

Allostery at opioid receptors: modulation with small molecule ligands

Kathryn E Livingston and John R Traynor

Department of Pharmacology, University of Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor, MI 48109,
USA

Running Title: Allostery at opioid receptors

Correspondence to:

John Traynor

Department of Pharmacology

University of Michigan Medical School

1301 MSRB III

1150 West Medical Center Drive

Ann Arbor

MI 48109-5632

Email: jtraynor@umich.edu

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as doi: [10.1111/bph.13823](https://doi.org/10.1111/bph.13823)

Abstract

Opioid receptors are 7-transmembrane domain receptors that couple to heterotrimeric G proteins. The endogenous ligands for opioid receptors are peptides which bind to the orthosteric site on the receptors. The μ -opioid receptor is the target for opioid analgesics while the δ -opioid receptor has been suggested as a target for pain management, migraine, and depression. Similarly, κ -opioid receptors are involved in pain and depression and nociceptin receptors in pain and mood behaviors. However, exogenous orthosteric ligands for the opioid receptors cause a myriad of on-target side effects. Recently selective allosteric ligands for μ - and δ -opioid receptors have been described. These compounds bind to a site on the receptor distinct from the orthosteric site. Occupation of this allosteric site leads to modulation of orthosteric ligand binding affinity and/or efficacy. Allosteric modulators may be positive, negative, or silent (neutral) (PAMs, NAMs or SAMs respectively). PAMs may have *in vivo* activity by enhancing the activity of exogenous drugs or endogenous opioid peptides. Enhancing endogenous opioid peptide activity maintains the temporal and spatial distribution of these molecules but improves and potentially qualitatively changes activity at their cognate receptors which could limit side-effects compared to traditional opioid drugs. In this review we describe the rationale and promise for the development of allosteric modulators for opioid receptors, the discovery of selective allosteric modulators, the identification of potential allosteric sites on opioid receptors, and the mode of action of the modulators.

Introduction

The role of the [mu-opioid receptor](#) (μ -OR) (Alexander et al., 2015), in the modulation of pain makes this receptor one of the most pharmacologically targeted G protein-coupled receptors (GPCRs) in modern medicine and μ -OR agonists such as [morphine](#) and oxycodone are invaluable in the clinic. As a result the number of prescriptions written for opioid analgesics is rising rapidly. However, while activation of μ -OR provides pain-relief it also results in a wide range of unwanted effects including constipation and life-threatening respiratory depression, as well as rewarding effects that lead to addiction liability (Matthes et al., 1996). This in turn has led to the current opioid abuse epidemic in the UK, USA, and other countries. In the USA specifically, there has been a 4-fold increase in the number of deaths from licit and illicit opioids since 1999 (Heron, 2016; Volkow, 2014). In addition, the effectiveness of traditional opioid drugs such as morphine in the management of neuropathic pain is controversial (Smith et al., 2012; McNicol et al., 2013). Consequently, there remains an unmet need for safer efficacious analgesics that circumvent the issues associated with activation of μ -OR by opioid drugs.

Alternative approaches have included the development of compounds acting at other members of the [opioid receptor](#) (OR) family (Alexander et al., 2015), particularly [delta](#) (δ -OR) and [kappa](#) (κ -OR) agonists, as well as compounds with activity at more than one opioid receptor. While δ -OR

agonists suffer from a lack of efficacious analgesia and proconvulsive effects, they may be effective as antidepressants (Jutkiewicz, 2006) and in migraine treatment (Charles and Pradhan, 2016). Additionally, κ -OR agonists possess analgesic properties (Chavkin, 2011) but are linked with dysphoria (Pfeiffer et al., 1986) and are pro-depressant to the extent that κ -OR antagonists may find use in the management of depression (Shippenberg, 2009; Chavkin, 2011; Lalanne et al., 2014). Finally, agonists for the [nociception receptor](#) (NOPR; Alexander et al., 2015) may be analgesic or pronociceptive depending on the circumstances (Lambert, 2008). Selective δ -OR, κ -OR, and NOPR compounds have not successfully found their way into the clinic, although mixed μ -OR/ δ -OR (Harland et al., 2015) and mixed μ -OR/NOPR compounds (Toll, 2013) show promise.

Despite best efforts, the μ -OR system remains the most efficacious target for the treatment of pain. In this review we discuss allosteric modulators as a novel way to harness the analgesic efficacy of the μ -OR and the potentially beneficial therapeutic actions of other opioid receptors. This article focusses on small molecule exogenous ligands as allosteric modulators of the μ -OR. In addition, allosteric modulation of the μ -OR (and other GPCRs) *via* receptor heteromers has also been proposed. For information on this aspect the reader is referred to reviews by Fujita et al (2015) and Ferre et al (2014).

Allosteric ligands of opioid receptors as potential therapeutics

Morphine and other traditional opioid drugs act at the orthosteric site on the opioid receptors, defined as the site for the [endogenous opioid peptides](#), including Leu- and Met-enkephalin, β -endorphin and the dynorphins. Opioid receptors, like all 7-transmembrane domain (7-TM), GPCRs, are allosteric proteins. The simplest idea of 7-TM domain receptor action can be explained by the Monod-Wyman-Changeux two-state allosterity model (Monod et al., 1965) where receptors are divided into inactive (R) and active (R*) conformations that exist in

equilibrium. These do not represent individual conformations but rather ensembles of R and R* states (Kenakin, 2013). R* states are distinguished from R states by an ability to bind agonists with high affinity and activate heterotrimeric G proteins, triggering downstream intracellular signaling pathways. The conformational state of a GPCR, including ORs, is controlled not only by agonist occupying the orthosteric site but also by endogenous substances acting at other sites on the receptor. These include sodium ions (Pert and Snyder, 1974; Simon and Groth, 1975; Yabaluri and Medzihradsky, 1997; Fenalti et al., 2014; Shang et al., 2014), and interacting proteins, especially heterotrimeric G proteins that stabilize the R* state (DeVree et al., 2016). Furthermore, there is evidence that the lipid environment regulates GPCR function. In particular, cholesterol modulates the function of both μ - and δ -ORs (Levitt et al., 2009; Xu et al., 2008; Zheng et al., 2012) as well as other GPCRs, probably by a combination of direct actions at a conserved motif on the receptors and membrane effects (for review, see Oates and Watts, 2011).

A burgeoning field in drug discovery at GPCRs is the development of small molecule allosteric modulators that bind to druggable pockets on receptors separate from the orthosteric sites. These spatially distinct allosteric sites are defined by the ability of molecules binding at these sites to regulate the activity of molecules binding at the orthosteric site (Figure 1). Allosteric modulators can alter affinity, potency, and efficacy of orthosteric ligands. Positive allosteric modulators (PAMs) improve the activity of orthosteric ligands. Negative allosteric modulators (NAMs) do the opposite and SAMs or silent allosteric modulators occupy the site without activity and as such act as antagonists to PAMs and NAMs. Ideally, PAMs and NAMs would enhance or inhibit respectively the affinity and/or efficacy of an orthosteric ligand while failing to directly activate or inhibit the receptor on its own. However, some compounds may have direct agonist activity; such compounds are known as “ago-PAMs” (Figure 1). Allosteric activity is dependent on the binding affinity (K_B) of the modulator and the allosteric cooperativity ($\alpha\beta$) which describes the ability of the modulator to change the affinity and/or efficacy of an orthosteric ligand (Figure 1; Christopoulos and Kenakin, 2002; Melancon et al., 2012; Christopoulos, 2014). Allosteric modulators also have differing effects depending on the orthosteric ligand, a phenomenon called

‘probe dependence’. It is thought that allosteric modulators provide better selectivity and could provide better therapeutic indexes with fewer side effects. For more on this topic see (Christopoulos and Kenakin, 2002; Christopoulos, 2014; Christopoulos et al., 2014; Burford et al., 2015a).

A prime example of the potential power of allosteric modulators is PAM activity at the μ -OR (μ -PAM). Such a compound could serve to increase the potency and/or efficacy of opioid drugs like morphine, and lower the dose requirement. Perhaps more importantly, a μ -PAM can be predicted to enhance the activity of endogenous opioid peptides which are elevated during stress and in pain states (Hughes, 1983). This activity would be confined to μ -ORs that have access to released endogenous opioids at specific times, and so maintain their spatial as well as temporal selectivity pattern. This is in sharp contrast to traditional opioid agonists which activate μ -OR across many tissues with limitations set only by pharmacokinetic parameters. There is evidence that such an approach would be feasible since non-selectively increasing opioid peptide levels by blocking enzymes responsible for their degradation with “enkephalinase inhibitors” provides preclinical analgesia (Roques et al., 2012), but not constipation (Noble et al., 2008), respiratory depression (Boudinot et al., 2001), antinociceptive tolerance (Noble et al., 1992b) or abuse liability (Noble et al., 1992a; Valverde et al., 1996).

An additional potential advantage of using small molecule allosteric modulators for the ORs is to introduce a signaling bias downstream of the receptors. Biased agonism is the preferential activation of one signaling pathway over another and has been demonstrated at the μ -OR between β -arrestin recruitment and G protein activation (McPherson et al., 2010, Thompson et al., 2015). The goal of bias signaling is to activate pathways downstream of ORs responsible for the beneficial effects (e.g. pain-relieving in the case of the μ -OR) without activating pathways producing undesirable effects. For example, the β -arrestin pathway has been implicated in the constipation and respiratory depressive actions of opioids (Raehal and Bohn, 2011), and newly developed biased ligands including Oliceridine (TRV130; Dewire et al., 2013) and PZM21

(Manglik et al., 2016) avoid activation of this pathway. It is tempting to speculate that the μ -OR occupied by a PAM might behave as a novel receptor compared to an unoccupied μ -OR and so be envisaged to signal differently. Similarly introducing bias at δ -ORs could promote antidepressant actions over proconvulsant actions and at κ -ORs could enhance analgesia at the expense of dysphoria. For a more comprehensive discussion of the potential benefits of opioid PAMs as therapeutic agents see (Burford et al., 2015a).

Discovery of small molecule allosteric modulators of opioid receptors

The BMS series of compounds

The first selective positive allosteric modulators of μ -OR, BMS-986121 and [BMS-986122](#), were identified in 2013 (Table 1; Figure 2; Burford et al., 2013) using a high-throughput screen (HTS) monitoring for ability to enhance a low concentration of the putative endogenous μ -OR agonist, endomorphin-1, to recruit β -arrestin to μ -OR. The HTS methodology has been described in detail (Burford et al., 2014; Bertekap et al., 2015). Further studies with BMS-986122 showed that it can enhance the affinity and/or efficacy of various opioid agonists, including opioid peptides Leu- and Met-enkephalin, β -endorphin as well as endomorphin-1. Along with BMS-986122, a number of structurally similar μ -PAMs were identified, plus SAMs such as BMS-986124 (Figure 2). BMS-986122 exhibits dramatic probe dependence in that its effects are reliant on the ligand occupying the orthosteric site. For agonists such as [methadone](#), [DAMGO](#), and the endogenous opioid peptides, BMS-986122 enhances the potency and affinity while for morphine and nalbuphine it enhances agonist efficacy with no alteration in the affinity. There is no effect on the binding of antagonists (Livingston and Traynor, 2014). This is discussed in more detail later under “mechanism of allosterism at opioid receptors” in the subsection “role of orthosteric ligand and Na^+ ions” as it points to a potential explanation for the action of the

modulators. BMS-986122 does not have PAM activity at the δ -OR, a fact which has been taken into account in structure-activity studies.

The structure-activity relationships of the BMS series of μ -OR allosteric modulators published so far is unclear. Subtle changes have profound effects on defining a compound as a PAM or a SAM (compare BMS-986122 and BMS-986124 in Figure 2). No NAMs have been described in this series. With this in mind Bisignano et al (Bisignano et al., 2015) searched the emolecules (emolecules) and ZINC (Irwin et al., 2012) databases for structural analogues. Of the compounds identified 28 were evaluated in the β -arrestin recruitment assay; 14 were found to be PAMs and 12 were identified as SAMs. None of the compounds had higher affinity than the original molecules, although one compound, MS1 (Table 1; Figure 2), was chosen for a more extensive study. MS1 did not bind to the μ -OR orthosteric site but improved the affinity of methadone and the potency of methadone to activate heterotrimeric G proteins. Surprisingly, neither the affinity nor potency to activate G proteins was enhanced for [endorphin-1](#) or DAMGO, in spite of the fact that MS1 was discovered using endomorphin-1 as the orthosteric probe. This anomaly could be due to the fact that endomorphins may be β -arrestin-biased molecules (McPherson et al., 2010). On the other hand, the conflicting probe dependence may be explained by the relatively weak allosteric cooperativity of MS1, even against methadone which thus far is the most sensitive orthosteric ligand to allosteric modulation (Livingston and Traynor, 2014).

Using the β -arrestin recruitment HTS assay (Burford et al., 2014; Bertekap et al., 2015) allosteric modulators of the closely related δ -OR have been discovered (Burford et al., 2015b). These compounds are structurally dissimilar to BMS-986122 being tetramethyl substituted hexahydroxanthine-1,8-diones. The lead compound BMS-986187 (Table 1; Figure 2) is effective as a δ -PAM in the <100 nM range, while showing 100-fold weaker PAM activity at the μ -OR. The high potency of BMS-986187 is somewhat surprising given its affinity for the unoccupied receptor (K_B) of approximately 1 μ M. On the other hand, this demonstrates that allosterism is bidirectional and so the orthosteric agonist enhances PAM affinity, and also highlights the

importance of efficacy interactions (β) as well as affinity interactions (α). Indeed, BMS-986187 is able to stimulate signaling downstream of δ -OR even in the absence of orthosteric agonist. However, the compound does not bind to the orthosteric site, as determined by its inability to displace ^3H -diprenorphine and so it is activating the receptor through its allosteric site. Consequently, it is designated as an “ago-PAM” (Figure 1). Like the μ -PAMs, BMS-986187 also exhibited probe dependence when tested on a limited number of compounds with a greatest effect on the affinity of the peptide Leu-enkephalin (32-fold shift) and smaller shifts for SNC80 (14-fold shift) and Tan-67 (3-fold shift). BMS-986187 acted as a δ -PAM for several downstream measures including the [^{35}S]GTP γ S binding assay, inhibition of adenylate cyclase, recruitment of β -arrestin and phosphorylation of ERK1/2 for all three of the aforementioned ligands (Burford et al., 2015b). Moreover, BMS-986187 has been demonstrated to potentiate endogenous opioid signaling at δ -OR in intercalated cells that modulate output from the amygdala (Winters et al., 2016).

Other putative allosteric modulators

In addition to the small molecules described above, other putative, structurally unrelated modulators of ORs have been described (Table 1; Figure 2).

The cannabinoids [\$\Delta^9\$ -tetrahydrocannabinol](#) (THC) and [Cannabidiol](#) (CBD) (Figure 2) were suggested many years ago (Vaysse et al., 1987) to be NAMs of both μ -OR and δ -OR. This assertion was based on the ability of the cannabinoids to fully inhibit ^3H -orthosteric agonist binding to the μ -OR and δ -OR in rat brain membranes, in a non-competitive manner, by reducing the Bmax but not altering ligand affinity. To avoid the caveat that the compounds might be working *via* [cannabinoid \(CB\) receptors](#) in the rat brain membranes and so acting indirectly through receptor–receptor interactions the authors showed THC to be just as effective at solubilized, partially purified μ -OR. This also suggests the effect was on the receptor itself or a

closely associated lipid, but not due to a non-specific effect on the lipid bilayer. In support of this CB receptor-independent effect on μ -OR, several other cannabinoids displayed a wide variety of activities that were not correlated with their activity at CB receptors. For instance, levonantradol and dextrantradol, were equiactive at inhibiting binding of the μ -OR orthosteric agonist ^3H -DHM (dihydromorphine) to rat brain membranes but showed 100-fold difference in behavioral potencies as cannabinoids (Johnson et al., 1981). Also, 11-hydroxy-THC displayed comparable cannabinoid potency to THC, but had less than 20 % of the activity of THC at displacing ^3H -DHM. Later kinetic experiments comparing the effect of THC and CBD at μ -OR and δ -OR in rat cortical membranes (Kathmann et al., 2006) were claimed to support the idea of the cannabinoids as allosteric modulators by demonstrating that CBD and THC at high concentrations (30-100 μM) increased the dissociation rate for the μ -OR agonist ^3H -DAMGO in the presence of a high concentration of naloxone. Similar, but much smaller shifts in the dissociation rate of the antagonist ^3H -NTI (naltrindole) from the δ -OR were seen. On the other hand both THC and CBD alone enhanced ^3H -DAMGO and ^3H -NTI dissociation and also displaced DAMGO binding in competition assays, giving affinities in the 10 μM range, albeit with a reported Hill slope ~ 1.5 , though only CBD inhibited ^3H -NTI binding. Moreover, no functional studies of allosterism have been reported. Thus it cannot be ruled out that the cannabinoids at these very high concentrations are acting non-specifically or even binding to the orthosteric site rather than acting as true allosteric modulators. The CB1 antagonist rimonabant shows a similar profile (Kathmann et al., 2006) and this compound has been reported to have an affinity at μ -OR of 650nM and to be a μ -OR antagonist *in vivo* and *in vitro* (Seeley et al., 2012). The concentrations of the cannabinoids acting at opioid receptors are much higher than their affinity for the CB1 cannabinoid receptor, suggesting that activity at ORs likely does not play a role in the *in vivo* activities of the cannabinoids.

The neoclerodan diterpene [Salvinorin A](#) (Sal A; Figure 2) is a selective κ -OR agonist which lacks a positively charged nitrogen atom for interaction with the conserved Asp in TM-III of the

κ -OR (Roth et al., 2002). Based on the observation that Sal A has a weak ability to compete with orthosteric ligands at μ -OR, Rothman and colleagues examined the compound as a possible allosteric modulator of this receptor (Rothman et al., 2007). Their data suggested that Sal A might be a negative allosteric modulator of μ -OR based on its ability to only partially inhibit binding of the agonists ^3H -DAMGO or ^{125}I -[IOXY] or the antagonist ^3H -diprenorphine to the orthosteric site of the receptor in both μ -OR expressing CHO cells and rat brain membranes. Binding experiments showed that Sal A decreased the affinity of the orthosteric ligands by 2 to 3-fold, reduced B_{max} values and had complex effects on ligand dissociation. In the [^{35}S]GTP γ S assay, which measures μ -OR activation of heterotrimeric G proteins, Sal A decreased both the potency (EC_{50}) and B_{max} for DAMGO. The concentrations of Sal A used in these experiments were in the high μM range, much higher than the affinity of Sal A for the κ -OR (~ 4 nM; Roth et al., 2002). This will make *in vivo* studies challenging, although a study in κ -OR knockout animals might be informative.

Ignavine (Figure 2) is a diterpene alkaloid isolated from the plant *Aconitum Japonica* (Saito et al., 1982; Ohbuchi et al., 2016). There is evidence that “processed aconite tuber” has analgesic activity mediated by the κ -OR, although the specific κ -OR agonist has not been isolated (Ohbuchi et al., 2016). Ignavine itself gives a biphasic antinociceptive dose-response curve in the mouse tail-flick and tail pressure tests. The title of a recent publication (Ohbuchi et al., 2016) states ignavine as a “novel allosteric modulator of the μ -OR”. This claim is based on the finding that the compound both enhances and inhibits the activity of the μ -OR orthosteric agonist DAMGO to inhibit cAMP accumulation and to cause internalization of μ -OR in HEK cells depending on the ignavine concentration (1 or 10 μM respectively). However, binding studies reported in the same publication indicate that the compound fully displaces ^3H -diprenorphine from the orthosteric site of the μ -OR in an apparently competitive manner and docking studies suggest that the compound binds at the orthosteric site. Thus, this compound would seem to be

incorrectly identified as an allosteric modulator, but may have other actions at μ -OR, for example as a μ -OR partial agonist.

Finally a thiazolidine compound, SCH-202676 (Figure 2), has been claimed to be a non-specific allosteric modulator of many GPCRs including the μ -, δ - and κ -ORs (Fawzi et al., 2001). However, this compound covalently binds to GPCRs by sulfhydryl bond formation and so is not a true allosteric modulator (Göblyös et al., 2005; Lewandowicz et al., 2006).

The above evidence suggests certain cannabinoids and Sal A as NAMs of μ -OR. A negative modulator, unless it can be specially targeted at reducing the side-effects of orthosteric μ -OR agonists, e.g. by introducing a bias into downstream signaling as discussed above, may not make a useful clinical compound. Nonetheless, it will be important to re-evaluate these putative modulators (as well as ignavine) of ORs using more rigorous analysis methods for the determination of allostery (Melancon et al., 2012; Christopoulos, 2014), since these natural products could provide scaffolds for the future design of modulators.

Mechanism of allostery at opioid receptors

Allosteric binding site(s) on opioid receptors

There is no definitive structural work that accurately defines the nature and location of allosteric sites on the ORs. However, there have been several attempts to identify site(s) on μ - and δ -ORs by computational methods using docking and molecular dynamics (MD) simulations.

Using molecular docking Bartuzi and colleagues (Bartuzi et al., 2016) obtained several poses for BMS-986122 within the μ -OR although two had very similar orientations and interaction energies. These data indicated an allosteric site involving amino-acids above the orthosteric

binding pocket and towards the extracellular surface in TM domains II and VII (Figure 3). At the δ -OR Shang and colleagues (Shang et al., 2016) using metadynamic calculations (Schneider et al., 2015) of the δ -OR bound to the orthosteric ligand SNC80 and in a water-lipid environment found two metastable binding poses for BMS-986187 occupying the same site that was in close proximity to the orthosteric site but, as in the μ -OR, towards the extracellular surface (Figure 3). Both metastable states formed direct polar, water-mediated polar, hydrophobic, and/or aromatic interactions with amino-acids residues in TM domains I, II and VII, with several residues specific to a particular pose. Mutational studies of several amino-acid residues in the putative site affected either the binding of the modulator and/or the degree of cooperativity between the modulator and the orthosteric ligand, therefore giving some credence to this as an allosteric site (Shang et al., 2016), although with the caveat that mutagenesis can alter orthosteric ligand affinity and basal activity of the receptor, thus providing confounds.

MD simulations of an active μ -OR homology model in complex with G α s protein in a raft-like membrane suggested a common binding pocket for lipophilic modulators CDB and THC at the top of TM domains I, II and VI (Bartuzi et al., 2016). Cannabinoids occupying this site appear to oppose the action of agonists by moving the TM domains closer together towards an inactive receptor state. In addition, a second site for Sal A at μ -OR that overlapped with the binding site for DAMGO was suggested, possibly explaining its NAM activity.

Overall, computational evidence suggests the μ -OR and δ -OR are predicted to have similarly positioned allosteric sites (Figure 3). It is worth noting that this putative site is correspondingly situated to the allosteric site on the [muscarinic receptors](#) including M1 (Abdul-Ridha et al., 2014), M2 (Jäger et al., 2007; Haga et al., 2012; Dror et al., 2013), and M4 receptors (Thal et al., 2016) and the site for the modulator maraviroc on the CCR5 receptor (Tan et al., 2013), suggesting this region of class A GPCRs could be a common site for allosterism.

Role of orthosteric ligand and Na⁺ ions

Na⁺ ions play a major role in stabilizing inactive R states of 7-TM domain receptors. This was first shown by the ability of NaCl to inhibit the binding of orthosteric agonists to μ -OR while having no effect on orthosteric antagonist binding (Pert et al., 1973), due to a shift in equilibrium to inactive R conformational states. Thus Na⁺ can be considered an endogenous NAM of 7-TM receptors. Current understanding of the mechanisms by which Na⁺ stabilizes R is better appreciated due to recent high-resolution crystallographic work performed first with the adenosine A2A receptor (Liu et al., 2012) and later with other receptors including the δ -OR (Fenalti et al., 2014). The binding site of Na⁺ is conserved across many GPCRs, including all the ORs. This site is located in the middle of the 7-TM bundle and involves coordination with an aspartate residue in TM II (Asp 2.50) and a Ser residue in TM II (Ser 3.39) plus a number of highly organized water molecules across TM domains II, III, VI and VII (Katrich et al., 2014). Importantly, the Na⁺ ion is absent in the structures of active GPCRs including μ -OR (Huang et al., 2015) because movement of the TM domains upon receptor activation provides insufficient space for the Na⁺ ion and its associated water molecules.

The Monod-Wyman-Changeux two state model has been applied to describe the action of small molecule allosteric modulators of muscarinic receptors (Canals et al., 2012) and of the μ -OR (Livingston and Traynor, 2014) where they act to promote formation of R*. There is evidence that the allosteric activity of BMS-986122 at the μ -OR is related to the negative modulatory activity of Na⁺ ions (Livingston and Traynor, 2014). The degree of allosteric activity of BMS-986122 is dependent on the orthosteric probe, such that antagonists are insensitive and agonists are generally highly sensitive in line with their efficacy. There is a strong inverse correlation between the sensitivity of a μ -OR agonist to Na⁺ ions and the sensitivity of the same ligand to positive allosteric modulation by BMS-986122, with methadone being the orthosteric ligand most sensitive to μ -PAM activity (Figure 4). Moreover, the action of BMS-986122 antagonizes

the ability of Na⁺ ions to inhibit agonist binding such that BMS-986122 and Na⁺ ions oppose each other's action. As BMS-986122 is selective for μ -OR over δ -OR while the Na⁺ binding site is conserved, we have proposed a model in which the μ -PAM binds at a distinct site from Na⁺ to allosterically disrupt the binding of Na⁺ (Figure 5). In support of this, ligands that target the Na⁺ binding site on GPCRs, such as amiloride, are not selective amongst GPCRs that are sensitive to Na⁺ ions (Gao and Ijzerman, 2000; Hoare et al., 2000; Schetz and Sibley, 2001; Heitman et al., 2008). It is notable that “superagonists” at μ -OR such as BU72 and etorphine do not fit this pattern. These compounds are insensitive to the actions of the modulators (Livingston and Traynor, 2014) and much less affected by Na⁺ ions (Lee et al., 1999).

Following publication of the experimental data discussed above, Bartuzi and colleagues (Bartuzi et al., 2016) performed principal component analysis of μ -OR in a native membrane environment. Their calculations showed that BMS-986122 bound to a putative allosteric site (see above) and interacted with a Trp at the top of TM VII (Trp7.35) to alter the conformation of this TM domain resulting in stabilization of the binding of the orthosteric ligand methadone as determined by its interaction with Asp3.32 in the orthosteric pocket and destabilization of Na⁺ ion binding as measured by the distance of this ion from Asp 2.50. Similarly, recent molecular dynamics simulations of the Galanin receptor identified a potential allosteric site involving TM domains 2 and 3 and extracellular loops 1 and 2 that the authors propose could disrupt Na⁺ binding (Hui et al., 2016).

It should be understood that the putative binding sites used for these calculations are defined by docking procedures and may not represent the true allosteric sites. Nonetheless, there are multiple binding sites on μ -OR that allosterically communicate, including: the orthosteric site, allosteric site for BMS-986122, the Na⁺ binding site, and the G protein-binding site (Figure 5). The interplay between the sites differs depending on the orthosteric ligand. As Na⁺ regulates a number of GPCRs, and the Na⁺ site is highly conserved and MD simulations suggest that

allosteric sites are similarly situated close to the orthosteric binding pocket this may be common mechanism of action for small molecule allosteric modulation across GPCRs.

Conclusions

Selective allosteric modulators of the μ - and δ -OR have been described, but there are no specific modulators published to date for the κ -OR or the NOPR. Knowledge of allosteric modulation of opioid receptors is still in its infancy. However, we know the μ - and δ -OR PAMs show a marked probe dependence that appears to relate to the efficacy of the probe (the ligand occupying the orthosteric site) and to the sensitivity of the probe to Na^+ ions that stabilize inactive R states of the receptors. At least for the μ - and δ -ORs proof of principal for *in vivo* efficacy of allosteric modulators is needed. This will require the development of more potent and drug-like molecules. Although some ideas about structural requirements and identity of the allosteric site on ORs have been developed using computational methods the field will benefit immensely from confirmation of the location and nature of allosteric binding site(s) and the conduit by which occupation of this site leads to dissociation of the bound Na^+ ion and formation of R^* . This will come from biophysical methods such as hydrogen-deuterium exchange mass spectrometry, NMR and X-ray crystallography. Given the recent success in crystallizing GPCRs, including crystal structures of muscarinic receptors bound to allosteric modulators this information should soon be available, allowing for the rational design of a new generation of allosteric modulators acting at ORs.

Nomenclature of Targets and Ligands

Key protein targets and ligands in this article are hyperlinked to corresponding entries in <http://www.guidetopharmacology.org>, the common portal for data from the IUPHAR/BPS Guide to PHARMACOLOGY (Southan et al., 2016), and are permanently archived in the Concise Guide to PHARMACOLOGY 2015/16 (Alexander et al., 2015).

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by a grant from the National Institutes of Health, USA (DA 033397 to JRT). We thank Veronica Taylor, Nicholas Griggs and Matthew Stanzyk for critical reading of the manuscript and Evan Schramm for help with the figures.

Author contributions

KEL and JRT wrote the review

Conflicts of Interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest

References

Abdul-Ridha, A, Lane, JR, Mistry, SN, López, L, Sexton, PM, Scammells, PJ, Christopoulos A, Canals M. (2014). Mechanistic insights into allosteric structure-function relationships at the M1 muscarinic acetylcholine receptor. *J Biol Chem* 289: 33701–33711.

Alexander SP, Davenport AP, Kelly E, Marion N, Peters JA, Benson HE, Faccenda E, Pawson AJ, Sharman JL, Southan C, Davies JA, CGTP Collaborators (2015). The Concise Guide to

Pharmacology 2015/16. G protein-coupled receptors. *Brit J Pharmacol* 172: 5744-5869.

Winters BL, Gregoriou GC, Kisiwaa SA, Wells OA, Medagoda DI, Hermes SM, Burford NT, Alt A, Aicher SA, Bagley EE (2017). Endogenous opioids regulate moment-to-moment neuronal communication and excitability. *Nature Communications* 8: 14611.

Bartuzi D, Kaczor AA, Matosiuk D (2016). Interplay between two allosteric sites and their influence on agonist binding in human μ opioid receptor. *J Chem Inf Model* 56: 563–570.

Bertekap RL, Burford NT, Li Z, Alt A. (2015). High-throughput screening for allosteric modulators of GPCRs. *Methods Mol Biol* 1335: 223–240.

Bisignano P, Burford NT, Shang Y, Marlow B, Livingston KE, Fenton AM, Rockwell K, Budenholzer L, Traynor JR, Gerritz SW, Alt A, Filizola M (2015). Ligand-based discovery of a new scaffold for allosteric modulation of the μ -opioid receptor. *J Chem Inf Model* 55: 1836–1843.

Boudinot E, Morin-Surun M, Foutz AS, Fournié-Zaluski M, Roques BP, Denavit-Saubié M (2001). Effects of the potent analgesic enkephalin-catabolizing enzyme inhibitors RB101 and kelatorphan on respiration. *Pain* 90: 7–13.

Burford NT, Clark MJ, Wehrman TS, Gerritz SW, Banks M, O'Connell J, Traynor JR, Alt A. (2013). Discovery of positive allosteric modulators and silent allosteric modulators of the μ -opioid receptor. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 110: 10830–10835.

Burford NT, Traynor JR, Alt A (2015a). Positive allosteric modulators of the μ -opioid receptor: a novel approach for future pain medications. *Br J Pharmacol* 172: 277–286.

Burford NT, Wehrman T, Bassoni D, O'Connell J, Banks M, Zhang L, Alt A (2014). Identification of selective agonists and positive allosteric modulators for μ - and δ -opioid receptors from a single high-throughput screen. *J Biomol Screen* 19: 1255–1265.

Burford NT, Livingston KE, Canals M, Ryan MR, Budenholzer LM, Han Y, Shang Y, Herbst JJ, O'Connell J, Banks M, Zhang L, Filizaola M, Bassoni DL, Wehrman TS, Christopoulos A, Traynor JR, Gerritz SW, Alt A (2015b). Discovery, synthesis, and molecular pharmacology of selective positive allosteric modulators of the δ -opioid receptor. *J Med Chem* 58: 4220–4229.

Canals M, Lane JR, Wen A, Scammells PJ, Sexton PM, Christopoulos A (2012). A Monod-Wyman-Changeux mechanism can explain G protein-coupled receptor (GPCR) allosteric modulation. *J Biol Chem* 287: 650–659.

Charles A Pradhan AA (2016). Delta-opioid receptors as targets for migraine therapy. *Curr Opin Neurol* 29: 314–319.

Chavkin C (2011). The therapeutic potential of κ -opioids for treatment of pain and addiction. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 36: 369–370.

Christopoulos A (2014). Advances in G protein-coupled receptor allostery: from function to structure. *Mol Pharmacol* 86: 463–478.

Christopoulos A, Changeux J-P, Catterall WA, Fabbro D, Burris TP, Cidlowski JA, Olsen RW, Peters JA, Neubig RR, Pin JP, Sexton PM, Kenakin TP, Ehlert FJ, Spedding M, Langmead CJ (2014). International Union of Basic and Clinical Pharmacology. XC. Multisite Pharmacology: Recommendations for the nomenclature of receptor allosterism and allosteric ligands. *Pharmacol Rev* 66: 918–947.

Christopoulos A, Kenakin T (2002). G protein-coupled receptor allosterism and complexing. *Pharmacol Rev* 54: 323–374.

Conn PJ, Christopoulos A, Lindsley CW (2009). Allosteric modulation of GPCRs: A novel approach for the treatment of CNS disorders. *Nat Rev Drug Discovery* 8: 41 -54

DeVree BT, Mahoney JP, Vélez-Ruiz GA, Rasmussen SGF, Kuszak AJ, Edwald E, Fung JJ, Manglik A, Masureel M, Du Y, Matt RA, Pardon E, Steyaert J, Kobilka BK, Sunahara RK (2016). Allosteric coupling from G protein to the agonist-binding pocket in GPCRs. *Nature* 535:

182–186.

Dewire SM, Yamashita DS, Rominger DH, Liu G, Cowan CL, Graczyk TM, Chen XT, Pitis PM, Gotchev D, Yuan C, Kobish M, Lark MW, Violin JD (2013). A G protein-biased ligand at the μ -opioid receptor is potently analgesic with reduced gastrointestinal and respiratory dysfunction compared with morphine. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 344: 708–717.

Dror RO, Green HF, Valant C, Borhani DW, Valcourt JR, Pan AC, Arlow DH, Canals M, Lane JR, Rahmani R, Baell JB, Sexton PM, Christopolous A, Shaw DE (2013). Structural basis for modulation of a G-protein-coupled receptor by allosteric drugs. *Nature* 503: 295–299.

emolecules: <https://www.emolecules.com>

Fawzi AB, Macdonald D, Benbow LL, Smith-Torhan A, Zhang H, Weig BC, Ho G, Tulshian D, Linder ME, Graziano MP (2001). SCH-202676: An allosteric modulator of both agonist and antagonist binding to G protein-coupled receptors. *Mol Pharmacol* 59: 30-37.

Fenalti G, Giguere PM, Katritch V, Huang X-P, Thompson AA, Cherezov V, Roth BL, Stevens RC (2014). Molecular control of δ -opioid receptor signalling. *Nature* 506: 191–196.

Ferré S, Casadó V, Devi LA, Filizola M, Jockers R, Lohse MJ, Milligan G, J Pin J-P, Guitart X

(2014). G protein–coupled receptor oligomerization revisited: Functional and pharmacological perspectives. *Pharmacological Reviews* 66: 413-434.

Fujita W, Gomes I, Devi LA (2015). Heteromers of μ - δ opioid receptors: new pharmacology and novel therapeutic possibilities. *Br J Pharmacol* 172: 375-387.

Gao Z, Ijzerman A (2000). Allosteric modulation of A(2A) adenosine receptors by amiloride analogues and sodium ions. *Biochem Pharmacol* 60: 669–676.

Göblyös A, Vries H de, Brussee J, Ijzerman AP (2005). Synthesis and biological evaluation of a new series of 2,3,5-substituted [1,2,4]-thiadiazoles as modulators of adenosine A1 receptors and their molecular mechanism of action. *J Med Chem* 48: 1145–1151.

Haga K, Kruse AC, Asada H, Yurugi-Kobayashi T, Shiroishi M, Zhang C, Weis WI, Okada T, Kobilka BK, Haga T, Kobayashi T (2012). Structure of the human M2 muscarinic acetylcholine receptor bound to an antagonist. *Nature* 482: 547–551.

Haga K, Kruse AC, Asada H, Yurugi-Kobayashi T, Shiroishi M, Zhang C, Weis WI, Okada T, Kobilka BK, Haga T, Kobayashi T (2012). Structure of the human M2 muscarinic acetylcholine receptor bound to an antagonist. *Nature* 482: 547–551.

Harland AA., Yeomans L, Griggs NW, Anand JP, Pogozheva ID, Jutkiewicz EM, Traynor JR, Mosberg HI (2015). Further optimization and evaluation of bioavailable, mixed-efficacy μ -opioid receptor (MOR) agonists/ δ -opioid receptor (DOR) antagonists: balancing MOR and DOR affinities. *J Med Chem.* 58: 8952–8969.

Heitman LH, Ye K, Oosterom J, Ijzerman AP (2008). Amiloride derivatives and a nonpeptidic antagonist bind at two distinct allosteric sites in the human gonadotropin-releasing hormone receptor. *Mol Pharmacol* 73: 1808–1815.

Heron M (2016) Deaths: Leading causes for 2013. *National Vital Statistics Reports* 65: 1-95.

Hoare SR, Coldwell MC, Armstrong D, and Strange PG (2000). Regulation of human D₁, D_{2(long)}, D_{2(short)}, D₃ and D₄ dopamine receptors by amiloride and amiloride analogues. *Brit J Pharmacol* 130: 1045–1059.

Huang W, Manglik A, Venkatakrisnan AJ, Laeremans T, Feinberg EN, Sanborn AL, Kato HE, Livingston KE, Thorsen TS, Kling RC, Granier S, Gmeiner P, Husbunds SM, Traynor JR, Weis WI, Stayaert J, Dror RO, Kobilka BK (2015). Structural insights into μ -opioid receptor activation. *Nature* 524: 315–323.

Hughes, J. (1983). Biogenesis, release and inactivation of enkephalins and dynorphins. *Br Med Bull* 39: 17-24.

Hui W-Q, Cheng Q, Liu T-Y, Ouyang Q (2016). Homology modeling, docking, and molecular dynamics simulation of the receptor GALR2 and its interactions with galanin and a positive allosteric modulator. *J Mol Model* 22: 90.

Irwin JJ, Sterling T, Mysinger MM, Bolstad ES, Coleman RG (2012). ZINC: a free tool to discover chemistry for biology. *J Chem Inf Model* 52: 1757–1768.

Jäger D, Schmalenbach C, Prilla S, Schrobang J, Kebig A, Sennwitz M, Heller E, Trankle C, Holzgrabe U, Holtje HD, Mohr K (2007). Allosteric small molecules unveil a role of an extracellular E2/transmembrane helix 7 junction for G protein-coupled receptor activation. *J Biol Chem* 282: 34968–34976.

Johnson KM, Melvin IS, Althuis TH, Bindra JS, Harbart CA, Milne GM, Weissman A (1981). Selective and potent analgetics derived from cannabinoids. *J Clin Pharmacol* 21: 2715-2825.

Jutkiewicz EM (2006). The antidepressant-like effects of delta-opioid receptor agonists. *Mol Interv* 6: 162–169.

Kathmann M, Flau K, Redmer A, Tränkle C, Schlicker E (2006). Cannabidiol is an allosteric modulator at μ - and δ -opioid receptors. *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch Pharmacol* 372: 354–361.

Katritch V, Fenalti G, Abola EE, Roth BL, Cherezov V, Stevens RC (2014). Allosteric sodium in class A GPCR signaling. *Trends Biochem Sci* 39:233–244.

Kenakin T (2013). New concepts in pharmacological efficacy at 7TM receptors: IUPHAR review 2. *Brit J Pharmacol* 168: 554–575.

Lalanne L, Ayrançi G, Kieffer BL, Lutz P-E (2014). The κ -opioid receptor: from addiction to depression, and back. *Front Psychiatry* 5: 170.

Lambert DG (2008). The nociceptin/orphanin FQ receptor: a target with broad therapeutic potential. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* 7: 694–710.

Lee KO, Akil H, Woods JH, Traynor JR (1999). Differential binding properties of oripavines at cloned μ - and δ -opioid receptors. *Eur J Pharmacol* 378: 323–330.

Levitt ES, Clark MJ, Jenkins PM, Martens JR, Traynor JR (2009). Differential effect of membrane cholesterol removal on μ - and δ -opioid receptors: a parallel comparison of acute and chronic signaling to adenylyl cyclase. *J Biol Chem* 284: 22108–22122.

Lewandowicz AM, Vepsäläinen J, Laitinen JT (2006). The ‘allosteric modulator’ SCH-202676

disrupts G protein-coupled receptor function via sulphhydryl-sensitive mechanisms. *Brit J Pharmacol* 147: 422–429.

Liu W, Chun E, Thompson AA, Chubukov P, Xu F, Katritch V, Han GW, Roth CB, Heitman LH, Izjerman AP, Cherezov, Stevens RC (2012). Structural basis for allosteric regulation of GPCRs by sodium ions. *Science* 337: 232–236.

Livingston KE and Traynor JR (2014). Disruption of the Na⁺ ion binding site as a mechanism for positive allosteric modulation of the μ -opioid receptor. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 111: 18369-18374.

Manglik A, Lin H, Aryal DK, McCorvy JD, Dengler D, Corder G, Levit A, Kling RC, Bernat V, Hubner H, Huang XP, Sassano MF, Giguere PM, Lober S, Da Duan, Scherrer G, Kobilka BK, Gmeiner P, Roth BL, Shoichet BK (2016). Structure-based discovery of opioid analgesics with reduced side effects. *Nature* 537: 185–190.

Matthes HW, Maldonado R, Simonin F, Valverde O, Slowe S, Kitchen I, Befort K, Dierich A, LeMeur M, Dolle P, Tzavara E, Hanoune J, Roques BP, Keiffer BL (1996). Loss of morphine-induced analgesia, reward effect and withdrawal symptoms in mice lacking the μ -opioid-receptor gene. *Nature* 383: 819–823.

McNicol ED, Midbari A, and Eisenberg E (2013). Opioids for neuropathic pain. In *Cochrane*

Database of Systematic Reviews, E.D. McNicol, ed. (Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd)

McPherson J, Rivero G, Baptist M, Llorente J, Al-Sabah S, Krasel C, Dewey BL, Bailey CP, Rosethorne EM, Charlton SJ, Henderson G, Kelly E (2010). μ -opioid receptors: correlation of agonist efficacy for signalling with ability to activate internalization. *Mol Pharmacol* 78: 756–766.

Melancon BJ, Hopkins CR, Wood MR, Emmitte KA, Niswender CM, Christopoulos A, Conn PJ, Lindsley CW (2012). Allosteric modulation of seven transmembrane spanning receptors: theory, practice, and opportunities for central nervous system drug discovery. *J Med Chem* 55: 1445–1464.

Monod J, Wyman J, Changeux JP (1965). On the nature of allosteric transitions: a plausible model. *J Mol Biol* 12: 88–118.

Noble F, Benturquia N, Bilkei-Gorzo A, Zimmer A, Roques BP (2008). Use of preproenkephalin knockout mice and selective inhibitors of enkephalinases to investigate the role of enkephalins in various behaviours. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 196: 327–335.

Noble F, Coric P, Fournié-Zaluski MC, Roques BP (1992a). Lack of physical dependence in mice after repeated systemic administration of the mixed inhibitor prodrug of enkephalin-degrading enzymes, RB101. *Eur J Pharmacol* 223: 91–96.

Noble F, Turcaud S, Fournié-Zaluski MC, Roques BP (1992b). Repeated systemic administration of the mixed inhibitor of enkephalin-degrading enzymes, RB101, does not induce either antinociceptive tolerance or cross-tolerance with morphine. *Eur J Pharmacol* 223: 83–89.

Oates J, Watts A (2011). Uncovering the intimate relationship between lipids, cholesterol and GPCR activation. *Current Opinion Struct Biol* 21: 802-807.

Ohbuchi K, Miyagi C, Suzuki Y, Mizuhara Y, Mizuno K, Omiya Y, Yamamoto M, Warabi E, Sudo Y, Yokoyama A, Miyano K, Hirokawa T, Uezono Y(2016). Ignavine: a novel allosteric modulator of the μ opioid receptor. *Sci Rep* 6: 31748.

Pert C, Snyder S (1974). Opiate receptor binding of agonists and antagonists affected differentially by sodium. *Mol Pharmacol* 1: 868–879.

Pert CB, Pasternak G, Snyder SH (1973). Opiate agonists and antagonists discriminated by receptor binding in brain. *Science* 182: 1359–1361.

Pfeiffer A, Brantl V, Herz A, and Emrich HM (1986). Psychotomimesis mediated by κ -opiate receptors. *Science* 233: 774–776.

Raehal KM, Bohn LM (2011). The role of beta-arrestin2 in the severity of antinociceptive tolerance and physical dependence induced by different opioid pain therapeutics. *Neuropharmacology* 60: 58–65.

Roques BP, Fournié-Zaluski M-C, Wurm M (2012). Inhibiting the breakdown of endogenous opioids and cannabinoids to alleviate pain. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* 11: 292–310.

Roth BL, Baner K, Westkaemper R, Siebert D, Rice KC, Steinberg S, Ernsberger P, Rothman RB (2002). Salvinorin A: a potent naturally occurring nonnitrogenous κ -opioid selective agonist. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 99: 11934–11939.

Rothman RB, Murphy DL, Xu H, Godin JA, Dersch CM, Partilla JS, Tidgewell K, Schmidt M, Prisinzano TE (2007). Salvinorin A: allosteric interactions at the μ -opioid receptor. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 320: 801–810.

Saito H, Ueyama T, Naka N, Yagi J, Okamoto T (1982). Pharmacological studies of ignavine, an aconitum alkaloid. *Chem Pharm Bull (Tokyo)* 30: 1844–1850.

Schetz JA, Sibley DR (2001). The binding-site crevice of the D4 dopamine receptor is coupled to three distinct sites of allosteric modulation. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 296: 359–563.

Schneider S, Provasi D, Filizola M (2015). The dynamic process of drug-GPCR binding at either orthosteric or allosteric sites evaluated by metadynamics. *Methods Mol. Biol.* 1335: 277–294.

Seely KA, Brents LK, Franks LN, Rajasekaran M, Zimmerman SM, Fantegrossi WE, Prather PL (2012). AM-251 and rimonabant act as direct antagonists at μ -opioid receptors: implications for opioid/cannabinoid interaction studies. *Neuropharmacology* 63: 905-915.

Shang Y, LeRouzic V, Schneider S, Bisignano P, Pasternak GW, Filizola M (2014). Mechanistic insights into the allosteric modulation of opioid receptors by sodium ions. *Biochemistry* 53: 5140–5149.

Shang Y, Yeatman HR, Provasi D, Alt A, Christopoulos A, Canals M, Filizola M (2016). Proposed mode of binding and action of positive allosteric modulators at opioid receptors. *ACS Chem Biol* 11: 1220–1229.

Shippenberg TS (2009). The dynorphin/kappa opioid receptor system: a new target for the treatment of addiction and affective disorders? *Neuropsychopharmacology* 34: 247.

Simon EJ, Groth J (1975). Kinetics of opiate receptor inactivation by sulfhydryl reagents: evidence for conformational change in presence of sodium ions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 72: 2404–2407.

Smith BH, Torrance N, Johnson M (2012). Assessment and management of neuropathic pain in primary care. *Pain Manag* 2: 553–559.

Southan C, Sharman JL, Benson HE, Faccenda E, Pawson AJ, Alexander SP et al (2016). The IUPHAR/BPS Guide to PHARMACOLOGY in 2016: towards curated quantitative interactions between 1300 protein targets and 6000 ligands. *Nucl Acids Res* 44: D1054-1068.

Tan Q, Zhu Y, Li J, Chen Z, Han GW, Kufareva I, Li T, Ma L, Fenalti G, Li J, Zhang W, Xie X, Yang H, Jiang H, Cherezov V, Liu H, Stevens RC, Zhao Q, Wu B (2013). Structure of the CCR5 chemokine receptor-HIV entry inhibitor maraviroc complex. *Science* 341: 1387–1390.

Thal DM, Sun, B, Feng D, Nawaratne V, Leach K, Felder CC, Bures MG, Evans DA, Weis WI, Bachhawat P, Kobilka TS, Sexton PM, Kobilka BK, Christopoulos A (2016). Crystal structures of the M1 and M4 muscarinic acetylcholine receptors. *Nature* 531: 335–340.

Thompson GL, Lane JR, Coudrat T, Sexton PM, Christopoulos A, Canals M (2015). Biased agonism of endogenous opioid peptides at the μ -opioid receptor. *Mol Pharmacol* 88: 335-346.

Toll L (2013). The use of bifunctional NOP/ μ and NOP receptor selective compounds for the treatment of pain, drug abuse, and psychiatric disorders. *Curr Pharm Des* 19: 7451–7460.

Valverde O, Fournie-Zaluski MC, Roques BP, Maldonado R (1996). Similar involvement of several brain areas in the antinociception of endogenous and exogenous opioids. *Eur J Pharmacol* 312: 15-25

Vaysse PJ, Gardner EL, Zukin RS (1987). Modulation of rat brain opioid receptors by cannabinoids. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 241: 534–539.

Volkow ND (2014) America's addiction to opioids: heroin and prescription drug abuse. <https://www.drugabuse.gov/about-nida/legislative-activities/testimony-to-congress/2016/americas-addiction-to-opioids-heroin-prescription-drug-abuse>.

Xu W, Yoon SI, Huang P, Wang Y, Chen C, Chong PL, Liu-Chen LY(2006). Localization of the kappa opioid receptor in lipid rafts. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 317: 1295-1306.

Yabaluri N, Medzihradsky F (1997). Regulation of mu-opioid receptor in neural cells by extracellular sodium. *J Neurochem* 68: 1053–1061.

Zheng H, Pearsall EA, Hurst DP, Zhang Y, Chu J, Zhou Y, Reggio PH, Loh HH, Law PY (2012). Palmitoylation and membrane cholesterol stabilize μ -opioid receptor homodimerization and G protein coupling. *BMC Cell Biol* 13: 6.

Table 1

Confirmed or putative small molecule allosteric modulators of opioid receptors*

	μ -OR	δ -OR	κ -OR	References
Salvinorin A	x			Rothman et al., 2007
Cannabidiol	x	x		Vaysse et al., 1987; Kathmann et al., 2006
THC	x	x		Vaysse et al., 1987; Kathmann et al., 2006
BMS-986122	x			Burford et al., 2013; Livingston and Traynor, 2014
BMS-986121	x			Burford et al., 2013
BMS-986124				Burford et al., 2013
BMS-986187	x	x		Burford et al., 2015b
MS1	x			Bisignano et al., 2015
Ignavine	x			Ohbuchi et al., 2016
SCH-202676	x	x	x	Fazwi et al., 2001 (but see Gogyov et al., 2005; Leanadowicz et al., 2006)

* To date no modulators have been identified for NOPR

Author Manuscript

Legends to Figures

Figure 1

Small molecule allosteric modulation at GPCRs. Allosteric ligands bind to a site distinct from the orthosteric site to modulate orthosteric agonist affinity and/or efficacy. α is the co-operativity factor between the two sites and represents the degree of an enhancement by a PAM (if a positive value) or reduction by a NAM (if a negative value) of the affinity of the orthosteric ligand. β is the modulation factor and describes allosteric modulation of orthosteric ligand efficacy. β will have positive value for a PAM or a negative value for a NAM. Allosteric modulators may activate intracellular messengers directly as ago-PAMs. Modified from Conn et al., 2009.

Figure 2

Structures of known or putative allosteric modulators of opioid receptors discussed in the text. Shown are compounds discovered by high throughput screening that exhibit PAM (BMS-986122, and BMS 986121) or SAM (BMS9861224) activity at μ -OR plus the similarly structured MS1 which was identified by chemoinformatic analysis. BMS-986187 is a δ -PAM discovered by high throughput screening. Other compounds that have been suggested as modulators include the natural products cannabidiol, tetrahydrocannabinol (THC), Ignavine and Salvinorin A as well as the small molecule SCH-202676.

Figure 3

Theoretical binding site for BMS-986122 on both μ -OR and δ -OR. Inactive state μ -OR (pdb 4DKL; Huang et al., 2015) and inactive state δ -OR (pdb 4N6H; Fenalti et al., 2014) were

aligned. The residues proposed (Bartuzi et al., 2016; Shang et al., 2016) to be involved in allosteric ligand binding are highlighted in green for the μ -OR and orange for the δ -OR. (a) view of aligned receptors from the extracellular side, (b) side view. The orthosteric site is shown occupied by the irreversible μ -OR antagonist β -funaltrexamine (purple). Extracellular loop 2 and TM6 have been removed from image b for clarity.


Figure 4

Relationship between the effect of the μ -PAM, BMS-986122, and the effect of Na^+ ions plus guanine nucleotide on the binding affinity of opioid ligands to the orthosteric site on μ -OR. The abscissa represents a reduction in affinity values (as a shift ratio) for each opioid ligand in the presence of Na^+ ions and guanine nucleotide. The ordinate represents the increase in affinity (as a shift ratio) in the presence of Na^+ ions and guanine nucleotide in the presence of BMS-986122. Adapted from Livingston and Traynor, 2014.

Figure 5

Allosteric interactions within the μ -OR. Inactive receptor (R) contains a Na^+ ion. Orthosteric agonist captures an active state (R*) that does not contain Na^+ ion (dotted circle) and allows for receptor interaction with intracellular signaling proteins (e.g. heterotrimeric G protein or β -arrestin). It is proposed that the μ -PAM improves the affinity and potency of the orthosteric agonist by its incompatibility with Na^+ binding, thereby promoting a state that more readily binds and responds to agonist.


Figure 1




BPH_13823_f1.tif

ct


Figure 2.



A




BPH_13823_f3.tif



cript

Figure 5



BPH_13823_f5.tif

Autl