

Comparison of Efficacy of Pregabalin Vs Duloxetine in Peripheral Neuropathy Pain in Type 2 Diabetic Patients at Low Doses

SUMAYYA SHABBIR¹, ASIF ISLAM², AMER ZOHAIB³, TOOBA FATIMA⁴, SAIMA RIAZ⁵, UZMA MALIK⁶

^{1,2}Senior Registrar, Mayo Hospital, King Edward Medical University, Lahore.

³Fellow Rheumatology, Sheikh Zayed Hospital, Lahore.

⁴Senior Registrar, Mayo Hospital, King Edward Medical University, Lahore.

⁵Assistant Professor Medicine University Of Lahore, Lahore.

⁶Associate Professor Of Medicine King Edward Medical University, Lahore.

Correspondence to: Sumayya Shabbir, Email: kemcolian_121@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Objective: This research is specifically designed to compare the efficacy, safety and dosage pattern of DLX and PGB in peripheral neuropathy pain in type 2 diabetic patients. In this clinical trial, we have used a low dosage of both drugs to measure the outcomes.

Place and Duration: Mayo Hospital Endocrine Out Patient Department. 01-01-2022 to 31-03-2022

Study type: Randomized controlled clinical trial

Methodology: All the patients were randomly divided into two equal groups of pregabalin and duloxetine. For this study, some empty capsules were prepared which were filled with either duloxetine, pregabalin, or starch as a placebo. Initially, patients of the duloxetine group received a placebo capsule once daily as a washout period for ten days. Later on, they received a fixed dose of 30 mg/d duloxetine in the first week of treatment and different doses of 30 mg/d to 60 mg/d were used for the next eleven weeks based on drug efficacy and tolerability. However, the group of pregabalin patients received a placebo capsule twice a day for ten days as a washout period. After that, they received 75 mg/Bd for the first week of treatment and 75 mg/Bd to 150 mg/Bd for eleven weeks of treatment.

Results: The current study reported 74% ADRs in the duloxetine group while pregabalin reported 37% adverse reactions to medication. The significant mean difference related to incidents was observed as ($p < 0.05$, $= 0.01$ and < 0.001) between both groups. In some cases, mild and tolerable adverse reactions were reported however severe reactions led to discontinuation of the drug. In 19% of cases of the duloxetine group treatment discontinuation was reported while PGB only had a ratio of 7%.

Conclusion: In conclusion despite both drugs having equal efficacy still, the DPNP patients had a better tolerability ratio for pregabalin than duloxetine.

Keywords: Type 2 diabetes, Duloxetine, Pregabalin, Peripheral neuropathy pain

INTRODUCTION

Diabetes is an alarming epidemic in the Asian region. In Iran, nearly 4.5 million population is suffering from diabetes in 2011 and this ratio is expected to increase to 9.5 million by 2030.^{1,2} However, the prevalence of diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain in diabetic patients in England, the United States, and the Middle Eastern region is reported as 20%, 10%, and 50% respectively.³⁻⁵ In the Asian region especially in the Iran region prevalence of peripheral neuropathy in diabetic patients is observed as 30% to 50%. Meanwhile, no reports of DPNP have been produced in this region however it can be estimated that the largely diabetic population of Iran is suffering from DPNP.^{6,7} Diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain has adverse effects on an individual's quality of life. The expensive treatment and high prevalence of disorder burdened the health care system of the country. The inconsistent and frustrating diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain (DPNP) also causes depression and limits the person's daily activities. DPNP involves three distinct types of pain including dysesthesia, paresthesia, and muscle electrical shock. Patients undergo severe colds along with hyperalgesia and allodynia. Symptoms occur in the lower extremities and disease progression leads toward the hands. At night the pain becomes severe and create disturbance in sleep along with a reduction of daily activities. The collapse in sleep and reduction in daily life activities worsen the blood glucose levels. Thus it progresses to diabetes.⁸

There are many pharmacological and non-pharmacological treatments present in the market. Some cases can be resolved by controlling blood glucose levels while acupuncture and electric nerve stimulation also relieve pain.^{9,10} However, some drugs such as duloxetine, pregabalin, topical analgesics, and tricyclic antidepressants are also used in clinical settings.¹¹ Food and drug association of America has recommended duloxetine and pregabalin as first-line therapy however the results related to the effectiveness and safety of the drug vary from region to region due to genetic and environmental variations.^{12,13} This research is specifically designed to compare the efficacy, safety, and dosage

pattern of DLX and PGB. In this clinical trial, we have used a low dosage of both drugs to measure the outcomes.

METHODOLOGY

This randomized double-blind control clinical trial was conducted in Mayo hospital for a time duration of 12 weeks. A total of 180 patients were recruited. The sample size was calculated by using the formula suggested for randomized clinical trials. For this study type, I error of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) and type II error ($\beta = 0.2$) of 20% with the power of 80% plus 20% dropout was used for sample size. Patients were voluntarily selected from diabetic clinics through inclusion and exclusion criteria.

All the patients with type 2 diabetes diagnosed according to the American Diabetes Association guideline 2017 were included.¹⁴ The diabetic duration of patients was set as ≥ 5 years in the inclusion criteria. Only those patients whose DPNP was identified by Michigan Neuropathy Screening Instrument (MNSI) examination were selected.^{15,16,17} Patients who reported DPNP severity ≥ 40 mm of 11 points with pain duration ≥ 12 months on the visual analog scale were observed. We assured that all the selected patients were aged above 40 years. On the other hand, all the patients allergic to duloxetine and pregabalin were excluded. Cases of DPNP with a history of hepatic, renal, and heart failure, visual and intellectual disability, severe depression, and uncontrolled hyper expansion were excluded. Patients having pain attributable to different reasons were also not entertained. Those patients who consumed any other drug before 14 days of research and those with MNSI examination scores < 2 were also excluded. For this research diabetic control, drugs were unchanged.

All the patients were randomly divided into two equal groups of pregabalin and duloxetine. For this study, some empty capsules were prepared which were filled with either duloxetine, pregabalin, or starch as a placebo. Initially, patients of the duloxetine group received a placebo capsule once daily as a washout period for ten days. Later on, they received a fixed dose of 30 mg/d duloxetine in the first week of treatment and different doses of 30 mg/d to 60 mg/d were used for the next eleven weeks based on drug efficacy

and tolerability. However, the group of pregabalin patients received a placebo capsule twice a day for ten days as a washout period. After that, they received 75 mg/Bd for the first week of treatment and 75 mg/Bd to 150 mg/Bd for eleven weeks of treatment. After twelve weeks of treatment, drugs were continued or switched to other drugs based on efficacy, pain recovery, and tolerability. Efficacy and safety of drugs were observed on daily phone recordings and monthly physical examinations. Pain intensity was measured by the visual analog scale. Visual analog scale and adverse drug reactions were blinded to the drug type during the study. Discontinuation of treatment was based on the severity of ADRs.

Statistical Analysis: For this study, SPSS software version 19.0 was used and the significant statistical value was set as <0.05 . To access the data normality Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied. Student t-test was used to compare the intensity, incidents of adverse drug effects, and demographic and biochemical markers. All the variables were reported in mean and standard deviations.

RESULTS

In the diabetic center of our institution total of 497 patients with peripheral pain were diagnosed. Out of these patients 180 who fulfilled inclusion were recruited for final analysis. Out of these patients majority of them were females 109 versus 71). In duloxetine, a group total of 66 (73%) patients was settled while 78 patients (87%) were placed in the pregabalin group. The demographic and clinical data of patients were represented in Table 1. According to the VAS score, the intensity of DPNP was reduced in comparison to the previous month however no significant difference was observed between both groups. In the current study, the time duration and drug interaction were significantly correlated ($P < 0.001$) (Table 2). Regarding adverse drug reactions, the current study reported 74% ADRs in the duloxetine group while pregabalin reported 37% adverse reactions to medication. The significant mean difference related to incidents was observed as ($p < 0.05$, $=0.01$ and <0.001) between both groups. In some cases, mild and tolerable adverse reactions were reported however severe reactions led to discontinuation of the drug. In 19% of cases of the duloxetine group treatment discontinuation was reported while PGB only had a ratio of 7%.

Table 1: Demographic and clinical representation of participants¹⁸

| Variables | Interventional groups | | P-value |
|--|--|--|---------|
| | Pregabalin (n= 78) Mean \pm SD | Duloxetine (n= 66) Mean \pm SD | |
| Age in years | 54.03 \pm 4.46 | 54.93 \pm 3.70 | 0.388 |
| Gender | | | |
| Female | 49 | 39 | |
| Male | 29 | 27 | |
| Body Mass Index (kg/m ²) | 26.55 \pm 0.99 | 26.12 \pm 1.02 | 0.595 |
| Duration of Diabetes | 9.05 \pm 2.85 | 9.57 \pm 3.20 | 0.145 |
| HA1c (mg%) | 8.7 \pm 1.72 | 8.9 \pm 1.20 | 0.655 |
| Duration of DPNP | 4.09 \pm 2.02 | 3.55 \pm 1.66 | 0.067 |
| Fasting Blood Glucose (mg/dl) | 144.74 \pm 19.44 | 146.34 \pm 13.39 | 0.699 |
| Serum Creatinine (mg/dl) | 1.02 \pm 0.09 | 0.95 \pm 0.11 | 0.088 |
| Michigan Neuropathy Scale Instrument questionnaire | 6.71 \pm 2.03 | 6.65 \pm 1.80 | 0.810 |
| Visual analogue scale | 61.74 \pm 16.34 | 67.23 \pm 19.29 | 0.052 |
| Michigan Neuropathy Scale Instrument examination | 2.82 \pm 0.43 | 2.69 \pm 0.55 | 0.076 |

Table 2: Comparison of DPNP Intensity in both groups¹⁸

| Variables | Visual Analogue score of DPNP (mm) | | P- Value |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|
| | Pregabalin Mean \pm SD | Duloxetine Mean \pm SD | |
| Before treatment | 61.7 \pm 16.3 | 67.2 \pm 19.3 | < 0.001 |

| | | | |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|-----------|
| 1st month | 29.7 \pm 7.8 | 32.4 \pm 8.5 | < 0.001 |
| 2nd month | 22.3 \pm 6.4 | 22.3 \pm 6.4 | < 0.001 |
| 3rd month | 16.0 \pm 5.5 | 16.2 \pm 4.2 | < 0.001 |

Table 3: Adverse drug reaction in both groups¹⁸

| Adverse drug reaction (ADRs) | Pregabalin N (%) | Duloxetine N (%) | P- value |
|------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Edema | 11 (12%) | 0 (0%) | < 0.001 |
| Anorexia | 2 (2%) | 22 (25%) | < 0.001 |
| Somnolence | 18 (20%) | 8 (9%) | 0.06 |
| Nausea | 2 (2%) | 20 (23%) | < 0.001 |
| Dizziness | 14 (15%) | 4 (5%) | 0.06 |
| Vomiting | 0 (0%) | 10 (11%) | < 0.001 |
| Weight gain | 16 (18%) | 0 (0%) | < 0.001 |
| Shivering | 0 (0%) | 16 (18%) | < 0.001 |
| Increased micturition | 1 (1%) | 8 (9%) | 0.01 |
| Agitation | 0 (0%) | 14 (16%) | < 0.001 |
| Arrhythmia | 0 (0%) | 4 (5%) | 0.06 |
| Tremor | 0 (0%) | 14 (16%) | < 0.001 |
| Tachycardia | 2 (2%) | 10 (11%) | 0.01 |
| Muscle rigidity | 0 (0%) | 14 (16%) | < 0.001 |
| Hypertension | 2 (2%) | 10 (11%) | 0.01 |
| Diaphoresis | 0 (0%) | 11 (12%) | < 0.001 |
| Headache | 6 (7%) | 4 (5%) | 0.75 |
| Abdominal cramp | 2 (2%) | 14 (16%) | 0.02 |
| Hyperthermia | 0 (0%) | 8 (9%) | < 0.001 |
| Diarrhea | 3 (3%) | 10 (11%) | 0.02 |

DISCUSSION

In this clinical trial comparison of efficacy, safety and dosage pattern of duloxetine and pregabalin was drawn on a sample in context of diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain. In both groups intensity of DPNP was reduced in comparison to the previous month. However, no significant difference related to VAS score was reported between groups. Many studies had similar results and examined the same issue.¹⁸⁻²⁵ A study by Boyle et al¹⁸, Tannenberget al¹⁹, and Devi et al²⁰ conducted a direct comparison of two drugs while Quilici et al²¹ performed a meta-analysis on nine separate researches. All these studies found relief effects of both drugs on DPNP patients without any significant difference. Furthermore, in the current study, the dose of treatment was flexible and dependable on patients' responsiveness. The average dose of duloxetine in current study was parallel to the previous studies.^{18-21,23,26,27} Two non-interventional post-hoc studies conducted on the German and American populations used average doses of 53.9 and 55.2 mg/d for DPNP patients.^{26,27} This average dosage was comparatively higher than our study. Meanwhile study by Boyle et al¹⁸ reported a higher dosage of duloxetine in DPNP patients in the United Kingdom. They used 60 and 120 mg/d doses for their participants however both doses were efficient without any significant difference. Tannenberget al¹⁹ conducted their study on the worldwide white population and suggested 60 mg/d dosages of duloxetine for DPNP patients. Literature of Asian countries had similar findings. A study conducted on the Indian population prescribed 20 to 80mg of duloxetine for DPNP patients via dose responses.²⁰ However, they did not report the average dose of duloxetine and pregabalin for their participants. However, another clinical trial by Zakerkish et al.²⁸ suggested a 30 to 60 mg/d dose of duloxetine in comparison to Nortriptyline for DPNP cases in Southern Iran. The average dose of the current study is nearer to the Japanese study by Yasuda et al²² which gave a fixed dose of 40 mg/d however, the fixed dose of the current study was 30mg/d. The average weight of the current study was 60kg parallel to the mentioned Japanese study. However, a study by Raskin et al used a fixed dose of 120 mg/d of duloxetine on patients with an average weight of 80kg and observed effective outcomes. However, in the current study, no correlation analysis was performed related to weight and dose of DLX.

Comparing the data of the pregabalin drug study Happich et al²⁶ reported an average dose of 173.5 mg/d. However, in the current study, the average dose was comparatively lower than in

three other studies.^{18,19,25} Devi et al²⁰ observed average consumption of 150 to 600 mg/d ideal whereas a study by Boyle et al¹⁸ and Tannenberget al¹⁹ suggested an average dosage of 600/d and 300 mg/d of pregabalin respectively. However, all these suggestions are above the average doses of pregabalin consumed in the current study. On contrary, the adverse drug reaction of pregabalin was similar to many previous studies. These reactions included dizziness, drowsiness, edema, and weight gain similar to previous studies.¹⁸⁻²⁰ The reaction was more adverse in the pregabalin group than duloxetine. Interestingly the reactions reported in the duloxetine group were not reported earlier. Previous studies reported nausea, anorexia, vomiting, and diaphoresis in the duloxetine group.^{18-23,28} However in the current study duloxetine causes hypertension, muscle rigidity, shivering, and tremor. According to Sternbach and Hunter's criteria²⁹ diaphoresis, nausea and hyperthermia are the symptoms of Serotonin syndrome (SS). Due to moderate to severe cases of serotonin syndrome reported in the current study duloxetine was discontinued. However the cases of arrhythmia incidence were statistically lesser in the DLX group than in the PGB group but due to ADR, the other incidence rate was reported as 5% in DLX.

In the current study due to adverse drug reactions, the discontinuation of duloxetine was observed in 19% cases and pregabalin discontinuation was reported in 7% cases. These results are comparatively higher than the study of Devi et al., in which he reported a 9% discontinuation ratio of pregabalin without the reason of adverse drug reaction. Meanwhile, a study by Zakerkish et al²⁸ had no reason for discontinuation while Yasuda et al²² reported 96% ADRs and 22% discontinuation. Gene polymorphism is the major explanation for the effective dose and safety of duloxetine.³⁰ Genotypic differences can be the reason for diverse efficacy and drug safety in different populations. Some studies reported that patients with CYP1A2 gene polymorphism suffered from severe adverse drug reactions to anti-rheumatic drugs.^{31,32} Other factors like the social and natural environment and mental conditions can cause variation in dose-response and ADRs in different regions.^{33,34}

CONCLUSION

In conclusion despite both drugs having equal efficacy still, the DPNP patients had a better tolerability ratio for pregabalin than duloxetine. Thus this research supports the pregabalin drug for the treatment of diabetic patients however if duloxetine is required very minimum dose should be prescribed to avoid the incidents of serotonin syndrome.

REFERENCES

1. Esteghamati A, Etamad K, Koohpayehzadeh J, Abbasi M, Meysamie A, Noshad S, et al. Trends in the prevalence of diabetes and impaired fasting glucose in association with obesity in Iran: 2005–2011. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract.* 2014;103(2):319–327.
2. Javanbakht M, Mashayekhi A, Baradaran HR, Haghdoost A, Afshin A. Projection of diabetes population size and associated economic burden through 2030 in Iran: evidence from micro-simulation Markov model and Bayesian meta-analysis. *PLoS One.* 2015;10(7):e0132505.
3. Dyck PJ, Kratz K, Karnes J, Litchy WJ, Klein R, Pach J, et al. The prevalence by staged severity of various types of diabetic neuropathy, retinopathy, and nephropathy in a population-based cohort: the Rochester Diabetic Neuropathy Study. *Neurology.* 1993;43(4):817.
4. Abbott CA, Malik RA, Ernest R, Kulkarni J, Boulton AJ. Prevalence and Characteristics of Painful Diabetic Neuropathy in a Large Community-Based Diabetes Population in the UK. *Diabetes care.* 2011;DC_111108.
5. Jambart S, Ammache Z, Haddad F, Younes A, Hassoun A, Abdalla K, et al. Prevalence of painful diabetic peripheral neuropathy among patients with diabetes mellitus in the Middle East region. *J Int Med Res.* 2011;39(2):366–377.
6. Esteghamati A, Larijani B, Aghajani MH, Ghaemi F, Kermanchi J, Shahrami A, et al. Diabetes in Iran: prospective analysis from first nationwide diabetes report of National Program for prevention and control of diabetes (NPPCD-2016) *Sci Res.* 2017;7(1):13461.
7. Sobhani S, Asayesh H, Sharifi F, Djallalinia S, Baradaran HR, Arzaghi SM, et al. Prevalence of diabetic peripheral neuropathy in Iran: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Diabetes & Metabolic Disorders.* 2014;13(1):97.

8. Tesfaye S, Boulton AJ, Dickenson AH. Mechanisms and management of diabetic painful distal symmetrical polyneuropathy. *Diabetes Care.* 2013;36(9):2456–65.
9. Thakral G, Kim PJ, La Fontaine J, Menzies R, Najafi B, Lavery LA. Electrical stimulation as an adjunctive treatment of painful and sensory diabetic neuropathy. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications Sage CA; 2013.
10. Garrow AP, Xing M, Vere J, Verrall B, Wang L, Jude EB. Role of acupuncture in the management of diabetic painful neuropathy (DPN): a pilot RCT. *Acupuncture in Medicine.* 2014;acupmed2013-010495.
11. Javed S, Petropoulos IN, Alam U, Malik RA. Treatment of painful diabetic neuropathy. *Therapeutic advances in chronic disease.* 2015;6(1):15–28.
12. Agyeman AA, Ofori-Asenso R. Perspective: does personalized medicine hold the future for medicine? *Journal of pharmacy & bioallied sciences.* 2015;7(3):239. 13.
13. Maliepaard M, Nofziger C, Papalua M, Zineh I, Uyama Y, Prasad K, et al. Pharmacogenetics in the evaluation of new drugs: a multiregional regulatory perspective. *Nat Rev Drug Discov.* 2013;12(2): 103–15.
14. McCulloch DK, Hayward RA. Screening for type 2 diabetes mellitus. *UpToDate UpToDate* 2016.
15. Moghtaderi A, Bakhshpour A, Rashidi H. Validation of Michigan neuropathyscreening instrument for diabetic peripheral neuropathy. *Clin Neurol Neurosurg.* 2006;108(5):477–81.
16. Herman W, Pop-Busui R, Braffett B, Martin C, Cleary P, Albers J, et al. Use of the Michigan neuropathy screening instrument as a measure of distal symmetrical peripheral neuropathy in type 1 diabetes: results from the diabetes control and complications trial/ epidemiology of diabetes interventions and complications. *Diabet Med.* 2012;29(7):937–44.
17. Boyle J, Eriksson ME, Gribble L, Gouni R, Johnson S, Coppini DV, et al. Randomized, placebo-controlled comparison of amitriptyline, duloxetine, and pregabalin in patients with chronic diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain: impact on pain, polysomnographic sleep, daytime functioning, and quality of life. *Diabetes care.* 2012; DC_120656.
18. Joharchi K, Memari M, Azargashb E, Saadat N. Efficacy and safety of duloxetine and Pregabalin in Iranian patients with diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain: a double-blind, randomized clinical trial. *J Diabetes Metab Disord.* 2019 Aug 13;18(2):575-582
19. Tannenberget al, editors. Duloxetine, pregabalin, and duloxetine plus gabapentin for diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain management in patients with inadequate pain response to gabapentin: an open-label, randomized, noninferiority comparison. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings;* 2011: Elsevier.
20. Devi P, Madhu K, Ganapathy B, Sarma G, John L, Kulkarni C. Evaluation of efficacy and safety of gabapentin, duloxetine, and pregabalin in patients with painful diabetic peripheral neuropathy. *Indian J Pharm.* 2012;44(1):51.
21. Quilici S, Chancellor J, Löthgren M, Simon D, Said G, LeTK, et al. Meta-analysis of duloxetine vs. pregabalin and gabapentin in the treatment of diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain. *BMC Neurol.* 2009;9(1):6.
22. Yasuda H, Hotta N, Kasuga M, Kashiwagi A, Kawamori R, Yamada T, et al. Efficacy and safety of 40 mg or 60 mg duloxetine in Japanese adults with diabetic neuropathic pain: results from a randomized, 52-week, open-label study. *Journal of Diabetes Investigation.* 2016;7(1):100–8.
23. Raskin J, Wang F, Pritchett YL, Goldstein DJ. Duloxetine for patients with diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain: a 6-month open-label safety study. *Pain Med.* 2006;7(5):373–85.
24. Richter RW, Portenoy R, Sharma U, Lamoreaux L, Bockbrader H, Knapp LE. Relief of painful diabetic peripheral neuropathy with pregabalin: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial. *J Pain.* 2005;6(4):253–60.
25. Parsons B, Argoff CE, Clair A, Emir B. Improvement in pain severity category in clinical trials of pregabalin. *J Pain Res.* 2016;9: 779–85.
26. Hapich M, Schneider E, Boess FG, Wilhelm S, Schacht A, Birkinle F, et al. Effectiveness of duloxetine compared with pregabalin and gabapentin in diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain: results from a German observational study. *Clin J Pain.* 2014;30(10):875–85.
27. Sun P, Zhao Y, Zhao Z, Bernauer M, Watson P. Dosing pattern comparison between duloxetine and pregabalin among patients with diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain. *Pain Practice.* 2012;12(8):641–8.
28. Zakerkish M, Amiri F, Nasab NM, Ghorbani A. Comparative Efficacy of Duloxetine Versus Nortriptyline in Patients with Diabetic Peripheral Neuropathic Pain: A Double Blind Randomized Controlled Trial. *Iranian Red Crescent Medical Journal.* 2017;19(8).
29. Volpi-Abadie J, Kaye AM, Kaye AD. Serotonin syndrome. *Ochsner J.* 2013;13(4):533–40.
30. Porcelli S, Fabbri C, Serretti A. Meta-analysis of serotonin transporter gene promoter polymorphism (5-HTTLPR) association with antidepressant efficacy. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol.* 2012;22(4):239–58.
31. Tay JK, Tan CH, Chong S-A, Tan E-C. Functional polymorphisms of the cytochrome P450 1A2 (CYP1A2) gene and prolonged QTc interval in schizophrenia. *Prog Neuro-Psychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry.* 2007;31(6):1297–302.
32. Grabar PB, Rozman B, Tomšič M, Šuput D, Logar D, Dolžan V. Genetic polymorphism of CYP1A2 and the toxicity of leflunomide treatment in rheumatoid arthritis patients. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol.* 2008;64(9):871–6.
33. Alomar MJ. Factors affecting the development of adverse drug reactions. *Saudi pharmaceutical journal.* 2014;22(2):83–94.
34. Bushra R, Aslam N, Khan AY. Food-drug interactions. *Oman Medical Journal.* 2011;26(2):77–83.