

Themed Section: Molecular Pharmacology of GPCRs

REVIEW

Mechanisms of rapid opioid receptor desensitization, resensitization and tolerance in brain neurons

Vu C Dang¹ and MacDonald J Christie²

¹Department of Psychiatry, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA and ²Brain & Mind Research Institute, University of Sydney, NSW, Australia

Correspondence

MacDonald J Christie, Brain & Mind Research Institute, University of Sydney, 100 Mallett Street, Camperdown, NSW 2050, Australia. E-mail: mac.christie@sydney.edu.au

Keywords

opioid; morphine; opioid signalling; opioid efficacy; mu-receptor; β -arrestin; protein kinase; desensitization; endocytosis; receptor recycling

Received

8 February 2011

Revised

2 May 2011

Accepted

4 May 2011

Agonists acting on μ -opioid receptors (MOR) are very effective analgesics but cause tolerance during long-term or repeated exposure. Intensive efforts have been made to find novel opioid agonists that are efficacious analgesics but can elude the signalling events that cause tolerance. μ -Opioid agonists differentially couple to downstream signalling mechanisms. Some agonists, such as enkephalins, D-Ala(2),N-Me-Phe(4),Gly(5)-ol]-enkephalin (DAMGO), methadone and sufentanyl are efficacious at mediating G-protein and effector coupling, as well as triggering MOR regulatory events that include MOR phosphorylation, β -arrestin binding, receptor endocytosis and recycling. By contrast, morphine and closely related alkaloids can mediate efficacious MOR–effector coupling but poorly trigger receptor regulation. Several models have been proposed to relate differential MOR regulation by different opioids with their propensity to cause tolerance. Most are based on dogma that β -arrestin-2 (β arr-2) binding causes MOR desensitization and/or that MOR endocytosis and recycling are required for receptor resensitization. This review will examine some of these notions in light of recent evidence establishing that MOR dephosphorylation and resensitization do not require endocytosis. Recent evidence from opioid-treated animals also suggests that impaired MOR–effector coupling is driven, at least in part, by enhanced desensitization, as well as impaired resensitization that appears to be β arr-2 dependent. Better understanding of how chronic exposure to opioids alters receptor regulatory mechanisms may facilitate the development of effective analgesics that produce limited tolerance.

LINKED ARTICLES

This article is part of a themed section on the Molecular Pharmacology of G Protein-Coupled Receptors (GPCRs). To view the other articles in this section visit <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/bph.2012.165.issue-6>. To view the 2010 themed section on the same topic visit <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/bph.2010.159.issue-5/issuetoc>

Abbreviations

β arr-2, β -arrestin-2 (a.k.a. Arrestin 3); DAMGO, D-Ala(2),N-Me-Phe(4),Gly(5)-ol]-enkephalin; GRK, G-protein receptor kinase; LC, locus coeruleus; HEK 293, human embryonic kidney 293 cells; MOR, μ -opioid receptor; PAG, periaqueductal grey; PKC, protein kinase C; RET, resonance energy transfer

Introduction

Opioids are potent and effective analgesics. It is well established that nearly all clinically used opioids mediate their analgesic effects by activating the μ -opioid receptor (MOR; Kieffer and Gaveriaux-Ruff, 2002). However, long-term use of μ -opioid agonists produces adverse effects that include the development of tolerance and addiction, limiting their clinical utility (Williams *et al.*, 2001; Christie, 2008; Morgan and Christie, 2011). Qualitatively, all MOR agonists produce tolerance *in vivo* although there are differences in the extent of

tolerance (Morgan and Christie, 2011), suggesting that opioid analgesics resistant to tolerance could be developed. Recent promising approaches to limit tolerance have been extensively reviewed and include simultaneous activation of more than one opioid receptor type (e.g. MOR and DOR receptors), selective targeting of heteromultimers or opioids that differentially activate distinct intracellular signalling cascades, possibly involving differential activation of $G\alpha$ subtypes (Pineyro and Archer-Lahlou, 2007), and particularly differential G-protein activation versus endocytosis (e.g. Martini and Whistler, 2007; Christie, 2008; Koch and Holtt, 2008; Berger and Whistler, 2010; von Zastrow, 2010).

The molecular mechanisms mediating opioid tolerance *in vivo* remain uncertain, but there is accumulating evidence linking mechanisms of MOR desensitization receptor phosphorylation, arrestin association, endocytosis and recycling to tolerance development. For example, knockout (k.o.) mice lacking key MOR regulatory proteins, including β -arrestin-2 k.o. (β arr-2; Bohn *et al.*, 2000; 2002), exhibited enhanced morphine analgesic responses, while development of morphine analgesic tolerance was attenuated. Impetus to investigate MOR regulatory mechanisms of tolerance also came from the finding that different agonists can differentially engage these mechanisms (Keith *et al.*, 1996; Whistler and von Zastrow, 1998; Alvarez *et al.*, 2002). There are many reviews on the topic (see von Zastrow *et al.*, 2003; Connor *et al.*, 2004; Martini and Whistler, 2007; Koch and Hollt, 2008; Berger and Whistler, 2010; von Zastrow, 2010). Notably, morphine and closely related alkaloid agonists were found to quite efficaciously activate G-protein signalling but poorly mediate endocytosis, whereas most efficacious peptides and some small molecule agonists efficiently engage both processes.

The process of MOR regulation is thought to resemble that of the well-characterized β_2 -adrenoceptor. Briefly, G-protein receptor kinase-2 (GRK2) phosphorylation of the agonist-bound β_2 -adrenoceptor enhances its affinity for β arr-2 binding, triggering receptor endocytosis via clathrin-dynamin-dependent mechanisms (Gainetdinov *et al.*, 2004). MOR is also predominantly phosphorylated by GRK2 (Wang, 2000; Li and Wang, 2001), GRK3 and perhaps weakly by GRK5 (Kovoor *et al.*, 1998; Terman *et al.*, 2004). To the extent that they have been studied, other GRK isoforms do not contribute to acute MOR desensitization (Johnson *et al.*, 2006a). Like the β_2 -adrenoceptor, MOR interacts predominantly with β arr-2 (Cheng *et al.*, 1998), although it has been suggested that MOR can interact with β arr-1 in the absence of β arr-2 (but not with morphine activation; Bohn *et al.*, 2004). Following endocytosis, MOR is sorted for recycling back to the surface membrane (von Zastrow *et al.*, 2003). Like the β_2 -adrenoceptor, β arr-2-dependent endocytosis and recycling are thought to be essential for MOR resensitization (Law *et al.*, 2000; Koch *et al.*, 2005), although more recent evidence strongly challenges this assumption (Arttamangkul *et al.*, 2006; Dang *et al.*, 2011; Doll *et al.*, 2011).

Currently, there are varying and apparently incompatible hypotheses for the involvement of MOR regulatory processes in opioid tolerance (see Bohn *et al.*, 2004; Koch and Hollt, 2008; Berger and Whistler, 2010). It is widely thought that opioid agonists that differentially engage MOR-signalling and receptor regulatory processes have different propensity to cause tolerance. Supporting evidence for this notion revolves around the accepted dogma that MOR endocytosis and recycling are required for receptor dephosphorylation and resensitization. This review considers some of these assumptions and focuses on how the process of MOR regulation contributes to the development opioid tolerance at the receptor level in light of recent findings that strongly suggest that MOR desensitization does not require receptor endocytosis and recycling but tolerance does involve MOR desensitization, as well as resensitization mechanisms that are arrestin-dependent.

Definitions of tolerance and desensitization

The terms tolerance and desensitization are often used to describe very different processes that may be mediated by distinct mechanisms. Drug tolerance is defined as a loss of responsiveness to an agonist after continued exposure and is best quantified by the rightward shift in the dose–response curve that may be associated with a reduction in the maximum response in whole animals or similar shifts to concentration–response curves in isolated systems. However, common use of the term in different experimental contexts can be confusing because the mechanisms regulating MOR function during short-term agonist exposure may differ from that during or after long-term agonist exposure. Whilst most studies examine tolerance following long-term drug exposure of days to weeks, others ascribe tolerance to a very short-term loss of MOR responsiveness that occurs in the minutes to several hours after acute agonist exposure either *in vivo* or *in vitro*. Although the latter is correct usage, it can be confusing because loss of MOR responsiveness during short-term, sustained exposure is closely linked to mechanisms of rapid MOR desensitization that may include receptor endocytosis rather than long-term regulation of MOR function. As discussed in detail below, the process of rapid MOR desensitization certainly contributes to long-term MOR regulation and tolerance, but the two are not equivalent. As such, we restrict the usage of the term ‘tolerance’ to phenomena observed after long-term exposure (several days to weeks) to opioids and describe short-term studies, where relevant, as ‘acute tolerance’.

Usage of the term ‘desensitization’ can also be confusing because it is, like tolerance, an operational definition for loss of receptor function that can be applied to very different phenomena. Here we adopt the most common usage ascribed to the rapid loss of MOR–effector coupling that occurs during sustained exposure to agonists, usually *in vitro*, that occurs within seconds to several minutes. The same term, however, has been applied correctly to measurements of MOR–effector coupling *in vitro* after long-term opioid exposure (e.g. Bohn *et al.*, 2000; 2002), which does not actually measure the loss of receptor function during sustained agonist application. Loss of sensitivity or what has been described as ‘desensitization’ in this context is equivalent to tolerance at the cellular or molecular level. We avoid use of the term ‘desensitization’ in this context because it confounds the distinction between loss of MOR function that occurs within seconds to minutes during agonist application (usually defined as desensitization) and the tolerance (as defined above) that develops over days and weeks.

As introduced above, the process of MOR regulation involves multiple processes, including phosphorylation, arrestin binding, endocytosis and resensitization (dephosphorylation); which may not require receptor endocytosis and recycling. It is therefore important to note that measurements of MOR desensitization as defined here can encompass multiple components of the MOR regulatory processes, depending on the temporal resolution of the assay. Thus, measurements of desensitization may include loss of MOR–effector coupling prior to endocytosis (seconds to several

minutes), desensitization due to endocytosis (which produces loss of MOR–effector coupling by removing receptors from the surface membrane; usually 2–30 min) or resensitization and recycling (which slowly reverses desensitization; usually 20 min–1 h). Assays of MOR activation of G-proteins employing methods such as activity of G-protein-modulated ion channels (e.g. Dang *et al.*, 2009) or resonance energy transfer (RET) methods (e.g. Molinari *et al.*, 2010) continuously monitor MOR signalling over time scales of seconds to minutes during and shortly after induction of desensitization, so they can easily distinguish these components. However, biochemical assays for desensitization, such as inhibition of adenylate cyclase, that require more than 5 min of sustained opioid exposure (most assays take 10–20 min, e.g. Law *et al.*, 2000, or longer, e.g. Koch *et al.*, 2005) may be measuring the combined effects of rapid desensitization at the cell surface plus endocytosis or resensitization (Connor *et al.*, 2004). Therefore, attempts to compare kinetics and mechanisms regulating MOR signalling across studies can be confusing. Careful consideration should be given to the duration of agonist treatment and the time required to measure MOR–effector coupling when comparing mechanisms of MOR regulation across assays because multiple components may be involved.

Differential MOR desensitization, endocytosis and tolerance

Differential agonist efficacy for G-protein signalling and endocytosis

The discovery that different opioid agonists have different efficacies for G-protein signalling and mediation of receptor endocytosis has provided impetus to determine whether MOR regulatory mechanisms contribute to tolerance, which could explain why MOR function is lost in the absence of reduced MOR expression. It has been hypothesized that the poor ability of morphine to initiate efficient MOR endocytosis gives morphine high liability for causing tolerance. Many studies have established that morphine activates MOR but poorly induces endocytosis (Arden *et al.*, 1995; Keith *et al.*, 1996; Sternini *et al.*, 1996; Whistler and von Zastrow, 1998; Borgland *et al.*, 2003), as widely reviewed (see von Zastrow *et al.*, 2003; Connor *et al.*, 2004; Martini and Whistler, 2007; Koch and Holtt, 2008; Berger and Whistler, 2010; von Zastrow, 2010). Most quantitative studies of signalling efficacy have concluded that intrinsic efficacy to activate G-proteins versus endocytosis or β arr-2 association with MOR are not linearly related (Borgland *et al.*, 2003; Molinari *et al.*, 2010; but also see McPherson *et al.*, 2010). Molinari *et al.* (2010) using RET methods, reported a hyperbolic relationship between intrinsic activity for G-protein and β arr-2, consistent with earlier studies. By contrast, McPherson *et al.* (2010) found a more linear relationship for both β arr-2 recruitment and endocytosis, with some outliers (but not morphine). This discrepancy could be due to the methods used to determine G-protein activation (GTP γ S binding for 2 h by McPherson *et al.*, 2010 and RET methods by Molinari *et al.*, 2010), the expression of different densities of RET donors and acceptors in the two studies or the use an operational model by

McPherson *et al.* (2010) but not Molinari *et al.* (2010). It is well established that overexpression of GRKs or arrestins can profoundly enhance induction of endocytosis by morphine (e.g. Whistler and von Zastrow, 1998; Bohn *et al.*, 2004). Morphine also fails to induce MOR endocytosis in spinal cord *in vivo* (Trafton *et al.*, 2000), but it efficiently induces endocytosis in medium spiny striatal neurons (Haberstock-Debic *et al.*, 2003; Yu *et al.*, 2009).

Do strongly internalizing opioid agonists produce less tolerance than weakly internalizing agonists?

Morphine produces more behavioural tolerance than strongly internalizing agonists. This finding has been widely cited to support the notion that MOR recycling influences tolerance. Morphine, for instance, produced greater opioid tolerance when compared with agonists like DAMGO, sufentanyl or etorphine, when equivalent induction doses and continuous infusions were used to control for pharmacokinetic differences (Stevens and Yaksh, 1989; Duttaroy and Yoburn, 1995; Madia *et al.*, 2009). Whilst this seems to support the notion that strongly internalizing agonists produce less tolerance than weakly internalizing agonists, the interpretation is seriously confounded by large differences in intrinsic efficacy for G-protein activation among these agonists. Etorphine, sufentanyl and DAMGO all exhibit much higher intrinsic efficacy for G-protein activation than morphine (Traynor and Nahorski, 1995; Emmerson *et al.*, 1996; Selley *et al.*, 1998; McPherson *et al.*, 2010; Molinari *et al.*, 2010), although some studies using GTP γ S binding have reported that the intrinsic efficacy of sufentanyl is comparable with morphine (Emmerson *et al.*, 1996; Selley *et al.*, 1998). Low intrinsic efficacy agonists usually produce larger rightward shifts in concentration–response curves than high efficacy agonists. This occurs when MOR–effector coupling is impaired either by irreversible antagonists or chronic drug treatment presumably because low intrinsic efficacy agonists such as morphine must occupy a greater fraction of the total receptor population to produce a given level of effect, due to lesser receptor reserve (e.g. Christie *et al.*, 1987; Stevens and Yaksh, 1989; Mjanger and Yaksh, 1991; Connor *et al.*, 1999).

To properly test the notion that strongly versus weakly internalizing opioids produce differential tolerance would therefore require direct comparison of the extent of tolerance produced by morphine with opioids that exhibit comparable intrinsic efficacy for G-protein activation but much higher efficacy for endocytosis than morphine, while ensuring equivalent receptor stimulation and duration of action. Methadone and endomorphins have been considered good candidates because their intrinsic efficacies for G-protein activation appear similar to morphine and both efficiently induce MOR endocytosis. However, the intrinsic efficacy of methadone is more similar to DAMGO than morphine in GTP γ S assays (Selley *et al.*, 1998; McPherson *et al.*, 2010) and *in vivo* (Adams *et al.*, 1990). The apparently low efficacy of methadone in electrophysiological studies is caused by non-MOR actions on ion channels (Rodriguez-Martin *et al.*, 2008). Methadone and endomorphins also have very different pharmacokinetic properties and toxicity compared with morphine that can further complicate interpretations. Although He and Whistler (2005) did examine this issue using metha-

done and morphine, the results are very difficult to interpret because i.c.v. dose equivalence was not established. By contrast, Soignier *et al.* (2004) reported comparable rates of tolerance development and completely symmetrical cross-tolerance during continuous i.c.v. infusion of morphine, endomorphin-1 and endomorphin-2, suggesting tolerance may not be different between strongly and weakly internalizing agonists when intrinsic efficacy is matched. Furthermore, there is no clear evidence that strongly internalizing agonists produce differential tolerance compared with weakly internalizing opioids in humans (Morgan and Christie, 2011). For example, comparison of tolerance development in pain patients during continuous administration of transdermal fentanyl (high efficacy, moderate endocytosis) versus buprenorphine (low efficacy, non-internalizing) found fentanyl produced greater tolerance (Sittl *et al.*, 2006). Therefore, it remains uncertain whether or not strongly internalizing agonists produce less tolerance than weakly internalizing agonists.

Decreased MOR–effector coupling contributes to opioid tolerance

Chronic exposure to opioids can cause profound tolerance in both animals and humans (Christie, 2008; Morgan and Christie, 2011). Tolerance measured in whole animals is mediated by multiple adaptive mechanisms ranging from molecular mechanisms of MOR–effector coupling in neurons, second messenger systems in opioid sensitive cells, non-neuronal cells (including glia) and neural networks interacting with opioid sensitive neurons, to learned behaviour in animals (see Christie, 2008). Nonetheless, there is very solid evidence that impaired MOR–effector coupling contributes to tolerance *in vivo*.

Opioid tolerance has been extensively quantified in isolated tissues, neurons and membrane preparations from morphine tolerant animals, as well as in cell culture models. Functional measurements of impaired MOR–effector coupling in isolated tissues and cells after chronic morphine treatment consistently show a loss of functional receptors without consistent changes in MOR binding density (down-regulation, reviewed by Christie, 2008; Koch and Hollt, 2008). Agonists that strongly promote MOR endocytosis, such as etorphine, are an exception because they do induce receptor down-regulation (Stafford *et al.*, 2001), presumably because a small proportion of endocytosed MOR is degraded during each internalization cycle (Whistler *et al.*, 2002).

Operational models (or Fuchgott analysis) used to quantify the loss of functional MOR–effector coupling in isolated systems (e.g. Chavkin and Goldstein, 1984; Christie *et al.*, 1987; Bailey *et al.*, 2009a) after chronic morphine have calculated a loss of approximately 80% of functional surface MOR is required to account for the observed shift in agonist concentration–response curves. Studies using physiological end-points (direct $G\gamma\beta$ interactions with ion channels) in single opioid sensitive neurons have reported impaired MOR–effector coupling in a range of neuronal cell types from animals that have been chronically treated with morphine *in vivo* (except Ingram *et al.*, 2008), including rat and mouse periaqueductal grey (PAG; Bagley *et al.*, 2005), rat and mouse locus coeruleus (LC; Christie *et al.*, 1987; Connor *et al.*, 1999; Dang and Williams, 2004; Bailey *et al.*, 2009a; Dang *et al.*,

2011; Quillinan *et al.*, 2011) and mouse trigeminal ganglion neurons (Johnson *et al.*, 2006b). Similar results were also reported for inhibition of GABAergic synaptic transmission in nerve terminals in PAG (Hack *et al.*, 2003; Fyfe *et al.*, 2010). These findings are consistent with those examining MOR-activated $GTP\gamma S$ binding in brainstem in parallel with MOR binding density (Bohn *et al.*, 2000) and $GTP\gamma S$ binding in some brain regions but not others (Sim *et al.*, 1996; Kim *et al.*, 2008). Taken together, these results are consistent with earlier reports in cultured cells showing that chronic morphine exposure impaired MOR–effector coupling ($GTP\gamma S$ binding) without greatly affecting MOR binding density (Puttfarcken *et al.*, 1988; Puttfarcken and Cox, 1989).

β -Arrestin-2 and endocytic mechanisms are involved in opioid tolerance

Although the phenomenon that chronic morphine impairs MOR–effector coupling without much effect on MOR binding density has been known for more than 20 years, the mechanisms responsible are still uncertain and controversial. There is, however, accumulating evidence that the MOR regulatory mechanisms involved in acute desensitization, including association with β arr-2 and endocytosis, are intimately involved in the development of opioid tolerance.

Bohn *et al.* (2000; 2002; 2004) established that development of morphine anti-nociceptive tolerance (but not withdrawal) is blunted in β arr-2 k.o. mice. Concurrently, $GTP\gamma S$ assays in brainstem membranes from the k.o. mice also showed a blunted shift in the concentration–response curve (tolerance). Acute anti-nociceptive responses to morphine (but not etorphine, fentanyl or methadone; Bohn *et al.*, 2004; or other opioid actions of morphine, Raehal *et al.*, 2005) were also enhanced in the β arr-2 k.o. It was suggested that MOR is resistant to desensitization in the absence of β arr-2 (see contrary evidence; Bradaia *et al.*, 2005; Walwyn *et al.*, 2007; Dang *et al.*, 2009; 2011). Additional support for the involvement of MOR regulatory processes in the development of opioid tolerance comes from study using GRK3 k.o. mice. This study showed MOR tolerance was reduced in hippocampal neurons from GRK3 k.o. mice (Terman *et al.*, 2004). Development of behavioural tolerance to fentanyl was attenuated; however, there was no effect on morphine tolerance. Together, these studies suggest that arrestin-dependent MOR regulation is linked to morphine tolerance.

These studies suggest that blocking MOR endocytosis, which is presumably impaired in the β arr-2 k.o. (but see Arttamangkul *et al.*, 2008; Quillinan *et al.*, 2011), attenuates tolerance but others have provided seemingly contradictory evidence that induction of MOR endocytosis and recycling limits morphine tolerance, and suppression of endocytosis or recycling enhances it. He *et al.* (2002) reported that inclusion of an extremely low dose of a strongly-internalizing agonist, DAMGO (that had no anti-nociceptive effect on its own), with constantly infused i.t. morphine limited the development of tolerance and also stimulated MOR endocytosis in spinal cord and cultured cells (but see contrary evidence; Bailey *et al.*, 2003; Koch *et al.*, 2005). This was not observed with either drug alone at the doses used. The authors hypothesized that a very low concentration of DAMGO, which does not induce detectable endocytosis by itself, can stimulate endocytosis of morphine-occupied MOR and thereby reduces

tolerance, perhaps via interaction with homomultimers of MOR. Similarly, Kim *et al.* (2008) studied a transgenic MOR mouse, in which part of the C-terminal region of the DOR is substituted into MOR (rMOR). This conferred the ability of morphine to efficiently mediate MOR endocytosis and recycling. The rMOR mice showed similar anti-nociceptive sensitivity to morphine as wild-types but developed less morphine anti-nociceptive tolerance, as well as less reduction in MOR-activated GTP γ S binding in brainstem membranes. Consistent with these studies, the converse has also been reported in spinophilin k.o. mice (Charlton *et al.*, 2008); development of morphine tolerance was enhanced in spinophilin k.o. mice. Spinophilin is a neuronal scaffolding protein that facilitates MOR endocytosis, so endocytosis should be impaired in the k.o., although other regulatory actions of spinophilin cannot be ruled out. Taken together, these studies suggest that MOR endocytosis limits tolerance and, therefore, opioids that do not promote receptor endocytosis should produce greater tolerance than agonists that do promote MOR endocytosis (but see above for lack of direct behavioural evidence that this is the case).

The findings described above appear contradictory in terms of the relationship between endocytosis and tolerance. On the one hand, blocking β arr-2 association with MOR (which should impair endocytosis) inhibits morphine tolerance and, on the other hand, manipulations that enhance MOR endocytosis (and *vice versa*) impair development of morphine tolerance. Various explanations have been proposed to account for these disparate findings. In the case of manipulations that prevent β arr-2 binding, it was proposed that β arr-2 association is necessary for, or facilitates MOR desensitization (Bohn *et al.*, 2002; 2004, but see below). However, desensitization (as defined above) was not directly examined in those studies. But examination of MOR desensitization in both sensory and LC neurons show that it is unaffected by β arr-2 deletion. It is therefore unclear how β arr-2 deletion can account for blunted tolerance in the k.o. mice. Two general interpretations (not mutually exclusive) for the inhibition of tolerance were developed by Whistler and co-workers that are in line with findings from other groups (e.g. Berger and Whistler, 2010). One interpretation is that strongly internalizing agonists produce less tolerance because the cycles of endocytosis promote dephosphorylation of MOR in endosomes and resensitized receptors are then recycled to the cell surface. Because morphine poorly stimulates endocytosis of phosphorylated and desensitized MOR (whether or not MOR associated with arrestins) the desensitized receptors accumulate at the cell surface causing tolerance. The other interpretation is that morphine causes persistent signalling that contributes to secondary adaptations involved in tolerance *in vivo*, whereas endocytosis terminates persistent signalling, limiting downstream adaptations and tolerance. These concepts are summarized in Figure 1. These authors have also provided extensive evidence that such secondary adaptations are more pronounced following chronic morphine stimulation of wild-type MOR compared with chimeric MOR that can undergo endocytosis and recycling when stimulated by morphine (*ibid.*).

In essence, both types of study described above include the notion that arrestin-dependent endocytosis and recycling is necessary for MOR resensitization to occur. This notion is




Figure 1

Previous models to explain how strongly internalizing opioid agonists can produce less tolerance than weakly internalizing agonists. (A) Strongly internalizing agonists induce rapid desensitization of MOR coupling. GRK2-mediated phosphorylation is pivotal for β arr-2 binding and endocytosis, both processes that were considered irreversible at the cell surface, so MOR slowly resensitizes over the time course of endocytosis and recycling. (B) With weakly internalizing agonists, MOR desensitizes slowly (accelerated by PKC activity) but accumulates in a phosphorylated desensitized state at the cell surface because it stimulates GRK2 and β arr-2 binding very weakly, so cannot resensitize causing tolerance. As discussed in the text, the crucial assumption that endocytosis (and recycling) is necessary for resensitization is incorrect.

based largely on the model established for β_2 -adrenoceptor recycling (Gainetdinov *et al.*, 2004). Although some studies appear to support this for MOR (Koch *et al.*, 1998; 2001; Law *et al.*, 2000; Qiu *et al.*, 2003), more recent findings discussed below clearly establish that MOR dephosphorylation proceeds efficiently at the cell surface, as does resensitization in the β arr-2 k.o. or when endocytosis is blocked.

MOR desensitization does not require β arrestin and is distinct from endocytosis

Two lines of evidence directly establish that MOR desensitization does not require endocytosis. Arttamangkul *et al.* (2006) directly studied desensitization and endocytosis of MOR in cultured LC neurons in parallel with a transgenic FLAG-tagged MOR mouse. The lectin concanavalin-A completely blocked endocytosis induced by met-enkephalin but did not affect desensitization. Similarly, Dang *et al.* (2009) reported that inhibition of dynamin-dependent endocytosis had no effect on the rate or extent of MOR desensitization induced by

met-enkephalin in mouse LC neurons. Whilst endocytosis could produce desensitization by removing MOR from the surface membrane, it is clear from these studies that functional desensitization of MOR–effector coupling does not require it.

Kinetics of desensitization and endocytosis

MOR desensitization and endocytosis can also be distinguished on the basis of time course and differential efficacies of opioid agonists. Kinetically, rapid desensitization of MOR largely precedes endocytosis for high efficacy peptide agonists. The time constants for rapid desensitization in neurons and cultured cells are of the order of 1–3 min at 33–37° (Bailey *et al.*, 2004; Dang and Williams, 2004; Arttamangkul *et al.*, 2006; Dang *et al.*, 2009), when measured during stimulation by high-efficacy, strongly internalizing agonists (e.g. met-enkephalin, DAMGO) and other methods that provide reliable data in the second to minute range (Connor *et al.*, 2004), after which the process reaches steady state in less than 10 min. The time course of MOR desensitization is also similar to that reported for β arr-2 association (Oakley *et al.*, 2000; McPherson *et al.*, 2010; Molinari *et al.*, 2010) and phosphorylation of residues in the C-terminal region of MOR (T370 and S375; Doll *et al.*, 2011), all of which saturated within 2–3 min when stimulated by efficacious peptide agonists. Endocytosis induced by the same agonists is somewhat slower, with time constants generally in the order of ≥ 5 min and reaching steady state in less than 30 min (Law *et al.*, 2000; Borgland *et al.*, 2003; Tanowitz and von Zastrow, 2003; Arttamangkul *et al.*, 2006; 2008; Johnson *et al.*, 2006a; Tanowitz *et al.*, 2008). This suggests that MOR desensitization and endocytosis may occur as separate or sequential processes with some temporal overlap.

Differential efficacy of opioids for desensitization and endocytosis

In some studies (but not others), opioids differentially couple to desensitization and endocytosis. In heterologous expression systems, a range of opioid agonists, including morphine, can cause desensitization (Borgland *et al.*, 2003; Johnson *et al.*, 2006a; Chu *et al.*, 2010). Intrinsic efficacies of several opioids to cause G-protein activation are highly correlated with their efficacy to produce rapid desensitization. It should be noted that much higher levels of receptor occupancy are required for the latter; that is, the coupling efficacy is approximately 10-fold lower for desensitization than G-protein activation (Borgland *et al.*, 2003). However, this was not the case for endocytosis when the same agonists are used; morphine displayed distinctly lower efficacy than expected from either G-protein activation or desensitization. Earlier studies that claimed a strong correlation between the intrinsic efficacy for desensitization and endocytosis in cultured cells (Koch *et al.*, 2005) could have been confounded because the duration of the desensitization assays used (inhibition of cAMP formation) encompassed both phenomena.

By contrast with cultured cells, morphine produces little desensitization in native LC neurons (Dang and Williams, 2005; Virk and Williams, 2008; Bailey *et al.*, 2009b). In these cases, desensitization appears better correlated with capacity to induce MOR endocytosis than G-protein activation. Bailey and co-workers have provided a potential explanation for the

differences between some cultured cells and this has been confirmed by others (Chu *et al.*, 2010). In cultured cells (HEK293), morphine- but not DAMGO-induced desensitization is blocked by protein kinase C (PKC) inhibition (Johnson *et al.*, 2006a). Conversely, in LC neurons, where morphine induces little desensitization, PKC activation enhances morphine-induced (but not DAMGO) desensitization (Bailey *et al.*, 2009b). This provides clear evidence of agonist-dependent differential desensitization, with morphine but not DAMGO being PKC-dependent. The same studies suggested the reverse sensitivity for GRK inhibition, with DAMGO-induced desensitization being more sensitive to disruption of GRK than morphine (but see lack of effect of GRK inhibition alone in Dang *et al.*, 2009).

Differential MOR phosphorylation and desensitization

Opioid agonists can differentially phosphorylate MOR (Johnson *et al.*, 2006a). This could provide a plausible explanation for differential desensitization between morphine and DAMGO and its dependence on PKC phosphorylation in some cell types. Serial phosphorylation of up to 20 potential sites in the intracellular regions of MOR contribute to receptor desensitization and endocytosis, particularly GRK substrates near the C-terminal (see Connor *et al.*, 2004; Koch and Holtt, 2008 for review). Some of these sites are essential for GRK phosphorylation and arrestin-dependent endocytosis (*ibid.*). Mutation of several residues in the C-terminal of MOR (S363, T370 or S375 to A) impairs DAMGO-mediated receptor phosphorylation and endocytosis (El Kouhen *et al.*, 2001; Schulz *et al.*, 2004). Until recently, only S375 has been shown to undergo agonist specific phosphorylation by both DAMGO and (more slowly) morphine using phosphosite-specific antibodies (Schulz *et al.*, 2004).

More recently, Doll *et al.* (2011) have produced phosphosite-specific antibodies for S363, T370 and S375 of mouse MOR. They showed that S363 was constitutively phosphorylated in HEK293 cells. They confirmed that both DAMGO and morphine (less efficiently) induced phosphorylation of S375. DAMGO also induced efficient phosphorylation of T370, but morphine did not. Importantly, PKC stimulation directly phosphorylated at T370 in an agonist-independent manner. This appears to provide a nice explanation of the PKC dependence of morphine- but not DAMGO-induced desensitization. If efficient desensitization requires phosphorylation of both T370 and S375, then morphine-induced desensitization would require PKC activation but DAMGO would not. PKC activation might therefore be sufficient to induce desensitization when S375 (and perhaps other unidentified sites) is also phosphorylated. It is conceivable that in addition to phosphorylation of both T370 and S375, additional phosphorylation events are required to facilitate β arr-2 binding, so phosphorylation of T370 and S375 may be necessary (El Kouhen *et al.*, 2001) but not be sufficient to induce effective β arr-2-dependent endocytosis when morphine is the agonist.

β arr-2 is not necessary for desensitization of MOR

A possible interpretation of the effects of the β arr-2 k.o. on development of morphine tolerance is that β arr-2 associa-

tion with MOR is necessary for desensitization (see above). Although this may be correct for some neurons, it is clearly not the case in neurons studied to date, or HEK293 cells where morphine efficiently induces desensitization but not β arr-2-dependent endocytosis. Walwyn *et al.* (2007) showed that DAMGO-induced desensitization of MOR coupling (G β mediated) to voltage-gated calcium current inhibition in sensory neurons was unaffected in the β arr-2 k.o., and this was substantiated by (Arttamangkul *et al.*, 2008) in LC neurons. More recent studies established in LC that desensitization induced by met-enkephalin can be mediated by at least two distinct mechanisms independently involving ERK1/2 activity and GRK2- β arr-2 (Dang *et al.*, 2009). Blocking either mechanism alone was not sufficient to inhibit desensitization. The specific process for the ERK1/2-dependent mechanism is not yet known but MOR desensitization, internalization and phosphorylation have all been reported to be prevented by ERK1/2 inhibition in some heterologous expression systems (Polakiewicz *et al.*, 1998; Schmidt *et al.*, 2000). As is likely for the initial events of the GRK- β arr-2 interaction, signalling by ERK1/2 may therefore prevent coupling of MOR to effectors by phosphorylating MOR at sites not occupied by G α -subunits (Schmidt *et al.*, 2000). Alternatively, ERK1/2 may act indirectly to mediate desensitization via phosphorylation of G α -interacting protein (GAIP), a regulator of G-protein signalling (RGS), by potentiating the rate of GTP hydrolysis, as has been reported in some cell types (Ogier-Denis *et al.*, 2000). There are many other possible mechanisms involved in MOR desensitization and endocytosis that could be differentially affected by morphine-like opioids (Koch and Hollt, 2008), including facilitating translocation of MOR from lipid raft domains (Zheng *et al.*, 2008) or activation of phospholipase D2 (Koch *et al.*, 2006), both of which are poorly induced by morphine. Acute tolerance to morphine *in vivo* is also differentially sensitive to inhibition of c-Jun N-terminal kinase compared with strongly-internalizing agonists such as fentanyl (Melief *et al.*, 2010).

These findings also underscore the possibility that desensitization may be mediated by multiple mechanisms in different cell types or cellular compartments. LC neurons display strong ERK1/2 activation (Eitan *et al.*, 2003; Dang *et al.*, 2009) after opioid administration, but many other neurons (and cell types) do not (Eitan *et al.*, 2003). Therefore, desensitization may be mediated primarily by GRK- β arr2-dependent mechanisms in some neuronal types (e.g. Li and Wang, 2001) but can be initiated by other redundant mechanisms in other cells (see Koch and Hollt, 2008). Other differences between cell types can influence MOR desensitization; for example, the capacity of opioids to induce endocytosis can be strongly influenced by co-expression of other GPCRs such the NK1 receptor in the same cell (Yu *et al.*, 2009). It is also likely that the mechanisms of desensitization are distinct in different cellular compartments. Fyfe *et al.* (2010) reported that no desensitization of MOR-induced presynaptic GABAergic inhibition, during superfusion of morphine, met-enkephalin or DAMGO for up to 30 min in rat PAG neurons; even when a fraction of receptors had been inactivated with an irreversible MOR antagonist to rule out the potential confound of large receptor reserve.

Morphine tolerance is associated with enhanced MOR desensitization

Desensitization induced by met-enkephalin, DAMGO and morphine (and methadone; Quillinan *et al.*, 2011) are all more pronounced in LC (Dang and Williams, 2004; 2005), as well as PAG neurons (Ingram *et al.*, 2008) after chronic exposure to morphine. Enhanced desensitization would be expected to contribute to opioid tolerance by more prominently reducing functional MOR on cell surface during episodes of agonist administration. There are many possible adaptations caused by chronic morphine that could be responsible for this observation, but enhanced endocytosis does not appear to be responsible. Enhanced desensitization after chronic morphine treatment was associated with reduced endocytosis (Quillinan *et al.*, 2011). Other adaptive mechanisms could include those directly involved with MOR phosphorylation such as ERK1/2, GRKs (but GRK2 is decreased; Fan *et al.*, 2002) or arrestins (but β arr-2 is decreased in PAG; Fan *et al.*, 2003) or others such as RGS proteins (Gold *et al.*, 2003), phospholipase D2 (Koch *et al.*, 2006) or spinophilin (Charlton *et al.*, 2008).

Resensitization and dephosphorylation of MOR do not require endocytosis and recycling

The models of differential tolerance between strongly and weakly internalizing agonists introduced above generally require endocytosis and recycling to resensitize MOR. Morphine and similar agonists, by failing to induce endocytosis, are thought to produce accumulation of desensitized MOR at the cell surface, thereby producing tolerance. More recent evidence discussed below establishes that MOR dephosphorylates and resensitizes efficiently at the cell surface regardless of whether strongly or weakly internalizing agonists are examined, so other explanations for the involvement of MOR regulatory mechanisms in tolerance are required.

Schulz *et al.* (2004) provided evidence that recycling may be required to dephosphorylate MOR at S375. Briefly, phosphorylation of S375 persisted long after removal of morphine from cells but was readily reversible using the strongly internalizing agonist, DAMGO (but see below for strong evidence to the contrary). Functional studies using inhibition of cAMP formation as an endpoint showed monensin (to inhibit endosomal recycling), truncated MOR mutants (Qiu *et al.*, 2003) or MOR splice variants (Koch *et al.*, 2001; Tanowitz and von Zastrow, 2003; Tanowitz *et al.*, 2008) all reduced both recycling and resensitization of endocytosed MOR. Although these appear to support a requirement for endocytosis and recycling to resensitize MOR, assays of MOR function were performed over time scales greatly exceeding acute desensitization of G-protein coupling to MOR (see above), β arr-2 binding (Oakley *et al.*, 2000), endocytosis (Tanowitz and von Zastrow, 2003; Arttamangkul *et al.*, 2006, 2008) and often recycling (Koch *et al.*, 2001; Tanowitz and von Zastrow, 2003; Arttamangkul *et al.*, 2008; Tanowitz *et al.*, 2008) Therefore, such methods cannot distinguish recovery of functional MOR at the cell surface from the increased MOR surface

density (and therefore function) resulting from recycling (Connor *et al.*, 2004).

More recent studies have established conclusively that endocytosis is not necessary for either resensitization or dephosphorylation of MOR. Using met-enkephalin in cultured LC neurons, Arttamangkul *et al.* (2006) showed directly that concanavalin-A blocks endocytosis of FLAG-tagged MOR but does not affect resensitization. Doll *et al.* (2011) have shown conclusively that dephosphorylation of S375 is rapid using both DAMGO and morphine as agonists. This contradicts the earlier study of Schulz *et al.* (2004), but the explanation may be that morphine did not wash effectively from the cell preparations in the earlier study because in Doll *et al.* (2011) dephosphorylation for several agonists was enhanced by a brief rinse with low pH which presumably facilitates agonist removal from the preparation. More importantly, Doll *et al.* (2011) showed that after DAMGO exposure, dephosphorylation of both S375 and T370 were just as rapid in cells incubated in concanavalin-A, which completely blocked endocytosis. Although these findings may not generalise to the many other phosphorylation sites on MOR (see Koch and Hollt, 2008) they do establish that sites involved in β arr-2 binding dephosphorylate just as efficiently when endocytosis is blocked.

Recent studies of MOR resensitization in LC neurons from β arr-2 k.o. and wild-type mice (Dang *et al.*, 2011; Quillinan *et al.*, 2011) are consistent with the study of Doll *et al.* (2011). If arrestin-dependent endocytosis is required for MOR resensitization, then recovery from desensitization induced by a strongly internalizing agonist should be impaired but the opposite was found. In wild-type mice, MOR resensitized slowly after met-enkephalin induced desensitization (approximately 60 min), similar to that reported earlier for LC neurons from rat (Osborne and Williams, 1995; Dang and Williams, 2004) and similar to the rate of MOR recycling reported in cultured cells (Koch *et al.*, 2001; Tanowitz and von Zastrow, 2003). In LC neurons from β arr-2 k.o. mice, MOR resensitization was accelerated, being nearly complete within 20 min (Dang *et al.*, 2011; Quillinan *et al.*, 2011). Accelerated resensitization in the β arr-2 k.o. was mimicked in wild-type LC by manipulations that should block arrestin association upstream (an intracellular GRK inhibitor) or endocytosis downstream of arrestin association (an intracellular dynamin inhibitor; Dang *et al.*, 2011). Conversely, resensitization was slowed by a phosphatase inhibitor under conditions of impaired arrestin association (β arr-2 k.o. plus GRK inhibitor, Dang *et al.*, 2011). This shows that MOR resensitization is rapid when endocytosis is blocked and the time course is quite consistent with the dephosphorylation rate reported by Doll *et al.* (2011). The slow resensitization in wild-type LC is almost certainly due to the fact that once receptors are endocytosed, relatively slow receptor recycling (Koch *et al.*, 2001; Tanowitz and von Zastrow, 2003) is necessary for recovery of MOR localization and signalling at the surface membrane. It should be noted that such resensitization rates may differ in different neurons because the three most abundant splice variants recycle at different rates (MOR1, MOR1A and MOR1B; Oldfield *et al.*, 2008).

The necessity for endocytosis and recycling to resensitize some GPCRs presumably depends on the affinity of arrestins for the agonist occupied receptor (Oakley *et al.*, 1999; 2000;

Gainetdinov *et al.*, 2004). The rapid resensitization and dephosphorylation of MOR at the cell surface suggests that the affinity of the β arr-2 association is relatively weak (Oakley *et al.*, 2000), so that it can dissociate rapidly prior to endocytosis thereby exposing the phosphorylated C-terminal residues (S375, T370 and presumably others) to phosphatases. The very rapid reversal of MOR- β arr-2 RET signals upon agonist washout reported by McPherson *et al.* (2010) for most strongly and weakly internalizing opioids (except etorphine, which has extremely high affinity for MOR) is consistent with this possibility.

Arrestin-dependent impairment of MOR resensitization contributes to morphine tolerance

Impairment of the capacity of MOR to rapidly resensitize appears to contribute to morphine tolerance. In addition to enhanced desensitization, MOR resensitization is impaired in LC neurons after chronic morphine (Dang and Williams, 2004), but the mechanisms are still not certain. Dang *et al.* (2011) and Quillinan *et al.* (2011) recently confirmed this in mouse LC and further established that the impairment is arrestin-dependent. Impaired MOR resensitization after chronic morphine in wild-type LC neurons was reversed and resembled that in the β arr-2 k.o. either by disrupting GRK2 function or inhibition of dynamin function with intracellular inhibitors. These findings link the impairment of MOR resensitization in LC to adaptations within the process of GRK2- β arr-2-dynamin-dependent MOR regulation.

Dang *et al.* (2011) and Quillinan *et al.* (2011) also reported that cellular morphine tolerance in the same population of LC neurons was similar to that previously reported in wild-type neurons (see above) but abolished in the β arr-2 k.o. The finding that morphine treatment failed to produce cellular tolerance in LC neurons from β arr-2 k.o. mice is consistent with the seminal findings that analgesic morphine tolerance, as well as tolerance to DAMGO-stimulated GTP γ S binding in brainstem and spinal cord membranes, is attenuated in these animals (Bohn *et al.*, 2000; 2002). These findings suggest that persistence of rapid recovery from desensitization after chronic morphine could contribute to the attenuation of behavioural opioid tolerance in β arr-2 k.o. mice if the mechanism found in LC is found to generalise to analgesia-related neurons. It was proposed that following chronic morphine, β arr-2-dependent regulation of MOR is enhanced, slowing MOR resensitization, thereby shifting the equilibrium between receptor desensitization and resensitization to an accumulation of desensitized MOR that accounts for MOR tolerance (Dang *et al.*, 2011). As such, ablation of β arr-2 in the k.o. mice facilitates resensitization and prevents cellular opioid tolerance in LC neurons. Impaired resensitization could be important for tolerance *in vivo* if the phenomenon is found to generalize to neurons involved in analgesia.

The mechanisms of enhanced desensitization (see above) and β arr-2-dependent impairment of resensitization during chronic morphine treatment *in vivo* are still not known. Impaired resensitization was observed after very brief exposure to met-enkephalin and was sensitive to GRK, β arr-2 or

dynamin inhibition, suggesting a possibly enhanced rate of GRK phosphorylation after chronic morphine that engages β arr-2 and clathrin-dynamin-dependent processes (Dang *et al.*, 2011). Quillinan *et al.* (2011) also reported in a GRK2 transgenic that can be blocked by a novel agent (NaPP1) that both impaired resensitization and cellular opioid tolerance in LC neurons were reversed by the GRK2 inhibitor. The dependence of both tolerance and resensitization on GRK, β arr-2 and dynamin would predict the explanation for MOR tolerance (and slow resensitization) may be an enhanced rate of endocytosis after chronic morphine. However, Quillinan *et al.* (2011) found no difference in the extent of met-enkephalin-induced MOR endocytosis in LC neurons from chronically treated with morphine. Similarly, the extent of endocytosis induced by DAMGO in spinal cord *in vivo* was also not reduced by chronic morphine treatment (Trafton and Basbaum, 2004). The latter findings seem at odds with the effects of β arr-2 deletion and dynamin inhibition. The mechanism of impaired resensitization is, therefore, still unclear but a range of adaptations produced by chronic morphine could be responsible. Although untested, it is possible sites other than T370 and S375 are more persistently phosphorylated by chronic morphine to enhance other downstream events that do not increase endocytosis or that post-endocytic trafficking and sorting mechanisms are affected by chronic morphine.

Concluding remarks

The discovery of differential signalling efficacies of opioid agonists for G-protein coupling, desensitization and endocytosis and their potential involvement in the development of opioid tolerance stimulated much research to understand these mechanisms with the hope of developing opioids that can elude or limit tolerance. This idea seems to be substantiated by the consistent findings that greater opioid tolerance develops to agonists with low (morphine and related alkaloids) versus high (enkephalin-related peptides, sufentanyl, etorphine, etc.) differential efficacy for endocytosis. However, that interpretation is much less certain when the direct influence of intrinsic efficacies of these drugs for G-protein signalling on tolerance are taken into account. Nonetheless, the effects on morphine tolerance of genetically ablating trafficking proteins (β arr-2 k.o.) or constructing MOR mutants that recycle efficiently with morphine both strongly suggest MOR desensitization, endocytosis and recycling are important for tolerance. Some of the assumptions underpinning explanations of how this works are incomplete or incorrect. First, β arr-2 binding and endocytosis are not necessary to produce desensitization of MOR. In the absence of β arr-2, other, non-arrestin mechanisms can very efficiently desensitize the receptor. More importantly, there is now very strong evidence that one of the simplest explanations for greater tolerance with weakly internalizing agonists, that phosphorylated and desensitized MOR accumulates at the surface because endocytosis is required for dephosphorylation and resensitization, is incorrect. MOR dephosphorylates and resensitizes as efficiently or more efficiently when endocytosis is blocked, regardless of the agonist used. These findings are outlined in




Figure 2

Summary of current evidence for mechanisms of MOR regulation in resensitization and tolerance. (A) Desensitized MOR efficiently resensitizes when GRK2, β arr-2 (k.o.) or dynamin (to block endocytosis directly) are blocked, suggesting that resensitization is very efficient in the absence of endocytosis. Directly blocking endocytosis with concanavalin-A (ConA) does not affect resensitization or dephosphorylation of MOR. (B) After chronic morphine treatment, desensitization is enhanced, and resensitization is blocked. This does not appear to involve changes in endocytosis, but impaired resensitization is restored to control rates by inhibiting GRK2, β arr-2 or dynamin.

Figure 2. This demands rethinking of models used to explain the effects of transgenics and knockouts.

The finding that rapid desensitization of MOR is enhanced and resensitization is impaired in LC neurons after chronic morphine, if widely substantiated in other neurons, may contribute to further developments. If it is confirmed widely through the CNS and in different cellular compartments that enhanced rapid MOR desensitization and arrestin-dependent impairment of resensitization strongly contribute to opioid tolerance, then drugs able to elude these mechanisms might be found to produce less tolerance. The finding that a salvinorin A analogue, herkinorin, efficaciously engages MOR-G-protein signalling but does not induce β arr-2 translocation, even when GRK2 is overexpressed (Groer *et al.*, 2007) confirms the possibility that opioid agonists may be found that would not facilitate arrestin-dependent impairment of resensitization in tolerance. Virk *et al.* (2009) reported the intriguing finding that met-enkephalin can engage G-protein signalling in the presence of low concentrations of buprenorphine (a low efficacy for G-proteins, non-internalizing agonist) but no longer produces any rapid desensitization. If validated more widely this suggests that opioids, or related drugs could be found to stabilize MOR in conformations that are able to signal to G-proteins but cannot desensitize, which could perhaps limit tolerance.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia

Conflicts of interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

References

- Adams JU, Paronis CA, Holtzman SG (1990). Assessment of relative intrinsic activity of mu-opioid analgesics in vivo by using beta-funaltrexamine. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 255: 1027–1032.
- Alvarez VA, Arttamangkul S, Dang V, Salem A, Whistler JL, von Zastrow M *et al.* (2002). μ -Opioid receptors: ligand-dependent activation of potassium conductance, desensitization, and internalization. *J Neurosci* 22: 5769–5776.
- Arden JR, Segredo V, Wang Z, Lameh J, Sadee W (1995). Phosphorylation and agonist-specific intracellular trafficking of an epitope-tagged μ -opioid receptor expressed in HEK 293 cells. *J Neurochem* 65: 1636–1645.
- Arttamangkul S, Torrecilla M, Kobayashi K, Okano H, Williams JT (2006). Separation of μ -opioid receptor desensitization and internalization: endogenous receptors in primary neuronal cultures. *J Neurosci* 26: 4118–4125.
- Arttamangkul S, Quillinan N, Low MJ, von Zastrow M, Pintar J, Williams JT (2008). Differential activation and trafficking of μ -opioid receptors in brain slices. *Mol Pharmacol* 74: 972–979.
- Bagley EE, Chieng BC, Christie MJ, Connor M (2005). Opioid tolerance in periaqueductal gray neurons isolated from mice chronically treated with morphine. *Br J Pharmacol* 146: 68–76.
- Bailey CP, Couch D, Johnson E, Griffiths K, Kelly E, Henderson G (2003). μ -opioid receptor desensitization in mature rat neurons: lack of interaction between DAMGO and morphine. *J Neurosci* 23: 10515–10520.
- Bailey CP, Kelly E, Henderson G (2004). Protein kinase C activation enhances morphine-induced rapid desensitization of μ -opioid receptors in mature rat locus ceruleus neurons. *Mol Pharmacol* 66: 1592–1598.
- Bailey CP, Llorente J, Gabra BH, Smith FL, Dewey WL, Kelly E *et al.* (2009a). Role of protein kinase C and μ -opioid receptor (MOPr) desensitization in tolerance to morphine in rat locus coeruleus neurons. *Eur J Neurosci* 29: 307–318.
- Bailey CP, Oldfield S, Llorente J, Caunt CJ, Teschemacher AG, Roberts L *et al.* (2009b). Involvement of PKC alpha and G-protein-coupled receptor kinase 2 in agonist-selective desensitization of μ -opioid receptors in mature brain neurons. *Br J Pharmacol* 158: 157–164.
- Berger AC, Whistler JL (2010). How to design an opioid drug that causes reduced tolerance and dependence. *Ann Neurol* 67: 559–569.
- Bohn LM, Gainetdinov RR, Lin FT, Lefkowitz RJ, Caron MG (2000). μ -opioid receptor desensitization by β -arrestin-2 determines morphine tolerance but not dependence. *Nature* 408: 720–723.
- Bohn LM, Lefkowitz RJ, Caron MG (2002). Differential mechanisms of morphine antinociceptive tolerance revealed in β arrestin-2 knock-out mice. *J Neurosci* 22: 10494–10500.
- Bohn LM, Dykstra LA, Lefkowitz RJ, Caron MG, Barak LS (2004). Relative opioid efficacy is determined by the complements of the G protein-coupled receptor desensitization machinery. *Mol Pharmacol* 66: 106–112.
- Borgland SL, Connor M, Osborne PB, Furness JB, Christie MJ (2003). Opioid agonists have different efficacy profiles for G protein activation, rapid desensitization, and endocytosis of μ -opioid receptors. *J Biol Chem* 278: 18776–18784.
- Bradaia A, Berton F, Ferrari S, Luscher C (2005). β -Arrestin2, interacting with phosphodiesterase 4, regulates synaptic release probability and presynaptic inhibition by opioids. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 102: 3034–3039.
- Charlton JJ, Allen PB, Psifogeorgou K, Chakravarty S, Gomes I, Neve RL *et al.* (2008). Multiple actions of spinophilin regulate μ opioid receptor function. *Neuron* 58: 238–247.
- Chavkin C, Goldstein A (1984). Opioid receptor reserve in normal and morphine-tolerant guinea pig ileum myenteric plexus. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 81: 7253–7257.
- Cheng ZJ, Yu QM, Wu YL, Ma L, Pei G (1998). Selective interference of β -arrestin 1 with kappa and delta but not μ opioid receptor/G protein coupling. *J Biol Chem* 273: 24328–24333.
- Christie MJ (2008). Cellular neuroadaptations to chronic opioids: tolerance, withdrawal and addiction. *Br J Pharmacol* 154: 384–396.
- Christie MJ, Williams JT, North RA (1987). Cellular mechanisms of opioid tolerance: studies in single brain neurons. *Mol Pharmacol* 32: 633–638.
- Chu J, Zheng H, Zhang Y, Loh HH, Law PY (2010). Agonist-dependent μ -opioid receptor signaling can lead to heterologous desensitization. *Cell Signal* 22: 684–696.
- Connor M, Borgland SL, Christie MJ (1999). Continued morphine modulation of calcium channel currents in acutely isolated locus coeruleus neurons from morphine-dependent rats. *Br J Pharmacol* 128: 1561–1569.
- Connor M, Osborne PB, Christie MJ (2004). μ -opioid receptor desensitization: is morphine different? *Br J Pharmacol* 143: 685–696.
- Dang VC, Williams JT (2004). Chronic morphine treatment reduces recovery from opioid desensitization. *J Neurosci* 24: 7699–7706.
- Dang VC, Williams JT (2005). Morphine-induced μ -opioid receptor desensitization. *Mol Pharmacol* 68: 1127–1132.
- Dang VC, Napier IA, Christie MJ (2009). Two distinct mechanisms mediate acute μ -opioid receptor desensitization in native neurons. *J Neurosci* 29: 3322–3327.
- Dang VC, Chieng B, Azriel Y, Christie MJ (2011). Morphine tolerance produced by β arrestin-2-dependent impairment of μ -opioid receptor resensitization. *J Neurosci* 31: 7122–7130.
- Doll C, Konietzko J, Koch T, Höllt V, Schulz S (2011). Agonist-selective patterns of μ -opioid receptor phosphorylation revealed by phosphosite-specific antibodies. *Br J Pharmacol* 164: 298–307.
- Duttaroy A, Yoburn BC (1995). The effect of intrinsic efficacy on opioid tolerance. *Anesthesiol* 82: 1226–1236.

- Eitan S, Bryant CD, Saliminejad N, Yang YC, Vojdani E, Keith D *et al.* (2003). Brain region-specific mechanisms for acute morphine-induced mitogen-activated protein kinase modulation and distinct patterns of activation during analgesic tolerance and locomotor sensitization. *J Neurosci* 23: 8360–8369.
- El Kouhen R, Burd AL, Erickson-Herbrandson LJ, Chang CY, Law PY, Loh HH (2001). Phosphorylation of Ser363, Thr370, and Ser375 residues within the carboxyl tail differentially regulates μ -opioid receptor internalization. *J Biol Chem* 276:12774–12780.
- Emmerson PJ, Clark MJ, Mansour A, Akil H, Woods JH, Medzihradsky F (1996). Characterization of opioid agonist efficacy in a C6 glioma cell line expressing the μ opioid receptor. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 278: 1121–1127.
- Fan X, Zhang J, Zhang X, Yue W, Ma L (2002). Acute and chronic morphine treatments and morphine withdrawal differentially regulate GRK2 and GRK5 gene expression in rat brain. *Neuropharmacology* 43: 809–816.
- Fan XL, Zhang JS, Zhang XQ, Yue W, Ma L (2003). Differential regulation of β -arrestin 1 and β -arrestin 2 gene expression in rat brain by morphine. *Neuroscience* 117: 383–389.
- Fyfe LW, Cleary DR, Macey TA, Morgan MM, Ingram SL (2010). Tolerance to the antinociceptive effect of morphine in the absence of short-term presynaptic desensitization in rat periaqueductal gray neurons. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 335: 674–680.
- Gainetdinov RR, Premont RT, Bohn LM, Lefkowitz RJ, Caron MG (2004). Desensitization of G protein-coupled receptors and neuronal functions. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 27: 107–144.
- Gold SJ, Han MH, Herman AE, Ni YG, Pudiak CM, Aghajanian GK *et al.* (2003). Regulation of RGS proteins by chronic morphine in rat locus coeruleus. *Eur J Neurosci* 17: 971–980.
- Groer CE, Tidgewell K, Moyer RA, Harding WW, Rothman RB, Prisinzano TE *et al.* (2007). An opioid agonist that does not induce μ -opioid receptor–arrestin interactions or receptor internalization. *Mol Pharmacol* 71: 549–557.
- Haberstock-Debic H, Wein M, Barrot M, Colago EE, Rahman Z, Neve RL *et al.* (2003). Morphine acutely regulates opioid receptor trafficking selectively in dendrites of nucleus accumbens neurons. *J Neurosci* 23: 4324–4332.
- Hack SP, Vaughan CW, Christie MJ (2003). Modulation of GABA release during morphine withdrawal in midbrain neurons in vitro. *Neuropharmacology* 45: 575–584.
- He L, Whistler JL (2005). An opiate cocktail that reduces morphine tolerance and dependence. *Curr Biol* 15: 1028–1033.
- He L, Fong J, von Zastrow M, Whistler JL (2002). Regulation of opioid receptor trafficking and morphine tolerance by receptor oligomerization. *Cell* 108: 271–282.
- Ingram SL, Macey TA, Fossum EN, Morgan MM (2008). Tolerance to repeated morphine administration is associated with increased potency of opioid agonists. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 33: 2494–2504.
- Johnson EA, Oldfield S, Braksator E, Gonzalez-Cuello A, Couch D, Hall KJ *et al.* (2006a). Agonist-selective mechanisms of μ -opioid receptor desensitization in human embryonic kidney 293 cells. *Mol Pharmacol* 70: 676–685.
- Johnson EE, Chieng B, Napier I, Connor M (2006b). Decreased μ -opioid receptor signalling and a reduction in calcium current density in sensory neurons from chronically morphine-treated mice. *Br J Pharmacol* 14: 947–955.
- Keith DE, Murray SR, Zaki PA, Chu PC, Lissin DV, Kang L *et al.* (1996). Morphine activates opioid receptors without causing their rapid internalization. *J Biol Chem* 271: 19021–19024.
- Kieffer BL, Gaveriaux-Ruff C (2002). Exploring the opioid system by gene knockout. *Prog Neurobiol* 66: 285–306.
- Kim JA, Bartlett S, He L, Nielsen CK, Chang AM, Kharazia V *et al.* (2008). Morphine-induced receptor endocytosis in a novel knockin mouse reduces tolerance and dependence. *Curr Biol* 18: 129–135.
- Koch T, Holtt V (2008). Role of receptor internalization in opioid tolerance and dependence. *Pharmacol Ther* 117: 199–206.
- Koch T, Schulz S, Schroder H, Wolf R, Raulf E, Holtt V (1998). Carboxyl-terminal splicing of the rat μ opioid receptor modulates agonist-mediated internalization and receptor resensitization. *J Biol Chem* 273: 13652–13657.
- Koch T, Schulz S, Pfeiffer M, Klutzny M, Schroder H, Kahl E *et al.* (2001). C-terminal splice variants of the mouse μ -opioid receptor differ in morphine-induced internalization and receptor resensitization. *J Biol Chem* 276: 31408–31414.
- Koch T, Wiedera A, Bartzsch K, Schulz S, Brandenburg LO, Wundrack N *et al.* (2005). Receptor endocytosis counteracts the development of opioid tolerance. *Mol Pharmacol* 67: 280–287.
- Koch T, Wu DF, Yang LQ, Brandenburg LO, Holtt V (2006). Role of phospholipase D2 in the agonist-induced and constitutive endocytosis of G-protein coupled receptors. *J Neurochem* 97: 365–372.
- Kovoor A, Cerver JP, Wu A, Chavkin C (1998). Agonist induced homologous desensitization of μ -opioid receptors mediated by G protein-coupled receptor kinases is dependent on agonist efficacy. *Mol Pharmacol* 54: 704–711.
- Law PY, Erickson LJ, El-Kouhen R, Dicker L, Solberg J, Wang W *et al.* (2000). Receptor density and recycling affect the rate of agonist-induced desensitization of μ -opioid receptor. *Mol Pharmacol* 58: 388–398.
- Li AH, Wang HL (2001). G protein-coupled receptor kinase 2 mediates μ -opioid receptor desensitization in GABAergic neurons of the nucleus raphe magnus. *J Neurochem* 77: 435–444.
- Madia PA, Dighe SV, Sirohi S, Walker EA, Yoburn BC (2009). Dosing protocol and analgesic efficacy determine opioid tolerance in the mouse. *Psychopharmacol* 207: 413–422.
- Martini L, Whistler JL (2007). The role of μ opioid receptor desensitization and endocytosis in morphine tolerance and dependence. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 17: 17556–17564.
- McPherson J, Rivero G, Baptist M, Llorente J, Al-Sabah S, Krasel C *et al.* (2010). μ -opioid receptors: correlation of agonist efficacy for signalling with ability to activate internalization. *Mol Pharmacol* 78: 756–766.
- Melief EJ, Miyatake M, Bruchas MR, Chavkin C (2010). Ligand-directed c-Jun N-terminal kinase activation disrupts opioid receptor signaling. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 107: 11608–11613.
- Mjanger E, Yaksh TL (1991). Characteristics of dose-dependent antagonism by beta-funaltrexamine of the antinociceptive effects of intrathecal mu agonists. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 258: 544–550.
- Molinari P, Vezzi V, Sbraccia M, Gro C, Riitano D, Ambrosio C *et al.* (2010). Morphine-like opiates selectively antagonize receptor-arrestin interactions. *J Biol Chem* 285: 12522–12535.
- Morgan MM, Christie MJ (2011). Analysis of opioid efficacy, tolerance, addiction, and dependence from cell culture to human. *Br J Pharmacol* 164: 1322–1334.

- Oakley RH, Laporte SA, Holt JA, Barak LS, Caron MG (1999). Association of β -arrestin with G protein-coupled receptors during clathrin-mediated endocytosis dictates the profile of receptor resensitization. *J Biol Chem* 274: 32248–32257.
- Oakley RH, Laporte SA, Holt JA, Caron MG, Barak LS (2000). Differential affinities of visual arrestin, β arrestin1, and β arrestin2 for G protein-coupled receptors delineate two major classes of receptors. *J Biol Chem* 275: 17201–17210.
- Ogier-Denis E, Pattingre S, El Benna J, Codogno P (2000). Erk1/2-dependent phosphorylation of Galpha-interacting protein stimulates its GTPase accelerating activity and autophagy in human colon cancer cells. *J Biol Chem* 275: 39090–39095.
- Oldfield S, Braksator E, Rodriguez-Martin I, Bailey CP, Donaldson LF, Henderson G *et al.* (2008). C-terminal splice variants of the μ -opioid receptor: existence, distribution and functional characteristics. *J Neurochem* 104: 937–945.
- Osborne PB, Williams JT (1995). Characterization of acute homologous desensitization of μ -opioid receptor-induced currents in locus coeruleus neurones. *Br J Pharmacol* 115: 925–932.
- Pineyro G, Archer-Lahlou E (2007). Ligand-specific receptor states: implications for opiate receptor signalling and regulation. *Cell Signal* 19: 8–19.
- Polakiewicz RD, Schieferl SM, Dorner LF, Kansra V, Comb MJ (1998). A mitogen-activated protein kinase pathway is required for μ -opioid receptor desensitization. *J Biol Chem* 273: 12402–12406.
- Puttfarcken PS, Cox BM (1989). Morphine-induced desensitization and down-regulation at μ -receptors in 7315C pituitary tumor cells. *Life Sci* 45: 1937–1942.
- Puttfarcken PS, Werling LL, Cox BM (1988). Effects of chronic morphine exposure on opioid inhibition of adenylyl cyclase in 7315c cell membranes: a useful model for the study of tolerance at μ opioid receptors. *Mol Pharmacol* 33: 520–527.
- Qiu Y, Law PY, Loh HH (2003). μ -opioid receptor desensitization: role of receptor phosphorylation, internalization, and representation. *J Biol Chem* 278: 36733–36739.
- Quillinan N, Lau E, Virk M, von Zastrow M, Williams JT (2011). Recovery from μ -opioid receptor desensitization following chronic treatment with morphine and methadone. *J Neurosci* 31: 4434–4443.
- Raehal KM, Walker JK, Bohn LM (2005). Morphine side effects in β -arrestin 2 knockout mice. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 314: 1195–1201.
- Rodriguez-Martin I, Braksator E, Bailey CP, Goodchild S, Marrion NV, Kelly E *et al.* (2008). Methadone: does it really have low efficacy at μ -opioid receptors? *Neuroreport* 19: 589–593.
- Schmidt H, Schulz S, Klutzny M, Koch T, Handel M, Holtt V (2000). Involvement of mitogen-activated protein kinase in agonist-induced phosphorylation of the μ -opioid receptor in HEK 293 cells. *J Neurochem* 74: 414–422.
- Schulz S, Mayer D, Pfeiffer M, Stumm R, Koch T, Holtt V (2004). Morphine induces terminal μ -opioid receptor desensitization by sustained phosphorylation of serine-375. *EMBO J* 23: 3282–3289.
- Selley DE, Liu Q, Childers SR (1998). Signal transduction correlates of μ opioid agonist intrinsic efficacy: receptor-stimulated [³⁵S]GTP γ S binding in mMOR-CHO cells and rat thalamus. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 285: 496–505.
- Sim LJ, Selley DE, Dworkin SI, Childers SR (1996). Effects of chronic morphine administration on μ opioid receptor-stimulated [³⁵S]GTP γ S autoradiography in rat brain. *J Neurosci* 16: 2684–2692.
- Sittl R, Nuijten M, Nautrup BP (2006). Patterns of dosage changes with transdermal buprenorphine and transdermal fentanyl for the treatment of noncancer and cancer pain: a retrospective data analysis in Germany. *Clin Therapeut* 28: 1144–1154.
- Soignier RD, Vaccarino AL, Fanti KA, Wilson AM, Zadina JE (2004). Analgesic tolerance and cross-tolerance to i.c.v. endomorphin-1, endomorphin-2, and morphine in mice. *Neurosci Lett* 366: 211–214.
- Stafford K, Gomes AB, Shen J, Yoburn BC (2001). μ -Opioid receptor downregulation contributes to opioid tolerance in vivo. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav* 69: 233–237.
- Sternini C, Spann M, Anton B, Keith DE Jr, Bunnett NW, von Zastrow M *et al.* (1996). Agonist-selective endocytosis of μ opioid receptor by neurons in vivo. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 93: 9241–9246.
- Stevens CW, Yaksh TL (1989). Potency of infused spinal antinociceptive agents is inversely related to magnitude of tolerance after continuous infusion. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 250: 1–8.
- Tanowitz M, von Zastrow M (2003). A novel endocytic recycling signal that distinguishes the membrane trafficking of naturally occurring opioid receptors. *J Biol Chem* 278: 45978–45986.
- Tanowitz M, Hislop JN, von Zastrow M (2008). Alternative splicing determines the post-endocytic sorting fate of G-protein-coupled receptors. *J Biol Chem* 283: 35614–35621.
- Terman GW, Jin W, Cheong YP, Lowe J, Caron MG, Lefkowitz RJ *et al.* (2004). G-protein receptor kinase 3 (GRK3) influences opioid analgesic tolerance but not opioid withdrawal. *Br J Pharmacol* 141: 55–64.
- Trafton JA, Basbaum AI (2004). [d-Ala²,N-MePhe⁴,Gly-ol⁵]enkephalin-induced internalization of the μ opioid receptor in the spinal cord of morphine tolerant rats. *Neurosci* 125: 541–543.
- Trafton JA, Abbadie C, Marek K, Basbaum AI (2000). Postsynaptic signaling via the [μ]-opioid receptor: responses of dorsal horn neurons to exogenous opioids and noxious stimulation. *J Neurosci* 20: 8578–8584.
- Traynor JR, Nahorski SR (1995). Modulation by μ -opioid agonists of guanosine-5'-O-(3-[³⁵S]thio)triphosphate binding to membranes from human neuroblastoma SH-SY5Y cells. *Mol Pharmacol* 47: 848–854.
- Virk MS, Williams JT (2008). Agonist-specific regulation of μ -opioid receptor desensitization and recovery from desensitization. *Mol Pharmacol* 73: 1301–1308.
- Virk MS, Arttamangkul S, Birdsong WT, Williams JT (2009). Buprenorphine is a weak partial agonist that inhibits opioid receptor desensitization. *J Neurosci* 29: 7341–7348.
- Walwyn W, Evans CJ, Hales TG (2007). β -arrestin2 and c-Src regulate the constitutive activity and recycling of μ opioid receptors in dorsal root ganglion neurons. *J Neurosci* 27: 5092–5104.
- Wang HL (2000). A cluster of Ser/Thr residues at the C-terminus of μ -opioid receptor is required for G protein-coupled receptor kinase 2-mediated desensitization. *Neuropharmacology* 39: 353–363.
- Whistler JL, von Zastrow M (1998). Morphine-activated opioid receptors elude desensitization by β -arrestin. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 95: 9914–9919.

Whistler JL, Enquist J, Marley A, Fong J, Gladher F, Tsuruda P *et al.* (2002). Modulation of postendocytic sorting of G protein-coupled receptors. *Science* 297: 615–620.

Williams JT, Christie MJ, Manzoni O (2001). Cellular and synaptic adaptations mediating opioid dependence. *Physiol Rev* 81: 299–343.

Yu YJ, Arttamangkul S, Evans CJ, Williams JT, von Zastrow M (2009). Neurokinin 1 receptors regulate morphine-induced endocytosis and desensitization of μ -opioid receptors in CNS neurons. *J Neurosci* 29: 222–233.

von Zastrow M (2010). Regulation of opioid receptors by endocytic membrane traffic: mechanisms and translational implications. *Drug Alcohol Depend* 108: 166–171.

von Zastrow M, Svingos A, Haberstock-Debic H, Evans C (2003). Regulated endocytosis of opioid receptors: cellular mechanisms and proposed roles in physiological adaptation to opiate drugs. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 13: 348–353.

Zheng H, Chu J, Qiu Y, Loh HH, Law PY (2008). Agonist-selective signaling is determined by the receptor location within the membrane domains. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 105: 9421–9426.