

| ref. 1, continuation | | drug monitoring data indicated a phenotype of poor CYP1A2 activity. They indicate that this might be due to the slightly elevated levels of C-reactive protein (2.2-2.4 times the upper limit of normal), resulting from a vaginal mycosis. | lizer CYP1A2 phenotype has to be considered as well.' | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|----|--------------|--|--------|------------|------|--------|----|------|---|--------|----|------|--------|------------|-----|--|---|--|--|---|--------|----|-----|--------|------------|-----|--|--|------------|--------------------|--|
| ref. 2 Zastrozhin et al. Impact of polymorphism of CYP2D6 on equilibrium concentration of duloxetine in patients suffering from major depressive disorder. Psychopharmacol Bull 2020;50:47-57. PMID: 32733111. | 3 | <p>118 patients were treated with duloxetine (mean dose 104 mg/day) for a period of 8 weeks.</p> <p>Duloxetine effectiveness was evaluated with the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale and the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale, Adverse events were evaluated with the UKU Side- Effect Rating Scale (UKU).</p> <p>Therapeutic drug monitoring was performed in the 8th week of treatment.</p> <p>Other psychotropic medication is excluded, but it is not mentioned whether non-psychotropic comedication affecting CYP2D6 is excluded. All patients had a history of alcohol abuse, but were currently abstinent.</p> <p>The Benjamin-Hochberg test was used to adjust for multiple comparisons.</p> <p>Genotyping: - 95x NM - 23x IM</p> <p>Results:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Results compared to NM:</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th><th></th><th>IM</th><th>value for NM</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">median Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale score</td><td>week 4</td><td>x 1.14 (S)</td><td>22.0</td></tr> <tr> <td>week 8</td><td>NS</td><td>16.0</td></tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">median Hamilton Depression Rating Scale score</td><td>week 4</td><td>NS</td><td>14.0</td></tr> <tr> <td>week 8</td><td>x 1.22 (S)</td><td>9.0</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td colspan="3">For both IM and NM, the median Hamilton Depression Rating Scale score in week 1 was 22.0, indicating a decrease during treatment with 59% for NM and with 50% for IM. Because response is usually defined as a decrease $\geq 50\%$, the difference between NM and IM is unlikely to be clinically relevant.</td></tr> <tr> <td rowspan="2">median UKU Side-Effect Rating Scale score</td><td>week 4</td><td>NS</td><td>3.0</td></tr> <tr> <td>week 8</td><td>x 1.33 (S)</td><td>3.0</td></tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">median dose-corrected plasma concentration of duloxetine</td><td>x 1.79 (S)</td><td>0.776 ng/ml per mg</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Note: Genotyping was for *4. This is the most important variant allele in this Russian population. Genotype distribution was in Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium.</p> | Results compared to NM: | | | | | | IM | value for NM | median Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale score | week 4 | x 1.14 (S) | 22.0 | week 8 | NS | 16.0 | median Hamilton Depression Rating Scale score | week 4 | NS | 14.0 | week 8 | x 1.22 (S) | 9.0 | | For both IM and NM, the median Hamilton Depression Rating Scale score in week 1 was 22.0, indicating a decrease during treatment with 59% for NM and with 50% for IM. Because response is usually defined as a decrease $\geq 50\%$, the difference between NM and IM is unlikely to be clinically relevant. | | | median UKU Side-Effect Rating Scale score | week 4 | NS | 3.0 | week 8 | x 1.33 (S) | 3.0 | median dose-corrected plasma concentration of duloxetine | | x 1.79 (S) | 0.776 ng/ml per mg | <p>Authors' conclusion: 'The effect of genetic polymorphism of the CYP2D6 gene on the efficacy and safety profiles of duloxetine was demonstrated in a group of 118 patients with recurrent depressive disorder.'</p> <p>Median dose-corrected trough concentration compared to NM: IM: 179%</p> |
| Results compared to NM: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | IM | value for NM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| median Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale score | week 4 | x 1.14 (S) | 22.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | week 8 | NS | 16.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| median Hamilton Depression Rating Scale score | week 4 | NS | 14.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | week 8 | x 1.22 (S) | 9.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | For both IM and NM, the median Hamilton Depression Rating Scale score in week 1 was 22.0, indicating a decrease during treatment with 59% for NM and with 50% for IM. Because response is usually defined as a decrease $\geq 50\%$, the difference between NM and IM is unlikely to be clinically relevant. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| median UKU Side-Effect Rating Scale score | week 4 | NS | 3.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | week 8 | x 1.33 (S) | 3.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| median dose-corrected plasma concentration of duloxetine | | x 1.79 (S) | 0.776 ng/ml per mg | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ref. 3 Ahmed AT et al. Pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic interaction associated with venlafaxine-XR remission in patients with major depressive disorder with history of citalopram / escitalopram | 3 | <p>28 patients, in whom citalopram or escitalopram previously failed, were treated with duloxetine for a period of 8 weeks. Duloxetine dose was titrated and maximum dose was reached at week 4. 29 additional patients also completed 8 weeks of duloxetine treatment, while 21 additional patients discontinued duloxetine prematurely because of ineffectiveness or adverse events. It was not investigated whether the completers and drop-outs differed in CYP2D6 phenotype distribution.</p> <p>Remission was defined as a 16-item Quick Inventory of Depressive Symptomatology Clinician-rated (QIDS-C₁₆)</p> | <p>Authors' conclusion: 'We found no significant difference in duloxetine remission rates by CYP2D6 metabolism phenotype.'</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| <p>treatment failure. J Affect Disord 2019;246:62-8. PMID: 30578947.</p> <p>ref. 3, continuation</p> | <p>PM+IM: AA UM: AA</p> | <p>score ≤ 5. The maximum score on the QIDS-C₁₆ is 27. Significance was determined with a linear regression model and OR was calculated assuming a linear effect for PM versus NM+IM versus UM. It is not mentioned whether relevant comedication is excluded.</p> <p>Genotyping: - 25x NM+gene dose 1 - 1x PM+gene dose 0.25-0.5 - 2x UM</p> <p>Results:</p> <table><tr><th colspan="4">Results compared to NM+gene dose 1:</th></tr><tr><td></td><td>PM+gene dose 0.25-0.5</td><td>UM</td><td>value for NM+gene dose 1</td></tr><tr><td>% of patients with remission</td><td>NS for PM+gene dose 0.25-0.5 versus NM+gene dose 1 versus UM</td><td></td><td>24%</td></tr></table> <p>Note: Genotyping was for *2A, *3 through *6, *9, *10, *17, *41, and gene duplication, These are the most important gene variants in this White population.</p> | Results compared to NM+gene dose 1: | | | | | PM+gene dose 0.25-0.5 | UM | value for NM+gene dose 1 | % of patients with remission | NS for PM+gene dose 0.25-0.5 versus NM+gene dose 1 versus UM | | 24% | |
|--|--|---|--|--|----------------|--------------------|---|-----------------------|----|--------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|-----|--|
| Results compared to NM+gene dose 1: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | PM+gene dose 0.25-0.5 | UM | value for NM+gene dose 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| % of patients with remission | NS for PM+gene dose 0.25-0.5 versus NM+gene dose 1 versus UM | | 24% | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>ref. 4 Kamei S et al. Rapid onset of syndrome of inappropriate antidiuretic hormone secretion induced by duloxetine in an elderly type 2 diabetic patient with painful diabetic neuropathy. J Diabetes Investig 2015;6:343-5. PubMed PMID: 25969720.</p> | <p>1 IM: D</p> | <p>An 80-year-old Japanese woman developed nausea and decreased appetite in the morning after starting duloxetine 20 mg/day for diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain. Following hospitalisation, she was found to be drowsy and her serum sodium concentration and serum chloride concentration were at 87% of the lower limit of the normal values. The serum concentration of anti-diuretic hormone was 3.6 times the upper limit of the normal values. Having ruled out other possible causes of hyponatraemia, the diagnosis of duloxetine-induced syndrome of inadequate secretion of anti-diuretic hormone was made. Gradual recovery occurred after withdrawal of duloxetine and the patient was able to leave the hospital without any symptoms after 13 days. The woman's genotype was found to be CYP2D6 *1/*5 (IM) and CYP1A2 *1/*1C (IM).</p> | <p>Authors' conclusion: 'These phenotypes indicate the intermediate metabolizer of duloxetine. We failed to evaluate the patient's serum concentration of duloxetine, but we assume that this was one of the reasons why duloxetine induced the syndrome of inappropriate antidiuretic hormone secretion, although its precise association remains unknown.'</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>ref. 5 Lobo ED et al. Pharmacokinetics of orally administered duloxetine in children and adolescents with major depressive disorder. Clin Pharmacokinet 2014;53:731-40. PubMed PMID: 24989060.</p> | <p>3 PM: AA IM: AA</p> | <p>428 paediatric patients (7-18 years) were treated with duloxetine 20-120 mg/day. Smoking was not excluded.</p> <p>Genotyping (calculated from the listed percentages for "NM" and "PM"): - 377x "NM" - 30x "IM" - 21x "PM"</p> <p>Results:</p> <table><tr><th colspan="2">"PM" versus "IM" versus "NM":</th></tr><tr><td>oral clearance</td><td>no difference (NS)</td></tr></table> <p>NOTE: The analysed CYP2D6 alleles and the translation of genotype to phenotype were not described. When calculating the number of patients with a genotype other than NM and PM, it was assumed that UM was not determined.</p> | "PM" versus "IM" versus "NM": | | oral clearance | no difference (NS) | <p>Authors' conclusion: 'Patient characteristics such as age, sex, BMI, serum creatinine, CYP2D6 predicted phenotype, and menarche status did not have a statistically significant effect on any of the duloxetine pharmacokinetic parameters.'</p> | | | | | | | | |
| "PM" versus "IM" versus "NM": | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| oral clearance | no difference (NS) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|----|-------------|--|
| ref. 6 Beatty NC et al. Pharmacogenetic workup of perioperative serotonin syndrome. J Clin Anesth 2013;25:662-5. PubMed PMID: 24096103. | 1 IM: B | A 47-year-old man, who was receiving treatment with duloxetine 120 mg/day, trazodone 100 mg/day and gabapentin, underwent general anaesthesia with fentanyl, midazolam, propofol, suxamethonium, desflurane and vecuronium. Towards the end of the procedure he received ketamine, ondansetron 4 mg, glycopyrronium and neostigmine. During waking, the patient had a systolic blood pressure of nearly 200 mmHg and a heart rate > 160 beats per minute. Following extubation, he also developed muscle rigidity over his entire body, locked jaw, tremor, confusion, agitation, ocular clonus and complained of pain. As these problems persisted, midazolam, esmolol and fentanyl 2x 50 µg were administered 20 minutes after extubation. Fentanyl appeared to aggravate the confusion and muscle rigidity. Therefore, lorazepam and hydromorphone were administered. The diagnosis of serotonin syndrome was made and he received an additional dose of hydromorphone. Gradual recovery occurred and the symptoms disappeared in the 24 hours after the surgery. The man's genotype was found to be CYP2D6 *2A/*4. | Authors' conclusion: 'A subsequent cytochrome P4502D6 genetic test result suggested a potential alteration in metabolism. For this patient, who was taking combination antidepressant medications and receiving common perioperative medicines, additive pharmacodynamic effects converged with a pharmacogenetic predisposition, resulting in serotonin syndrome.' | | | | |
| ref. 7 Tianmei S et al. Pharmacokinetics and tolerability of duloxetine following oral administration to healthy Chinese subjects. Clin Pharmacokinet 2007;46:767-75. PubMed PMID: 17713974. | 3 IM: AA | 20 healthy volunteers received duloxetine 60 mg 1x daily for 1 or 6 days. The oral clearance did not differ between administration of a single dose or multiple doses. Smoking was not excluded. Genotyping: - 12 NM - 8 IM <table border="1"><tr><td colspan="2">Oral clearance compared to NM (86.2 L/hour):</td></tr><tr><td>IM</td><td>x 0.87 (NS)</td></tr></table> NOTE 1: Alleles *2-*11, *14A, *14B, *15, *17, *19, *20, *25, *26, *29, *30, *31, *35, *36, *40 and *41 were genotyped. NOTE 2: The translation of genotype to phenotype was not described in detail. The authors did indicate that *10/*10 phenotype includes IM. *10 is the most important variant allele in this Chinese patient group. | Oral clearance compared to NM (86.2 L/hour): | | IM | x 0.87 (NS) | Authors' conclusion: 'Comparison of duloxetine pharmacokinetics between CYP2D6 intermediate metabolizers and CYP2D6 normal metabolisers showed that duloxetine exposure was slightly higher (16%) in CYP2D6 intermediate metabolisers than in CYP2D6 normal metabolisers. However, this magnitude of difference is not clinically meaningful.' Oral clearance compared to NM: IM: 87% |
| Oral clearance compared to NM (86.2 L/hour): | | | | | | | |
| IM | x 0.87 (NS) | | | | | | |
| ref. 8 Chan C et al. Duloxetine pharmacokinetics are similar in Japanese and Caucasian subjects. Br J Clin Pharmacol 2007;63:310-4. PubMed PMID: 17380590. | 3 PM: AA | 80 healthy volunteers received duloxetine 20, 40 or 60 mg single dose (n=48) or 20 or 40 mg 2x daily for 5 days (n = 32). Genotyping: administration of a single dose: - 38x (NM + genotype 1/0) - 6x IM - 4x PM administration of multiple doses: - 25x (NM + genotype 1/0) - 6x IM - 1x UM Results: - Following administration of a single dose, the exposure to duloxetine was 1-3x greater for 2 PMs than the average exposure for the non-PMs. For the other 2 PMs, the pharmacokinetics were comparable to the non-PMs. - For 2 volunteers in the group receiving 40 mg 2x daily, the exposure to duloxetine was 2-5x greater than the average exposure in this group. These two volunteers were found | Authors' conclusion: 'The high duloxetine concentrations observed in normal metabolizers suggests that exposure cannot be predicted by knowledge of CYP2D6 metabolizer status alone, and other factors, such as the degree of expression of CYP1A2 activity, appear to affect duloxetine pharmacokinetics more substantially.' | | | | |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------|---|--|
| ref. 8, continuation | | to be NM or genotype 1/0. NOTE: The specific alleles and the translation of genotype to phenotype was not described in detail. The genotyping assay manufactured by DNA Sciences Laboratories was used. This assay appears to detect at least *3, *4, *10 and gene duplication. These are the most important variant alleles in these groups, which both consisted of 50% Japanese and 50% Caucasian individuals. The authors defined IM as CYP2D6*10 genotype, which together with the reported frequency of 30% in the Japanese volunteers appears to indicate the genotype *10/*10 (*1/*10 is generally the most common genotype in Asian populations). IM was not found in the Caucasian volunteers, which must mean that *1/*3 and *1/*4 were considered as NM. | |
| ref. 9 SmPC Cymbalta (duloxetine) 30-03-16. | 0 PM: AA | The pharmacokinetics of duloxetine in patients who are poor metabolisers with regards to CYP2D6, were not examined specifically. Limited data suggest that the plasma concentrations of duloxetine in these patients are higher. | |

| | |
|------------|----|
| Risk group | -- |
|------------|----|

Comments:

- For the period after 2015, case reports that did not check the duloxetine concentration were not included in the risk analysis, because they provide too little information about a possible causal involvement of the CYP2D6 phenotype.
- Metabolisation of duloxetine by CYP2D6 was demonstrated using CYP2D6 inhibitors (Skinner MH et al. Duloxetine is both an inhibitor and a substrate of cytochrome P4502D6 in healthy volunteers. Clin Pharmacol Ther 2003;73:170-7.) The referenced article demonstrates that the strong CYP2D6 inhibitor paroxetine increases the AUC of duloxetine by 59% in Asian volunteers (S). No increase in side effects was observed following addition of paroxetine. Duloxetine was given at a dose of 40 mg/day (50-67% of the standard maintenance dose).

Date of literature search: 29 August 2022.

| | Phenotype | Code | Gene-drug interaction | Action | Date |
|--|-----------|------|-----------------------|--------|------------------|
| KNMP Pharmacogenetics Working Group decision | PM | 3 AA | no | no | 14 November 2022 |
| | IM | 3 D | no | no | |
| | UM | 3 AA | no | no | |

Mechanism:

Duloxetine is converted to inactive metabolites, primarily by CYP1A2 and to a lesser extent by CYP2D6.

Duloxetine is a moderate inhibitor of CYP2D6.

The NVZA does not indicate a therapeutic range for duloxetine, but in literature a therapeutic range of duloxetine of 30-120 ng/ml is mentioned with plasma concentrations > 240 ng/ml considered to be toxic (Hiemke C et al. Consensus guidelines for therapeutic drug monitoring in neuropsychopharmacology: update 2017. Pharmacopsychiatry 2018; 51:9-62).