Open Access



Histamine H₁ receptor antagonists enhance the efficacy of antibacterials against *Escherichia coli*

G. G. Bruer^{1*}, P. Hagedorn¹, M. Kietzmann¹, A. F. Tohamy^{1,2}, V. Filor¹, E. Schultz¹, S. Mielke-Kuschow¹ and J. Meissner¹

Abstract

Background: H₁ receptor antagonists are commonly used for the treatment of allergic diseases. The aim of this study was to find out, if antihistaminic compounds like mepyramine have the ability to influence the activity of antibacterials. Therefore, the checkerboard method was chosen to detect these possible effects in vitro. Studies were performed with two different *Escherichia coli (E. coli)* strains as test microbes, treated with antibacterials in combination with mepyramine.

Results: The minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC) of *E. coli* ATCC[®] 25922[™] and *E. coli* PIG 01 was reduced by combinations of the tested antibacterials with mepyramine.

Conclusions: These results have to be confirmed in vivo, before the use of antihistamines should be considered as potential way to minimize the amount of used antibacterials for treatment of *E. coli* infections.

Keywords: Escherichia coli, Antihistamines, Antibacterials, Checkerboard

Background

As mentioned by World Health Organization, BVL (Federal Office of Consumer Protection and Food Safety, Germany) and various other governmental and non-governmental organizations the number of infections caused by resistant bacteria is increasing in recent years in human beings and animals. For a targeted reduction of resistance new treatment options of infections are required. Brennan-Krohn et al. [1] showed synergistic effects of combinations of minocycline and colistin as well as minocycline and meropenem. In addition, Maier et al. [2] discovered antibacterial effects of various non antibiotic compounds, for example loratadine. El-Banna et al. [3] already described the modulation of antibiotic efficacy by antihistaminic drugs against Klebsiella pneumoniae.

It is also known that various bacteria (for example *Lactobacillus reuteri* and *Escherichia coli*) produce histamine under defined circumstances [4, 5], although the

* Correspondence: gustav.gerd.bruer@tiho-hannover.de

BM

¹Department of Pharmacology, Toxicology and Pharmacy, University of Veterinary Medicine Hannover Foundation, Hannover, Germany Full list of author information is available at the end of the article biological significance remains unclear. This mechanism leads to the hypothesis of the described study, that antihistamines potentiate the efficacy of antibacterials. Therefore, an investigation of interactions between antibacterial agents and histamine H1 receptor antagonists on the growth of E. coli was performed. E. coli is commonly found in the lower intestine of numerous animals and human beings as part of the commensal microbiota [6]. Two different E. coli strains were used. The first strain, *E. coli* ATCC[®] 25922[™] represents a reference strain for antimicrobial susceptibility testing and is sensitive for enrofloxacin. The second strain (E. coli PIG 01) was isolated from pigs in own experiments and is resistant to enrofloxacin. El-Nakeeb et al. [7] already described growth-inhibiting effects on bacteria for H₁ antihistaminic compounds like mepyramine, which represents a first generation H_1 antihistamine [8].

Eight conventionally used antibacterials in veterinary medicine including amoxicillin, sulfadiazine/trimethoprim, tetracycline, colistin, enrofloxacin, florfenicol, gentamicin and kanamycin were tested in combination with mepyramine in vitro (checkerboard method).



Results

Compared with the MIC of the compounds alone the MIC values of amoxicillin (penicillins), sulfadiazine combined with trimethoprim (trimethoprim-potentiated sulfonamides), colistin (polymyxins), enrofloxacin (fluoroquinolones), tetracycline (tetracyclines) and florfenicol were lower when combined with mepyramine (Table 1). For the combination of gentamicin (aminoglycosides) with mepyramine no interaction was found. Therefore, another aminoglycoside (kanamycin) was tested, which also showed no interaction. To exclude possible pH effects, pH changes were measured at 0 and 24 h of incubation for the combination of enrofloxacin and mepyramine. No pH changes were found.

The highest dose reduction index (DRI) was calculated for colistin and florfenicol. For colistin in combination with mepyramine the MIC of *E. coli* ATCC[®] 25922[™] was reduced from 8.0 to 1.0 µg/ml (Fig. 1). In addition, for florfenicol the MIC of *E. coli* ATCC[®] 25922[™] and *E. coli* PIG 01 was decreased from 8.0 to 2.0 µg/ml.

To exclude cytotoxic effects of mepyramine on the growth of *E. coli*, the ratio of viable and dead bacteria cells were determined. The positive control showed 98% viable cells and the negative control 100% dead cells. All

mepyramine suspended samples of *E. coli* exhibited 100% viable cells.

Discussion

The antibacterial effect of antihistamines described by El-Nakeeb et al. [7] was confirmed in the present study for concentrations of 1000 µg/ml mepyramine. Additionally, it was found that mepyramine was able to enhance the antibacterial effects of amoxicillin, sulfadiazine combined with trimethoprim, colistin, enrofloxacin, tetracycline and florfenicol against *E. coli* ATCC[®] 25922[™] and *E. coli* PIG 01. This is not a cytotoxic effect as shown in the present study due to 100% living cells after mepyramine incubation for 24 h in different concentrations.

Possible mechanisms for the enhanced efficacy of antibacterials in presence of antihistamines were already discussed by El-Banna et al. [3], but the exact effect seems to be unclear.

El-Banna et al. [3] argues that the enhanced efficacy should be caused by an inhibition of bacterial efflux pumps by antihistamines. They also mentioned an inhibition of biofilm formation for the antihistamine promethazine by inhibiting quorum sensing. Another idea is based on the main structural feature of antihistamines, a

Table 1 MIC of antibacterials in combination with mepyramine for *E. coli* ATCC[®] 25922[™] and *E. coli* PIG 01

Combination with MEP	MIC (µg/ml)					
	Alone		Combined		DRI Median	DRI Bange
	Median	Range	Median	Range	Median	nunge
<i>E. coli</i> ATCC® 25922™	1					
AMX	1.5	1.5–2	1*	1.0-1.5	1.5	1.3–1.5
SDZ/TMP	2	1-4	1**	0.3–1	3	2–8
TET	0.5	0.5–0.5	0.3*	0.3–0.5	2	1–2
CST	8	8-8	1**	1-2	8	4-8
ENR	0.01	0.01-0.01	0.005**	0.005-0.005	2	2–2
FFC	8	8–16	2***	2-4	4	4-4
GEN	0.3	0.3–0.5	0.3	0.3–0.5	1	1-1
KA	4	4.0-0.5	4	0.5–0.5	1	1-1
<i>E. coli</i> PIG 01						
AMX	1.5	1–3	1.3	0.8–2	1.5	1-1.5
SDZ/TMP	2	2–4	2	1–2	1.5	1–2
TET	1	1-4	0.5*	0.5–1	2	2-4
CST	2	2–4	1.5	1–2	2	1–4
ENR	16	16–16	8	8–16	2	1–2
FFC	8	8-32	2**	2–4	4	4-8
GEN	0.5	4-4	0.5	4-4	1	1-1
KAN	8	4–8	8	4–8	1	1-1

Data are expressed as median and range (n = 6)

Statistical significances were assessed between MIC alone and combined

AMX Amoxicillin, SDZ/TMP Sulfadiazine/trimethoprim, TET Tetracycline, CST Colistin, ENR Enrofloxacin, FFC Florfenicol, GEN Gentamicin, KAN Kanamycin, MEP Mepyramine, MIC Minimum inhibitory concentration, DRI Dose reduction index (MIC_{alone} / MIC_{combined})

*Significantly different (p < 0.05), **Significantly different (p < 0.01)



tertiary amino group and a lipophilic aromatic moiety, hence they possess certain surfactant-like characters [9]. Possible properties like this might cause alterations of biological membrane permeability [10, 11] which could negatively affect the bacteria. Hagmar et al. [12] showed that antihistamines could influence bacterial cells by binding to the minor groove of the bacterial DNA and intercalating between the base pairs. It can be hypothesized that bacteria like *E. coli* produce histamine under stress conditions possibly as a protection against environmental factors. Postulating that this effect is mediated via bacterial histamine receptors, histamine receptor antagonists could interact with this mechanism. Therefore, the efficacy of antibacterial agents should be enhanced. These assumptions have to be proven by further studies.

Antihistamines have been classified into two generations, the first-generation and second-generation and moreover in various chemical groups: the ethanolamines, ethylenediamines, alkylamines, piperazines, piperidines, phenothiazines and others [8]. The results in this study for the ethylenediamine mepyramine were compared in single experiments with the ethanolamine diphenhydramine and for the second generation antihistaminic drug the piperazine cetirizine and for others azelastine. In the current study, an antibacterial dose reduction was confirmed only for a combination with the first generation antihistamines, which is in contrast to El-Banna et al. [3], who found similar effects for different antibiotics in combination also with cetirizine on the growth of *Klebsiella pneumoniae*.

Second-generation H_1 antihistamines are newer drugs that are much more selective for peripheral H_1 receptors [13]. It could be imagined that bacteria may have unspecific binding sides for antihistamines, therefore cetirizine and azelastine are not able to effect because of their specificity. Based on the present study this difference in chemical structure may be the reason for the shown enhanced efficacy only in combination with the first generation antihistamines. Furthermore, the combination with mepyramine enhanced the efficacy for six of the used antibacterials. No effects on the aminoglycosides gentamicin and kanamycin in combination with mepyramine were shown, which is in contrast to the study results of El-Banna et al. [3], where an enhanced efficacy was shown for the combination of cetirizine and diphenhydramine on the growth of *Klebsiella pneumoniae*, as well.

These in vitro findings need to be confirmed in vivo. Besides, more research is required to answer the raised questions and to get a better idea of how bacteria, histamine and antihistamines are interacting.

Conclusion

The combined use of antihistamines and antibacterials might be a potential option to treat infectious diseases in future and to reduce the absolute amount of antibacterials used therapeutically.

Methods

Bacterial culture

Two different *E. coli* strains were used. The first strain, *Escherichia coli* ATCC[•] 25922[±] (American Type Culture Collection, Manassas, VA, USA) represents a reference strain for antimicrobial susceptibility testing and is sensitive for enrofloxacin (MIC $\leq 0.03 \,\mu$ g/ml). A second strain (*E. coli* PIG 01) was isolated from pigs in own experiments and exhibits an MIC for enrofloxacin of $\geq 16 \,\mu$ g/ml.

Agents

Mepyramine maleate was obtained from Tocris Bioscience (Bristol, UK) and Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO, USA). Cetirizine dihydrochloride, azelastine hydrochloride, diphenhydramine hydrochloride, amoxicillin, sulfadiazine sodium salt, trimethoprim, enrofloxacin, colistin sulfate salt, gentamicin sulfate and kanamycin sulfate were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO, USA). Tetracycline hydrochloride was obtained from Carl Roth (Karlsruhe, Germany) and florfenicol from Cayman Chemical Company (Ann Arbor, MI, USA). All agents were directly diluted in M9 minimal medium (described below), except florfenicol, which was first dissolved in 10 µl dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO), and enrofloxacin by adding 5% of 1 N sodium hydroxide solution. The trimethoprim-potentiated sulfonamides were used at a ratio of 19:1 (sulfadiazine:trimethoprim) stock solution dissolved with 0.5 ml of DMSO in 20 ml M9 minimal medium.

Medium

M9 minimal medium was used for the cultivation of *E. coli* strains. This buffered minimal microbial medium is composed of 5 g glucose, 6 g disodium hydrogen phosphate, 3 g potassium dihydrogen phosphate, 1 g ammonium chloride, 0.5 g sodium chloride, 120 mg magnesium sulfate, 10 mg calcium chloride and 20 mg thiamine hydrochloride in one liter double distilled water.

Checkerboard method

To identify an enhanced efficacy of an antibacterial agent in combination with a non-antibacterial active agent, the in vitro checkerboard method was used [14]. The E. coli strains were subcultured on 7% columbia sheep blood agar plates (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) for 24 h at 37 °C. An E. coli inoculum was suspended in M9 minimal medium and adjusted to a 0.5 McFarland turbidity standard correlating to 1.5×10^8 CFU/ml (colony-forming unit). The agents were diluted with M9 minimal medium. The checkerboard tests were carried out in 96-multiwellplates (Greiner, Kremsmuenster, Austria) containing a total volume of 200 µl per well including bacteria suspension. Controls were filled with medium, antihistaminic or antibacterial agent and bacteria suspension. The H₁ receptor antagonist was serially diluted along the rows in logarithmic increasing concentrations from 0 up to $1000 \,\mu\text{g/ml}$, various antibacterial agents along the columns starting at zero and ending at two times MIC (Fig. 2).

Then each well was filled with an unique combination of the two substances (for example well C4 in Fig. 2 with 50 μ l of 100 μ g/ml mepyramine and 50 μ l of 1 μ g/ml colistin). Finally, M9 minimal medium containing 1.5 × 10⁸ CFU/ml was added to the wells. To exclude effects caused by pH changes the pH was evaluated at time points 0 and 24 h after incubation for the combination of enrofloxacin and mepyramine in every well of the



Content courtesy of Springer Nature, terms of use apply. Rights reserved.

96-multiwell-plate with pH paper (range 1–14, Carl Roth, Karlsruhe, Germany).

Bacterial growth was compared after 24 h of incubation at 37 °C by measuring the absorbance with a microplate reader at 570 nm (MRX Microplate Reader, Dynatech Laboratories, Channel Islands, GB). Each single study was performed six times. The concentration of the first well without visible bacterial growth due to the combination of two agents was used to determine the MIC_{combined} and was compared with the respective MIC_{alone}. A dose reduction index (DRI) was calculated according to Chou [15] by means of:

$$DRI = \frac{MIC_{alone}}{MIC_{combined}}$$

Cytotoxic effects of the test compounds

To determine the amount of viable and dead bacteria under mepyramine stress conditions (30, 100 and $1000 \,\mu\text{g/ml}$ mepyramine, incubation time 24 h at 37 °C) the LIVE/DEAD[™] BacLight[™] Bacterial Viability Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) was used according to manufactures manual. The assay contains two fluorescent nucleic acid stains (SYTO 9 and propidium iodide). Bacteria with intact membranes (living bacteria) are stained fluorescent green, whereas cells with damaged membranes (dead bacteria) are stained fluorescent red. Bacteria cultures without adding any agent served as positive control. Bacteria with addition of isopropylalcohol (70%, Honeywell, Morristown, NJ, USA) were used as negative control. The stained bacterial suspension was analysed using fluorescence microscopy (Leica, Wetzlar, Germany) by counting the stained bacterial colonies in two visual fields (100 x magnification) at 490 and 546 nm [16, 17].

Statistical analysis

Statistical significances of differences between MIC values were assessed using the Mann-Whitney U-test (GraphPad Prism version 7.04, GraphPad Software, Inc., La Jolla, CA, USA). Statistical significance was set at a p value < 0.05. Data given in the text and table are presented as median and range.

Abbreviations

°C: Degree Celsius; AMX: Amoxicillin; ATCC: American Type Culture Collection; BVL: Federal Office of Consumer Protection and Food Safety; CFU: Colony-forming unit; CST: Colistin; DMSO: Dimethyl sulfoxide; DRI: Dose reduction index; *E. coli: Escherichia coli*; ENR: Enrofloxacin; FFC: Florfenicol; g: Grams; GEN: Gentamicin; KAN: Kanamycin; MEP: Mepyramine; mg: Milligrams; MIC: Minimum inhibitory concentration; ml: Millilitre; NG: No growth of bacteria; nm: Nanometre; SDZ/TMP: Sulfadiazine/trimethoprim; TET: Tetracycline; µg: Micrograms; µl: Microliter

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Authors' contributions

GGB, JM and MK conceived and planned the experiments. GGB, SMK, JM and VF worked out the experimental method. GGB, AFT and ES carried out the experiments. GGB, JM, PH and MK contributed to the interpretation of the results. GGB wrote the manuscript with support from PH, JM and MK. All authors discussed the results and contributed to the final manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Author details

¹Department of Pharmacology, Toxicology and Pharmacy, University of Veterinary Medicine Hannover Foundation, Hannover, Germany. ²Department of Toxicology and Forensic Medicine, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Cairo University, Giza, Egypt.

Received: 19 September 2018 Accepted: 24 January 2019 Published online: 11 February 2019

References

- Brennan-Krohn T, Truelson KA, Smith KP, Kirby JE. Screening for synergistic activity of antimicrobial combinations against carbapenem-resistant Enterobacteriaceae using inkjet printer-based technology. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2017;72:2775–81.
- Maier L, Pruteanu M, Kuhn M, Zeller G, Telzerow A, Anderson EE, Brochado AR, Fernandez KC, Dose H, Mori H, et al. Extensive impact of non-antibiotic drugs on human gut bacteria. Nature. 2018;555:623–8.
- El-Banna T, Sonbol F, El-Aziz A, Al-Fakharany O. Modulation of antibiotic efficacy against Klebsiella pneumoniae by antihistaminic drugs. J Med Microb Diagn. 2016;5:2.
- Thomas CM, Hong T, van Pijkeren JP, Hemarajata P, Trinh DV, Hu W, Britton RA, Kalkum M, Versalovic J. Histamine derived from probiotic lactobacillus reuteri suppresses TNF via modulation of PKA and ERK signaling. PLoS One. 2012;7:2.
- Barcik W, Pugin B, Westermann P, Perez NR, Ferstl R, Wawrzyniak M, Smolinska S, Jutel M, Hessel EM, Michalovich D, et al. Histamine-secreting microbes are increased in the gut of adult asthma patients. J Allergy Clin Immunol. 2016;138:1491–4.
- Allocati N, Masulli M, Alexeyev MF, Di Ilio C. Escherichia coli in Europe: an overview. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2013;10:6235–54.
- El-Nakeeb MA, Abou-Shleib HM, Khalil AM, Omar HG, El-Halfawy OM. In vitro antibacterial activity of some antihistaminics belonging to different groups against multi-drug resistant clinical isolates. Braz J Microbiol. 2011;42:980–91.
- Simons FER, Simons KJ. H(1)antihistamines: current status and future directions. World Allergy Organ J. 2008;1:145–55.
- 9. Attwood D, Florence AT. Physicochemical principles of pharmacy. 6th ed. London: Pharmaceutical Press; 2016. p. 193-246.
- Guth PS, Spirtes MA. The Phenothiazinetranquilizers: Biochemical and Biophysical Actions. Int Rev of Neurobiol. 1964;7:231-278.
- 11. Molnar J, Kiraly J, Mandi Y. The antibacterial action and R-factor-inhibiting activity by chlorpromazine. Experientia. 1975;31:444–5.

- Hagmar P, Pierrou S, Nielsen P, Norden B, Kubista M. Ionic strength dependence of the binding of methylene blue to chromatin and calf thymus DNA. J Biomol Struct Dyn. 1992;9:667–79.
- 13. Camelo-Nunes IC. New antihistamines: a critical view. J Pediatr. 2006;82:173–80.
- Zuo GY, Yang CX, Han J, Li YQ, Wang GC. Synergism of prenylflavonoids from Morus alba root bark against clinical MRSA isolates. Phytomedicine. 2018;39:93–9.
- Chou T-C. Theoretical basis, experimental design, and computerized simulation of synergism and antagonism in drug combination studies. Pharmacol Rev. 2006;58:621–81.
- Boulos L, Prevost M, Barbeau B, Coallier J, Desjardins R. LIVE/DEAD BacLight : application of a new rapid staining method for direct enumeration of viable and total bacteria in drinking water. J Microbiol Methods. 1999;37:77–86.
- Stiefel P, Schmidt-Emrich S, Maniura-Weber K, Ren Q. Critical aspects of using bacterial cell viability assays with the fluorophores SYTO9 and propidium iodide. BMC Microbiol. 2015;15:36.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- · thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions



Terms and Conditions

Springer Nature journal content, brought to you courtesy of Springer Nature Customer Service Center GmbH ("Springer Nature").

Springer Nature supports a reasonable amount of sharing of research papers by authors, subscribers and authorised users ("Users"), for smallscale personal, non-commercial use provided that all copyright, trade and service marks and other proprietary notices are maintained. By accessing, sharing, receiving or otherwise using the Springer Nature journal content you agree to these terms of use ("Terms"). For these purposes, Springer Nature considers academic use (by researchers and students) to be non-commercial.

These Terms are supplementary and will apply in addition to any applicable website terms and conditions, a relevant site licence or a personal subscription. These Terms will prevail over any conflict or ambiguity with regards to the relevant terms, a site licence or a personal subscription (to the extent of the conflict or ambiguity only). For Creative Commons-licensed articles, the terms of the Creative Commons license used will apply.

We collect and use personal data to provide access to the Springer Nature journal content. We may also use these personal data internally within ResearchGate and Springer Nature and as agreed share it, in an anonymised way, for purposes of tracking, analysis and reporting. We will not otherwise disclose your personal data outside the ResearchGate or the Springer Nature group of companies unless we have your permission as detailed in the Privacy Policy.

While Users may use the Springer Nature journal content for small scale, personal non-commercial use, it is important to note that Users may not:

- 1. use such content for the purpose of providing other users with access on a regular or large scale basis or as a means to circumvent access control;
- 2. use such content where to do so would be considered a criminal or statutory offence in any jurisdiction, or gives rise to civil liability, or is otherwise unlawful;
- 3. falsely or misleadingly imply or suggest endorsement, approval, sponsorship, or association unless explicitly agreed to by Springer Nature in writing;
- 4. use bots or other automated methods to access the content or redirect messages
- 5. override any security feature or exclusionary protocol; or
- 6. share the content in order to create substitute for Springer Nature products or services or a systematic database of Springer Nature journal content.

In line with the restriction against commercial use, Springer Nature does not permit the creation of a product or service that creates revenue, royalties, rent or income from our content or its inclusion as part of a paid for service or for other commercial gain. Springer Nature journal content cannot be used for inter-library loans and librarians may not upload Springer Nature journal content on a large scale into their, or any other, institutional repository.

These terms of use are reviewed regularly and may be amended at any time. Springer Nature is not obligated to publish any information or content on this website and may remove it or features or functionality at our sole discretion, at any time with or without notice. Springer Nature may revoke this licence to you at any time and remove access to any copies of the Springer Nature journal content which have been saved.

To the fullest extent permitted by law, Springer Nature makes no warranties, representations or guarantees to Users, either express or implied with respect to the Springer nature journal content and all parties disclaim and waive any implied warranties or warranties imposed by law, including merchantability or fitness for any particular purpose.

Please note that these rights do not automatically extend to content, data or other material published by Springer Nature that may be licensed from third parties.

If you would like to use or distribute our Springer Nature journal content to a wider audience or on a regular basis or in any other manner not expressly permitted by these Terms, please contact Springer Nature at

onlineservice@springernature.com