



Mycophenolate Mofetil Versus Cyclophosphamide For Therapy of Lupus Nephritis

¹ A.Kandeepan, ¹ A.Kettelhut

^{1,2} Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science

Correspondence : doctorkandeepan524624@gmail.com

Article History :

Received date : 2019/10/26

Revised date : 2019/11/07

Accepted date : 2019/12/18

Published date : 2020/01/05



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (BY NC) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

ABSTRACT

Background: The treatment of lupus nephritis has evolved significantly over the past two decades, with mycophenolate mofetil (MMF) emerging as a key therapeutic agent. The early work by (FK Yong & P D'Cruz, 2008) highlighted the safety profile of MMF compared to cyclophosphamide, noting that while both treatments resulted in similar rates of adverse events, the cyclophosphamide group experienced two deaths, including one from a cerebral hemorrhage and another from sepsis related to active systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE). **Literature Review:** Subsequent cohort studies further reinforced the notion that MMF not only exhibits a lower incidence of infections but also shows comparable efficacy to other agents like azathioprine in maintaining remission. Notably, the versatility of MMF is underscored by case studies demonstrating its effectiveness across various manifestations of systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE), including minimal change disease (Hoon Hong et al., 2011). Moreover, systematic reviews and meta-analyses have confirmed MMF's efficacy in induction therapy, addressing pharmacokinetic considerations that may influence treatment outcomes (Rohit, 2015). Randomized control trials conducted in diverse populations further corroborated MMF's safety and efficacy, suggesting it as a preferable option for induction therapy (Sedhain et al., 2018). The literature also emphasizes MMF's broader therapeutic implications, as it has been shown to positively affect non-renal manifestations of SLE, thereby expanding its clinical utility (Hong Jung et al., 2019). **Conclusion:** In conclusion, the body of literature consistently supports the use of MMF over cyclophosphamide for lupus nephritis therapy, highlighting its superior safety profile and comparable efficacy. The ongoing exploration of MMF's mechanisms and broader applications in SLE management will likely influence future therapeutic strategies and clinical guidelines.

Keyword: Mycophenolate Mofetil, Cyclophosphamide, Therapy of Lupus Nephritis

INTRODUCTION

The treatment of lupus nephritis has evolved significantly over the past two decades, with mycophenolate mofetil (MMF) emerging as a key therapeutic agent. The early work by (FK Yong & P D'Cruz, 2008) highlighted the safety profile of MMF compared to cyclophosphamide, noting that while both treatments resulted in similar rates of adverse events, the cyclophosphamide group experienced two deaths, including one from a cerebral hemorrhage and another from sepsis related to active systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE). This study laid the groundwork for subsequent investigations into the efficacy and safety of MMF, particularly in comparison to cyclophosphamide, which has been associated with higher risks of severe adverse effects.

Building on this foundation, provided further insights into the comparative outcomes of MMF and cyclophosphamide as maintenance therapies in lupus nephritis. This cohort study revealed that MMF not only demonstrated a lower incidence of infections but also showed comparable effectiveness to azathioprine, reinforcing the notion that MMF could serve as a reliable alternative in managing lupus nephritis. The study's findings were pivotal in shaping treatment protocols and highlighted the need for ongoing evaluation of therapeutic strategies in this patient population.

In 2011, (Hoon Hong et al., 2011) reported a successful case of minimal change disease treated with MMF in a patient with SLE, emphasizing the drug's potential effectiveness beyond traditional lupus nephritis presentations. This case further illustrated the versatility of MMF and its role in managing various manifestations of SLE.

The pharmacokinetics of MMF were explored by (Rohit, 2015), who conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis that confirmed MMF's efficacy in induction therapy for lupus nephritis. This comprehensive analysis underscored the importance of understanding drug metabolism and its implications for therapeutic outcomes, particularly in autoimmune diseases.

(Sedhain et al., 2018) contributed to the literature with a randomized control trial comparing low-dose cyclophosphamide with oral MMF in a Nepalese population. This study reinforced earlier findings regarding the safety and efficacy of MMF, suggesting that it could be a preferable option for induction therapy in diverse populations.

Further expanding the understanding of MMF's role, (Hong Jung et al., 2019) examined its effects on non-renal manifestations of SLE. Their research indicated that MMF not only suppressed renal inflammation but also had beneficial effects on hematologic and neuropsychiatric abnormalities, thus broadening the therapeutic scope of MMF in SLE management.

Most recently, (Trevisonno et al., 2011) reflected on a 20-year experience with MMF, affirming its status as the standard of care for lupus nephritis. Their findings highlighted MMF's superior safety profile compared to cyclophosphamide and its effectiveness in inducing remission and preventing disease flares. The authors called for further research into the long-term maintenance therapy of MMF, recognizing the need for ongoing exploration of its therapeutic potential.

Through these studies, the literature reveals a consistent trend favoring MMF as a safer and equally effective alternative to cyclophosphamide in the treatment of lupus nephritis. The evolving understanding of MMF's mechanisms of action and its impact on both renal and extrarenal manifestations of SLE continues to shape clinical practice and guide future research in this area.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The article "Mycophenolate mofetil in the treatment of lupus nephritis" by (FK Yong & P D'Cruz, 2008) provides a comparative analysis of the outcomes associated with mycophenolate mofetil (MMF) and cyclophosphamide in the treatment of lupus nephritis. The authors present critical insights into the safety and efficacy of these two therapeutic agents, particularly focusing on the incidence of adverse events and overall patient outcomes.

One of the most significant findings highlighted in the article is the mortality rate associated with each treatment group. The authors report two deaths in the cyclophosphamide group, one resulting from a cerebral hemorrhage shortly after administration and the other from active systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) complicated by sepsis after two doses of cyclophosphamide. In contrast, no deaths were reported in the MMF group during the study period. This stark difference raises important questions about the safety profile of cyclophosphamide, particularly in the context of its acute toxicities compared to MMF (FK Yong & P D'Cruz, 2008).

Moreover, the article discusses the rates of infections observed in both treatment groups, noting that there was no significant difference in the incidence of infections, with three patients in each group experiencing pneumonia or septicemia and an additional three developing herpes zoster. This suggests that while cyclophosphamide may have a higher associated mortality, MMF does not appear to confer a higher risk of infectious complications, at least within the parameters of this study (FK Yong & P D'Cruz, 2008).

The authors also touch upon the immunosuppressive burden associated with MMF, particularly in the context of transplant settings where increased rates of infections with herpesviruses have been reported. However, they clarify that such increases have not been observed in studies focused on lupus nephritis, indicating that the immunosuppressive effects of MMF may be more manageable in this specific patient population (FK Yong & P D'Cruz, 2008).

Additionally, the article introduces the enteric-coated formulation of mycophenolate sodium, noting a single observational study involving 16 patients. The results indicated that eight patients achieved complete remission and four had partial remission, with low gastrointestinal side effects reported. This suggests that mycophenolate sodium may be a viable alternative, although further studies are warranted to fully establish its efficacy in lupus nephritis (FK Yong & P D'Cruz, 2008).

The article by (Suceena, 2010) presents a comprehensive examination of the use of mycophenolate mofetil (MMF) as a maintenance therapy for patients with lupus nephritis, specifically focusing on classes III and IV. The study highlights the ongoing debate regarding the efficacy and safety of MMF compared to cyclophosphamide, especially in the context of maintaining remission in lupus nephritis.

Suceena references findings from Contreras et al., which provide a comparative analysis of MMF, azathioprine, and pulsed intravenous cyclophosphamide as maintenance therapies following a regimen of monthly pulsed intravenous cyclophosphamide for up to seven months. Notably, the study reports a concerning mortality rate, with four deaths in the cyclophosphamide group compared to one in the MMF group, suggesting a potential safety advantage for MMF in this patient population. Additionally, the incidence of end-stage renal disease (ESRD) was lower in the MMF and azathioprine groups, which further underscores the therapeutic benefits of MMF in maintaining renal function.

The article also discusses the findings from the MAINTAIN trial conducted by the European Working Party on Systemic Lupus Erythematosus, which aimed to compare MMF with azathioprine in the context of maintaining remission for diffuse, proliferative lupus nephritis. The results indicated that MMF and azathioprine demonstrated equivalent efficacy, reinforcing the position of MMF as a viable alternative for maintenance therapy.

Furthermore, Suceena emphasizes the role of cyclophosphamide as a treatment reserved for patients with a significant proliferative component of lupus nephritis who exhibit ongoing clinical activity. This distinction is critical, as it suggests that cyclophosphamide may not be the first-line option for all lupus nephritis patients, particularly those without severe manifestations.

The article titled "A Case of Minimal Change Disease Treated Successfully with Mycophenolate Mofetil in a Patient with Systemic Lupus Erythematosus" by (Hoon Hong et al., 2011) presents a compelling case study that underscores the effectiveness of Mycophenolate Mofetil (MMF) in treating lupus nephritis,

specifically in the context of minimal change disease associated with systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE).

The authors provide a detailed account of the patient's clinical presentation, treatment regimen, and subsequent outcomes, which collectively highlight MMF's therapeutic potential. The case emphasizes that MMF can lead to significant clinical improvements, including the resolution of nephrotic syndrome and stabilization of renal function, which is crucial for patients suffering from lupus nephritis. This aligns with the growing body of literature supporting MMF as a first-line therapy in this patient population.

Critically, the article effectively illustrates the mechanism of action of MMF, which inhibits lymphocyte proliferation and consequently reduces the immune-mediated damage that characterizes lupus nephritis. This pharmacological profile is particularly relevant given the need for therapies that minimize adverse effects while maintaining efficacy. The authors' choice to focus on a case study format allows for an in-depth exploration of the patient's response to treatment, providing valuable insights into the practical application of MMF in clinical settings.

However, while the case study format is informative, it also presents limitations in terms of generalizability. The findings are based on a single patient's experience, which may not fully represent the broader population of individuals with lupus nephritis. Future studies involving larger cohorts and controlled trials are essential to validate these findings and to compare the efficacy of MMF against cyclophosphamide, another established treatment for lupus nephritis.

The article by (Rohit, 2015) provides a comprehensive overview of the pharmacokinetics of mycophenolate mofetil (MMF) in patients with lupus nephritis, with a particular focus on the measurement of free mycophenolic acid (MPA) and its levels in saliva. This exploration is significant given the increasing use of MMF as an alternative to cyclophosphamide for the induction therapy of lupus nephritis.

One of the key insights from the article is the potential to establish a global database on mycophenolic acid. This initiative could significantly enhance the understanding of MMF's pharmacokinetics across various clinical settings and indications. The author argues that by pooling data from diverse populations, researchers could better delineate the therapeutic window of MMF, optimize dosing regimens, and potentially identify predictors of treatment response or adverse effects.

The systematic review and meta-analysis referenced in the article highlights the efficacy and adverse events associated with MMF compared to cyclophosphamide. This comparison is crucial, as cyclophosphamide has long been the standard treatment for lupus nephritis but comes with a range of side effects that can severely impact patient quality of life. The article suggests that MMF may offer a more favorable safety profile, which is an important consideration for clinicians when choosing the most appropriate therapy for their patients.

Rohit's analysis also touches on the pharmacokinetic parameters of MMF, emphasizing the variability in drug absorption and metabolism among patients with lupus nephritis. This variability can affect drug efficacy and safety, underscoring the need for personalized medicine approaches in the treatment of this condition. The measurement of MPA in saliva as a non-invasive method for monitoring drug levels presents an innovative strategy that could facilitate better management of therapy in clinical practice.

The article titled "Low dose mycophenolate mofetil versus cyclophosphamide in the induction therapy of lupus nephritis in Nepalese population: a randomized control trial" by (Sedhain et al., 2018) provides a comprehensive examination of the efficacy and safety of low-dose intravenous cyclophosphamide compared to oral mycophenolate mofetil (MMF) in the treatment of lupus nephritis. This randomized control trial is particularly significant as it addresses a critical gap in the literature regarding treatment options for this condition within the Nepalese population.

The study's methodology is robust, utilizing a randomized control design that enhances the reliability of the findings. The authors detail the inclusion and exclusion criteria for participant selection, ensuring a well-defined study population. This approach allows for a clearer understanding of the comparative effectiveness of MMF and cyclophosphamide, which is crucial given the chronic nature of lupus nephritis and the potential for long-term complications associated with these therapies.

In terms of results, the authors report that both treatments demonstrated comparable efficacy in inducing remission of lupus nephritis. However, the adverse event profiles differed significantly between the two groups. MMF was associated with a lower incidence of severe side effects, which is a critical consideration for clinicians when selecting a treatment regimen. The authors emphasize the importance of balancing efficacy with safety, particularly in a population that may have unique genetic and environmental factors influencing drug metabolism and response.

The systematic review and meta-analysis aspect of the article further strengthens the findings by situating the results within the broader context of existing literature. By synthesizing data from multiple studies, the authors provide a clearer picture of the treatment landscape for lupus nephritis, highlighting the potential advantages of MMF over cyclophosphamide. This is particularly relevant given the increasing focus on personalized medicine and the need for treatment strategies that minimize adverse effects while maximizing therapeutic outcomes.

However, the article does have limitations that should be acknowledged. The sample size, while adequate for preliminary findings, may not be large enough to generalize the results broadly across different populations. Additionally, the follow-up period may not be sufficient to fully assess long-term outcomes and late-onset adverse effects associated with either treatment.

The article titled "The Effect of Mycophenolate Mofetil on Non-Renal Manifestations in Systemic Lupus Erythematosus: Results from Korean Lupus Network Registry" by (Hong Jung et al., 2019) provides a comprehensive

examination of the role of mycophenolate mofetil (MMF) in the treatment of systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE), particularly in relation to its effects on non-renal manifestations. The authors effectively contextualize MMF within the broader framework of lupus nephritis (LN) management, highlighting its pharmacological mechanism as a reversible inhibitor of inosine 5-monophosphate dehydrogenase, which subsequently leads to the suppression of guanosine nucleotides.

The article underscores the established efficacy of both MMF and cyclophosphamide in the induction and maintenance of LN, with a particular emphasis on the comparative effectiveness of MMF. The authors reference several randomized controlled trials that indicate MMF not only achieves comparable, if not superior, outcomes in renal inflammation suppression when juxtaposed with cyclophosphamide, but also extends its therapeutic benefits to non-renal manifestations, such as hematologic and neuropsychiatric abnormalities. This is a significant finding, as it suggests that MMF may provide a more holistic approach to SLE management beyond renal implications.

However, the authors also acknowledge the limitations in the existing literature regarding the therapeutic effects of MMF on non-renal organs or tissues in SLE. This gap highlights a critical area for future research, as the current understanding is primarily focused on renal outcomes. The authors call for more extensive studies to elucidate the full spectrum of MMF's effects, which would enhance clinical decision-making and patient management strategies in SLE.

The article "Mycophenolate Mofetil for Systemic Lupus Erythematosus: Our 20-Year Experience" by (Trevisonno et al., 2011) provides an extensive overview of mycophenolate mofetil (MMF) as a therapeutic agent for systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE), particularly focusing on its application in lupus nephritis. The authors succinctly outline the pharmacological properties of MMF, emphasizing its role as a pro-drug that inhibits inosine monophosphate dehydrogenase (IMPDH), subsequently leading to reduced proliferation of B-cells and T-cells as well as diminished antibody production.

The article critically evaluates the efficacy of MMF in inducing remission in lupus nephritis, citing several randomized controlled trials that underscore its effectiveness and safety profile. Notably, the authors reference Ginzler et al., who demonstrated that MMF not only induces remission but also exhibits a superior safety profile compared to cyclophosphamide, a traditional treatment for lupus nephritis. This comparison is crucial, as cyclophosphamide, while effective, is associated with a range of adverse effects that can significantly impact patient quality of life.

Furthermore, the article discusses landmark studies such as the ALMS and MAINTAIN trials, which have solidified MMF's position as the standard of care for lupus nephritis over the past two decades. The authors highlight that these trials not only confirm MMF's efficacy in treatment induction but also its role in preventing disease flares, which is vital for long-term disease management.

CONCLUSION

The literature on the comparison between mycophenolate mofetil (MMF) and cyclophosphamide for the treatment of lupus nephritis presents a compelling case for the former as a safer and equally effective alternative. The foundational studies highlight significant differences in safety profiles, particularly concerning mortality rates and the incidence of severe adverse events. For instance, early work revealed two deaths in the cyclophosphamide group, raising concerns about its safety compared to MMF, which reported no deaths during the same period (FK Yong & P D'Cruz, 2008).

Subsequent cohort studies further reinforced the notion that MMF not only exhibits a lower incidence of infections but also shows comparable efficacy to other agents like azathioprine in maintaining remission. Notably, the versatility of MMF is underscored by case studies demonstrating its effectiveness across various manifestations of systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE), including minimal change disease (Hoon Hong et al., 2011).

Moreover, systematic reviews and meta-analyses have confirmed MMF's efficacy in induction therapy, addressing pharmacokinetic considerations that may influence treatment outcomes (Rohit, 2015). Randomized control trials conducted in diverse populations further corroborated MMF's safety and efficacy, suggesting it as a preferable option for induction therapy (Sedhain et al., 2018).

The literature also emphasizes MMF's broader therapeutic implications, as it has been shown to positively affect non-renal manifestations of SLE, thereby expanding its clinical utility (Hong Jung et al., 2019). The culmination of these findings positions MMF as the standard of care for lupus nephritis, with a strong call for continued research to explore its long-term maintenance therapy potential (Trevisonno et al., 2011).

In conclusion, the body of literature consistently supports the use of MMF over cyclophosphamide for lupus nephritis therapy, highlighting its superior safety profile and comparable efficacy. The ongoing exploration of MMF's mechanisms and broader applications in SLE management will likely influence future therapeutic strategies and clinical guidelines.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

- Disclosure Statement : The authors have no conflicts of Interest to declare
- Funding Sources : None
- Acknowledgements : -
- Author Contribution : All authors discussed and contributed the final content for journal submission and publication

REFERENCES

1. FK Yong, P. & P D'Cruz, D., 2008. Mycophenolate mofetil in the treatment of lupus nephritis. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
2. Hoon Hong, Y., Young Yun, D., Wook Jung, Y., Jin Oh, M., Je Kim, H., & Ki Lee, C., 2011. A Case of Minimal Change Disease Treated Successfully with Mycophenolate Mofetil in a Patient with Systemic Lupus Erythematosus. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

3. Rohit, K., 2015. Pharmacokinetics of oral mycophenolate mofetil (MMF) in patients with lupus nephritis with a special reference to the measurement of free MPA and saliva MPA.. [PDF]
4. Sedhain, A., Hada, R., K. Agrawal, R., R. Bhattarai, G., & Baral, A., 2018. Low dose mycophenolate mofetil versus cyclophosphamide in the induction therapy of lupus nephritis in Nepalese population: a randomized control trial. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
5. Hong Jung, U., Gyu Kwak, S., Choe, J. Y., Lee, S. S., & Kim, S. K., 2019. The Effect of Mycophenolate Mofetil on Non-Renal Manifestations in Systemic Lupus Erythematosus: Results from Korean Lupus Network Registry. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
6. Trevisonno, M., Hall, A., Rosengarten, S., & M Ginzler, E., 2011. Mycophenolate Mofetil for Systemic Lupus Erythematosus: Our 20-Year Experience. ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
7. Suceena, A., 2010. A Cohort study of exposure controlled mycopenolic acid in class iii and class IV lupus nephritis in a tertiary care centre in South India.. [PDF]