Antidiabetic medication-induced acute interstitial nephritis: case report and literature search
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Introduction
Liraglutide, a glucagon-like peptide-1 (GLP-1) receptor agonist, is a recognised treatment for type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM). It mimics human GLP-1 and works by augmenting insulin secretion, inhibiting glucagon secretion and inhibiting gastric acid secretion.1 It has been shown to not only improve glycaemic control in people with diabetes, but also result in weight loss, reduced hypoglycaemic episodes, reduced albuminuria, reduced progression to macroalbuminuria and reduced incidence of myocardial infarction and stroke events.2–6 Gastrointestinal upset is the commonest reported side effect, which occurs in up to 56% of patients in clinical trials. Furthermore, BNF recommends avoiding liraglutide treatment in end-stage renal disease/estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) <15 mL/min/1.73 m² (depending on brand), due to the increased risk of adverse events.

We present a rare case of a female with chronic kidney disease (CKD), whose treatment with liraglutide was associated with rapid deterioration of renal function and tubulointerstitial nephritis. Our literature search highlighted one previous case, thus we would like to raise awareness of this potential rare side effect of liraglutide treatment.6 We have further conducted a literature search of all case reports noting associations of glucose-lowering therapies with acute interstitial nephritis to raise awareness of this potential com

Case history
A 59-year-old woman with T2DM and CKD stage 3 (G3b A1), maintained stable glycaemic control with HbA1c 58 on linagliptin 5 mg once daily and reduced carbohydrate diet. Medication history also included amlodipine 5 mg and atorvastatin 20 mg. She was started on liraglutide in January 2019 to improve her metabolic control further. Linagliptin treatment was discontinued, given that the combination of linagliptin and liraglutide is unlikely to provide synergistic effects and is not cost effective. Despite improvement in glycaemia, rapid deterioration in renal function was noted subsequent to starting liraglutide (Table 1 and Figure 1).

There was no other explanation for the drop in eGFR: she did not experience diarrhoea, nausea or vomiting. Weight and BMI had remained stable throughout liraglutide treatment at 70 kg and 24.3 kg/m², respectively. Furthermore, blood pressure remained stable at around 120/70 mm Hg. She had remained euvoalaemic whilst on liraglutide treatment. She had not taken NSAIDs. Urinalysis was bland. Complement C3 and C4, double-stranded DNA 1 (dsDNA1), anti-neutrophil cytoplasm antibodies (ANCA), myeloperoxidase (MPO) and anti-proteinase 3 antibody (PR3) were all negative. Ultrasound of the kidney showed normal kidneys bilaterally (right 10.7 cm, left 10.4 cm) and no evidence of obstruction. Moreover, there was no family history of renal disease.

As the rapid drop in eGFR was only noted after commencing liraglutide, it was postulated that the loss in renal function may be due to liraglutide initiation. Unfortunately, due to a delay in the medical appointments, the only available eGFR results were prior to and at 5 months after start of treatment, thus complicating matters further. The eGFR was 35 mL/min/1.73 m² prior to starting liraglutide and dropped rapidly to 17 mL/min/1.73 m² when measured five months later – a significant fall of 51%. It was therefore decided to stop liraglutide treatment in May 2019 and her liraglutide was restarted.

Renal biopsy was performed in July 2019 (Figure 2). Significant interstitial fibrosis and tubular atrophy (IFTA) were present, with
profound interstitial inflammatory infiltrate and mild focal tubulitis. All these findings heavily supported the diagnosis of acute interstitial nephritis. Furthermore, mild glomerular mesangial expansion and arteriolar hyalinosis was seen, suggestive but not specific for a diagnosis of diabetic nephropathy. We therefore concluded that the kidney biopsy showed significant acute interstitial nephritis with mild diabetic nephropathy.

Despite stopping liraglutide, her renal function did not improve (Figure 1). She progressed to end stage renal disease. Steroid treatment was considered but not deemed beneficial due to severe IFTA and her diabetes. She has started peritoneal dialysis and is awaiting renal transplant.

Discussion
Acute interstitial nephritis is a common cause of acute kidney injury (AKI), and has been identified in the diagnosis of 12.9% of kidney biopsies from patients with AKI. The main cause of acute interstitial nephritis in the developed world is medications, which contribute to >70% of cases. Antibiotics, NSAIDs, anti-inflammatory agents, anticonvulsants, diuretics and proton pump inhibitors are the most common culprits. Other causes of interstitial nephritis include infections, autoimmune disorders, systemic diseases, metabolic causes and environmental exposure. The presentation of drug-induced acute interstitial nephritis is highly variable. The classic triad of symptoms of rash, fever and eosinophilia are only witnessed in <10% of patients. Laboratory tests and imaging are usually unhelpful in the diagnosis of drug-induced acute interstitial nephritis as they lack both sensitivity and specificity. Renal biopsy is the gold standard investigation to make a definitive diagnosis. Main histological findings include interstitial inflammation, comprising primarily of lymphocytes and monocytes, and tubulitis is evident. If the nephritis continues to deteriorate, chronic appearances of interstitial fibrosis and tubular atrophy may be present.

Our case highlights a person with stable diabetes and established CKD whose kidney function rapidly deteriorated further after liraglutide initiation. People with diabetes and CKD3 are expected
### Table 2: Cases of antidiabetic medication-induced acute interstitial nephritis to date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Drug</th>
<th>Drug name</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Initial renal function</th>
<th>Time to presentation at hospital</th>
<th>Renal function post GLP-1 introduction</th>
<th>Renal</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Recovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLP 1 RA</td>
<td>Liraglutide</td>
<td>Gariani et al 2014</td>
<td>83M</td>
<td>Creatinine 2.14 mg/dL eGFR 32 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Creatinine 9.3 mg/dL eGFR 6 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>Discontinued liraglutide. Steroids and transient dialysis</td>
<td>Partial recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exenatide</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Dubois – Laforgue et al 2014</td>
<td>75M</td>
<td>Creatinine 130 μmol/L</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>Creatinine 1148 μmol/L</td>
<td>Not done</td>
<td>Discontinued exenatide. Haemodialysis for 48h insulin therapy</td>
<td>Full recovery – 9 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exenatide</td>
<td>Bhatti et al 2010</td>
<td>65F</td>
<td>Creatinine 77 μmol/L eGFR 66 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>9 weeks</td>
<td>Creatinine 393 μmol/L eGFR 10 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>Not done</td>
<td>Discontinued exenatide. Prednisolone</td>
<td>Partial recovery – 6 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exenatide</td>
<td>Nandakaban et al 2013</td>
<td>58M</td>
<td>Creatinine 120 μmol/L eGFR 59 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Serum creatinine 209 μmol/L eGFR 39 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>Discontinued exenatide. Prednisolone</td>
<td>Partial recovery – 4 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGLT2 inhibitors</td>
<td>Empagliflozin</td>
<td>Ryan et al 2021</td>
<td>63F</td>
<td>Creatinine 60 μmol/L eGFR 48 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Creatinine 381 μmol/L</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>Discontinued empagliflozin. Prednisolone</td>
<td>Partial recovery – 8 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empagliflozin</td>
<td>Nandakaban et al 2013</td>
<td>67F</td>
<td>Creatinine 0.9 mg/dL eGFR 66 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>Creatinine 3.19 mg/dL eGFR 15 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>Haemodialysis, prednisolone</td>
<td>Partial recovery – 3 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canagliflozin</td>
<td>Gribben et al 2021</td>
<td>51M</td>
<td>Creatinine 1.5 mg/dL eGFR 53 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>Creatinine 11.6 mg/dL eGFR 6 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>Not done</td>
<td>Discontinued canagliflozin. IV fluids. Haemodialysis</td>
<td>Partial recovery – 4 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPP4 Inhibitors</td>
<td>Sitagliptin</td>
<td>Lin et al 2014</td>
<td>69M</td>
<td>Creatinine 1.07 mg/dL eGFR 69 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>4 weeks</td>
<td>Creatinine 4.95 mg/dL eGFR 12 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>Discontinued sitagliptin. Haemodialysis. Prednisolone</td>
<td>Partial recovery – 3 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitagliptin</td>
<td>Alsaad et al 2016</td>
<td>56M</td>
<td>Creatinine 1.5 mg/dL eGFR 51 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>Creatinine 2.2 mg/dL eGFR 33 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>Discontinued sitagliptin. Prednisolone</td>
<td>Full recovery – 6 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alogliptin</td>
<td>Shima et al 2019</td>
<td>68M</td>
<td>Creatinine 0.75 mg/dL eGFR 110 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>14 months</td>
<td>Creatinine 1.55 mg/dL eGFR 48 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>Discontinued alogliptin</td>
<td>Partial recovery – 3 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfonylureas</td>
<td>Gliclazide</td>
<td>Oyama et al 2018</td>
<td>Retrospective study using spontaneous reporting system databased. Based on 5,195,890 reports of all adverse drug reactions, 3,088 reports of drug-induced tubulointerstitial nephritis were evaluated. Results suggested that gliclazide had the highest reporting odds ratio of tubulointerstitial nephritis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glimepiride</td>
<td>Akbar et al 2016</td>
<td>50M</td>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>Unreported</td>
<td>Creatinine 2.72 mg/dL eGFR 32 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>Discontinued glimepiride. Prednisolone</td>
<td>Partial recovery – few weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thiazolidinediones</td>
<td>Rosiglitazone</td>
<td>Castledine et al 2006</td>
<td>55M</td>
<td>Creatinine 97 μmol/L eGFR 97 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>Creatinine 458 μmol/L eGFR 12 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>Discontinued rosiglitazone. Prednisolone</td>
<td>Partial recovery – 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosiglitazone</td>
<td>Ghani et al 2009</td>
<td>65M</td>
<td>Creatinine 150 μmol/L eGFR 43 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>2 weeks</td>
<td>Creatinine 1474 μmol/L eGFR 3 mL/min/1.73 m²</td>
<td>Confirmed</td>
<td>Discontinued rosiglitazone. Haemodialysis. Mycophenolate mofetil.</td>
<td>Partial recovery – 6 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GLP1RA, glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonist; SGLT2 inhibitors, sodium-glucose co-transporter-2 inhibitors; DPP4 inhibitors, dipeptidyl-peptide 4 inhibitors; F, female; M, male.

**NOTE:** References for the above table can be found at the end of the article before the main article references.
to experience a progressive decline in eGFR of 1.9–3.3 mL/min/1.73 m² per year. In contrast, our case experienced a decline in eGFR of 18 mL/min/1.73 m² within 5 months. Due to the time correlation between eGFR decline and initiation of liraglutide, it was highly suggestive that this decline was due to liraglutide therapy; we could not determine any other reason for such a rapid decline in eGFR.

There have been similar case reports to ours in the literature where use of liraglutide (and other antidiabetic medications) resulted in acute interstitial nephritis (Table 2). These cases, like ours, experienced no gastrointestinal symptoms thus no dehydration, yet deterioration in kidney function was evident. Renal biopsy supported the diagnosis.

It is speculated whether this injury results from an immunological response. Pathogenesis of drug-induced acute interstitial nephritis is thought to occur from type IV delayed hypersensitivity reaction to the offending medication. This can happen within days or months of exposure to the medication in question. It is unclear exactly how this process occurs, however suspected mechanisms include molecular mimicry or direct binding of hapten drug to tubular membrane, resulting in an immunogenic response. Furthermore, antibody production has been shown to occur after liraglutide introduction (~8.5% of cases).

Current standard of care for treatment of drug-induced acute interstitial nephritis involves early recognition of the culprit drug and discontinuation of the medication. Late recognition of kidney damage and continued drug use may result in kidney fibrosis, with 40–60% of people with acute tubulointerstitial nephritis ultimately developing chronic kidney disease. Corticosteroid therapy is controversial in the treatment of drug-induced acute interstitial nephritis. Some studies report rapid and complete recovery of baseline renal function in those treated with steroids, whilst others have failed to confirm these findings. No prospective randomised controlled trials investigating corticosteroid treatment in acute interstitial nephritis have been conducted as yet. Multicentre prospective randomised controlled trials are needed to study the effect of corticosteroid therapy on interstitial nephritis. Nevertheless, the main conclusion from all studies investigating steroid treatment is that the earlier steroid treatment was initiated, the better the prognosis.

The situation is further complicated when using steroids to treat acute interstitial nephritis in people with diabetes due to glucocorticoid-induced hyperglycaemia. Furthermore, it has been noted in the literature that people with diabetes are less likely to respond to steroid treatment. In addition, interstitial fibrosis in renal biopsy is associated with poor response to steroids. This may be due to fibrosis indicating irreversible damage of renal tissue. In our case, as significant interstitial fibrosis and tubular atrophy was noted on renal biopsy, it was deemed that steroid therapy would not be beneficial. Furthermore, with our patient’s diabetes under stable control, steroid therapy was avoided to ensure HbA1c did not deteriorate.

Of interest, liraglutide and other GLP-1 agonists have been reported to cause acute kidney injury via a different pathogenesis. Those affected severely by the gastrointestinal side effect of liraglutide treatment may experience dehydration and progress to acute kidney injury. In these patients, renal biopsy confirms acute tubular necrosis. Careful fluid balance and examination is necessary to determine intravascular volume depletion. Fluid rehydration is essential in the treatment of these patients. This represents a diagnostic challenge for physicians, whereby clinical and laboratory features are comparable for both acute tubulointerstitial nephritis due to medication and acute tubular injury due to dehydration. Especially in people with diabetes, the complexity for diagnosis of renal disease is challenging. However, as our case experienced no gastrointestinal side effects, had stable weight and blood pressure and was clinically euvoalaemic throughout liraglutide treatment, it was unlikely she had kidney function deterioration via this mechanism. Histological investigation further confirmed our suspicions, and excluded volume depletion as a cause of her eGFR deterioration.

Despite our case report, we would like to highlight the multiple studies reporting the benefit of liraglutide on metabolic, cardiovascular and renal outcomes. Furthermore, post hoc analysis of people with CKD have further shown the safety and efficacy of liraglutide treatment, and its benefits in reducing all-cause mortality in this patient subtype. We therefore conclude that liraglutide has a positive impact on renal function. However, physicians should be aware of acute interstitial nephritis as a possible rare side effect.

**Conclusion**

Despite the multiple cardiovascular and renal benefits of liraglutide therapy, our case highlights a rare side effect – acute interstitial nephritis. Few cases have been reported in the literature, thus high clinical suspicion needs to be maintained in those with rapid renal deterioration after liraglutide (and other antidiabetic medication) initiation. If interstitial nephritis is suspected and volume depletion has been excluded as a differential diagnosis, the gold standard in-
vestigation is renal biopsy. Definitive management of antidiabetic medication-induced acute interstitial nephritis involves identification and removal of the offending medication. Steroid therapy is controversial, with a limited effect noted in those with diabetes. From our case we thus aim to raise awareness to clinicians about a rare possible side effect of liraglutide (and other antidiabetic medication) therapy and highlight its investigation and management.
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