JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.
JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI:10.1124/jpet.108.141382

N-Arachidonyl maleimide (NAM) potentiates the pharmacological and biochemical effects of the endocannabinoid 2-arachidonylglycerol through inhibition of monoacylglycerol lipase

James J. Burston, Laura J. Sim-Selley, John P. Harloe, Anu Mahadevan, Raj K. Razdan, Dana E. Selley and Jenny L. Wiley

Department of Pharmacology & Toxicology (JJB, LJS, JPH, DES, JLW), Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA 23298-0613, USA

University of the West of England Bristol (JJB), Coldharbour Lane Bristol BS16 1QY, UK

Organix, Inc. (RKR, AM), Woburn, MA 01801, USA

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

Copyright 2008 by the American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics.

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

Running Title: 2-AG + NAM Effects

Corresponding Author: James Burston, Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology, Virginia Commonwealth University, P.O. Box 980613, Richmond, Virginia 23298-0613, Phone: (804) 828-8443, FAX: (804) 828-2117, E-mail: jburston@vcu.edu

Recommended Section: Neuropharmacology

Document Information:

Number of text pages = 22 (including figure legends, but not including references or figures)

Abstract = 249 words

Introduction = 640 words

Discussion = 1365 words

Number of tables = 0

Number of figures = 5

Number of references = 39

Abbreviations:

AEA = anandamide

2-AG = 2-arachidonylglycerol

FAAH = fatty acid amide hydrolase

MAFP = methyl arachidonyl fluorophosphonate

MAGL = monoacylglycerol lipase

NAM = N-arachidonyl maleimide

PMSF = phenylmethyl sulfonamide

SR141716A = N-(piperidin-1-yl)-5-(4-chlorophenyl)-1-(2,4-dichlorophenyl)-4-methyl- H-pyrazole-3-carboxamide HCl

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

THC = Δ^9-tetrahydrocannabinol

WIN 55,212-2 = R(+)-[2,3-dihydro-5-methyl-3-{[(morpholinyl)methyl]pyrrolo-[1,2,3-de]-1,4-benzoxazinyl}-(1-naphthalenyl)methanone mesylate

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

Abstract

Inhibition of the metabolism of the endocannabinoids, anandamide (AEA) and 2-arachidonyl glycerol (2-AG), by their primary metabolic enzymes, fatty acid amide hydrolase (FAAH) and monoacylglycerol lipase (MAGL), respectively, has the potential to increase understanding of the physiological functions of the endocannabinoid system. To date, selective inhibitors of FAAH, but not MAGL, have been developed. The purpose of this study was to determine the selectivity and efficacy of N-arachidonyl maleimide (NAM), a putative MAGL inhibitor, for modulation of the effects of 2-AG. Our results showed that NAM unmasked 2-AG activity in a tetrad of *in vivo* tests sensitive to the effects of cannabinoids in mice. The efficacy of 2-AG (and AEA) to produce hypothermia was reduced compared to Δ^9-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC); however, 2-AG differed from AEA by its lower efficacy for catalepsy. All tetrad effects were partially CB_1-receptor mediated, as they were attenuated (but not eliminated) by SR141716A and in $CB_1^{-/-}$ mice. *In vitro*, NAM increased endogenous levels of 2-AG in the brain. Further, NAM raised the potency of 2-AG, but not AEA, in agonist-stimulated [^{35}S]GTPγS binding assay, a measure of G-protein activation. These results suggest that NAM is a MAGL inhibitor with *in vivo* and *in vitro* efficacy. NAM and other MAGL inhibitors are valuable tools to elucidate the biological functions of 2-AG as well as to examine the consequences of dysregulation of this endocannabinoid. In addition, NAM's unmasking of 2-AG effects that are only partially reversed by SR141716A offers support for the existence of non-CB_1, non-CB_2 cannabinoid receptors.

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

Introduction

The endocannabinoid system is comprised of two main receptors and various endogenous ligands. The CB_1 cannabinoid receptor is found in both the CNS and periphery and is believed to interact with and modulate various neurotransmitter systems (Howlett, 2002; Szabo and Schlicker, 2005). The CB_2 cannabinoid receptor is found principally in the immune system (Pertwee, 1997), although recent reports suggest that it may also be present in the brain stem (Van Sickle et al., 2005). To date, the two main cannabinoid ligands that have been isolated from the brain are anandamide (AEA) and 2-arachidonylglycerol (2-AG) (Hillard, 2000). Discovery and isolation of these ligands has led to significant advances in the cannabinoid field, ranging from the possible therapeutic application of endocannabinoids to the physiological role of the endocannabinoid system.

Despite these advances, understanding the full role of these ligands has proven difficult due to their extremely short biological half life, which is mediated by degradation enzymes (Laine et al., 2002). The enzymes primarily responsible for inactivation of AEA and 2-AG are fatty acid amide hydrolase (FAAH) and monoacylglycerol lipase (MAGL), respectively (Basavarajappa, 2007). In order to study these endocannabinoid inactivation pathways, significant work has been undertaken to develop selective enzyme inhibitors. To date, there has been some success with developing potent and selective inhibitors of FAAH. For example, the use of FAAH inhibitor URB-597 has revealed a potential role for AEA degradation inhibitors in the treatment of chronic pain (Jayamanne et al., 2006).

In contrast, the development of inhibitors of MAGL has been slower, in part due to the fact that most previous research focused on AEA, the first endocannabinoid to be discovered (Devane et al., 1992). Recent research, however, has indicated the importance of 2-AG in various physiological processes, including appetite regulation and energy balance and stress-induced opioid-independent analgesia (Cota, 2007; Hohmann et al., 2005). Other

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

studies have shown that 2-AG levels may be altered in pathological conditions such as celiac disease (D'Argenio et al., 2007). These converging lines of research have prompted renewed interest in developing inhibitors of 2-AG synthesis and inactivation. This increased focus on 2-AG may aid in the understanding of its physiological properties and in discovery of potential therapeutic indications for 2-AG modulation.

Currently, two main compounds have been shown to inhibit 2-AG degradation: URB-602 and methyl arachidonyl fluorophosphonate (MAFP) (Makara et al., 2005; Savinainen et al., 2003). Both of these compounds have significant limitations. In addition to inhibiting MAGL, MAFP inhibits FAAH and directly activates CB_1 receptors as well as having non-cannabinoid targets (Lio et al., 1996). Although URB-602 is far more selective for MAGL than MAFP, the main limitations to use of this compound *in vivo* are low potency and solubility. The IC_{50} of URB-602 for MAGL in mice is 28 μM and its maximum solubility is approximately 1mg/ml (Makara et al., 2005). These two factors prevent effective systemic administration of this compound.

Recent research with N-arachidonyl maleimide (NAM) is more promising. NAM prevented cerebellar membrane-mediated degradation of 2-AG at a relatively low concentration (IC_{50} 140 nM) (Saario et al., 2005). Despite these initial results, there have been no reports of the effect of NAM on 2-AG action within *in vivo* systems. However, very recently Blankman and colleagues (2007) showed that NAM inhibited up to 80 percent of 2-AG degradation, thus confirming the results of Saario et al. (2005). Based on this research and the fact that there is little information on the *in vivo* effects of NAM, the aims of this study were to examine NAM modulation of the tetrad effects of 2-AG (a four factor test which includes suppression of spontaneous activity, antinociception, hypothermia and catalepsy (Martin et al., 1991)), to determine the effects of NAM on CB_1 receptor binding and activation, to assess the selectivity of NAM for 2-AG vs AEA, and to examine the effect of NAM on endogenous 2-AG levels.

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

Methods

Subjects

Female ICR mice (outbred albino mouse strain developed by Dr. T. S. Hauschka of Fox Chase Cancer Center) were purchased from Harlan (Dublin, VA), were housed five per cage. All animals were kept in a temperature controlled (23 °C) environment with a 12-hr light–dark cycle (lights on at 7 a.m.). Separate mice (n=6 per group) were used for testing each drug dose in the *in vivo* procedures. The mice were free fed and had free access to water. The studies reported in this manuscript were carried out in accordance with guidelines published in the Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals (National Research Council, 1996) and were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee at Virginia Commonwealth University.

Chemicals

N-Arachidonyl maleimide was provided by Cayman Chemical, (Ann Arbor, Michigan). SR141716A and SR144528 were provided by the Drug Supply Program of the National Institute of Drug Abuse (Rockville, MD). 2-AG (Organix identification number O-1361) and AEA were synthesized in our labs (Organix Inc., Woburn, MA). All compounds were dissolved in a vehicle of ethanol, Emulphor-620 (Rhone-Poulenc, Inc., Princeton, NJ), and physiological saline in a ratio of 1:1:18. R(+)-[2,3-dihydro-5-methyl-3-{[(morpholinyl)methyl]pyrrolo-[1,2,3-de]-1,4-benzoxazinyl}-(1-naphthalenyl)methanone mesylate (WIN55,212-2), guanosine 5' diphosphate (GDP) and bovine serum albumin (BSA), were purchased from Sigma Chemical Company (St. Louis, MO). GTPγS was purchased from Roche Diagnostics (Branchburg, NJ). [^{35}S]GTPγS (1150-1300 Ci/mmol) was obtained from Perkin Elmer Life Sciences (Boston, MA). [^{3}H]SR141716A (44.0 Ci/mmol) was purchased from Amersham Pharmacia (Piscataway, NJ). Scintillation

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

fluid (ScinitSafe Econo 1) was purchased form Fisher Scientific (Pittsburgh, PA). Adenosine deaminase was purchased from Sigma Chemical Company (St. Louis, MO).

Apparatus

Measurement of spontaneous activity in mice occurred in square mouse chambers (20 cm X 20 cm X 20 cm) surrounded by panels of photocell beams (Open Field Activity System, Med Associate Inc, St. Albans, VT). A tail flick apparatus and digital thermometer (Fisher Scientific, Pittsburgh, PA) were used to measure antinociception and rectal temperature, respectively. The ring immobility device was constructed in the investigator's lab and consisted of a metal ring (diameter = 5.5 cm) centered at right angles to an elevated (height = 16 cm) board that was painted black. A Micromass Quattro II (Triple Quad) equipped with EI/CI Source, CPI (atmospheric pressure chemical ionization) with Megaflow and Nanoflow options was used for measurement of 2-AG levels.

***In Vivo* Procedures**

Mice were acclimated to the experimental setting for 1 h before the first injection. Baseline values for rectal temperature (in °C) and tail flick latency (in s) were obtained immediately before any injection. After injection(s), each mouse was tested in two procedures (spontaneous activity and tail flick or rectal temperature and ring immobility). Tail flick latency or rectal temperature was measured at 6 min after the last injection. Antinociception was calculated as percent of maximum possible effect {((test – control time) / (10-control time)) × 100}. In order to avoid damage to the tail, the ambient heat source was turned off after a 10-s maximum latency. Rectal temperature values were expressed as the difference between control temperature and temperature following drug administration. Five min after measurement of antinociception or rectal temperature, mice were placed in individual activity chambers and spontaneous activity was measured for

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

10 min or they were placed on the ring immobility apparatus for 5 min, respectively. Spontaneous activity was measured as total number of interruptions of 16 photocell beams per chamber during the 10-min test. During placement on the ring immobility apparatus, the total amount of time (in s) that the mouse remained motionless was measured. This value was divided by 300 s and multiplied by 100 to obtain a percent immobility rating. NAM, SR144528 and SR141716A, were administered to the mice via i.p. injection, 5 minutes befor 2-AG was administered. 2-AG was injected i.v. via the tail vein 6 minute before testing. Compounds were injected i.p. or i.v. at a volume of 0.01 ml/g body weight, (e.g., a 30 g mouse would receive an injection volume of 0.3 ml).

In Vitro Procedures

For all in vitro procedures, mice were sacrificed by decapitation and the cerebellum was dissected out. Tissue was stored at -80°C until use.

Agonist-Stimulated [^{35}S]GTPγS Binding. Tissue was placed in 5 mL cold membrane buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl, 3 mM $MgCl_2$, 1 mM EGTA, pH 7.4) and homogenized. Endocannabinoid degradation inhibitors (0.1-50 uM) were then incubated with the homogenate for 30 min at 30°C, in order to ensure that there was significant inhibition of FAAH/MAGL before 2-AG/AEA was added to the protein. The samples were then centrifuged at 50,000 g at 5°C for 10 min. The supernatant was removed and samples were re-suspended in 5mL assay buffer A (50 mM Tris-HCl, 3 mM $MgCl_2$, 0.2 mM EGTA, 100 mM NaCl, pH 7.4). Protein concentration was determined by Bradford method (Bradford, 1976). Prior to assay, membranes (4–8 µg protein) were pre-incubated for 25 min at 30 °C with adenosine deaminase (3 mU/ml) in assay buffer. Concentration-effect curves were generated by incubating the appropriate amount of membrane protein (4-8 µg) in assay buffer B (assay buffer A plus 1.25 g/L BSA) with 0.1-60 µM of cannabinoid WIN/AEA/2-AG plus inhibitors (20 – 300

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

nM) in the presence of 30 μM GDP and 0.1 nM [^{35}S]GTPγS in 0.5 mL total volume for 2 hours at 30°C. Basal binding was measured in the absence of agonist and non-specific binding was measured in the presence of 20 μM unlabeled GTPγS. The reaction was terminated by vacuum filtration though Whatman GF/B glass fiber filters, followed by three washes with 4°C Tris buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.4). Bound radioactivity was determined by liquid scintillation spectrophotometry at 95% efficiency after 10-h extraction in ScintiSafe Econo 1 scintillation fluid.

[^{3}H]SR141716A Binding. Membranes were prepared as described above. Membrane proteins (8 μg) were incubated with 0.2-3 nM [^{3}H]SR141716A in assay buffer B in the presence or absence of 5 μM unlabeled SR141716A (to determine non-specific binding) for 90min at 30°C. A second set of samples was prepared using the same protocol but with varying concentrations of NAM (0.01- 10 μM). The reaction was terminated by vacuum filtration though Whatman GF/B glass fiber filter that was pre-soaked in Tris buffer containing 5 g/L BSA (Tris-BSA), followed by 3 washes with 4°C Tris-BSA. Bound radioactivity was determined by liquid scintillation spectrophotometry at 45% efficiency after extraction in ScinitSafe Econo 1 scintillation fluid.

Quantification of 2-AG and AEA Levels. Adult female mice were injected i.p. with either vehicle (1:1:18) or 5 mg/kg NAM. One hour later, mice were decapitated and the cerebellum was harvested and rapidly cooled by immersion in liquid nitrogen. 2-AG and AEA were then extracted using a methanol/chloroform extraction (Hardison et al., 2006). Following extraction, quantification of 2-AG and AEA was conducted by Liquid chromatography mass spectrometry analysis (Kingsley and Marnett, 2003).

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

Data Analysis. Data for [^{35}S]GTPγS binding experiments are reported as mean and standard error of at least four experiments, which were each performed in triplicate. Non-specific binding was subtracted from each sample. Net stimulated [^{35}S]GTPγS binding is defined as agonist-stimulated minus basal [^{35}S]GTPγS binding, and percent stimulation is defined as (net-stimulated/basal [^{35}S]GTPγS binding) x 100%. Nonlinear iterative regression analyses of agonist concentration-effect curves were performed with Prism 4.0 (GraphPad Software, Inc., San Diego, CA). For SR141716A displacement study, data are expressed as mean and standard error for % SR141716A bound for each concentration point of NAM, which was calculated as follows (specific radiolabeled SR141716 at each concentration of NAM/ specific radio-labeled SR141716 in the absence of NAM) multiplied by 100. Statistical significance was determined by ANOVA followed by Dunnett's post hoc test. For mass spectrometry data, mean and standard error were determined for 2-AG concentration (nM) per g of cerebellum for each condition. ANOVA was used to determine significant differences between control and test groups followed by Dunnett's post hoc test. Statistical analysis was performed using Sigma Stat, version 3.1 (Systat Software, Inc., San Jose, CA). Significance was defined as $p < 0.05$.

For behavioral data, means and standard error were derived for percent antinociception, percent inhibition of locomotor activity, percent catalepsy/ring immobility and Δ°C. ANOVA was used to determine significant differences between control and test groups (n=6 for all groups) followed by Dunnett's post hoc test. Statistical analysis was performed using Sigma Stat, version 3.1.

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

Results

To determine whether the putative MAGL inhibitor NAM enhanced the *in vivo* activity of 2-AG, this endocannabinoid was exogenously administered (i.v.) to mice that had been pretreated (i.p.) with 1 mg/kg NAM or vehicle, and a tetrad of *in vivo* measures that are characteristic of cannabinoid agonists was assessed. As shown in Figure 1, 2-AG alone did not affect any of the tetrad measures at doses up to 10 mg/kg. When combined with a 1 mg/kg dose of NAM, however, 2-AG produced significant and dose-dependent hypothermia, inhibition of locomotor activity, antinociception, and catalepsy. These results are similar to those previously observed with other cannabinoid agonists (Martin et al., 1991), although the magnitude of the catalepsy effect was comparatively modest. Moreover, NAM alone did not produce any of these *in vivo* effects. These results suggest that NAM acted in a permissive manner to reveal cannabimimetic pharmacological effects of 2-AG.

Experiments were then conducted to determine whether the *in vivo* effects of 2-AG in the presence of NAM were mediated by cannabinoid receptors. Results showed that all of these effects were significantly, but not completely, reversed by the CB_1 receptor antagonist SR141716A (Figure 2). In contrast, administration of the CB_2 antagonist SR144528 did not reduce the effects of the 2-AG + NAM combination (data not shown). Similarly, the hypothermic, antinociceptive and cataleptic effects of 2-AG + NAM were significantly reduced, but were not completely absent, in CB_1 receptor knockout mice as compared to C57/Bl6 wild-type littermates (Figure 3). Interestingly, mice of both genotypes showed significant inhibition of locomotor activity that was similar in magnitude. These results indicate that the majority of the *in vivo* activity of 2-AG in the presence of NAM was CB_1 receptor-mediated. However, the residual activity of 2-AG + NAM in CB_1 knockout mice (especially the high level of locomotor inhibition) suggests the possibility of additional mechanisms of action.

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

The findings that NAM had a permissive effect on 2-AG *in vivo*, and that the effects of 2-AG + NAM were predominantly CB_1 receptor-mediated, suggested that NAM was acting to inhibit metabolic inactivation of 2-AG. However, it is possible that NAM could be positively acting on CB_1 receptors along with 2-AG. Therefore, the effects of NAM and 2-AG on CB_1 receptor binding and signaling were assessed directly in membranes prepared from mouse cerebellum, using $[^3H]$SR141716 competition and ligand-mediated $[^{35}S]$GTPγS binding assays. As shown in Figure 4, NAM alone inhibited $[^3H]$SR141716A binding in a concentration-dependent manner and decreased basal $[^{35}S]$GTPγS binding (Figure 5). In contrast, the CB_1 receptor agonist WIN 55-212-2 produced an increase in $[^{35}S]$GTPγS binding. Thus, NAM alone did not activate CB_1 receptor-mediated G-proteins. More importantly, however, when NAM was combined with 2-AG (Figure 4), a significant leftward shift in the 2-AG concentration-effect curve was observed, with no difference in maximal stimulation. Curve-fitting analysis confirmed that NAM decreased the 2-AG EC_{50} value from 4.45 ± 0.34 μM to 0.68 ± 0.21 μM, while the E_{max} value was unaffected (80.40 ± 5.67% versus 77.45 ± 4.03% in the absence or presence of NAM, respectively). These results indicate that at a concentration of 150 nM, NAM enhanced the potency of 2-AG without affecting CB_1 receptor binding sites or altering basal G-protein activation. Furthermore, this concentration of NAM did not affect either the EC_{50} or E_{max} of the CB_1 full agonist WIN 55-212-2 (data not shown). NAM + 2-AG did not cause $[^{35}S]$GTPγS binding in CB_1 knockout tissue, here 2-AG produced an E_{max} in CB1 +/+ cerebellar tissue homogenates of 93.25 +/- 8.76 %, where as the E_{max} in CB1 -/- cerebellar tissue homogenates (data not shown) was 5.54 +/- 3.31 % (not significantly different from basal), which is surprising since NAM + 2-AG produced tetrad effects in CB_1 knockout mice (However, it should be noted that the highest concentration of 2-AG tested in this tissue was 10 μM). However, the $[^{35}S]$GTPγS assay is primarily designed to detect activation of $G_{i/o}$ proteins; hence, it is entirely feasible that 2-AG may be activating a receptor(s) distinct from CB_1 that is coupled to a non $G_{i/o}$ protein such as G_S or G_{olf}.

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

To determine whether NAM selectively enhances the potency of 2-AG, G-protein activation by the endocannabinoid AEA was examined in mouse cerebellar membranes in the presence and absence of NAM or the established FAAH inhibitor URB597 (Kathuria et al., 2003). Figure 5 showed that while URB597 decreased the EC_{50} value of AEA from 2.577 ± 0.31 M to 0.31 ± 0.27 µM, NAM (at a concentration of 150 nM) had no significant effect on the EC_{50} value of AEA. Neither enzyme inhibitor significantly affected the E_{max} value of AEA (210.89 +/- 11.23 % with NAM, 207.56 +/- 9.45 % with URB-597 and 212 +/- 10.44 % in the absence of inhibitor). These results indicate that NAM selectively increases the potency of 2-AG but not AEA. Importantly, these results also suggest that NAM does not act as an allosteric modulator of CB_1 receptors at the concentration examined because neither the EC_{50} nor E_{max} value of AEA or WIN (data not shown) was altered by NAM at a concentration of 150 nM.

The finding that NAM selectively enhanced the *in vitro* potency rather than maximal effect of 2-AG is consistent with the concept that NAM inhibits degradation of 2-AG. However, these findings do not demonstrate a protective effect of NAM on 2-AG levels *in vivo*. To determine whether NAM protects against 2-AG degradation *in vivo*, mass spectrometry analysis of 2-AG and AEA levels was performed in mouse cerebellar tissue that was collected 1 h after administration of 5 mg/kg NAM. Figure 4 shows that approximately twice the level of endogenous 2-AG was detected in the presence of NAM compared to vehicle-injected mice, whereas the level of AEA was not significantly altered by NAM 30.7 +/- 3.21 pM/g in vehicle-treated tissue and 33.1 +/- 2.69 pM/g in NAM-treated tissue. Furthermore, NAM (5 mg/kg) was shown to elevate the level of exogenously administered 2-AG (1 mg/kg) from 60 nM to 135 nM/g of cerebellum. These findings strongly suggest that NAM augments the *in vivo* action of 2-AG by selectively protecting 2-AG from metabolic degradation without affecting the degradation of AEA.

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

Discussion

The role of 2-AG in the CNS has not been well defined, likely due to its lability in the presence of endogenous MAGL. Previous studies showed that 2-AG was rapidly degraded (20 min) (Laine et al., 2002), suggesting that prevention of enzymatic degradation is necessary to reveal its pharmacological properties and biological functions. Consistent with this premise, the present results show that 2-AG produced significant dose-dependent effects in all tests in the cannabinoid tetrad when mice were pre-treated with NAM, but not when 2-AG was administered alone. Furthermore, tetrad effects observed with the combination of NAM and 2-AG were significantly attenuated by the CB_1-selective antagonist SR141716A, but unaffected by the CB_2-selective antagonist SR144528. These results are consistent with a large body of research demonstrating that cannabinoids of various classes, including AEAs (when metabolism is inhibited), THC-like cannabinoids, bicyclic cannabinoids, and aminoalkylindoles, produce dose-dependent and CB_1 mediated effects in these tests (Bourne et al., 2007; Compton and Martin, 1997; Compton et al., 1992a; Compton et al., 1992b; Wise et al., 2007).

The finding that 2-AG produced significant tetrad effects only when mice were pretreated with 1 mg/kg NAM suggests that NAM may be preventing enzymatic degradation of 2-AG by inhibiting MAGL. In contrast with the 1 mg/kg dose of NAM, a 10-fold lower dose (0.1 mg/kg) only moderately enhanced the tetrad effects of 2-AG (data not shown), suggesting insufficient inhibition of MAGL at this lower dose. The fact that NAM's enhancement of 2-AG was dose-dependent lends further support to the hypothesis of a saturable substrate (e.g., enzyme inhibition) is its mechanism of action.

However, it was important to rule out other explanations for the enhancement observed. First, we showed that 2-AG levels in the cerebellum increased substantially following administration of NAM but that AEA levels

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

were unaltered. These data suggest that NAM inhibits MAGL, which is in agreement with previous research (Saario et al., 2005). Second, NAM increased the potency, but not the efficacy, of 2-AG, thus ruling out the idea that NAM might alter the number of CB_1 receptors activated or the magnitude of activation by 2-AG. In contrast, NAM did not alter either potency or efficacy of AEA, suggesting that it is selective for metabolic inhibition of 2-AG and not AEA at the concentration tested. These results further suggest that MAGL does not degrade AEA and are consistent with previous research reports showing that FAAH preferentially degrades AEA (Boger et al., 2000; McKinney and Cravatt, 2005). However, it is worth noting that FAAH also degrades 2-AG to some extent (Basavarajappa, 2007). In addition, NAM is not exclusively selective for MAGL, but at a high concentration (50 μM) also interacts with FAAH (Blankman et al., 2007). Since this concentration is approximately 300 times greater than that used in the present study and since we saw no elevation of AEA levels in NAM-treated animals, NAM-mediated inhibition of FAAH is unlikely to account for the findings here.

Another possibility that we considered was that NAM might enhance the tetrad effects of 2-AG by directly activating the CB_1 receptor, although it did not produce tetrad effects when administered alone. In order to exclude this possibility more conclusively, the effects of NAM on CB_1 receptor binding and activation were examined. Results showed that, although NAM binds to the CB_1 receptor (at μM concentrations), it did not activate G-proteins. In fact, NAM inhibited basal G-protein activity, suggesting that it may be an antagonist/inverse agonist for the CB_1 receptor rather than an agonist. However, it is worth noting that NAM inhibits MAGL at a lower concentration than is required to block the CB_1 receptor, as shown by the fact that the 150 nM concentration of NAM enhanced 2-AG mediated [^{35}S]GTPγS binding, but did not cause significant SR141716A displacement or alter basal [^{35}S]GTPγS binding when presented alone. Based on these results, we concluded that NAM did not potentiate the tetrad effects of 2-AG through co-activation of the CB_1 receptor.

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

Although the tetrad effects observed with the combination of NAM and 2-AG were similar to those obtained with traditional THC-like cannabinoids (Martin et al., 1991), differences were also apparent. First, the maximum magnitude of hypothermia produced by 2-AG + NAM was approximately -3°C, as it is for AEA in PMSF-pretreated mice (Compton and Martin, 1997). In contrast, THC typically produces maximal temperature decreases up to -6 ^{o}C. A second difference is that 2-AG (+ NAM) produced a maximum of only 40-60 % catalepsy at doses that produced approximately 80% antinociception and suppression of locomotion. While this degree of catalepsy is often seen with THC-like cannabinoids, it is far lower than that observed with AEA (approximately 80-90 %) at doses that produced a similar magnitude of locomotor inhibition and antinociception (Compton and Martin, 1997). Hence, the pharmacological effects of 2-AG do not entirely resemble either THC or AEA.

One possible explanation for these apparent differences is that the dose of NAM utilized in these experiments may not fully inhibit MAGL. The presence of residual MAGL activity would result in effectively lower doses of 2-AG. For example, AEA causes a greater degree of hypothermia in mice that lack FAAH than in mice that were treated with PMSF and AEA (Compton and Martin, 1997; Wise et al., 2007). In order to investigate whether residual MAGL may have contributed to the results here, we tested a higher dose of NAM (3 mg/kg) in combination with 2-AG, but obtained similar results (data not shown). A more plausible explanation is that 2-AG is not only degraded by MAGL, but also by a compensatory/backup 2-AG hydrolyzing enzyme that is not affected by NAM. This alternative enzyme may be a member of the cycloxygenase family (Hu et al., 2008).

In addition to testing 2-AG in wild-type C57/Bl6 mice, we also assessed its effects in CB_1 knockout mice in the tetrad. These data were interesting for a couple of reasons. First, although the hypothermic, cataleptic and antinociceptive effects of 2-AG (+ NAM) were reduced in CB_1 knockout mice (vs. wild-type littermates), these

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

effects were not absent, as the magnitude of each effect was still significantly different from vehicle in these mice. Surprisingly, we found that, unlike the other three measures, locomotor inhibition was not reduced significantly in CB_1 knockout mice treated with 2-AG (+ NAM) as compared to wildtype mice. While somewhat surprising, these results were consistent with the observation that AEA produced the same level of locomotor inhibition, regardless of CB_1 genotype (Wise et al., 2007). While these results suggest that endocannabinoid action at non-CB_1, non-CB_2 cannabinoid receptor(s) might play a role in these findings, the possibility of a developmental compensatory process in the knockout mice cannot be entirely eliminated (Mackie, 2007). Interestingly, previous research has suggested that there may be other receptor targets for cannabinoids that, to date, have not been identified (Breivogel et al., 2001; Wiley and Martin, 2002). One possible non-CB_1 receptor candidate is GPR 55. Studies have shown that 2-AG and AEA stimulate [^{35}S]GTPγS binding in GPR 55 transfected cells (Pertwee, 2007; Ryberg et al., 2007). However, our behavioral and biochemical data suggest that 2-AG may be activating a non $G_{i/o}$-coupled receptor, ruling out the GPR 55 receptor since it seems to be coupled to a $G_{i/o}$ protein.

In conclusion, NAM treatment revealed the *in vivo* activity of 2-AG. While there were similarities in the profile of effects of 2-AG (+ NAM) and other cannabinoids in the tetrad, there were also differences. Notably, 2-AG (+ NAM) was less efficacious in producing hypothermia and catalepsy. Further, our *in vitro* data suggest that NAM enhanced the effect of 2-AG through inhibition of MAGL. Interestingly, however, some of the findings from this study also point to the possibility that 2-AG may have a target in the CNS that is distinct from the CB_1/CB_2 receptor. These results suggest that NAM (and other MAGL inhibitors) will be valuable tools to elucidate the biological functions of 2-AG. Moreover, dysregulation of 2-AG homeostasis might contribute to certain disorders, and NAM could provide a new therapeutic lead for development of MAGL inhibitors for

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

treatment of conditions such as chronic neuropathic pain, depression, and traumatic brain injury (Hill et al., 2008; Panikashvili et al., 2001; Petrosino et al., 2007).

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to dedicate this paper to the memory of Dr. Billy R Martin, an exceptional scientist and a wonderful human being, who was an inspiration to us all. We also thank Dr. Katherine W Falenski for *in vitro* work conducted with NAM; Ramona Winkler, Mary O'Connell, and Mary Tokarz for their assistance with mouse tetrad experiments; Justin Poklis for conducting mass spectrometry analysis; and QingTao for conducting the endocannabinoid extraction procedure. Finally, we would like to thank Cayman Chemical Company for providing the N-arachidonyl maleimide.

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

References

Basavarajappa BS (2007) Critical enzymes involved in endocannabinoid metabolism. *Protein Pept Lett* **14**:237-246.

Blankman JL, Simon GM and Cravatt BF (2007) A comprehensive profile of brain enzymes that hydrolyze the endocannabinoid 2-arachidonoylglycerol. *Chem Biol* **14**:1347-1356.

Boger DL, Fecik RA, Patterson JE, Miyauchi H, Patricelli MP and Cravatt BF (2000) Fatty acid amide hydrolase substrate specificity. *Bioorganic Medicinal Chemistry Letters* **10**:2613-2616.

Bourne C, Roy S, Wiley JL, Martin BR, Thomas BF, Mahadevan A and Razdan RK (2007) Novel, potent THC/anandamide (hybrid) analogs. *Bioorg Med Chem* **15**:7850-7864.

Bradford MM (1976) A rapid and sensitive method for the quantitation of microgram quantities of protein utilizing the principle of protein-dye binding. *Anal Biochem* **72**:248-254.

Breivogel CS, Griffin G, Di Marzo V and Martin BR (2001) Evidence for a new G protein-coupled cannabinoid receptor in mouse brain. *Mol Pharmacol* **60**:155-163.

Compton DR, Gold LH, Ward SJ, Balster RL and Martin BR (1992a) Aminoalkylindole analogs: cannabimimetic activity of a class of compounds structurally distinct from delta 9-tetrahydrocannabinol. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* **263**:1118-1126.

Compton DR, Johnson MR, Melvin LS and Martin BR (1992b) Pharmacological profile of a series of bicyclic cannabinoid analogs: classification as cannabimimetic agents. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* **260**:201-209.

Compton DR and Martin BR (1997) The effect of the enzyme inhibitor phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride on the pharmacological effect of anandamide in the mouse model of cannabimimetic activity. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* **283**:1138-1143.

Cota D (2007) CB1 receptors: emerging evidence for central and peripheral mechanisms that regulate energy balance, metabolism, and cardiovascular health. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev* **23**:507-517.

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

D'Argenio G, Petrosino S, Gianfrani C, Valenti M, Scaglione G, Grandone I, Nigam S, Sorrentini I, Mazzarella G and Di Marzo V (2007) Overactivity of the intestinal endocannabinoid system in celiac disease and in methotrexate-treated rats. *J Mol Med* **85**:523-530.

Devane WA, Hanus L, Breuer A, Pertwee RG, Stevenson LA, Griffin G, Gibson D, Mandelbaum A, Etinger A and Mechoulam R (1992) Isolation and structure of a brain constituent that binds to the cannabinoid receptor. *Science* **258**:1946-1949.

Hardison S, Weintraub ST and Giuffrida A (2006) Quantification of endocannabinoids in rat biological samples by GC/MS: technical and theoretical considerations. *Prostaglandins Other Lipid Mediat* **81**:106-112.

Hill MN, Miller GE, Ho WS, Gorzalka BB and Hillard CJ (2008) Serum endocannabinoid content is altered in females with depressive disorders: a preliminary report. *Pharmacopsychiatry* **41**:48-53.

Hillard CJ (2000) Biochemistry and pharmacology of the endocannabinoids arachidonylethanolamide and 2-arachidonylglycerol. *Prostaglandins Other Lipid Mediat* **61**:3-18.

Hohmann AG, Suplita RL, Bolton NM, Neely MH, Fegley D, Mangieri R, Krey JF, Walker JM, Holmes PV, Crystal JD, Duranti A, Tontini A, Mor M, Tarzia G and Piomelli D (2005) An endocannabinoid mechanism for stress-induced analgesia. *Nature* **435**:1108-1112.

Howlett AC (2002) The cannabinoid receptors. *Prostaglandins Other Lipid Mediat* **68-69**:619-631.

Hu SS, Bradshaw HB, Chen JS, Tan B and Walker JM (2008) Prostaglandin E2 glycerol ester, an endogenous COX-2 metabolite of 2-arachidonoylglycerol, induces hyperalgesia and modulates NFkappaB activity. *Br J Pharmacol* **153**:1538-1549.

Jayamanne A, Greenwood R, Mitchell VA, Aslan S, Piomelli D and Vaughan CW (2006) Actions of the FAAH inhibitor URB597 in neuropathic and inflammatory chronic pain models. *Br J Pharmacol* **147**:281-288.

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

Kathuria S, Gaetani S, Fegley D, Valino F, Duranti A, Tontini A, Mor M, Tarzia G, La Rana G, Calignano A, Giustino A, Tattoli M, Palmery M, Cuomo V and Piomelli D (2003) Modulation of anxiety through blockade of anandamide hydrolysis. *Nat Med* **9**:76-81.

Kingsley PJ and Marnett LJ (2003) Analysis of endocannabinoids by Ag+ coordination tandem mass spectrometry. *Anal Biochem* **314**:8-15.

Laine K, Jarvinen K, Mechoulam R, Breuer A and Jarvinen T (2002) Comparison of the enzymatic stability and intraocular pressure effects of 2-arachidonylglycerol and noladin ether, a novel putative endocannabinoid. *Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci* **43**:3216-3222.

Lio YC, Reynolds LJ, Balsinde J and Dennis EA (1996) Irreversible inhibition of Ca(2+)-independent phospholipase A2 by methyl arachidonyl fluorophosphonate. *Biochim Biophys Acta* **1302**:55-60.

Mackie K (2007) Understanding cannabinoid psychoactivity with mouse genetic models. *PLoS Biol* **5**:e280.

Makara JK, Mor M, Fegley D, Szabo SI, Kathuria S, Astarita G, Duranti A, Tontini A, Tarzia G, Rivara S, Freund TF and Piomelli D (2005) Selective inhibition of 2-AG hydrolysis enhances endocannabinoid signaling in hippocampus. *Nat Neurosci* **8**:1139-1141.

Martin BR, Compton DR, Thomas BF, Prescott WR, Little PJ, Razdan RK, Johnson MR, Melvin LS, Mechoulam R and Ward SJ (1991) Behavioral, biochemical, and molecular modeling evaluations of cannabinoid analogs. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav* **40**:471-478.

McKinney MK and Cravatt BF (2005) Structure and function of fatty acid amide hydrolase. *Annu Rev Biochem* **74**:411-432.

National Research Council (1996) *Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals*. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.

Panikashvili D, Simeonidou C, Ben-Shabat S, Hanus L, Breuer A, Mechoulam R and Shohami E (2001) An endogenous cannabinoid (2-AG) is neuroprotective after brain injury. *Nature* **413**:527-531.

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

Pertwee RG (1997) Pharmacology of cannabinoid CB1 and CB2 receptors. *Pharmacol Ther* **74**:129-180.

Pertwee RG (2007) GPR55: a new member of the cannabinoid receptor clan? *Br J Pharmacol* **152**:984-986.

Petrosino S, Palazzo E, de Novellis V, Bisogno T, Rossi F, Maione S and Di Marzo V (2007) Changes in spinal and supraspinal endocannabinoid levels in neuropathic rats. *Neuropharmacology* **52**:415-422.

Ryberg E, Larsson N, Sjogren S, Hjorth S, Hermansson NO, Leonova J, Elebring T, Nilsson K, Drmota T and Greasley PJ (2007) The orphan receptor GPR55 is a novel cannabinoid receptor. *Br J Pharmacol* **152**:1092-1101.

Saario SM, Salo OM, Nevalainen T, Poso A, Laitinen JT, Jarvinen T and Niemi R (2005) Characterization of the sulfhydryl-sensitive site in the enzyme responsible for hydrolysis of 2-arachidonoyl-glycerol in rat cerebellar membranes. *Chem Biol* **12**:649-656.

Savinainen JR, Saario SM, Niemi R, Jarvinen T and Laitinen JT (2003) An optimized approach to study endocannabinoid signaling: evidence against constitutive activity of rat brain adenosine A1 and cannabinoid CB1 receptors. *Br J Pharmacol* **140**:1451-1459.

Szabo B and Schlicker E (2005) Effects of cannabinoids on neurotransmission. *Handb Exp Pharmacol*:327-365.

Van Sickle MD, Duncan M, Kingsley PJ, Mouihate A, Urbani P, Mackie K, Stella N, Makriyannis A, Piomelli D, Davison JS, Marnett LJ, Di Marzo V, Pittman QJ, Patel KD and Sharkey KA (2005) Identification and functional characterization of brainstem cannabinoid CB2 receptors. *Science* **310**:329-332.

Wiley JL and Martin BR (2002) Cannabinoid pharmacology: implications for additional cannabinoid receptor subtypes. *Chem Phys Lipids* **121**:57-63.

Wise LE, Shelton CC, Cravatt BF, Martin BR and Lichtman AH (2007) Assessment of anandamide's pharmacological effects in mice deficient of both fatty acid amide hydrolase and cannabinoid CB1 receptors. *Eur J Pharmacol* **557**:44-48.

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

Footnotes

Research supported by National Institute of Health grants DA-016644 (JLW), DA-03672 (JLW), DA-09789 (JLW), DA-05274 (DES), DA-14277 (LJS), and DA-05488 (RKR).

Reprint requests to: Dr. Jenny Wiley, Dept. of Pharmacology & Toxicology, Virginia Commonwealth University, Box 980613, Richmond, VA 23298-0613, 804-828-2067 (phone), 804-828-2117 (fax), jwiley@vcu.edu (e-mail).

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

Legends for Figures

Figure 1. Effects of NAM and 2-AG alone and in combination on locomotor activity (a) rectal temperature (b), antinociception (c), and catalepsy (d). n = 6 mice per group. Significance from vehicle ($P < 0.05$) is denoted by *.

Figure 2. Effect of SR141716A on on locomotor activity (a), rectal temperature (b), antinociception (c), and catalepsy (d), induced by NAM and 2-AG. n = 6 mice per group. Significantly different effect ($p < 0.05$) from vehicle baseline is denoted by * whereas # denotes a significantly ($p < 0.05$) reduced effect compared to 2-AG + NAM.

Figure 3. Effects of NAM (1mg/kg) + 2-AG (10 mg/kg) on locomotor activity (a), rectal temperature (b), antinociception (c), and catalepsy (d) in $CB_1^{-/-}$ knockout and $CB_1^{+/+}$ wild-type mice. n = 6 mice per group. CB1 KO mice .Significant difference from VEH + NAM is denoted by * whereas a significant between wild-type and knockout mice ($p < 0.05$) is denoted by #.

Figure 4: (a) Effect of NAM on the percentage of radiolabeled SR141716A bound to cerebellum protein. (b) Stimulation of CB_1 mediated G-proteins by 2-AG alone and with NAM. (c) Effect of vehicle vs. NAM on endogenous 2-AG levels in the cerebellum. In all panels, significance (compared to baseline) is denoted by * ($P< 0.05$).

Figure 5. (a) Effect of NAM (300 nM pre-incubation followed by a 150 nM incubation) on AEA stimulated CB_1 mediated G-protein activation. (b) Effect of URB-597 (50 nM pre-incubation followed by a 10 nM incubation)

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

on AEA stimulated CB_1 mediated G-protein activation. (c) Effects of NAM (open triangles) to prevent [^{35}S]GTPγS binding. Significant difference is indicated by * ($P < 0.05$)

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.



Figure 1

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024









Figure 2

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024



Figure 3

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024



Figure 4

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024



*

Figure 5

JPET Fast Forward. Published on August 5, 2008 as DOI: 10.1124/jpet.108.141382
This article has not been copyedited and formatted. The final version may differ from this version.

Downloaded from jpet.aspetjournals.org at ASPET Journals on April 19, 2024