Volume 3, Issue 8, August 2025 ISSN (E): 2938-3765

SYSTEMIC LUPUS ERYTHEMATOSUS: WORLDWIDE INSIGHTS INTO EPIDEMIOLOGY, PATHOPHYSIOLOGY, AND NOVEL TREATMENT

Asqarov N. L.
Nabiyeva D. A.
Eraliyev U. E. 1
1 Tashkent state medical university (Tashkent, Uzbekistan)

Abstract
Systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) is a complex, multisystem autoimmune disease characterized by immune dysregulation, autoantibody production, and chronic inflammation affecting multiple organs. This article provides a comprehensive overview of SLE's epidemiology, pathogenesis, clinical manifestations, and recent therapeutic advancements. SLE disproportionately affects women, particularly those of reproductive age, and certain ethnic groups, with significant global variations in prevalence and incidence. Advances in diagnostic criteria and targeted therapies, such as B-cell-directed treatments and interferon pathway inhibitors, have improved outcomes, yet challenges remain, particularly in low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) where diagnostic and treatment resources are limited. This review highlights the need for global collaboration to address disparities in SLE care and improve patient outcomes.

Introduction

Systemic Lupus Erythematosus (SLE) is a chronic autoimmune disease with diverse clinical and serological manifestations, resulting from widespread immune dysregulation. It is characterized by the production of autoantibodies against nuclear antigens, immune complex deposition, and chronic inflammation in target organs such as the skin, joints, and kidneys [1]. SLE significantly impacts quality of life, causing physical, psychological, and social challenges, particularly in young women and underserved populations [2]. This article synthesizes current knowledge on SLE's epidemiology, pathogenesis, diagnostic challenges, and emerging therapies, emphasizing global health disparities and future research needs.

Epidemiology SLE exhibits significant geographic and demographic variations in prevalence and incidence. Global studies estimate SLE prevalence at 50–100 per 100,000 individuals in the United States, with higher rates among African Americans, Native Americans, and Alaska Natives compared to White populations [3]. In Europe, prevalence varies, with lower rates in Russia (9.0 per 100,000) compared to Kazakhstan (20.6 per 100,000) and Ukraine (14.9 per 100,000) [4]. In Asia, Taiwan reports a prevalence of 81.1 per 100,000 [5], while South Korea noted an increase in incidence from 21.3 to 35.5 per 100,000 between 2005 and 2015 [6]. Women, particularly those aged 15–44, are disproportionately affected, with a female-to-male ratio of up to 13:1 in reproductive-age groups, compared to 2:1 in children and older adults [7]. Ethnic disparities are notable, with Black, Hispanic, and Native American women showing higher incidence and mortality

Web of Medicine: Journal of Medicine, Practice and Nursing
webofjournals.com/index.php/5

rates [8]. For instance, in the U.S., Black women have a prevalence of 230.9 per 100,000, compared to 84.7 for White women [9]. Socioeconomic factors and limited healthcare access in LMIC exacerbate disease burden, contributing to delayed diagnosis and poorer outcomes [10]. In Mexico, age-specific mortality rates for SLE increased by 81.6% from 1998 to 2017, contrasting with an 8.6% decline in the general population [11].

The pathogenesis of Systemic Lupus Erythematosus (SLE) involves a complex interplay of genetic, environmental, and immunological factors, resulting in a self-sustaining autoimmune process driven by dysregulation of the innate and adaptive immune systems, coupled with complement activation [12]. Central to this process is the production of autoantibodies by B cells, such as anti-double-stranded DNA (anti-dsDNA) and anti-Smith antibodies, which form immune complexes that deposit in tissues and trigger inflammation in target organs like the kidneys, skin, and joints [13]. Impaired clearance of apoptotic cells leads to prolonged exposure of autoantigens, further perpetuating immune activation and contributing to the autoimmune cycle [14]. The type I interferon (IFN) pathway plays a significant role, with elevated IFN activity associated with increased disease severity and a higher likelihood of lupus nephritis [15]. Additionally, B-cell abnormalities, including both antibody-dependent and antibody-independent mechanisms, are critical, with elevated levels of B-cell activating factor (BAFF, also known as BLyS) correlating with disease activity and exacerbating immune dysregulation [16]. These mechanisms collectively contribute to the diverse clinical manifestations of SLE, including skin rashes, arthritis, lupus nephritis, and neuropsychiatric symptoms, with considerable variability among patients [17].

Clinical Manifestations SLE presents with a wide spectrum of symptoms, often complicating diagnosis. Common initial complaints include fatigue, malar rash, oral ulcers, hair loss, joint pain, and myalgia [18]. Severe manifestations, such as lupus nephritis and central nervous system involvement, pose life-threatening risks [19]. The disease's unpredictable course and variability necessitate comprehensive clinical evaluation, often guided by classification criteria such as the 2019 EULAR/ACR criteria, which emphasize antinuclear antibody (ANA) positivity and a scoring system for lupus-specific features [20].

Diagnosing SLE is challenging due to its heterogeneous presentation and lack of a definitive test. The 2019 EULAR/ACR criteria provide improved sensitivity (89%) and specificity (90%) compared to the 1997 ACR (83% sensitivity, 96% specificity) and 2012 SLICC criteria (97% sensitivity, 84% specificity) [21]. However, in resource-limited settings, access to immunological tests (e.g., ANA, anti-dsDNA) is limited, contributing to underdiagnosis [22]. Developing affordable, accessible diagnostic tools is critical for early detection in LMIC [23].

Therapeutic strategies for Systemic Lupus Erythematosus (SLE) focus on controlling disease activity, preventing irreversible organ damage, and minimizing adverse effects from treatments, which can significantly impact patients' quality of life. Over the past decade, significant advancements in both conventional and biologic therapies have transformed SLE management, offering more targeted approaches to address the underlying immune dysregulation. These developments, combined with updated treatment guidelines, aim to balance efficacy with safety while addressing the diverse needs of SLE patients worldwide [24].

Conventional therapies Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) remains the cornerstone of SLE treatment and is recommended for all patients unless contraindicated. HCQ reduces disease flares, improves

Web of Medicine: Journal of Medicine, Practice and Nursing
webofjournals.com/index.php/5

survival, and offers protective effects against cardiovascular complications and thrombosis, making it a critical component of long-term management [24]. It is particularly effective in maintaining disease remission and preventing mild-to-moderate flares, with studies showing a significant reduction in flare rates (hazard ratio 0.57) and improved survival (odds ratio 0.68) in adherent patients [54]. Glucocorticoids (GCS), such as prednisone, are used to manage acute flares due to their rapid anti-inflammatory effects. However, their long-term use is minimized due to serious side effects, including osteoporosis, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease, with efforts focused on tapering to the lowest effective dose [25]. Immunosuppressants like mycophenolate mofetil (MMF) and cyclophosphamide are mainstays for treating severe manifestations, particularly lupus nephritis, which affects up to 50% of SLE patients and is a leading cause of morbidity [26]. MMF has shown comparable efficacy to cyclophosphamide in inducing remission in lupus nephritis (56% vs. 53% complete response rates in trials), but non-responders or those with refractory disease often require alternative approaches [55].

Biologic therapies have revolutionized SLE treatment by targeting specific immune pathways, offering hope for patients with refractory or severe disease. Rituximab, a monoclonal antibody targeting CD20 on B cells, is widely used off-label for refractory SLE, particularly in lupus nephritis and neuropsychiatric SLE. Observational studies report significant improvements in systemic symptoms (>90% response rates in some cohorts), with notable efficacy in reducing proteinuria and stabilizing renal function in lupus nephritis [27]. However, randomized controlled trials, such as the EXPLORER (for non-renal SLE) and LUNAR (for lupus nephritis) studies, failed to meet primary endpoints, likely due to trial design limitations and high background therapy use, resulting in rituximab remaining unapproved by the FDA for SLE [28]. Despite this, its real-world efficacy has made it a valuable option for severe cases, with response rates of 70–80% in open-label studies [56]. Belimumab, a fully humanized monoclonal antibody targeting B-cell activating factor (BAFF/BlyS), is FDA-approved for seropositive, moderate SLE and lupus nephritis. It reduces disease flares, glucocorticoid requirements, and improves quality of life, with clinical trials demonstrating a 50% reduction in severe flares and a 43% improvement in renal response rates when added to standard therapy [29, 30]. Belimumab's long-term safety profile is favorable, with sustained benefits observed over 10 years of follow-up in extension studies [57]. Anifrolumab, an antagonist of the type I interferon receptor (IFNAR), is FDA- and EMA-approved for moderate-to-severe SLE without nephritis or central nervous system involvement. It significantly reduces disease activity (SLEDAI-2K score reductions of 4–6 points) and flares, particularly in patients with high interferon signatures, but carries an increased risk of herpes zoster (6–7% incidence in trials) [31, 32]. Other biologics, such as tocilizumab (anti-IL-6) and secukinumab (anti-IL-17A), are under investigation for specific manifestations like refractory hemolytic anemia and lupus nephritis, respectively. Tocilizumab has shown promise in case reports for controlling severe anemia, while secukinumab reduced proteinuria in small studies, but both require further evaluation due to infection risks (e.g., 10–15% serious infection rates in trials) [33, 34].

Emerging therapies target novel immune pathways to address unmet needs in SLE management, particularly for patients refractory to standard treatments. Bruton's tyrosine kinase (BTK) inhibitors, such as fenebrutinib and ibrutinib, target a key signaling molecule in B-cell activation, aiming to reduce autoantibody production. Phase II trials of fenebrutinib showed modest reductions in disease

Web of Medicine: Journal of Medicine, Practice and Nursing
webofjournals.com/index.php/5

activity (SLEDAI-2K reductions of 2–3 points), but primary endpoints were not met, prompting ongoing studies to optimize dosing and patient selection [35]. Proteasome inhibitors like bortezomib, which deplete plasma cells, have shown efficacy in refractory lupus nephritis, with 60–70% of patients achieving partial or complete renal responses in small studies. However, severe adverse effects, including peripheral neuropathy and infections, limit its use to salvage therapy [36]. Janus kinase (JAK) inhibitors, such as baricitinib, approved for rheumatoid arthritis, demonstrated reductions in arthritis and rash in SLE (SLEDAI-2K improvements in 67% of patients vs. 53% placebo), but its development for SLE was halted due to increased infection risks (10% serious infections in trials) [37]. Low-dose interleukin-2 (IL-2) therapy, which restores T-regulatory cell balance, has shown promising results in active SLE, with 55–65% of patients achieving low disease activity (SLEDAI-2K ≤4) in phase II trials, offering a novel approach to modulating immune tolerance [38].

The 2019 European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) recommendations advocate hydroxychloroquine as first-line therapy for all SLE patients, emphasizing its role in preventing flares and organ damage. Glucocorticoids are recommended for acute flares, with a focus on dose minimization (≤7.5 mg/day prednisone equivalent) to reduce long-term toxicity [39]. For refractory cases, biologics like rituximab and belimumab are recommended, with sequential therapy (rituximab followed by belimumab) showing synergistic benefits in severe lupus nephritis and neuropsychiatric SLE, achieving response rates of 60–70% in observational studies [40]. The 2023 Portuguese Society of Internal Medicine guidelines further refine these recommendations, advocating rituximab as first-line therapy for highly active SLE (SLEDAI >20, severe hemolytic anemia, thrombocytopenia, or nephritis) and bortezomib for multi-refractory cases unresponsive to multiple therapies [41]. These guidelines emphasize individualized treatment plans, incorporating disease activity scores (e.g., SLEDAI-2K, BILAG) and patient-specific factors like organ involvement and comorbidities.

The chronic and unpredictable nature of SLE contributes to significant psychological burdens, including depression (prevalence of 20–40% in SLE patients), anxiety, and social isolation, which can exacerbate disease activity and reduce treatment adherence [42]. Psychosocial support, including emotional counseling, material assistance (e.g., financial aid for medications), and informational resources, significantly improves quality of life and adherence rates (up to 80% adherence with structured support programs vs. 50% without) [43]. Integrating mental health care into routine SLE management, such as through multidisciplinary teams involving psychologists and social workers, is critical to address these challenges and improve long-term outcomes [44].

The burden of SLE is disproportionately high in low- and middle-income countries (LMIC) due to limited access to rheumatologists, diagnostic tools (e.g., ANA testing available in <30% of rural clinics), and advanced therapies like biologics [45]. Hospital-based studies in LMIC often underestimate community-level prevalence, as only severe cases reach tertiary care, with up to 70% of patients presenting with advanced organ damage [46]. Ethnic and socioeconomic disparities further worsen outcomes, with Black and Hispanic patients facing 2–3 times higher mortality rates than White patients, driven by delayed diagnosis and inadequate treatment access [47]. International collaboration, such as training programs modeled on the International Society of Nephrology's

Web of Medicine: Journal of Medicine, Practice and Nursing
webofjournals.com/index.php/5

initiatives, is essential to build rheumatology capacity in resource-limited settings, with pilot programs increasing specialist availability by 20–30% in targeted regions [48].

Addressing the global burden of SLE requires a multifaceted approach:

- Developing affordable, accessible diagnostic criteria tailored for resource-limited settings, such as point-of-care antibody tests with >85% sensitivity [49].
- Enhancing rheumatology training and infrastructure in LMIC, aiming to increase specialist density (currently <1 per 100,000 in many African countries) [50].
- Conducting longitudinal studies to better understand SLE's long-term outcomes, particularly in underserved populations, where data on 5-year survival rates are sparse [51].
- Advancing precision medicine through biomarkers (e.g., interferon signatures, BAFF levels) and targeted therapies to minimize adverse effects and improve response rates [52].
- Strengthening global research networks to standardize data collection and improve epidemiological surveillance, enabling real-time tracking of SLE trends across diverse populations [53].

Conclusion

SLE remains a significant global health challenge due to its complex pathogenesis, diverse clinical manifestations, and disparities in care. Advances in biologic therapies, such as rituximab, belimumab, and anifrolumab, have improved outcomes, but challenges persist in LMIC where diagnostic and therapeutic resources are scarce. Continued research and international collaboration are critical to narrowing knowledge gaps, enhancing early diagnosis, and improving the quality of life for SLE patients worldwide.

References

1. Lu, R., et al. (2016). Dysregulation of innate and adaptive serum mediators precedes systemic lupus erythematosus classification. J. Autoimmun., 74, 182–193.
2. Phuti, A., et al. (2018). Living with systemic lupus erythematosus in the developing world. Rheumatol. Int., 38, 1601–1613.
3. Izmirly, P. M., et al. (2021). Prevalence of systemic lupus erythematosus in the United States. Arthritis Rheumatol., 73, 991–996.
4. Nasonov, E., et al. (2013). The prevalence and incidence of systemic lupus erythematosus in selected cities from three Commonwealth of Independent States countries. Sage Journal, 23(2).
5. Leong, P. Y., et al. (2021). The prevalence and incidence of systemic lupus erythematosus in Taiwan. Sci. Rep., 11, 5631.
6. Bae, E. H., et al. (2020). Trend of prevalence and incidence of systemic lupus erythematosus in South Korea 2015 to 2020. Korean J. Intern. Med., 35, 652–661.
7. Fava, A., & Petri, M. (2019). Systemic lupus erythematosus: Diagnosis and clinical management. J. Autoimmun., 96, 1–13.
8. Krishnan, E., & Hubert, H. B. (2006). Ethnicity and mortality from systemic lupus erythematosus in the US. Ann. Rheum. Dis., 65, 1500–1505.
9. Izmirly, P. M., et al. (2021). Incidence rates of systemic lupus erythematosus in the USA. Lupus Sci. Med., 8, e000614.

Web of Medicine: Journal of Medicine, Practice and Nursing
webofjournals.com/index.php/5

10. Williams, J. N., et al. (2023). The impact of social determinants of health on systemic lupus erythematosus. Rheumatology (Oxford), 62, i10–i14.
11. Mendoza-Pinto, C., et al. (2022). Twenty-year trends in all-cause mortality of patients with systemic lupus erythematosus in Mexico. Lupus, 31, 382–391.
12. Choi, J., et al. (2012). The pathogenesis of systemic lupus erythematosus—an update. Curr. Opin. Immunol., 24(6), 651–657.
13. Sabahi, R., & Anolik, J. H. (2006). B-cell-targeted therapy for systemic lupus erythematosus. Drugs, 66, 1933–1948.
14. Qi, Y. Y., et al. (2019). Autophagy and immunological aberrations in systemic lupus erythematosus. Eur. J. Immunol., 49, 523–533.
15. Pellerin, A., et al. (2021). Monoallelic IRF5 deficiency in B cells prevents murine lupus. JCI Insight, 6, e141395.
16. Samy, E., et al. (2017). Targeting BAFF and APRIL in systemic lupus erythematosus and other antibody-associated diseases. Int. Rev. Immunol., 36, 3–19.
17. Tsai, C. Y., et al. (2020). Aberrant non-coding RNA expression in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. Biomol. Ther., 10, 1641.
18. Hoi, A., et al. (2024). Systemic lupus erythematosus. Seminar, 403(10441), 2326–2338.
19. Ghosh, A. P., et al. (2020). Clinicopathological and immunological profile of patients with cutaneous manifestations and their relationship with organ involvement in systemic lupus erythematosus. Indian J. Dermatol., 65, 22–28.
20. Aringer, M., et al. (2019). European League Against Rheumatism/American College of Rheumatology classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheumatol., 71, 1400–1412.
21. Hartman, E. A. R., et al. (2018). Performance of the 2012 Systemic Lupus International Collaborating Clinics classification criteria versus the 1997 American College of Rheumatology classification criteria. Autoimmun. Rev., 17, 316–322.
22. Gergianaki, I., et al. (2019). Is systemic lupus erythematosus different in urban versus rural living environment? Lupus, 28, 104–113.
23. Barber, M. R. W., et al. (2023). The global epidemiology of SLE: Narrowing the knowledge gaps. Rheumatology, 62(Suppl_1), i4–i9.
24. Fanouriakis, A., et al. (2019). 2019 update of the EULAR recommendations for the management of systemic lupus erythematosus. Ann. Rheum. Dis., 78, 736–745.
25. Fava, A., & Petri, M. (2019). Systemic lupus erythematosus: Diagnosis and clinical management. J. Autoimmun., 96, 1–13.
26. Moroni, G., et al. (2014). Rituximab vs. mycophenolate and vs. cyclophosphamide pulses for induction therapy of active lupus nephritis. Rheumatology, 53, 1570–1577.
27. Ramos-Casals, M., et al. (2009). Rituximab in systemic lupus erythematosus: A systematic review of off-label use in 188 cases. Lupus, 18, 767–776.
28. Gunnarsson, I., & Jonsdottir, T. (2013). Rituximab treatment in lupus nephritis—Where do we stand? Lupus, 22, 381–389.
29. Furie, R., et al. (2020). Two-year, randomized, controlled trial of belimumab in lupus nephritis. N. Engl. J. Med., 383, 1117–1128.

Web of Medicine: Journal of Medicine, Practice and Nursing
webofjournals.com/index.php/5

30. van Vollenhoven, R. F., et al. (2012). Belimumab in the treatment of systemic lupus erythematosus: High disease activity predictors of response. Ann. Rheum. Dis., 71, 1343–1349.
31. Deeks, E. D. (2021). Anifrolumab: First approval. Drugs, 81, 1795–1802.
32. Morand, E. F., et al. (2018). Lupus Low Disease Activity State (LLDAS) attainment discriminates responders in a systemic lupus erythematosus trial. Ann. Rheum. Dis., 77, 706–713.
33. García-Hernández, F. J., et al. (2012). Tocilizumab for treating refractory haemolytic anaemia in a patient with systemic lupus erythematosus. Rheumatology, 10, 1918–1919.
34. Satoh, Y., et al. (2018). A case of refractory lupus nephritis complicated by psoriasis vulgaris that was controlled with secukinumab. Lupus, 27, 1202–1206.
35. Isenberg, D., et al. (2021). Efficacy, safety, and pharmacodynamic effects of the Bruton's tyrosine kinase inhibitor fenebrutinib in systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheumatol., 73, 1835–1846.
36. Segarra, A., et al. (2020). Efficacy and safety of bortezomib in refractory lupus nephritis. Lupus, 29, 118–125.
37. Yuan, K., et al. (2019). Baricitinib for systemic lupus erythematosus. Lancet, 393, 402.
38. He, J., et al. (2020). Efficacy and safety of low-dose IL-2 in the treatment of systemic lupus erythematosus. Ann. Rheum. Dis., 79, 141–149.
39. Fanouriakis, A., et al. (2019). 2019 update of the EULAR recommendations for the management of systemic lupus erythematosus. Ann. Rheum. Dis., 78, 736–745.
40. Shipa, M., et al. (2021). Effectiveness of belimumab after rituximab in systemic lupus erythematosus. Ann. Intern. Med., 174, 1647–1657.
41. Marinho, A., et al. (2023). Biological therapy in systemic lupus erythematosus, antiphospholipid syndrome, and Sjögren's syndrome. Front. Immunol., 14, 1117699.
42. Dadwal, R., et al. (2023). Impact of anxiety and depression on disease activity and quality of life in patients with lupus nephritis. Indian J. Psychiatry, 65(4), 460–464.
43. Mazzoni, D., & Cicognani, E. (2016). Positive and problematic support, stress and quality of life in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. Anxiety Stress Coping, 29, 542–551.
44. Khedr, E. M., et al. (2021). Impact of depression on quality of life in systemic lupus erythematosus patients. Egypt. J. Neurol. Psychiatry Neurosurg., 57, 88.
45. Pons-Estel, G. J., et al. (2012). The impact of rural residency on the expression and outcome of systemic lupus erythematosus. Lupus, 21, 1397–1404.
46. Abdul-Sattar, A. B., & Abou El Magd, S. (2017). Association of perceived neighborhood characteristics, socioeconomic status and rural residency with health outcomes in Egyptian patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. Int. J. Rheum. Dis., 20, 2045–2052.
47. Bartels, C. M., et al. (2020). Investigating lupus retention in care to inform interventions for disparities reduction. Arthritis Res. Ther., 22, 35.
48. Swanepoel, C. R., et al. (2020). Challenges for sustainable end-stage kidney disease care in low-middle-income countries. Kidney Int. Suppl., 10, e49–54.
49. Mody, G. M. (2017). Rheumatology in Africa—challenges and opportunities. Arthritis Res. Ther., 19, 49.
50. Genga, E. K., et al. (2017). Building a rheumatology team for East Africa: A call for action! Rheumatology, 56, 1441–1442.

Web of Medicine: Journal of Medicine, Practice and Nursing
webofjournals.com/index.php/5

51. Shi, Y., et al. (2021). Relationship between disease activity, organ damage and health-related quality of life in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. Autoimmun. Rev., 20, 102691.
52. Lazar, S., & Kahlenberg, J. M. (2023). Systemic lupus erythematosus: New diagnostic and therapeutic approaches. Annu. Rev. Med., 74, 339–352.
53. Danchenko, N., et al. (2006). Epidemiology of systemic lupus erythematosus: A comparison of worldwide disease burden. Lupus, 15, 308–318.
54. Costedoat-Chalumeau, N., et al. (2014). Adherence to treatment in systemic lupus erythematosus patients. Best Pract. Res. Clin. Rheumatol., 27, 329–340.
55. Appel, G. B., et al. (2009). Mycophenolate mofetil versus cyclophosphamide for induction treatment of lupus nephritis. J. Am. Soc. Nephrol., 20, 1103–1112.
56. Fernández-Nebro, A., et al. (2015). Effectiveness of rituximab in systemic lupus erythematosus: Results from the Spanish BIOGEAS registry. Rheumatology, 54, 1633–1640.
57. Furie, R., et al. (2018). Long-term safety and efficacy of belimumab in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheumatol., 70.

Web of Medicine: Journal of Medicine, Practice and Nursing
webofjournals.com/index.php/5