

RITUXIMAB IN MEMBRANOUS NEPHROPATHY: PATHOPHYSIOLOGY, CLINICAL EFFICACY AND EMERGING STRATEGIES FOR OPTIMIZED THERAPY

Spandana A.*, Amith M. N.

Department of Pharmacy Practice, Sarada Vilas College of Pharmacy, Mysore, Karnataka, India.



*Corresponding Author: Spandana A.

Department of Pharmacy Practice, Sarada Vilas College of Pharmacy, Mysore, Karnataka, India.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18875015>

How to cite this Article: Spandana A.*, Amith M. N. (2026). Rituximab In Membranous Nephropathy: Pathophysiology, Clinical Efficacy And Emerging Strategies For Optimized Therapy. European Journal of Pharmaceutical and Medical Research, 13(3), 330-333.

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.



Article Received on 05/02/2026

Article Revised on 25/02/2026

Article Published on 01/03/2026

ABSTRACT

Membranous nephropathy (MN) stands as the principal cause of primary nephrotic syndrome in adults globally, characterized by autoimmune-mediated podocyte injury primarily driven by autoantibodies against the M-type phospholipase A2 receptor (PLA2R). The advent of rituximab, a chimeric anti-CD20 monoclonal antibody that depletes B cells, has revolutionized MN treatment paradigms by targeting the immunologic basis of disease. Multiple randomized controlled trials and meta-analyses have demonstrated rituximab's efficacy in inducing durable remissions with a superior safety profile compared to traditional immunosuppressive regimens such as calcineurin inhibitors and alkylating agents. Despite the wide adoption of rituximab, optimal dosing strategies remain a subject of debate, with emerging data supporting individualized regimens guided by pharmacokinetics and immune-monitoring. This comprehensive review synthesizes current understanding of MN pathogenesis, the scientific rationale for B cell-targeted therapy, critical evaluation of clinical trial data on rituximab, dosing protocols, safety profiles, and future directions aimed at personalized medicine. The review underscores rituximab's central role in MN management and highlights key challenges and opportunities for optimizing patient outcomes in this complex autoimmune glomerulopathy.

KEYWORDS: Membranous nephropathy, rituximab, PLA2R, B cell depletion, immuno-monitoring, dosing optimization.

1. INTRODUCTION

Membranous nephropathy (MN) is a chronic autoimmune glomerular disease and the leading histopathologic cause of primary nephrotic syndrome in adults worldwide.^[1] The disease is characterized by subepithelial immune complex deposition along the glomerular basement membrane (GBM), resulting in podocyte injury, proteinuria, and progressive renal impairment if untreated. The epidemiology of MN reveals a predilection for males and individuals of Caucasian descent, with incidence estimates ranging from 1 to 10 cases per 100,000 person-years depending on geographic and ethnic factors.^[1,2]

Historically, MN was diagnosed solely based on renal biopsy findings, with limited understanding of its immunologic underpinnings. The landmark discovery of the M-type phospholipase A2 receptor (PLA2R) as the

major target antigen in approximately 70–80% of primary MN cases has transformed the disease paradigm.^[3,4] This breakthrough delineated MN as an antigen-specific autoimmune glomerulopathy, enabling serologic diagnosis and monitoring through PLA2R autoantibody detection.

The pathogenesis involves autoantibodies binding to podocyte-expressed antigens, forming in situ immune complexes that activate complement pathways, leading to podocyte injury and proteinuria.^[3] This understanding has paved the way for targeted immunotherapies aimed at B cells—the source of pathogenic autoantibodies.

Rituximab, a chimeric monoclonal antibody targeting the CD20 antigen on B cells, has emerged as a potent immunosuppressive agent in MN treatment.^[1,2] By depleting circulating and tissue B cells, rituximab

reduces autoantibody production, attenuates immune complex deposition, and promotes clinical remission. Its introduction has challenged the historical reliance on alkylating agents and calcineurin inhibitors, offering improved safety and tolerability profiles.

This review integrates the current evidence on MN pathophysiology, the rationale for B cell–targeted therapy, clinical trial data on rituximab, dosing considerations, safety, and outstanding controversies. We emphasize recent advances in pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic modeling and immune-monitoring that support individualized therapy, heralding a new era in MN management.

2. Pathophysiology of Membranous Nephropathy and Rationale for B Cell–Targeted Therapy

The pathophysiology of MN is rooted in autoimmune mechanisms targeting podocyte antigens. The majority of primary MN cases involve autoantibodies against PLA2R, a transmembrane receptor expressed on podocytes.^[3] Binding of PLA2R autoantibodies leads to the formation of subepithelial immune deposits visible on electron microscopy and immunofluorescence. These deposits activate the complement cascade, particularly the membrane attack complex (C5b-9), resulting in podocyte injury, effacement of foot processes, and proteinuria.^[3,4]

Beyond PLA2R, other podocyte antigens have been identified in MN subsets, including thrombospondin type-1 domain-containing 7A (THSD7A), neural epidermal growth factor-like 1 protein (NELL-1), and semaphorin 3B (Sema3B). These antigens are linked to different clinical phenotypes and secondary causes such as malignancies, autoimmune diseases, or infections. For instance, NELL-1-associated MN often correlates with malignancy, while exostosin accumulation is linked to autoimmune connective tissue diseases.^[4]

Immunoglobulin subclass profiling reveals IgG4 predominance in PLA2R and THSD7A-associated MN, consistent with a non-inflammatory immune response. Conversely, NELL-1 and Sema3B MN demonstrate IgG1 dominance, frequently indicating secondary disease.^[4]

Crucially, circulating PLA2R autoantibody titers correlate with disease activity and precede changes in proteinuria by several months, providing a valuable biomarker for early diagnosis and monitoring.^[3] This temporal dissociation reflects the persistence of immune deposits despite declining antibody levels and supports early serologic intervention strategies.

The central role of B cells in MN pathogenesis underlies the rationale for B cell–targeted therapies. B cells participate in the autoimmune cascade as antibody producers and antigen-presenting cells, sustaining T cell activation. Rituximab targets CD20 expressed on mature B cells, inducing depletion through antibody-dependent

cellular cytotoxicity, complement-dependent cytotoxicity, and apoptosis.^[1,3]

B cell depletion reduces pathogenic autoantibody titers, disrupts immune complex formation, and allows podocyte recovery, resulting in clinical remission. This mechanistic insight distinguishes rituximab from calcineurin inhibitors, which target podocytes directly without addressing the underlying autoimmune cause.^[2]

3. Clinical Evidence Supporting Rituximab in Membranous Nephropathy

Rituximab's clinical utility in MN has been evaluated through multiple randomized controlled trials (RCTs), observational cohorts, and meta-analyses, collectively establishing its efficacy and safety.

3.1 GEMRITUX Trial

The GEMRITUX trial was a pioneering RCT assessing rituximab in MN patients with persistent nephrotic-range proteinuria despite maximal supportive care.^[5] Patients randomized to rituximab (two 375 mg/m² infusions) plus no immunosuppressive antiproteinuric treatment achieved significantly higher remission rates (64.9%) at median 17 months compared to supportive care alone (34.2%). PLA2R antibody depletion at 3 months strongly predicted remission. The trial demonstrated rituximab's ability to induce durable remissions with a safety profile comparable to controls.

3.2 MENTOR Trial

MENTOR compared rituximab (1 g on days 1 and 15, with optional retreatment) against cyclosporine A in PLA2R-positive MN.^[2,6] At 24 months, rituximab-treated patients exhibited a 60% remission rate versus 20% in the cyclosporine group, with 35% achieving complete remission versus none in the control arm. Notably, cyclosporine-treated patients experienced high relapse rates post-cessation, whereas rituximab-induced remissions were sustained. Serious adverse events were fewer with rituximab (17% vs. 31%), reinforcing its improved safety.

3.3 STARMEN Trial

The STARMEN trial evaluated a sequential regimen of tacrolimus for 6 months followed by a single rituximab dose against the classical cyclical protocol combining methylprednisolone and cyclophosphamide.^[7] At 24 months, the cyclical regimen yielded superior complete and partial remission rates (84% vs. 58%) and complete remission (60% vs. 26%). Although rituximab-containing regimens showed better tolerability, alkylating agent-based therapy-maintained superiority in very high-risk patients, indicating that rituximab may be preferable for moderate-risk cases.

3.4 Meta-analyses and Observational Studies

Multiple meta-analyses incorporating RCTs and cohort studies confirm that approximately two-thirds of MN patients treated with rituximab achieve remission, with

lower relapse rates than calcineurin inhibitors and fewer serious adverse events compared to cyclophosphamide-based regimens.^[8,9,12] These data have solidified rituximab's role as a first-line agent in contemporary MN treatment guidelines.^[9]

4. DOSING STRATEGIES AND PHARMACOKINETIC CONSIDERATIONS

Rituximab dosing in MN has evolved with clinical experience and pharmacologic insights, yielding multiple regimens with differing efficacy, safety, and cost profiles.

4.1 Standard Dosing Regimens

The original protocol extrapolated from lymphoma treatment involves four weekly infusions of 375 mg/m². This regimen achieves remission rates around 60–70% at 12 to 24 months and remains widely used.^[9,10]

4.2 Low-Dose and Fractionated Protocols

Low-dose regimens employing one or two 375 mg/m² doses have demonstrated comparable efficacy in selected cohorts, offering reduced cost and potential safety benefits.^[10] The “Nice protocol,” consisting of two 1 g doses administered two weeks apart, has shown faster time to remission, higher serum rituximab concentrations, more profound B cell depletion, and greater PLA2R antibody reduction at six months compared to standard dosing.^[11]

4.3 Pharmacokinetic and Pharmacodynamic Insights

Population pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic (PK/PD) modeling indicates that maintaining sustained rituximab serum levels is more critical than achieving high peak concentrations for durable B cell depletion and remission.^[12] This supports fractionated or mini-dose regimens tailored to individual patient kinetics. However, very low-frequency mini dosing (e.g., 100 mg every two months) fails to maintain adequate B cell depletion and is not recommended for MN.

4.4 Immuno-monitoring and Retreatment

Clinical remission typically lags weeks to months behind initial B cell depletion. Monitoring PLA2R antibody titers alongside peripheral B cell counts enables personalized retreatment, with re-dosing considered upon rising antibody levels or B cell reconstitution to prevent relapse.^[8,12] This approach reduces cumulative rituximab exposure while maintaining efficacy.

5. RITUXIMAB IN SPECIAL POPULATIONS AND SAFETY PROFILE

5.1 Patients with Reduced Kidney Function

MN patients with advanced kidney disease (eGFR <30 ml/min/1.73 m²) pose treatment challenges due to renal scarring and blunted immunosuppressive responses. Limited data from small cohorts suggest rituximab may decrease PLA2R antibody levels and proteinuria in some cases, though outcomes are variable.^[13] Histologic features such as tubular atrophy and interstitial fibrosis

may predict poor response and guide treatment decisions.

A randomized trial comparing cyclical therapy with cyclosporine and supportive care in patients with declining renal function showed that intense immunosuppression reduced progression but at the cost of increased serious adverse events. Data on rituximab in this group are sparse but growing, warranting cautious application and close monitoring.

5.2 Safety Profile

Rituximab displays a favorable safety profile relative to alkylating agents and calcineurin inhibitors. Common adverse events include infusion-related reactions and infections, with late-onset neutropenia reported infrequently.^[1,8] Long-term follow-up has not revealed increased malignancy or cardiovascular mortality, but persistent hypogammaglobulinemia and prolonged B cell depletion necessitate ongoing vigilance, especially during infectious outbreaks or when live vaccines are considered.^[1,14]

6. CURRENT CONTROVERSIES AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Despite compelling evidence, several controversies remain

- **Optimal First-Line Therapy:** Whether rituximab should universally replace alkylating agent-based regimens in all but the highest-risk MN patients remain debated. The STARMEN trial suggests classical cyclical therapy retains superiority in very high-risk cases.^[7]
- **Personalized Dosing:** Emerging PK/PD models and immunomonitoring strategies for rituximab level, PLA2R antibody titer, and B cell count provide a framework for individualized treatment. Prospective validation of these approaches is urgently needed.^[8,12]
- **Combination Therapies Trials** exploring rituximab combined with calcineurin inhibitors or low-dose steroids aim to improve early remission rates without excess toxicity, though long-term outcomes and cost-effectiveness require further study.^[7]

Future research should focus on stratifying patients by baseline PLA2R antibody titer, proteinuria, kidney function, and immunologic parameters to refine treatment algorithms.

7. CONCLUSION

Rituximab has become a cornerstone in the treatment of PLA2R-positive membranous nephropathy, offering durable remission with a more favorable safety profile than traditional immunosuppressive regimens. Multiple dosing strategies demonstrate efficacy, with fractionated protocols potentially accelerating remission in selected patients. Advances in pharmacokinetic modeling and immune-monitoring herald the era of personalized medicine in MN, promising optimized patient outcomes. Continued research is essential to validate individualized

treatment protocols and expand rituximab's therapeutic potential in diverse patient populations.

REFERENCES

1. Ronco P, Debiec H. Rituximab in membranous nephropathy. *N Engl J Med.*, 2021; 384(10): 937–48.
2. Ruggenti P, et al. Rituximab or cyclosporine in membranous nephropathy. *N Engl J Med.*, 2019; 381(1): 42–53.
3. Debiec H, et al. Rituximab in membranous nephropathy: a review. *Front Immunol*, 2022; 13: 859419.
4. *Indian Journal of Nephrology*. Optimizing rituximab dosing in membranous nephropathy: a continuing debate, 2025.
5. Gauckler P, et al. Rituximab in membranous nephropathy. *Kidney Int Rep.*, 2021; 6(4): 881-93.
6. Zhang Y, et al. Efficacy and safety of rituximab for membranous nephropathy in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front Nephrol*, 2025; 1548679.
7. Zhang L, et al. Different dosage regimens of rituximab in primary membranous nephropathy. *Int J Nephrol Renovasc Dis.*, 2024.
8. Wang X, et al. Dosing optimization of rituximab for primary membranous nephropathy by population pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic study. *Front Pharmacol*, 2024; 15: 1197651.
9. KDIGO. Rituximab dose optimization in membranous nephropathy. *Clin Kidney J.*, 2019; 12(5): 629–37.
10. Liu Z, et al. Efficacy and safety of rituximab in the treatment of membranous nephropathy: a meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*, 2020; 99(17): e19880.
11. Seitz-Polski B, et al. High-dose rituximab and early remission in PLA2R1-related membranous nephropathy. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*, 2019; 14(8): 1173-82.
12. Mao B, Han J, Wang J, Ye K. Efficacy and safety of rituximab for membranous nephropathy in adults: a meta-analysis of RCTs. *Front Nephrol*, Apr. 29, 2025; 5: 1548679.
13. Guo Y, et al. Rituximab in patients with membranous nephropathy and kidney insufficiency. *Front Pharmacol*, 2022; 13: 1002117.
14. Bharati J, Ramachandran R. Optimizing rituximab dosing in membranous nephropathy: A continuing debate. *Indian J Nephrol*, 2025; 35(587): 587–8.