International Journal of Research in Hospital and Clinical Pharmacy

# Drug-induced lupus erythematosus (DILE): a comprehensive analysis of pathogenesis, clinical profiles, diagnosis, and management strategies

**Robin George*[1], Abhishek Thiruganahalli Suresh[2], Harshitha Mavinahalli Ramnath[2], Ellampati Sunil Kumar[3]**

*[1]Department of Pharmacy Practice, Sri Adichunchanagiri College of Pharmacy, Adichunchanagiri University, Mandya, Karnataka, India.*
*[2]Pharm D, Sri Adichunchanagiri College of Pharmacy, Adichunchanagiri University, Mandya, Karnataka, India.*
*[3]Department of Pharmacy Practice, Krishna Teja Pharmacy College, Tirupati, Andhra Pradesh, India.*

## ABSTRACT

Drug-induced lupus erythematosus (DILE) represents a distinctive autoimmune phenomenon characterized by its association with prolonged exposure to certain medications, as opposed to the idiopathic nature of systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE). Unlike SLE, the hallmark feature of DILE is its tendency to remit upon cessation of the offending drug. This article embarks on a comprehensive exploration of DILE, elucidating its pathogenesis, clinical presentations, diagnostic criteria, and therapeutic interventions through a meticulous analysis of contemporary scholarly works. The pathogenesis of DILE is multifaceted, involving complex interactions between genetic predisposition, immune dysregulation, and the pharmacological properties of implicated medications. Understanding these intricate mechanisms is pivotal in both diagnosis and management. Clinical manifestations of DILE often mirror those of SLE, encompassing a spectrum of symptoms ranging from constitutional complaints to organ-specific involvement. Navigating the diagnostic landscape of DILE necessitates a discerning approach, leveraging a combination of clinical assessment, laboratory investigations, and exclusionary criteria to differentiate it from other autoimmune entities, particularly SLE. Management of DILE hinges upon prompt recognition and withdrawal of the offending agent, which typically precipitates clinical improvement and eventual resolution of symptoms. Pharmacological interventions may be warranted to alleviate acute manifestations or mitigate disease progression in refractory cases. However, the efficacy and safety profile of such treatments warrant careful consideration in light of potential adverse effects and drug interactions.

**Keywords:** Autoimmune Disorders; ADR; Anti-histone Antibodies; Drug Withdrawal Drug-Induced Lupus Erythematosus (DILE); Systemic Lupus Erythematosus (SLE).

**ISSN:** 2582-0672
Review Article

**Corresponding Author**
Name: Dr. Robin George
Email: robin.george793@gmail.com

**Article Info**
Received on: 14-11-2025
Revised on: 20-11-2025
Accepted on: 05-12-2025
**DOI:** https://doi.org/10.33974/ijrhcp.v8i1.256



## INTRODUCTION

Drug-induced lupus erythematosus (DILE) stands as a unique subset within the lupus erythematosus spectrum, wherein symptoms resembling those of lupus arise following the administration of certain medications [1-4]. In contrast to systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE), which manifests without a discernible cause and tends to persist over time, DILE emerges as a reaction to specific drugs and typically resolves upon discontinuation of the causative medication [5]. Despite being less common than SLE, the importance of DILE lies in its medication-induced origin, highlighting the critical role of healthcare providers in promptly identifying and managing its clinical presentation to ensure optimal patient outcomes and overall well-being [6-9].

### Epidemiology

Drug-induced lupus erythematosus (DILE) constitutes a distinctive subset within the broader

lupus erythematosus spectrum, characterized by the emergence of symptoms reminiscent of lupus subsequent to the administration of select medications. Unlike systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE), which lacks a discernible cause and tends to persist chronically, DILE arises as a direct response to specific drugs and typically ameliorates upon cessation of the inciting medication. Despite its relatively lower prevalence compared to SLE, the significance of DILE lies in its medication-triggered etiology, underscoring the pivotal role of healthcare practitioners in promptly recognizing and managing its clinical manifestations to optimize patient outcomes and overall well-being [1,8]. This necessitates thorough vigilance and adept clinical judgment to mitigate potential complications associated with DILE and ensure the effective delivery of patient care [4-7].

DILE constitutes about 10% of all lupus erythematosus cases. It predominantly affects older adults, with a minor female predominance, though the gender difference is less marked compared to SLE. Over 80 drugs have been linked to DILE, with procainamide, hydralazine, and quinidine being the most commonly associated [9,10].

## Pathogenesis

The pathogenesis of drug-induced lupus erythematosus (DILE) encompasses a multifaceted interplay involving genetic predisposition, environmental stimuli, and immunological responses. At its core, the process is thought to hinge upon the drug's ability to modulate immune regulation, thereby instigating the production of autoantibodies [11-14]. This intricate cascade of events involves a complex network of molecular pathways and cellular interactions, wherein genetic susceptibilities interact with external factors to trigger aberrant immune responses. The precise mechanisms through which drugs induce these immunological alterations are varied and can encompass diverse molecular targets and signaling pathways. Furthermore, environmental influences, such as concomitant infections or exposure to certain toxins, may exacerbate or precipitate the onset of DILE in genetically susceptible individuals. Elucidating the intricacies of these interactions is paramount for understanding the etiology of DILE and devising targeted therapeutic strategies aimed at mitigating its clinical manifestations [5,9].

**Genetic Factors:** Genetic susceptibility is a pivotal factor in Drug-Induced Lupus Erythematosus (DILE), with intricate molecular mechanisms underpinning its manifestation. Notably, certain Human Leukocyte Antigen [HLA] types, prominently exemplified by HLA-DR4, exhibit a pronounced prevalence among afflicted individuals, highlighting the significance of immunogenetic predisposition in this condition [15]. Moreover, the metabolic phenotype of slow acetylator status amplifies the susceptibility to DILE precipitated by pharmacological agents like hydralazine and procainamide. This intricate interplay of genetic predisposition and pharmacogenomic variability underscores the multifaceted nature of DILE etiology, thereby emphasizing the imperative for personalized therapeutic approaches in its management [16-23].

## Immunological Mechanisms

Genetic susceptibility plays a role in DILE, with specific HLA types (e.g., HLA-DR4) more prevalent in affected individuals. Additionally, individuals with slow acetylator status have a heightened risk of developing DILE from drugs such as hydralazine and procainamide [9,14,18].

Pharmaceutical agents implicated in Drug-Induced Lupus Erythematosus (DILE) exert their deleterious effects through a myriad of intricate immunological pathways, elucidating the multifaceted nature of this condition's pathogenesis. These drugs, through various mechanisms, instigate immune responses that culminate in the aberrant production of autoantibodies, heralding the hallmark immunological dysregulation characteristic of DILE [24,25]. Among the foremost mechanisms implicated, the generation of neoantigens stands prominently, wherein the drugs undergo metabolic transformations, yielding antigenic moieties capable of eliciting robust immune reactions. Additionally, direct cytotoxic effects inflicted by these agents on immune cells further exacerbate the immunopathological cascade. Furthermore, the interference with normal apoptotic processes, perturbing the delicate balance between cellular survival and death, serves as another pivotal mechanism in DILE induction. These intricate immunomodulatory mechanisms collectively orchestrate the generation of autoantibodies, prominently including antinuclear antibodies [ANAs] and anti-histone antibodies, which are discernible in over 95% of DILE cases. Such comprehensive delineation of the immunological intricacies underlying DILE underscores the necessity for heightened vigilance in pharmacovigilance endeavors and the imperative for tailored therapeutic interventions to mitigate its clinical repercussions [26-28].

## Clinical Features

The clinical presentation of DILE can vary, often resembling SLE but with distinct differences.

**Constitutional Symptoms:** Patients with DILE frequently exhibit nonspecific symptoms like fever, malaise, and arthralgia. These symptoms are generally milder than those seen in SLE [29,30].

**Musculoskeletal Manifestations:** Arthritis and arthralgia are prevalent in DILE, with polyarthritis occurring in approximately 50% of cases. Unlike SLE, joint deformities are rare.

**Cutaneous Manifestations:** Skin involvement in DILE includes photosensitivity, rash, and less commonly, discoid lupus lesions. These symptoms typically resolve after discontinuing the causative drug [29].

**Serological Findings:** A defining feature of DILE is the presence of antihistone antibodies, detected in over 90% of cases. Other autoantibodies, such as ANAs, are also common but less specific [31-33].

**Diagnostic Criteria**

Ascertaining the diagnosis of Drug-Induced Lupus Erythematosus (DILE) necessitates adherence to a structured diagnostic framework, wherein clinical assessment, reinforced by discerning laboratory findings and a meticulous process of exclusion, plays a pivotal role. This diagnostic endeavor is underpinned by a constellation of criteria that collectively guide the diagnostic trajectory, facilitating the accurate delineation of DILE from its differential diagnoses [31-35].

**Criteria for Diagnosis:** Central to the diagnostic algorithm are several hallmark criteria indicative of DILE, which collectively serve as the cornerstone for diagnostic confirmation:

**Chronic Exposure to a Suspected Drug:** A critical prerequisite for DILE diagnosis is a history of chronic exposure to a pharmacological agent implicated in the pathogenesis of drug-induced autoimmunity. This temporal relationship underscores the causative role of the implicated drug in precipitating the immunological dysregulation characteristic of DILE [31,32].

**Presence of Lupus-Like Symptoms:** DILE typically manifests with a spectrum of clinical manifestations reminiscent of systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE), encompassing constitutional symptoms, musculoskeletal complaints, cutaneous manifestations, and systemic involvement. The presence of these lupus-like symptoms serves as a cardinal feature guiding diagnostic suspicion towards DILE [33].

**Positive Serological Markers:** Immunological profiling constitutes an indispensable facet of the diagnostic evaluation, with serological markers assuming paramount significance. Notably, the presence of autoantibodies such as antinuclear antibodies (ANAs) and anti-histone antibodies serves as hallmark serological signatures of DILE, further bolstering diagnostic certainty [34-36].

**Symptom Resolution upon Discontinuation of the Drug:** A pivotal diagnostic criterion reflective of the reversible nature of DILE pathology is the observation of symptom resolution following the cessation of the offending drug. This temporal association underscores the causal link between drug exposure and the subsequent onset and progression of DILE, thereby affirming the diagnosis [33].

**Differential Diagnosis:** Critical to the diagnostic deliberation is the imperative to differentiate DILE from systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) and other autoimmune conditions sharing overlapping clinical features. Key distinguishing features aiding in the differential diagnosis include:

**Temporal Relationship with Drug Exposure:** Unlike idiopathic SLE, which lacks a discernible temporal association with drug exposure, DILE manifests following chronic exposure to specific pharmacological agents, thereby facilitating diagnostic differentiation based on the temporal profile of symptom onset [30,35].

**Distinctive Serological Profiles:** While both DILE and SLE may exhibit serological markers such as ANAs, the presence of anti-histone antibodies is particularly indicative of DILE, serving as a discriminative serological hallmark that distinguishes it from idiopathic SLE [30,34].

**Reversibility of Symptoms:** Unlike the chronic and relapsing course characteristic of SLE, DILE typically demonstrates a reversible trajectory, with symptom resolution observed upon discontinuation of the offending drug. This temporal relationship underscores the reversible nature of DILE pathology, aiding in its differentiation from SLE [32-34].

**Management**

The primary approach to managing DILE is stopping the offending drug, usually leading to symptom resolution within weeks to months.

**Drug Withdrawal:** Prompt discontinuation of the implicated drug is crucial. Most patients show significant improvement within days to weeks, with complete resolution occurring within several months.

**Pharmacological Treatment:** For persistent or severe symptoms, additional treatments like nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs [NSAIDs] and corticosteroids may be used. Hydroxychloroquine, commonly used in SLE, has limited evidence for efficacy in DILE but may be considered in refractory cases [34-36].

**Monitoring and Follow-Up:** Regular follow-up is essential to monitor symptom resolution and potential recurrence if another offending drug is introduced. The long-term prognosis is generally favorable, with most patients achieving complete recovery.

**Specific Drugs Associated with DILE [32-41]**

**Procainamide:** Procainamide, an antiarrhythmic agent, is one of the most well-documented causes of DILE. About 20-30% of patients on long-term procainamide therapy develop DILE.

**Hydralazine:** Hydralazine, used to treat hypertension, is another common agent associated

with DILE. The risk increases with higher doses and prolonged therapy.

**Quinidine:** Quinidine, another antiarrhythmic drug, has a lower incidence of DILE compared to procainamide but remains a notable contributor.

**Minocycline:** Minocycline, used for acne and rheumatoid arthritis, has been linked to DILE, particularly in younger populations.

**TNF-α Inhibitors:** Tumor necrosis factor-alpha (TNF-α) inhibitors, used for autoimmune conditions like rheumatoid arthritis and Crohn's disease, have also been associated with DILE.

## CONCLUSION

Drug-induced lupus erythematosus is a rare but important iatrogenic condition. Understanding its pathogenesis, clinical features, and management is essential for healthcare providers to promptly recognize and treat this condition. With appropriate interventions, the prognosis for DILE is generally favorable, underscoring the importance of ongoing research and awareness in this area.

## REFERENCES


1. Engavale MB. Determining the impact of macrophage-derived Dnase1L3 in lupus-like phenotypes in mice and its implications for treatment [thesis]. 2023.
2. Batu ED, Ozen S. Classification of pediatric vasculitides. In: The vasculitides. Vol. 145.
3. Chan JC. Clinical disorders of the kidney. Pediatr Clin North Am. 2018;66(1). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcl.2018.08.002
4. Vedove CD, Del Giglio M, Schena D, Girolomoni G. Drug-induced lupus erythematosus. Arch Dermatol Res. 2009;301:99–105. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00403-008-0895-5
5. Sarzi-Puttini P, Atzeni F, Capsoni F, et al. Drug-induced lupus erythematosus. Autoimmunity. 2005;38(7). https://doi.org/10.1080/08916930500285754
6. Antonov D, Kazandjieva J, Etugov D, et al. Drug-induced lupus erythematosus. Clin Dermatol. 2004;22(2):157–166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clindermatol.2003.12.009
7. Kaya Akca U, et al. Drug-induced lupus erythematosus in childhood: case-based review. Lupus. 2024. https://doi.org/10.1177/09612033241245078
8. Murphy G. Drug-induced lupus. In: Dubois' lupus erythematosus and related syndromes. 2025. p. 402–412.
9. Nguyen T, et al. Drug-induced lupus following mRNA COVID-19 vaccination and monoclonal antibody infusion. Kans J Med. 2024;17:36. https://doi.org/10.17161/kjm.vol17.18960
10. Amrhein JA, Kenny FM, Ross D. Granulocytopenia, lupus-like syndrome, and other complications of propylthiouracil therapy. J Pediatr. 1970;76(1):54–63.
11. Beernink DH, Miller JJ. Anticonvulsant-induced antinuclear antibodies and lupus-like disease in children. J Pediatr. 1973;82(1):113–117.
12. Irias JJ. Hydralazine-induced lupus erythematosus-like syndrome. Am J Dis Child. 1975;129(7):862–864.
13. Singsen BH, Fishman L, Hanson V. Antinuclear antibodies and lupus-like syndromes in children receiving anticonvulsants. Pediatrics. 1976;57(4):529–534.
14. Vanheule B, Carswell F. Sulphasalazine-induced systemic lupus erythematosus in a child. Eur J Pediatr. 1983;140(1):66–68.
15. Oner A, Topaloglu R, Besbas N, et al. Carbamazepine induced systemic lupus erythematosus. Clin Neurol Neurosurg. 1990;92(3):261–262. https://doi.org/10.1016/0303-8467(90)90090-7
16. Tolaymat A, Leventhal B, Sakarcan A, et al. Systemic lupus erythematosus in a child receiving long-term interferon therapy. J Pediatr. 1992;120(3):429–432. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-3476(05)80998-4
17. Kanno T, Miyata M, Kazuta Y, et al. Carbamazepine-induced systemic lupus erythematosus-like disease. Intern Med. 1992;31(11):1303–1305. https://doi.org/10.2169/internalmedicine.31.1303
18. Ansell BM. Drug-induced systemic lupus erythematosus in a nine-year-old boy. Lupus. 1993;2(3):193–194. https://doi.org/10.1177/096120339300200311
19. Sato-Matsumura KC, Koizumi H, Matsumura T, et al. Lupus erythematosus-like syndrome induced by thiamazole and propylthiouracil. J Dermatol. 1994;21(7):501–507. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1346-8138.1994.tb01785.x
20. Quilty B, McHugh N. Lupus-like syndrome associated with the use of minocycline. Br J Rheumatol. 1994;33(12):1197–1198. https://doi.org/10.1093/rheumatology/33.12.1197
21. Riviello JJ, Raphael SA, Brown LW, et al. Ethosuximide-associated systemic lupus erythematosus in childhood. J Epilepsy. 1994;7(1):23–26.
22. Byrne P, Williams B, Pritchard M. Minocycline-related lupus. Br J Rheumatol. 1994;33(7):674–676. https://doi.org/10.1093/rheumatology/33.7.674

23. Gendi N, Bowman S, Mowat A. Lupus-like syndrome in patients treated for acne. Br J Rheumatol. 1995;34(6):584–585. https://doi.org/10.1093/rheumatology/34.6.584
24. Tellez Arevalo AM, et al. Synthetic pharmacotherapy for systemic lupus erythematosus. Medicina (Kaunas). 2022;59(1):56. https://doi.org/10.3390/medicina59010056
25. Sim TM, Mak A, Tay SH. Insights into the role of neutrophils in neuropsychiatric SLE. Front Immunol. 2022;13:957303. https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2022.957303
26. Izmirly PM, Kim MY, Llanos C, et al. Risk of anti-SSA/Ro-SSB/La antibodies in neonatal lupus. Ann Rheum Dis. 2010;69:1827–1830. https://doi.org/10.1136/ard.2009.119263
27. Kumar DM, Kamath L, Reddy N. Efficacy of hydroxychloroquine as antidiabetic drug. Int J Basic Clin Pharmacol. 2017;6:895. https://doi.org/10.18203/2319-2003.ijbcp20171325
28. Hage MP, Al-Badri MR, Azar ST. Effect of hydroxychloroquine on glucose and lipid metabolism. Ther Adv Endocrinol Metab. 2014;5:77–85. https://doi.org/10.1177/2042018814525695
29. Capell HA. Effect of antimalarial agents on lipid profile in SLE. J Rheumatol. 2001;28:1742.
30. Stapley L. Bone loss prevention by an antimalarial drug. Trends Endocrinol Metab. 2001;12:146. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1043-2760(01)00400-4
31. Ruiz-Irastorza G, Ugarte A, Egurbide MV, et al. Antimalarials may influence malignancy risk in SLE. Ann Rheum Dis. 2007;66:815–817. https://doi.org/10.1136/ard.2006.065524
32. Abdel Galil SM. Hydroxychloroquine-induced toxic hepatitis. Lupus. 2015;24:638–640. https://doi.org/10.1177/0961203314560208
33. Jimenez-Alonso J, Tercedor J, Jaimez L, et al. Antimalarial drug-induced pruritus in lupus. Arthritis Rheum. 1998;41:744–745. https://doi.org/10.1002/1529-0131(199804)41:4<744::AID-ART22>3.0.CO;2-8
34. Marriott P, Borrie PF. Pigmentary changes following chloroquine. J R Soc Med. 1975;68:535–536.
35. Pasero G, Marson P. Corticosteroid therapy history. Reumatismo. 2011;62:292–299. https://doi.org/10.4081/reumatismo.2011.292
36. Benedek TG. Development of corticosteroid therapy. Clin Exp Rheumatol. 2011;29:5–12.
37. Compston J. Glucocorticoid-induced osteoporosis. Endocrine. 2018;61:7–16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12020-018-1588-2
38. Stojan G, Petri M. Risk-benefit of glucocorticoids in SLE. Curr Treat Options Rheumatol. 2017;3:164–172. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40674-017-0069-8
39. Biddie SC, Conway-Campbell BL, Lightman SL. Regulation of glucocorticoid signalling. Rheumatology. 2012;51:403–412. https://doi.org/10.1093/rheumatology/ker215
40. Surjit M, Ganti KP, Mukherji A, et al. Glucocorticoid receptor repression mechanisms. Cell. 2011;145:224–241. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2011.03.027
41. Buttgereit F, Saag KG, Cutolo M, et al. Molecular basis of glucocorticoid action. Scand J Rheumatol. 2005;34:14–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/03009740510018648