and R* states. *Pharmacology* 2000;61:14-21.
- [44] Knight PJ, Grigliatti TA. Diversity of G proteins in Lepidopteran cell lines: partial sequences of six G protein alpha subunits. *Arch Insect Biochem Physiol* 2004;57:142-50.

FIGURE LEGENDS:

1
2
3 **Figure 1:** Immunoblot analysis of hH₄R, hH₄R-RGS4, hH₄R-GAIP, RGS4 and GAIP in Sf9
4 cell membranes. Name and amount of the proteins loaded onto the gel are given below the
5 lanes. **A:** Detection of hH₄R, hH₄R-RGS4 and hH₄R-GAIP (all proteins FLAG-tagged) with
6 the M1 monoclonal antibody (anti-FLAG Ig). Four dilutions of a reference membrane,
7 expressing 7.5 pmol/mg FLAG-β₂AR and stained with the M1 antibody, were used for a
8 rough estimation of protein expression levels (right part of panel A). The expression levels are
9 1.8 pmol/mg for wild-type hH₄R (lane 1), 3.1 pmol/mg for hH₄R-RGS4 (lane 2) and 3.0
10 pmol/mg for hH₄R-GAIP (lane 3). **B:** Detection of non-fused RGS4 (left lane) and GAIP
11 (right lane) with an anti-RGS4 and an anti-GAIP antibody, respectively. The numbers on the
12 left of each panel indicate the molecular masses of the detected proteins in kDa. All
13 immunoblots were performed as described under Material and Methods.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30 **Figure 2:** Eadie-Hofstee plots, showing the effects of fused and co-expressed RGS proteins
31 on Gα_{i2} GTPase enzyme kinetics. Due to the large inter-membrane and inter-experimental
32 variability of the absolute signals (cf. Table 2), all GTPase activities were related to the V_{max}
33 value in the presence of 10 μM of HA (% of V_{max}(HA)). All data were obtained from steady-
34 state GTPase assays in Sf9 cell membranes, co-expressing the proteins given in the title of
35 each panel. The data for hH₄R-Gα_{i2} were taken from a previous publication [14]. The panels
36 show the constitutive activity (●) as well as the effect of HA (■) and THIO (▲). HA and
37 THIO were used at a concentration of 10 μM each. All data shown are means ± SD of 3-7
38 experiments performed in triplicates with membranes from at least two different preparations.
39 All experiments were performed as described in the Materials and Methods section.

40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57 **Figure 3:** Effect of NaCl on hH₄R- and hH₄R-GAIP-induced GTPase activity. Effects of
58 NaCl on steady-state GTPase activity were studied under control conditions (●), with HA-

1 stimulation (■) and THIO-inhibition (▲) in Sf9 cell membranes expressing hH₄R or hH₄R-
 2 GAIP with G α_{i2} and G $\beta_{1\gamma 2}$. HA and THIO were used at a concentration of 10 μ M each. The
 3
 4 GTPase assay was performed as described in the Material and Methods section. **A, C**:
 5 absolute GTPase activities in the systems expressing hH₄R (**A**) or hH₄R-GAIP (**C**). **B, D**:
 6
 7 percentage of HA and THIO effects, related to total ligand-regulated GTPase activity,
 8
 9 determined in the systems expressing hH₄R (**B**) or hH₄R-GAIP (**D**). Data shown are means \pm
 10
 11 SD of three experiments performed in triplicates (one membrane preparation). The data for
 12
 13 the non-fused hH₄R were taken from ref. [14].
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21

22 **Figure 4:** Comparison of the coupling efficiency of hH₄R and hH₄RGAIP to G-protein
 23 subtypes of the G $\alpha_{i/o}$ class. Both hH₄R (**A**) and hH₄R-GAIP (**B**) were co-expressed with
 24 G $\beta_{1\gamma 2}$ and various G-protein subunits of the G $\alpha_{i/o}$ class (G α_{i1} , G α_{i2} , G α_{i3} and G α_o). As a
 25 control, hH₄R and hH₄R-GAIP were expressed in the absence of mammalian G-proteins. G-
 26 protein coupling efficiency was determined by steady-state GTPase assay. Every group of
 27 three bars in the diagram represents the results for one specific membrane under control
 28 conditions (open bar), in the presence of agonist (HA, 10 μ M, grey bar) and in the presence of
 29 inverse agonist (THIO, 10 μ M, black bar). The proteins expressed in the different membranes
 30 are shown below the diagram. The data represent means \pm SD of two independent assays (one
 31 membrane batch, 3-4 replicates). The data for the non-fused hH₄R were taken from ref. [14].
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48

49 **Text for graphical abstract:**

50
 51 When co-expressed with G_i-proteins in Sf9 cells, the histamine H₄-receptor shows only a low
 52 signal-to-background ratio. This ratio can be markedly enhanced by fusing the RGS-protein
 53 GAIP to the receptor.
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65

Table 1: Impact of RGS4 and GAIP (fused or co-expressed with hH₄R) on the baseline and on the relative effects of HA and THIO in the steady-state GTPase assay. The data were determined with membranes from Sf9 cells co-expressing the proteins given in the table with G α_{i2} and G $\beta_1\gamma_2$. All data are shown as mean \pm SD (n given in the table). The results in the presence of RGS-proteins were compared to the data obtained with the wild-type hH₄R in one-way ANOVA, followed by Dunnet's multiple comparison test (significant difference: * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001). All experiments were performed in triplicates as described under Materials and Methods.

expressed proteins ^a	% relative HA effect ^b	% relative THIO effect ^b	% increase of baseline ^c	membranes ^d
wild-type hH ₄ R	+ 31.8 \pm 9.2 (n = 22)	- 27.5 \pm 11.3 (n = 20)	0.0 \pm 44 (n = 23)	10
hH ₄ R-GAIP	+ 53.6 \pm 16.4 ^{***} (n = 19)	- 39.9 \pm 7.0 ^{***} (n = 17)	+ 4.8 \pm 38.2 (n = 20)	7
hH ₄ R + GAIP	+ 40.8 \pm 12.3 (n = 7)	- 37.3 \pm 7.0 (n = 7)	- 29.7 \pm 34.4 (n = 8)	3
hH ₄ R-RGS4	+ 40.3 \pm 14.1 (n = 9)	- 40.9 \pm 10.9 ^{**} (n = 7)	+ 53.7 \pm 59.6 ^{**} (n = 10)	3
hH ₄ R + RGS4	+ 38.3 \pm 12.9 (n = 9)	- 39.2 \pm 7.0 ^{**} (n = 9)	- 11.9 \pm 34.3 (n = 10)	3

^a always expressed in combination with G α_{i2} and G $\beta_1\gamma_2$
^b % change of absolute GTPase activity in the presence of ligand, related to baseline (control conditions), means \pm SD
^c related to baseline of the standard system (hH₄R + G α_{i2} + G $\beta_1\gamma_2$), means \pm SD
^d number of different membranes (from different membrane preparations) used in the experiments

Table 2: Effects of fused and co-expressed RGS proteins on $G\alpha_{i2}$ GTPase enzyme kinetics (V_{max} and apparent K_m values). “Apparent” K_m values were calculated after subtraction of the control curve from the enzyme kinetic curves representing the effects of HA- and THIO (10 μ M each). The resulting net curves were fitted according to a one-site binding function. The data are from the same experiments that were also used for the Eadie-Hofstee plots in Fig. 2. All data shown are means \pm SD (n given in the table) using membranes from at least two different batches. The results were compared using one-way ANOVA, followed by Bonferroni’s multiple comparison test (K_m significantly different to: * wild-type hH₄R, ⁺hH₄R- $G\alpha_{i2}$, [#]hH₄R + RGS4 or [•]hH₄R-GAIP, one symbol: p<0.05, two symbols: p<0.01, three symbols: p<0.001). All experiments were performed in triplicates as described in the Materials and Methods section.


expressed proteins ^a	range of V_{max} ^b [pmol/(min*mg)]	app. K_m , agonist-stimulated (HA, 10 μ M) ^c [nM]	app. K_m , inverse agonist-inhibited (THIO, 10 μ M) ^c [nM]
hH ₄ R	6.0 - 27	462 \pm 181 (n = 6)	379 \pm 93 (n = 7)
hH ₄ R + RGS4	5.5 - 22	686 \pm 104 ⁺⁺⁺ (n = 5)	497 \pm 100 (n = 5)
hH ₄ R + GAIP	4.4 - 20	882 \pm 172 ^{**} , ⁺⁺⁺ (n = 3)	365 \pm 38 (n = 3)
hH ₄ R-RGS4	15 - 58	970 \pm 145 ^{***} , ⁺⁺⁺ , [#] , [•] (n = 7)	416 \pm 86 (n = 5)
hH ₄ R-GAIP	11 - 39	697 \pm 127 ⁺⁺⁺ (n = 6)	350 \pm 123 (n = 5)
hH ₄ R- $G\alpha_{i2}$	9.1 - 15	217 \pm 76 (n = 4)	272 \pm 133 (n = 4)


^a always expressed in combination with $G\alpha_{i2}$ and $G\beta_1\gamma_2$
^b V_{max} of the agonist-stimulated system (10 μ M HA)
^c determined after normalizing the enzyme kinetic curves to V_{max} (10 μ M HA) = 100 % and subtraction of the control curve, mean \pm SD

Table 3: Potency and efficacy of various hH₄R standard ligands at the hH₄R and at the hH₄R-RGS4 and hH₄R-GAIP fusion proteins. All results were determined in steady-state GTPase assays using Sf9 cell membranes that co-expressed the proteins given in the table. The data for the wild-type hH₄R were taken from a previous publication [14]. All data are shown as mean \pm SD from 2-11 experiments performed in triplicates. The results from the hH₄R-RGS4 fusion proteins were compared to the data obtained from the wild-type hH₄R in one-way ANOVA, followed by Dunnett's multiple comparison test (significant difference: * $p < 0.05$). All experiments were performed as described under Materials and Methods.

ligand	hH ₄ R + G α_{i2} + G $\beta_1\gamma_2$		hH ₄ R-RGS4 + G α_{i2} + G $\beta_1\gamma_2$		hH ₄ R-GAIP + G α_{i2} + G $\beta_1\gamma_2$	
	EC ₅₀ (nM)	efficacy	EC ₅₀ (nM)	efficacy	EC ₅₀ (nM)	efficacy
histamine	13 \pm 6	1.00	21 \pm 7*	1.00	13 \pm 7	1.00
imetit	7 \pm 5	0.69 \pm 0.15	13 \pm 7	0.62 \pm 0.03	16 \pm 4	0.75 \pm 0.18
immepip	44 \pm 14	0.68 \pm 0.15	85 \pm 61	0.67 \pm 0.14	12 \pm 3	0.88 \pm 0.24
R- α -methylhistamine	277 \pm 96	0.92 \pm 0.01	368 \pm 158	0.97 \pm 0.11	301 \pm 35	0.83 \pm 0.10
5-methylhistamine	32 \pm 8	0.87 \pm 0.01	71 \pm 32	1.08 \pm 0.10*	35 \pm 27	0.92 \pm 0.08
iodophenpropit	n.a.	~ 0.00	n.a.	~ 0.00	n.a.	~ 0.00
thioperamide	96 \pm 42	-1.00	179 \pm 64	-1.00	65 \pm 28	-1.00
JNJ-7777120	38 \pm 9	-0.31 \pm 0.07	91 \pm 45*	-0.28 \pm 0.04	32 \pm 13	-0.39 \pm 0.07

Figure 1














Figure 4





GTPase activity
[pmol/(min*mg)]



GTPase activity
[pmol/(min*mg)]

