Journal of Population Therapeutics & Clinical Pharmacology

RESEARCH ARTICLE
DOI: 10.53555/ywptsr98

INSILICO AND PHARMACOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO NOVEL THERAPEUTICS FOR NEUROPATHIC PAIN: A REVIEW OF FOCUS ON GLUTAMATERGIC AND CALCIUM CHANNEL PATHWAYS

Disha Patel[1], Dr. Nishkruti R. Mehta[2*], Mr. Khinya Ram[3], Dr. Pragnesh Patani[4]

[1]Student, Khyati College of Pharmacy, Palodiya, Ahmedabad
[2*]Professor & Head, Department of Pharmacology, Khyati College of Pharmacy, Palodiya, Ahmedabad
[3]Assitant Professor, Department of Pharmacology, Khyati College of Pharmacy, Palodiya, Ahmedabad
[4]Principal, Khyati College of Pharmacy, Palodiya, Ahmedabad

***Corresponding Author:** Dr. Nishkruti R. Mehta
[*]HOD, Department of Pharmacology, Khyati College of Pharmacy, Palodiya, Ahmedabad
Email: Nishkrutimehta@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Neuropathic pain is a complicated clinical problem with maladaptive alterations in nociceptive pathways, affecting millions of people worldwide. Conventional painkiller medications do not be sufficient to treat pain; new treatment strategies involve particular molecular processes.

Objective: The review discusses the present status of integrated computational and experimental models involving the discovery and testing of new therapeutic agents in the management of neuropathic pain through the activation of glutamatergic and calcium channel pathways.

Methods: The literature search was performed as a full search in PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science databases of 2015-2024 publications. Keywords were neuropathic pain, in silico drug design, glutamatergic pathways, calcium channels and pharmacological validation.

Results: Recent developments in computational drug design have established many potential drugs that would inhibit NMDA receptors, AMPA receptors, and voltage-gated calcium channels (VGCCs). The combined insilico-experimental techniques have been shown to be successful at 15-25% in q.v.f.i.c.d.t., a lot more successful than the conventional high-throughput screening technologies.

Conclusions: Computational modelling plus rigorous pharmacological validation is a potentially useful approach to developing drugs to treat neuropathic pain, but there is still work to do to translate promising preclinical findings into clinical success.

Keywords: Neuropathic pain, insilico drug design, glutamatergic pathways, calcium channels, NMDA receptors, voltage-gated calcium channels

1. Introduction

Neuropathic pain (pain generated by a lesion or disease of the somatosensory nervous system) is estimated to occur in about 7-10% of the global population and is one of the most difficult problems in pain medicine today (1,2). In contrast to nociceptive pain, which is a protective mechanism,

neuropathic pain is caused by abnormal neural signalling after the nerve is damaged or dysfunctional, resulting in spontaneous pain, allodynia and hyperalgesia (3). Its pathophysiology involves complex molecular cascade such as glutamatergic pathway sensitization and calcium channel pathway dysregulation, and is therefore an optimal target in rational drug design strategies (4).
Conventional anticonvulsant, antidepressant, and opioid pharmacological agents are only sufficient to relieve neuropathic pain in 40-60 percent of individuals and are commonly linked to serious adverse effects (5,6). This gap in therapy has motivated the desire to develop new techniques to discover drugs, and computational methods have become potent tools in finding and optimizing potential therapeutic agents (7,8).

The integration of insilico profiling with experimental validation represents a paradigm shift in neuropathic pain drug development. Computer-aided drug design (CADD) techniques, including molecular docking, molecular dynamics simulations, and machine learning algorithms, enable researchers to screen large chemical libraries and predict drug-target interactions with unprecedented efficiency (9,10). When combined with rigorous pharmacological validation in appropriate animal models and cellular systems, these approaches offer the potential to accelerate the identification of effective neuropathic pain therapeutics while reducing development costs and time-to-market (11).

2. Pathophysiology of Neuropathic Pain: Glutamatergic and Calcium Channel Involvement

2.1 Glutamatergic Pathway Dysfunction

Combining insilico profiling with experimental validation is a paradigm shift in the development of drugs in neuropathic pain. The tools of computer-aided drug design (CADD), such as molecular docking, machine learning algorithms, and molecular dynamics simulations, allow scientists to screen large chemical libraries and predict drug-target interactions with better efficiency than before (9,10). Together with rigorous pharmacological validation in suitable animal models and cellular systems, they have the potential to speed up the discovery of useful neuropathic pain therapeutics and lower the cost and time to market (11). There are several ways in which the glutamatergic system is central to the development and maintenance of neuropathic pain. The release of glutamate by the primary afferent terminals increases after peripheral nerve damage, resulting in the increased activation of postsynaptic glutamate receptors, especially, N methyl D aspartate (NMDA) receptors and -amino 3 hydroxy 5 methyl 4 isoxazolepropionic acid (AMPA) receptors (12,13). This overproduction of glutamatergic signaling is part of central sensitization, which is a major mechanism of neuropathic pain conditions (14).

The NMDA receptors are made up of NR1 and NR2 subunits and after nerve injury, they are highly up-regulated in the dorsal horn neurons. Specifically, the NR2B subunit has been reported as an essential mediator of neuropathic pain, and selective NR2B antagonists exhibit analgesic effects in preclinical models (15,16). Furthermore, changes in AMPA receptor trafficking and phosphorylation levels are also involved in increased excitatory transmission in the pain pathways (17).

Group I mGluRs (mGluR1 and mGluR5) are also metabotropic glutamate receptors which are involved in neuropathic pain. When these receptors are activated, intracellular signaling cascades that promote neuronal excitability and aid in the perpetuation of chronic pain states are triggered (18,19).

2.2 Calcium Channel Dysregulation

Neurotransmitter release and neuronal excitability rely on voltage-gated calcium channels (VGCCs), and therefore, these channels are of interest as neuropathic pain targets. After nerve damage, there is a dramatic alteration in the expression and functioning of the calcium channels, especially of α2δ subunits of the VGCCs (20,21). Subunit α2δ -1 is significantly increased in dorsal root ganglia and dorsal horn neurons in response to nerve injury, which promotes calcium influx and elevation of neurotransmitter release (22).

All types of calcium channels (L-type, N-type, P/Q-type, and T-type) mediate the mechanisms of neuropathic pain in the following ways. Specifically, N-type channels (Cav2.2) are essential to the release of glutamate and substance P via primary afferent terminals, and T-type channels (Cav3.2) help to increase postural dorsal neuronal excitability (23,24). Calcium channels are therapeutic targets in the treatment of neuropathic pain given the successful clinical use of gabapentin and pregabalin, which bind to the α2δ subunit, and alter calcium channel activity (25,26).

3. Insilico Approaches in Neuropathic Pain Drug Discovery

3.1 Computational Target Identification and Validation

Computational methods continue to play an important role in modern drug discovery to identify and validate potential therapeutic targets. In the case of neuropathic pain, systems biology methods have been applied to map complex molecular networks that mediate pain signaling, and key nodes that form targets of interest in therapy (27,28). The interrelation of glutamatergic and calcium channel pathways obtained through network pharmacology analysis gives valuable information on possible polypharmacological strategies (29).

Genetic variants and changes in expression linked to neuropathic pain susceptibility have been determined using genome-wide association studies (GWAS) and transcriptomic studies and can inform target prioritization (30,31). These datasets when combined with protein-protein interaction networks have made it possible to identify new targets in glutamatergic and calcium channel pathways (32).

3.2 Structure-Based Drug Design

The structure-based drug design (SBDD) has now become an effective method of designing neuropathic pain therapeutics. Detailed molecular docking studies and structure-activity relationship (SAR) analysis have been made possible by high-resolution crystal structures of central targets, such as NMDA receptor subunits and calcium channel components (33,34).

Homology modeling methods have been especially useful when the target of interest does not have any experimental structure, e.g., some calcium channel subunits. These are computational models which are proved to be structurally relevant in rational drug design by way of molecular dynamics simulation (35,36). The systematic optimization of small molecules by binding a given target site has also demonstrated promise using fragment based drug design approaches (37).

3.3 Ligand-Based Drug Design and Machine Learning

Neuropathic pain drug discovery Ligand-based drug design (LBDD) methods such as pharmacophore modeling and quantitative structure-activity relationship (QSAR) analysis have been effectively exploited to address the problem of neuropathic pain disease. Those approaches use known active compounds to screen essential molecular features needed to be active biologically (38,39).

Deep neural networks, and support vector machines are all machine learning algorithms that have transformed virtual screening of neuropathic pain targets. By doing so, these methods can be used to determine more complex non-linear correlations between molecular descriptors and biological activity, allowing compounds with greater likelihood of efficacy to be predicted (40,41). The latest developments in artificial intelligence, such as graph neural networks and transformer models have pushed the accuracy of activity predictions on novel compounds further (42). These comparative metrics, as detailed in Table 1, demonstrate that the selection of computational approaches should balance the trade-offs between accuracy, speed, and resource requirements based on specific project needs and constraints.

Table 1: Comparison of Computational Approaches for Neuropathic Pain Drug Discovery

Approach	Advantages	Limitations	Success Rate	Timeline
Molecular Docking	Fast, cost-effective	Limited flexibility consideration	10-15%	1-2 weeks
Molecular Dynamics	Accounts for flexibility	Computationally expensive	15-20%	2-4 weeks
Machine Learning	Handles complex relationships	Requires large training datasets	20-25%	1-3 weeks
Fragment-based Design	Enables systematic optimization	Requires structural information	25-30%	4-8 weeks
Pharmacophore Modeling	Uses known active compounds	Limited to known chemical space	12-18%	1-2 weeks

4. Pharmacological Validation Strategies

4.1 In Vitro Validation Systems

The computational predictions must be converted into possible therapeutic candidates by rigorous pharmacological validation. Dorsal root ganglia and dorsal horn neurons are the primary cell cultures available to offer a physiologically relevant system in which compound effects on glutamatergic signaling and calcium channel activity can be assessed (43,44). Patch-clamp electrophysiology is still considered gold standard in describing compound action on ion channel activities, allowing detailed mechanism of action and selectivity to be analyzed (45).

Calcium imaging methods have been useful in measuring the actions of compounds on intracellular calcium homeostasis of pain-relevant cells. These methods support the screening of compound libraries at high throughput and are supplemented with mechanistic information on drug action (46,47). Also, the effect of compounds on the glutamate release could be directly evaluated by neurotransmitter release assays with synaptosomal preparations or cultured neurons (48).

4.2 Animal Models of Neuropathic Pain

There are several animal models that have been engineered to reproduce various features of human neuropathic pain, and each has its own strengths and weaknesses. Chronic constriction injury (CCI) model which involves part ligation of the sciatic nerve, results in predictable mechanical allodynia and thermal hyperalgesia which lasts a few weeks (49,50). Several factors make the spinal nerve ligation (SNL) model an appropriate model of pain to test analgesic effects: it is more severe and reproducible (51).

Spared nerve injury (SNI) model has become a popular model because of its potent and durable pain phenotype, which is highly similar to the features of human neuropathic pain (52). In the case of diabetic neuropathy, the streptozotin induced diabetes model would offer an appropriate disease model to assess possible therapeutics (53). Using paclitaxel or oxaliplatin as a chemotherapy agent, a model chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy (CIPN) is necessary in order to test various treatment methods to this condition which is getting increasingly significant clinically (54,55). Table 3 provides a comprehensive comparison of the major animal models used in neuropathic pain research, detailing their methodologies, duration of pain behaviors, specific behavioral phenotypes, and clinical relevance.

Table 3: Animal Models for Neuropathic Pain Validation

Model	Methodology	Duration	Behavioral Phenotype	Clinical Relevance
CCI	Sciatic nerve ligation	2-8 weeks	Mechanical allodynia, thermal hyperalgesia	Peripheral nerve injury
SNL	L5/L6 spinal nerve ligation	4-12 weeks	Robust mechanical allodynia	Severe neuropathy
SNI	Tibial/peroneal nerve cut	8-16 weeks	Persistent allodynia	Partial nerve injury
STZ-diabetes	Streptozotocin injection	8-20 weeks	Progressive neuropathy	Diabetic neuropathy

Model	Methodology	Duration	Behavioral Phenotype	Clinical Relevance
Paclitaxel CIPN	Chemotherapy injection	4-8 weeks	Mechanical hypersensitivity	Chemotherapy neuropathy

4.3 Behavioral Assessment Methods

Pain-related behavior assessment is also important in the pharmacological validation studies. Mechanical allodynia is generally determined by von Frey filaments on the hind paw, and a lower withdrawal threshold means that pain sensitivity has increased (56). Thermal hyperalgesia is assessed by the use of radiant heat sources, where the shorter withdrawal latencies represent the higher the thermal sensitivity (57).

Advanced behavioral tests have been designed to measure other characteristics of neuropathic pain. The place preference paradigm has the potential to test the rewarding nature of analgesic effects, as this comprises information of clinical significance of observed analgesic effects (58). Operant conditioning activities can evaluate the effect of pain on voluntary behaviour, which may offer clinically useful endpoints where reflex-based measures might not succeed (59).

5. Current Therapeutic Targets and Validation Studies

5.1 NMDA Receptor Modulators

NMDA receptors are one of the most commonly studied targets of neuropathic pain therapy. Computational chemistry has revealed that many new NMDA receptor antagonists and allosteric modulators are being designed that have a better selectivity profile than standard competitive antagonists (60,61). It has been shown that molecular docking of the NR2B subunit can identify subtype-specific binding sites which can be used to selectively antagonize the NR2B subunit, potentially minimizing side effects caused by nonselective NMDA receptor blockage (62).

Recent insilico screens have identified NR2B-selective natural products with a high potency. As an example, the online screening of Chinese traditional medicine databases revealed flavonoid compounds that bind NR2B receptors with nanomolar affinity, which was subsequently confirmed by electrophysiological analysis (63). These compounds were effective analgesics in CCI and SNL models with little or no effects on motor activity and cognition (64).

Allosteric regulation of NMDA receptors has become an attractive prospect to realize more selective therapeutic effects. Computational work has determined binding sites other than the glutamate and glycine binding domains, allowing the synthesis of compounds that can regulate receptors instead of fully inhibiting activity (65,66). These allosteric modulators have been pharmacologically validated in several neuropathic pain models with fewer side effects than competitive antagonists (67).

5.2 Calcium Channel Modulators

N-type and T-type voltage-gated calcium channels have met the criteria of neuropathic pain therapeutic targets. There has been the creation of novel N-type calcium channel blockers using structure-based drug design methods which are more selective with reduced cardiovascular side effects (68,69). The mode of binding by selective channel blockers has been studied by molecular dynamics simulations, which have allowed structure-guided optimization (70).

The α2δ subunit of VGCCs has itself been under intense focus in the wake of the clinical success of gabapentin and pregabalin. Computational methods have discovered new α2δ ligands which may have better efficacy and safety profiles. Large chemical libraries have been screened virtually, then subjected to molecular docking and pharmacological validation, to produce a few promising targets that are now undergoing preclinical testing (71,72).

T-type calcium channel modulators are a new treatment modality of neuropathic pain. Computational work has also discovered state-dependent blockers with selective inhibitory effects on open or inactivated channels potentially offering more selective therapeutic properties (73,74). The efficacy of these new T-type channel modulators in decreasing mechanical allodynia and thermal hyperalgesia is pharmacologically validated in animal models (75). Table 2 summarizes the key therapeutic targets

currently under investigation, including their specific subtypes, mechanisms of action, clinical development status, and representative compounds that have shown efficacy in preclinical or clinical studies.

Table 2: Key Therapeutic Targets in Neuropathic Pain

Target	Subtype	Mechanism	Clinical Status	Representative Compounds
NMDA Receptor	NR2B	Glutamate antagonism	Phase II/III trials	Ifenprodil, Ro-25-6981
NMDA Receptor	NR2A	Glutamate antagonism	Preclinical	GNE-0723, TCN-201
Calcium Channels	Cav2.2 (N-type)	Calcium influx inhibition	Clinical use	Ziconotide, SNX-482
Calcium Channels	Cav3.2 (T-type)	Calcium influx inhibition	Preclinical	Z123212, TTA-A2
Calcium Channels	α2δ subunit	Channel trafficking	Clinical use	Gabapentin, Pregabalin
AMPA Receptor	GluA2	Glutamate modulation	Preclinical	GYKI-52466, NBQX

6. Integration of Computational and Experimental Approaches

6.1 Workflow Optimization

In order to make computational and experimental methods work successfully, the optimization of workflow should be done with a high level of care in order to achieve maximum efficiency and success rates. Usually, the process starts with the identification and validation of targets by applying bioinformatics methods, followed by virtual screening of compound libraries by applying molecular docking and machine learning methods (76,77). ADMET (Absorption, Distribution, Metabolism, Excretion, Toxicity) prediction is then applied to these hit compounds to select only the drug-like candidates with positive drug-like properties (78).

Identified compounds are first pharmacologically validated in vitro in binding studies, functional studies, and cell toxicity studies. Credible compounds are then tested in animal models of neuropathic pain under a set of well-defined behavioral protocols (79,80). In this process, repeated feedback between computational and experimental groups facilitates quick optimization of lead compounds in accordance with structure-activity correlation (81).

6.2 Success Rates and Optimization Strategies

Recently, studies of neuropathic pain drug discovery programs employing combined computational-experimental methods have noted that 15-25% of compounds identified by these methods have significant analgesic activity in animal models, compared to 1-5% of compounds hit by conventional high-throughput screening methods (82,83). These increased success rates indicate the ability of computational methods to rank compounds with high potential of biological activity and eliminate compounds with poor properties (84).

To further maximize the success rates several strategies have been used. Ensemble docking methods with multiple target conformations have enhanced the hit identification rates by considering target deformability (85). The accuracy of predictions of binding affinity has been improved by consensus scoring schemes, which are a combination of docking algorithms and scoring functions (86). Pain-specific machine learning models have demonstrated better pain-specific performance relative to general-purpose models at predicting analgesic activity (87).

7. Challenges and Future Directions

7.1 Translational Challenges

In spite of the breakthroughs that have been made in computational drug design and validation in animal models, clinical success in neuropathic pain therapeutics is difficult to translate. Some causes of this translational gap are differences in the pain mechanisms between species, constraints of available animal models, and heterogeneity of human neuropathic pain conditions (88,89). The collapses of various promising compounds in clinical trials but with good preclinical performance underscores the need to have better translational strategies (90).

A huge problem is that the predictive validity of existing animal models of human neuropathic pain is low. These models can be helpful to recapitulate some of the characteristics of neuropathic pain, but they might not capture the heterogeneity and complexity of human pain conditions (91,92). Creation of more advanced animal models, such as humanized models and models that more closely mirror a particular patient population, is a promising focus of future studies (93).

7.2 Technological Advances and Future Opportunities

There are some emerging technologies which have potential to move neuropathic pain drug discovery forward. High-resolution structures In cryo-electron microscopy, high-resolution structures of some previously intractable targets, such as intact NMDA receptors and calcium channel complexes, are now available, permitting more accurate structure-based drug design (94,95). It is believed that these structural developments, along with better computational algorithms, will improve the accuracy of virtual screening initiatives (96).

The field of artificial intelligence and machine learning is constantly growing, and deep learning models have demonstrated a specific potential in the context of the prediction of drug-target interactions and optimization of ADMET properties (97,98). Multi-omics data, such as genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics, are likely to yield a deeper insight into neuropathic pain mechanisms as well as new therapeutic targets (99,100).

7.3 Personalized Medicine Approaches

The heterogeneity of neuropathic pain implies that a tailored medicine strategy can be needed to achieve the best therapeutic results. Developments are underway to model the behavioral response of each patient to neuropathic pain management, using genetic, demographic and clinical parameters (101,102). Genomic research in pharmacogenomics has found that genetic variants do influence the metabolism and response to drugs and has made it possible to develop patient-specific dosing strategies (103).

Machine learning algorithms built on large clinical data sets are in development to determine which subsets of patients are most likely to respond to a particular treatment. Such methods could facilitate more specific clinical testing and a better choice of treatment in clinical practice (104,105).

8. Conclusions and Future Perspectives

Computational drug design and purposely applied pharmacological validation have contributed to a substantial improvement in the development of neuropathic pain therapeutics. Integrated in silico-experimental paradigms have been shown to be more successful than conventional drug discovery techniques, and a number of encouraging candidates are in preclinical and clinical development stages. Targeting glutamatergic and calcium channel pathways has been a particularly productive area of exploration with an emphasis on the detailed mechanistic insights into the pathophysiology of neuropathic pain.

There are however still serious concerns in the translation of promising preclinical outcomes to clinical success. The heterogeneity and complexity of the conditions of human neuropathic pain conditions need further improvement of animal models and validation plans. Moreover, the necessity of individualized medicine practices is becoming more and more evident, as the responses of different patients to neuropathic pain therapies differ significantly.

The future of this field will see more advanced computational models that involve artificial intelligence and machine learning methods, more animal models with better translational validity, and the combination of multi-omics data into new therapeutic targets and biomarkers. The recent development of the methods of structural biology, such as cryo-electron microscopy and sophisticated NMR spectroscopy, is expected to provide more and more detailed molecular information to inform the rational design of drugs.

These combined strategies will eventually lead to successful, safe, and individualized treatments of patients suffering neuropathic pains. The further development of the computational tools and experimental techniques ensures the further progress in this sphere of medical requirements which is the most important issue.

References

1. van Hecke O, Austin SK, Khan RA, Smith BH, Torrance N. Neuropathic pain in the general population: a systematic review of epidemiological studies. Pain. 2014;155(4):654-662.
2. Colloca L, Ludman T, Bouhassira D, Baron R, Dickenson AH, Yarnitsky D, et al. Neuropathic pain. Nat Rev Dis Primers. 2017;3:17002.
3. Jensen TS, Baron R, Haanpää M, Kalso E, Loeser JD, Rice AS, et al. A new definition of neuropathic pain. Pain. 2011;152(10):2204-2205.
4. Finnerup NB, Attal N, Haroutounian S, McNicol E, Baron R, Dworkin RH, et al. Pharmacotherapy for neuropathic pain in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Neurol. 2015;14(2):162-173.
5. Dworkin RH, O'Connor AB, Kent J, Mackey SC, Raja SN, Stacey BR, et al. Interventional management of neuropathic pain: NeuPSIG recommendations. Pain. 2013;154(11):2249-2261.
6. Bates D, Schultheis BC, Hanes MC, Jolly SM, Chakravarthy KV, Deer TR, et al. A comprehensive algorithm for management of neuropathic pain. Pain Med. 2019;20(S1):S2-12.
7. Chen YC, Chen IS, Chou SH, Liao WC, Chen CC. Computational drug design for neuropathic pain: voltage-gated sodium channel blockers. Curr Med Chem. 2020;27(28):4690-4706.
8. Huggins DJ, Sherman W, Tidor B. Rational approaches to improving selectivity in drug design. J Med Chem. 2012;55(4):1424-44.
9. Sliwoski G, Kothiwale S, Meiler J, Lowe EW Jr. Computational methods in drug discovery. Pharmacol Rev. 2014;66(1):334-395.
10. Yu W, MacKerell AD Jr. Computer-aided drug design methods. Methods Mol Biol. 2017;1520:85-106.
11. Paul SM, Mytelka DS, Dunwiddie CT, Persinger CC, Munos BH, Lindborg SR, et al. How to improve R&D productivity: the pharmaceutical industry's grand challenge. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2010;9(3):203-214.
12. Latremoliere A, Woolf CJ. Central sensitization: a generator of pain hypersensitivity by central neural plasticity. J Pain. 2009;10(9):895-926.
13. Kuner R, Flor H. Structural plasticity and reorganisation in chronic pain. Nat Rev Neurosci. 2017;18(1):20-30.
14. Woolf CJ, Salter MW. Neuronal plasticity: increasing the gain in pain. Science. 2000;288(5472):1765-1769.
15. Liu XJ, Gingrich JR, Vargas-Caballero M, Dong YN, Mazarati A, Sankar R, et al. Treatment of inflammatory and neuropathic pain by uncoupling Src from the NMDA receptor complex. Nat Med. 2008;14(12):1325-1332.
16. Petrenko AB, Yamakura T, Baba H, Shimoji K. The role of N-methyl-D-aspartate (NMDA) receptors in pain: a review. Anesth Analg. 2003;97(4):1108-1116.
17. Tao YX. AMPA receptor trafficking in inflammation-induced dorsal horn central sensitization. Neurosci Bull. 2012;28(4):111-120.
18. Neugebauer V. Metabotropic glutamate receptors—important modulators of nociception and pain behavior. Pain. 2002;98(1-2):1-8.
19. Fundytus ME. Glutamate receptors and nociception: implications for the drug treatment of pain. CNS Drugs. 2001;15(1):29-58.
20. Dolphin AC. Calcium channel auxiliary α2δ and β subunits: trafficking and one step beyond. Nat Rev Neurosci. 2012;13(8):542-555.

21. Zamponi GW, Striessnig J, Koschak A, Dolphin AC. The physiology, pathology, and pharmacology of voltage-gated calcium channels and their future therapeutic potential. Pharmacol Rev. 2015;67(4):821-870.
22. Li CY, Song YH, Higuera ES, Luo ZD. Spinal dorsal horn calcium channel alpha-2-delta-1 subunit upregulation contributes to peripheral nerve injury-induced tactile allodynia. J Neurosci. 2004;24(39):8494-8499.
23. Bourinet E, Altier C, Hildebrand ME, Trang T, Salter MW, Zamponi GW. Calcium-permeable ion channels in pain signaling. Physiol Rev. 2014;94(1):81-140.
24. Todorovic SM, Jevtovic-Todorovic V. T-type voltage-gated calcium channels as targets for the development of novel pain therapies. Br J Pharmacol. 2011;163(3):484-495.
25. Taylor CP, Angelotti T, Fauman E. Pharmacology and mechanism of action of pregabalin: the calcium channel alpha2-delta (alpha2-delta) subunit as a target for antiepileptic drug discovery. Epilepsy Res. 2007;73(2):137-150.
26. Gee NS, Brown JP, Dissanayake VU, Offord J, Thurlow R, Woodruff GN. The novel anticonvulsant drug, gabapentin (Neurontin), binds to the alpha2delta subunit of a calcium channel. J Biol Chem. 1996;271(10):5768-5776.
27. Barabási AL, Gulbahce N, Loscalzo J. Network medicine: a network-based approach to human disease. Nat Rev Genet. 2011;12(1):56-68.
28. Hopkins AL. Network pharmacology: the next paradigm in drug discovery. Nat Chem Biol. 2008;4(11):682-690.
29. Zhang GB, Li QY, Chen QL, Su SB. Network pharmacology: a new approach for chinese herbal medicine research. Evid Based Complement Alternat Med. 2013;2013:621423.
30. Veluchamy A, Hébert HL, Meng W, Palmer CNA, Smith BH. Systematic review of genetic association studies in people with chronic pain. Pain. 2018;159(8):1452-1468.
31. LaCroix-Fralish ML, Ledoux JB, Mogil JS. The Pain Genes Database: An interactive web browser of pain-related transgenic knockout studies. Pain. 2007;131(1-2):3.e1-4.
32. Zoubarev A, Hamer KM, Keshav KD, McCarthy EL, Santos JRC, Van Rossum T, et al. Gemma: a resource for the reuse, sharing and meta-analysis of expression profiling data. Bioinformatics. 2012;28(17):2272-2273.
33. Karakas E, Furukawa H. Crystal structure of a heterotetrameric NMDA receptor ion channel. Science. 2014;344(6187):992-997.
34. Wu J, Yan Z, Li Z, Qian X, Lu S, Dong M, et al. Structure of the voltage-gated calcium channel Cav1.1 at 3.6 Å resolution. Nature. 2016;537(7619):191-196.
35. Sali A, Blundell TL. Comparative protein modelling by satisfaction of spatial restraints. J Mol Biol. 1993;234(3):779-815.
36. Waterhouse A, Bertoni M, Bienert S, Studer G, Tauriello G, Gumienny R, et al. SWISS-MODEL: homology modelling of protein structures and complexes. Nucleic Acids Res. 2018;46(W1):W296-303.
37. Erlanson DA, Fesik SW, Hubbard RE, Jahnke W, Jhoti H. Twenty years on: the impact of fragments on drug discovery. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2016;15(9):605-619.
38. Yang SY. Pharmacophore modeling and applications in drug discovery: challenges and recent advances. Drug Discov Today. 2010;15(11-12):444-450.
39. Cramer RD, Patterson DE, Bunce JD. Comparative molecular field analysis (CoMFA). 1. Effect of shape on binding of steroids to carrier proteins. J Am Chem Soc. 1988;110(18):5959-5967.
40. Chen H, Engkvist O, Wang Y, Olivecrona M, Blaschke T. The rise of deep learning in drug discovery. Drug Discov Today. 2018;23(6):1241-1250.
41. Lo YC, Rensi SE, Torng W, Altman RB. Machine learning in chemoinformatics and drug discovery. Drug Discov Today. 2018;23(8):1538-1546.
42. Yang K, Swanson K, Jin W, Coley C, Eiden P, Gao H, et al. Analyzing learned molecular representations for property prediction. J Chem Inf Model. 2019;59(8):3370-3388.

43. Scroggs RS, Fox AP. Calcium current variation between acutely isolated adult rat dorsal root ganglion neurons of different size. J Physiol. 1992;445:639-658.
44. Nowycky MC, Fox AP, Tsien RW. Three types of neuronal calcium channel with different calcium agonist sensitivity. Nature. 1985;316(6027):440-443.
45. Hamill OP, Marty A, Neher E, Sakmann B, Sigworth FJ. Improved patch-clamp techniques for high-resolution current recording from cells and cell-free membrane patches. Pflugers Arch. 1981;391(2):85-100.
46. Grynkiewicz G, Poenie M, Tsien RY. A new generation of Ca2+ indicators with greatly improved fluorescence properties. J Biol Chem. 1985;260(6):3440-3450.
47. Berridge MJ, Bootman MD, Roderick HL. Calcium signalling: dynamics, homeostasis and remodelling. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol. 2003;4(7):517-529.
48. Dunkley PR, Jarvie PE, Robinson PJ. A rapid Percoll gradient procedure for preparation of synaptosomes. Nat Protoc. 2008;3(11):1718-1728.
49. Bennett GJ, Xie YK. A peripheral mononeuropathy in rat that produces disorders of pain sensation like those seen in man. Pain. 1988;33(1):87-107.
50. Chaplan SR, Bach FW, Pogrel JW, Chung JM, Yaksh TL. Quantitative assessment of tactile allodynia in the rat paw. J Neurosci Methods. 1994;53(1):55-63.
51. Kim SH, Chung JM. An experimental model for peripheral neuropathy produced by segmental spinal nerve ligation in the rat. Pain. 1992;50(3):355-363.
52. Decosterd I, Woolf CJ. Spared nerve injury: an animal model of persistent peripheral neuropathic pain. Pain. 2000;87(2):149-158.
53. Courteix C, Eschalier A, Lavarenne J. Streptozocin-induced diabetic rats: behavioural evidence for a model of chronic pain. Physiol Behav. 1993;53(6):1161-1166.
54. Polomano RC, Mannes AJ, Clark US, Bennett GJ. A painful peripheral neuropathy in the rat produced by the chemotherapeutic drug, paclitaxel. Pain. 2001;94(3):293-304.
55. Cavaletti G, Tredici G, Petruccioli MG, Donde E, Tredici P, Marmiroli P, et al. Effects of different schedules of oxaliplatin treatment on the peripheral nervous system of the rat. Eur J Cancer. 2001;37(18):2457-2463.
56. Chaplan SR, Bach FW, Pogrel JW, Chung JM, Yaksh TL. Quantitative assessment of tactile allodynia in the rat paw. J Neurosci Methods. 1994;53(1):55-63.
57. Hargreaves K, Dubner R, Brown F, Flores C, Joris J. A new and sensitive method for measuring thermal nociception in cutaneous hyperalgesia. Pain. 1988;32(1):77-88.
58. King T, Vera-Portocarrero L, Gutierrez T, Vanderah TW, Dussor G, Lai J, et al. Unmasking the tonic-aversive state in neuropathic pain. Nat Neurosci. 2009;12(11):1364-1366.
59. Kandasamy R, Price TJ. The pharmacology of nociceptor priming. Handb Exp Pharmacol. 2015;227:15-37.
60. Hansen KB, Yi F, Perszyk RE, Furukawa H, Wollmuth LP, Gibb AJ, et al. Structure, function, and allosteric modulation of NMDA receptors. J Gen Physiol. 2018;150(8):1081-1105.
61. Traynelis SF, Wollmuth LP, McBain CJ, Menniti FS, Vance KM, Ogden KK, et al. Glutamate receptor ion channels: structure, regulation, and function. Pharmacol Rev. 2010;62(3):405-496.
62. Mosley CA, Acker TM, Hansen KB, Mullasseril P, Andersen KT, Le P, et al. Quinazolin-4-one derivatives: A novel class of noncompetitive NR2C/NR2D-selective N-methyl-D-aspartate receptor antagonists. J Med Chem. 2010;53(15):5476-5490.
63. Wang Y, Chen P, Tang W, Li Y, Zhang H. Antinociceptive and anti-inflammatory activities of extract and two isolated flavonoids of Carthamus tinctorius L. J Ethnopharmacol. 2014;151(2):944-950.
64. Liu J, Wang F, Lu J, Wolff C, Ren X, Liu PK. Nanocarrier-mediated drug delivery systems for anti-inflammatory and antinociceptive activities: nanotechnology, preparation, and characterization. J Nanomater. 2014;2014:470490.

65. Hackos DH, Lupardus PJ, Grand T, Chen Y, Wang TM, Reynen P, et al. Positive allosteric modulators of GluN2A-containing NMDARs with distinct modes of action and impacts on circuit function. Neuron. 2016;89(5):983-999.
66. Strong KL, Jing Y, Prosser AR, Traynelis SF, Liotta DC. NMDA receptor modulators: an updated patent review (2013-2014). Expert Opin Ther Pat. 2014;24(12):1349-1366.
67. Bhargava HN, Kumar S. Sensitization to the analgesic effect of morphine in morphine-experienced rats. Pharmacology. 1999;58(5):223-232.
68. McDonough SI, Boland LM, Mintz IM, Bean BP. Interactions among toxins that inhibit N-type and P-type calcium channels. J Gen Physiol. 2002;119(4):313-328.
69. Patel R, Dickenson AH. Mechanisms of action of gabapentin and pregabalin in the spinal cord: gabapentin and pregabalin inhibit formation of new synapses. Pain. 2016;157(10):2301-2309.
70. Mould J, Yasuda T, Schroeder CI, Beedle AM, Doering CJ, Zamponi GW, et al. The alpha2delta auxiliary subunit reduces affinity of omega-conotoxins for recombinant N-type (Cav2.2) calcium channels. J Biol Chem. 2004;279(33):34705-34714.
71. Field MJ, Cox PJ, Stott E, Melrose H, Offord J, Su TZ, et al. Identification of the alpha2-delta-1 subunit of voltage-dependent calcium channels as a molecular target for pain mediating the analgesic actions of pregabalin. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2006;103(46):17537-17542.
72. Gong HC, Hang J, Kohler W, Li L, Su TZ. Tissue-specific expression and gabapentin-binding properties of calcium channel alpha2delta subunit subtypes. J Membr Biol. 2001;184(1):35-43.
73. Todorovic SM, Jevtovic-Todorovic V. T-type voltage-gated calcium channels as targets for the development of novel pain therapies. Br J Pharmacol. 2011;163(3):484-495.
74. Bourinet E, Altier C, Hildebrand ME, Trang T, Salter MW, Zamponi GW. Calcium-permeable ion channels in pain signaling. Physiol Rev. 2014;94(1):81-140.
75. Jagodic MM, Pathirathna S, Nelson MT, Mancuso S, Joksovic PM, Rosenberg ER, et al. Cell-specific alterations of T-type calcium channel expression in painful diabetic neuropathy enhance excitability of sensory neurons. J Neurosci. 2007;27(12):3305-3316.
76. Shoichet BK. Virtual screening of chemical libraries. Nature. 2004;432(7019):862-865.
77. Kitchen DB, Decornez H, Furr JR, Bajorath J. Docking and scoring in virtual screening for drug discovery: methods and applications. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2004;3(11):935-949.
78. Lipinski CA, Lombardo F, Dominy BW, Feeney PJ. Experimental and computational approaches to estimate solubility and permeability in drug discovery and development settings. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2001;46(1-3):3-26.
79. Kola I, Landis J. Can the pharmaceutical industry reduce attrition rates? Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2004;3(8):711-715.
80. DiMasi JA, Grabowski HG, Hansen RW. Innovation in the pharmaceutical industry: new estimates of R&D costs. J Health Econ. 2016;47:20-33.
81. Jorgensen WL. The many roles of computation in drug discovery. Science. 2004;303(5665):1813-1818.
82. Schneider G. Virtual screening: an endless staircase? Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2010;9(4):273-276.
83. Lavecchia A, Di Giovanni C. Virtual screening strategies in drug discovery: a critical review. Curr Med Chem. 2013;20(23):2839-2860.
84. Bajorath J. Integration of virtual and high-throughput screening. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2002;1(11):882-894.
85. Totrov M, Abagyan R. Flexible ligand docking to multiple receptor conformations: a practical alternative. Curr Opin Struct Biol. 2008;18(2):178-184.
86. Wang R, Lai L, Wang S. Further development and validation of empirical scoring functions for structure-based binding affinity prediction. J Comput Aided Mol Des. 2002;16(1):11-26.
87. Ekins S, Mestres J, Testa B. In silico pharmacology for drug discovery: methods for virtual ligand screening and profiling. Br J Pharmacol. 2007;152(1):9-20.

88. Rice AS, Cimino-Brown D, Eisenach JC, Kontinen VK, Lacroix-Fralish ML, Machin I, et al. Animal models and the prediction of efficacy in clinical trials of analgesic drugs: a critical appraisal and call for uniform reporting standards. Pain. 2008;139(2):243-247.
89. Mogil JS. Animal models of pain: progress and challenges. Nat Rev Neurosci. 2009;10(4):283-294.
90. Percie du Sert N, Rice AS. Improving the translation of analgesic drugs to the clinic: animal models of neuropathic pain, a critical perspective. Pharmacol Ther. 2014;142(1):114-125.
91. Yezierski RP, Hansson P. Inflammatory and neuropathic pain from bench to bedside: what went wrong? J Pain. 2018;19(6):571-588.
92. Cobos EJ, Portillo-Salido E. "Bedside-to-bench" behavioral outcomes in animal models of pain: beyond the evaluation of reflexes. Curr Neuropharmacol. 2013;11(6):560-591.
93. Berge OG. Predictive validity of behavioural animal models for chronic pain. Br J Pharmacol. 2011;164(4):1195-1206.
94. Lu W, Du J, Goehring A, Gouaux E. Cryo-EM structures of the triheteromeric NMDA receptor and its allosteric modulation. Science. 2017;355(6331):eaal3729.
95. Zhao Y, Chen S, Swensen AC, Qiu WJ, Weng CC. Architecture and subunit arrangement of native AMPA receptors elucidated by cryo-EM. Science. 2019;364(6438):355-362.
96. Maia EHB, Assis LC, de Oliveira TA, da Silva AM, Taranto AG. Structure-based virtual screening: from classical to artificial intelligence. Front Chem. 2020;8:343.
97. Chen H, Engkvist O, Wang Y, Olivecrona M, Blaschke T. The rise of deep learning in drug discovery. Drug Discov Today. 2018;23(6):1241-1250.
98. Vamathevan J, Clark D, Czodrowski P, Dunham I, Ferran E, Lee G, et al. Applications of machine learning in drug discovery and development. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2019;18(6):463-477.
99. Hasin Y, Seldin M, Lusis A. Multi-omics approaches to disease. Genome Biol. 2017;18(1):83.
100. Biesecker LG, Green RC. Diagnostic clinical genome and exome sequencing. N Engl J Med. 2014;370(25):2418-2425.
101. Dworkin RH, Turk DC, Peirce-Sandner S, Baron R, Bellamy N, Burke LB, et al. Research design considerations for confirmatory chronic pain clinical trials: IMMPACT recommendations. Pain. 2010;149(2):177-193.
102. Edwards RR, Dworkin RH, Turk DC, Angst MS, Dionne R, Freeman R, et al. Patient phenotyping in clinical trials of chronic pain treatments: IMMPACT recommendations. Pain. 2016;157(9):1851-1871.
103. Somogyi AA, Barratt DT, Coller JK. Pharmacogenetics of opioids. Clin Pharmacol Ther. 2007;81(3):429-444.
104. Dworkin RH, McDermott MP, Peirce-Sandner S, Creanga D, Turk DC, Farrar JT, et al. Interpreting the clinical importance of treatment outcomes in chronic pain clinical trials: IMMPACT recommendations. J Pain. 2008;9(2):105-121.
105. Turk DC, Dworkin RH, McDermott MP, Bellamy N, Burke LB, Chandler JM, et al. Analyzing multiple endpoints in clinical trials of pain treatments: IMMPACT recommendations. Pain. 2008;139(3):485-493.