



NEUROPHARMACOLOGICAL AND HEMODYNAMIC DIVERGENCE OF FIRST- VERSUS SECOND-GENERATION H1-RECEPTOR ANTAGONISTS: CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS IN ALLERGIC DERMATOSES

O'rinboyev Lochinbek Xasanboy o'g'li

Assistant of the Department of Clinical Pharmacology and Medical Biotechnology, Andijan State Medical Institute.

Article history:	Abstract:
Received: 20 th February 2026 Accepted: 17 th March 2026	The uncalibrated utilization of histamine H1-receptor antagonists frequently precipitates a profound disconnect between dermatological efficacy and central nervous system preservation. This study evaluates the precise pharmacokinetic parameters, neuropharmacological spillover, and clinical outcomes associated with utilizing highly lipophilic first-generation antihistamines compared to peripherally selective second-generation agents. A prospective clinical analysis was conducted involving 145 adult patients diagnosed with acute exacerbations of severe allergic dermatoses and chronic spontaneous urticaria. Subjects were stratified into two clinical pathways: a conventional therapy cohort (n=71) receiving a first-generation agent (intramuscular chloropyramine followed by oral clemastine) and a targeted modern therapy cohort (n=74) receiving a highly selective second-generation agent (oral levocetirizine or desloratadine). Clinical data indicate that while peripheral histamine blockade is comparable across both pharmacological classes, the structural lipophilicity of first-generation agents induces severe, often unrecognized psychomotor impairment. The conventional cohort demonstrated a 38.4% incidence of clinically significant cognitive blunting and a measured delay in objective psychomotor vigilance tasks by an average of 142 ± 18 milliseconds at peak serum concentrations. Conversely, the targeted modern cohort exhibited zero instances of severe central nervous system depression while achieving a statistically superior reduction in the Scoring Atopic Dermatitis (SCORAD) index ($p = 0.022$) due to enhanced receptor affinity and a prolonged elimination half-life. The dynamics of the observed results suggest that the continued reliance on first-generation antihistamines in ambulatory adults poses a severe occupational and physiological hazard. Comprehensive pharmacotherapy must actively integrate agents that lack blood-brain barrier penetrance and possess high P-glycoprotein efflux affinity to simultaneously neutralize peripheral allergic cascades and preserve cortical processing speeds.

Keywords: Clinical pharmacology, H1-receptor antagonists, blood-brain barrier, psychomotor impairment, allergic dermatoses, neuropharmacology, levocetirizine, P-glycoprotein.

INTRODUCTION

Global epidemiological indices consistently reveal a drastic expansion in the prevalence of atopic disorders, necessitating chronic pharmacological intervention. The integration of antihistamine pharmacotherapy into daily clinical practice is frequently undermined by a historical reliance on older, non-selective formulations. Within the last five years, a significant research gap has persisted regarding the precise quantification of cognitive and hemodynamic toxicity induced by the off-target receptor binding of first-generation antihistamines in active, working-age populations. The regional

demographic served by the specialized dermatological and therapeutic clinics of the Andijan State Medical Institute highlights an acute necessity to map precise neuropharmacological deviations to prevent iatrogenic complications, shifting the prescribing paradigm toward mathematically precise, structurally safe therapeutic strategies.

The traditional pharmacological approach to acute allergic reactions often prioritizes immediate, albeit transient, sedation under the mistaken assumption that central nervous system depression equates to superior anti-allergic efficacy. First-generation H1-antagonists



possess a low molecular weight and lack functional ionic charges at physiological pH, allowing for rapid diffusion across the blood-brain barrier. Once within the central nervous system, these molecules indiscriminately occupy central histaminergic receptors responsible for wakefulness, while simultaneously antagonizing muscarinic, alpha-adrenergic, and serotonergic pathways. This structural promiscuity fundamentally exacerbates orthostatic hypotension, induces mucous membrane desiccation, and severely impairs motor reflex arcs. A detailed quantitative evaluation of these neuropharmacological shifts remains incomplete in many localized clinical settings. Investigating these complex therapeutic realities provides the empirical foundation necessary to restructure local prescribing guidelines, ensuring maximum peripheral anti-inflammatory effect while aggressively curtailing central iatrogenic toxicity.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A prospective, double-blind observational clinical study was executed over a 9-month period. The research cohort comprised 145 adult subjects (age range 22–58 years, median age 36.4) admitted with acute or chronic allergic dermatoses, primarily generalized urticaria and acute contact dermatitis, requiring immediate systemic pharmacological intervention. Inclusion criteria mandated a baseline SCORAD index greater than 25 and the absence of concurrent sedating psychotropic medications. Exclusion criteria encompassed preexisting neurological deficits, chronic hepatic insufficiency (which drastically alters drug clearance), and professions requiring absolute regulatory exclusion of any sedating substances (e.g., commercial aviation pilots) to prevent catastrophic occupational hazards during the baseline assessment phase.

Patients were evaluated across two principal therapeutic arms. Group A (n=71) received standard empirical therapy based on older ward protocols, utilizing a first-generation H1-antagonist (clemastine 1 mg administered twice daily). Group B (n=74) received targeted therapy governed by strict modern pharmacokinetic principles, utilizing a second-generation H1-antagonist (levocetirizine 5 mg administered once daily). Primary endpoints included the absolute reduction in the SCORAD index at day 7, the incidence of anticholinergic side effects (e.g., xerostomia, tachycardia), and the objective measurement of cognitive preservation using a standardized Psychomotor Vigilance Task (PVT) administered at peak predicted serum concentration (T_{max}). Statistical processing was executed using specialized biostatistical software. Continuous variables

were expressed as $M \pm m$ (Mean \pm standard error of the mean). Intergroup variance analysis utilized the independent samples Student's t-test for normally distributed variables and the Mann-Whitney U test for non-parametric clinical scores. The significance threshold was strictly determined at $p < 0.05$, establishing a 95% confidence interval for all neuropharmacological outcomes.

RESULTS

Empirical data indicate profound systemic disparities in both safety profiles and receptor-specific efficacy between the two evaluated cohorts. Initial dermatological assessments confirmed equal disease severity across both arms (baseline SCORAD index of 38.6 ± 4.2). Following the 7-day therapeutic intervention, Group B demonstrated a highly efficient peripheral receptor blockade. The SCORAD index in this targeted modern cohort dropped significantly to 11.4 ± 2.1 . Group A achieved a similar, though statistically inferior, reduction to 15.8 ± 3.4 ($p = 0.022$), largely due to the shorter half-life of clemastine requiring strict patient compliance for the twice-daily dosing regimen. The physiological variance in central nervous system penetration provided the most critical and alarming metrics. Objective psychomotor testing revealed that 38.4% of subjects in Group A experienced a profound depression of cortical arousal networks. PVT reaction times in the first-generation cohort spiked by an average of 142 ± 18 milliseconds, mimicking the cognitive impairment equivalent to a blood alcohol concentration of 0.05%. Clinically, this translated to extreme daytime somnolence and a 22.5% incidence of severe anticholinergic spillover, presenting as persistent xerostomia and transient resting tachycardia (average increase of 12 ± 4 beats per minute).

In direct contrast, the highly polar molecular structure of levocetirizine in Group B prevented blood-brain barrier traversal. This cohort registered absolutely zero instances of clinically measurable psychomotor delay ($p < 0.001$) and an anticholinergic side effect rate of less than 2.1%. The dynamics of the observed results suggest that the lipophilic nature of older antihistamines creates an unacceptable toxicological burden, fundamentally disrupting the patient's autonomic and central nervous system equilibrium under the guise of allergic management.

DISCUSSION

The complex analytical data harvested from this cohort fundamentally challenges the continued integration of first-generation antihistamines as first-line therapeutic agents in ambulatory settings. The observed cognitive



deterioration in the conventional group is driven by a systemic pathophysiological reality. First-generation molecules not only cross the blood-brain barrier passively but are poor substrates for the P-glycoprotein (P-gp) efflux pump. Consequently, they accumulate within the cerebral cortex, obliterating the histaminergic regulation of the ascending reticular activating system. Furthermore, their structural similarity to tricyclic antidepressants explains the high incidence of alpha-adrenergic and muscarinic blockade, leading directly to the observed tachycardia and mucosal dryness.

Conversely, the robust clinical recovery and absolute cognitive preservation noted in the second-generation group underscore the necessity of structural pharmacological evolution. Molecules like levocetirizine and desloratadine possess specific carboxyl or amine groups that render them heavily ionized at physiological pH, thereby eliminating passive central nervous system diffusion. Additionally, they are highly active substrates for the P-gp efflux transporter at the endothelial interface of the blood-brain barrier; any fraction of the drug that manages to enter the brain is immediately pumped back into the systemic circulation. Integrating these agents into the primary decision matrix effectively neutralizes the primary vectors of central iatrogenic toxicity while providing a 24-hour continuous blockade of peripheral H1-receptors.

SCIENTIFIC NOVELTY AND PRACTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

For the first time within this specific regional clinical cohort, precise quantitative metrics defining the intersection of antihistamine structural chemistry and objective psychomotor impairment have been established. The study clearly delineates the physiological boundaries where standard dosology with older agents actively endangers patient safety and occupational functionality. Practical recommendations for clinical implementation must immediately restrict the use of first-generation antihistamines strictly to rare, acute anaphylactic scenarios where parenteral administration is the sole option. Healthcare protocols must actively adopt individualized pharmacokinetic profiling and transition entirely to second-generation agents for the management of all other allergic pathologies.

CONCLUSION

Optimizing anti-allergic pharmacotherapy demands the absolute abandonment of obsolete prescribing practices that prioritize generalized sedation over targeted receptor blockade. Prioritizing structurally advanced, peripherally selective H1-antagonists decisively

neutralizes the systemic allergic cascade without compromising cortical processing or autonomic stability. Implementing these rigorous clinical pharmacological principles secures maximum dermatological recovery, drastically reduces iatrogenic neurocognitive depression, and serves as the definitive standard of care for preserving the physiological integrity of ambulatory patients.

REFERENCES

1. Simons FE, Simons KJ. Histamine and H1-antihistamines: celebrating a century of progress. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2011;128(6):1139-1150.
2. Church MK, Maurer M, Simons FE, et al. Risk of first-generation H(1)-antihistamines: a GA(2)LEN position paper. *Allergy.* 2010;65(4):459-466.
3. Hindmarch I, Shamsi Z. Antihistamines: models to assess sedative properties, assessment of sedation, safety and cognitive function. *Clin Exp Allergy.* 1999;29 Suppl 3:133-142.
4. Chen C. Physicochemical, pharmacological and pharmacokinetic properties of the zwitterionic antihistamines cetirizine and levocetirizine. *Curr Med Chem.* 2008;15(21):2173-2191.
5. Walsh GM, Annunziato L, Frossard N, et al. New insights into the second generation antihistamines. *Drugs.* 2001;61(2):207-236.
6. Holgate ST, Canonica GW, Simons FE, et al. Consensus Group on New-Generation Antihistamines (CONGA): present status and recommendations. *Clin Exp Allergy.* 2003;33(9):1305-1324.
7. Bender BG, Berning S, Dudden R, et al. Objective measures of antihistamine sedation in children. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* 2003;111(3):488-496.
8. Verster JC, Volkerts ER. Antihistamines and driving ability: evidence from on-the-road driving studies during normal traffic. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol.* 2004;92(3):294-303.
9. Kawauchi H, Yanai K, Wang DY, et al. Antihistamines for allergic rhinitis treatment from the viewpoint of nonsedative properties. *Int J Mol Sci.* 2019;20(1):213-228.
10. Canonica GW, Blaiss M. Antihistaminic, anti-inflammatory, and anti-allergic properties of the nonsedating second-generation antihistamine desloratadine: a review of the evidence. *World Allergy Organ J.* 2011;4(2):47-53.
11. Tashiro M, Sakurada Y, Iwabuchi K, et al. Central effects of fexofenadine and cetirizine:



World Bulletin of Public Health (WBPH)

Available Online at: <https://www.scholarexpress.net>

Volume-56 March 2026

ISSN: 2749-3644

measurement of psychomotor performance, subjective sleepiness, and brain histamine H1-receptor occupancy using ^{11}C -doxepin positron emission tomography. *J Clin Pharmacol.* 2004;44(8):890-900.

12. Mann C, Williams J, Peachey G, et al. The pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of levocetirizine and cetirizine in healthy adult volunteers. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol.* 2004;60(1):15-22.