Pharmacogenetic Approaches to Personalized SSRI Therapy

Aadi Balsaraf

Abstract

A complicated interaction of pharmacokinetic (PK), pharmacodynamic (PD), genetic, and epigenetic factors influences inter-individual variability in response to selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs). This review summarizes recent findings in antidepressant pharmacogenetics, emphasizing the functions of important pharmacodynamic loci (SLC6A4, HTR2A, BDNF, ABCB1) and metabolic genes (CYP2C19, CYP2D6) in regulating drug exposure, efficacy, and tolerability. Evidence from observational studies and previous reports suggests that pharmacogenomic-guided therapy may improve treatment outcomes, especially for individuals with abnormal metabolic profiles or treatment resistance. Major obstacles to clinical translation include small effect sizes, population-specific heterogeneity, retrospective studies, and uneven integration with therapeutic drug monitoring. Additional implementation barriers include workflow integration, patient access, cost, and clinical education. To optimize the clinical impact of precision psychiatry, future research should focus on prospective, multicenter trials with diverse populations, standardized clinical decision frameworks, and integration of polygenic, epigenetic, and environmental data. This review investigates whether integrating pharmacogenomic information into SSRI prescribing can enhance treatment outcomes and reduce adverse events.

DOI: 10.5195/pur.2026.192

Introduction

Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) are widely used in the treatment of depression, yet individuals can differ considerably in their response to these medications. While some patients experience substantial improvement in depressive symptoms, others may have an inadequate response, require changes in medication or dosage, or experience adverse effects that limit treatment. This inter-individual variability creates an important challenge in antidepressant therapy because the same medication and dose may produce substantially different clinical outcomes among patients. Identifying factors that contribute to these differences may therefore help improve antidepressant selection, dosing, and overall treatment outcomes. Variability in SSRI response is multifactorial and may result from differences in pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic processes, along with epigenetic and environmental influences. Pharmacokinetic variation can affect how an individual metabolizes and is exposed to antidepressant, whereas pharmacodynamic variation can influence how the medication interacts with transporters, receptors, and other biological targets involved in serotonergic signaling. Genetic variation in metabolic enzymes such as CYP2C19 and CYP2D6 may contribute to differences in drug exposure and tolerability, while variation in genes such as SLC6A4 may influence serotonin transport and treatment response. Additional factors, including epigenetic regulation, ancestry, environmental influences, concomitant medications, and other clinical characteristics, further demonstrate that antidepressant response cannot be explained by a single genetic marker or biological mechanism.

Pharmacogenomics offers a potential approach for better understanding this variability and applying genetic information to individualized antidepressant therapy. By identifying genetic variants associated with drug metabolism, exposure, efficacy, or adverse effects, pharmacogenomic testing may provide additional information that can be considered when selecting an antidepressant or determining an appropriate dose. However, translating these associations into routine clinical practice remains challenging. Findings across studies have not always been consistently replicated, genetic effects may differ among populations, and methodological differences in study design and outcome measurement can complicate interpretation. These limitations have contributed to continued uncertainty regarding how pharmacogenomic information should be integrated with other clinical factors when making treatment decisions. This review examines the genetic basis of inter-individual variability in SSRI response and considers how pharmacogenomic information may contribute to individualized antidepressant therapy. Attention is given to genetic variation affecting pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic pathways, including genes involved in drug metabolism, serotonin transport, receptor activity, and blood–brain barrier trafficking, as well as the additional influence of epigenetic factors. The review also evaluates evidence supporting the clinical application of pharmacogenetic testing, considers methodological and translational limitations that currently restrict its utility, and examines approaches for improving the integration of genetic, epigenetic, and clinical information. Together, these areas provide a framework for understanding both the current evidence supporting pharmacogenomics in SSRI treatment and the remaining challenges that must be addressed before these approaches can be more consistently incorporated into individualized antidepressant selection and dosing.

Literature Selection

Literature for this review was identified primarily through searches of PubMed, supplemented by searches of relevant peer-reviewed journals. Search terms focused broadly on selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), pharmacogenetics and pharmacogenomics, antidepressant response, and genes involved in pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic variability, including CYP2C19, CYP2D6, SLC6A4, HTR2A, BDNF, and ABCB1. Additional studies were identified by reviewing the reference lists of relevant articles and literature reviews to locate research that contributed to the understanding of genetic variability, clinical application, and barriers to pharmacogenomic-guided antidepressant treatment. Studies were selected based on their relevance to SSRI response, pharmacogenomic testing, treatment efficacy or tolerability, and clinical implementation. Attention was given to recent literature while retaining older studies when they provided relevant foundational evidence. The selected literature included systematic and narrative reviews, observational studies, randomized clinical trials, case series, and case reports to provide both mechanistic and clinical perspectives on pharmacogenomic-guided SSRI treatment.

Genetic Basis of Variability in SSRI Response

Growing evidence suggests that inter-individual variability in SSRI response results from both pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic genetic diversity with epigenetic modulation providing an additional layer of regulation. While targeted analyses of high-impact loci like SLC6A4 (Sreeja et al., 2024) show how transporter expression alters central serotonin availability, the literature also distinguishes the effects of metabolic enzymes from receptor- and transporter-mediated effects (Radosavljevic et al., 2023; Porcelli et al., 2011). Extensive population genotyping of metabolic genes like CYP2C19 further illustrates how clearance rates directly affect plasma medication concentrations and dose requirements (Campos et al., 2022). Collectively, these investigations show how enzyme activity, receptor sensitivity, and blood–brain barrier trafficking contribute to differences in drug exposure and clinical efficacy. They also highlight ongoing methodological issues that hinder direct clinical adoption such as population-specific genetic effects, underpowered trials, varied clinical outcomes, and low reproducibility. The following synthesis examines these findings, their limitations, and their implications for genotype-guided SSRI optimization.

Radosavljevic et al. frame the broader conceptual landscape by showing that antidepressant outcomes are jointly determined by pharmacokinetic variability (CYP2D6/CYP2C19) and pharmacodynamic variability (monoamine-related targets like SLC6A4, MAO, and COMT), while pharmacoepigenetic mechanisms like DNA methylation further modulate response. Because ultrarapid metabolizers run the risk of underexposure and poor metabolizers run the risk of toxicity, the authors argue against single-marker prediction and in favor of multifactorial models that include genetic and environmental biology. Sreeja et al. highlights ethnic heterogeneity and the need for more research on non-promoter polymorphisms (STin2, I425V). Their review focuses on the serotonin transporter SLC6A4 and summarizes the consistent evidence, particularly in Caucasian cohorts, that 5-HTTLPR L/L carriers tend to have greater serotonin transporter (SERT) expression and better SSRI response, while S-allele

carriers show slower response and more adverse drug reactions (ADRs). While ABCB1 (P-glycoprotein) variants affect central nervous system (CNS) penetration, Porcelli et al. examined 226 studies and identified CYP2D6 and CYP2C19 as the most reliable metabolic predictors of exposure and adverse events. They also list pharmacodynamic candidates (5-HTT, BDNF, TPH, COMT, MAOA, and serotonin receptors) that associate with response but have replication failures. Campos et al. provide large-sample empirical data from 9,531 Australians, among whom CYP2C19 intermediate metabolizers reported more side effects (particularly for sertraline), rapid metabolizers demonstrated greater tolerability, and poor metabolizers reported slightly higher efficacy. These patterns were in line with Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium (CPIC) expectations, but retrospective self-reporting, missing dosage and serum-level data, the predominantly European ancestry of the sample, and a lack of multiple-test significance limited the findings.

These studies provide different forms of evidence supporting a multilayer model of SSRI response while also identifying methodological limitations that restrict clinical translation. Sreeja et al. provides mechanistic depth for a single high-impact pharmacodynamic locus (SLC6A4), while Campos et al. provide population-level evidence for a canonical metabolic locus (CYP2C19). Radosavljevic et al. and Porcelli et al. further support a model that incorporates metabolic activity, target biology, and environmental influences. While pharmacodynamic variations more accurately predict treatment response and side-effect patterns mediated at the receptor/transporter level, all four highlight how metabolic genotype influences plasma exposure and side-effect risk. Porcelli et al. emphasizes the need for multi-marker, combinatorial testing, which is consistent with commercial multi-gene panels and criticism of single-biomarker models; however, poor replication and modest effect sizes continue to restrict immediate clinical utility. Campos et al.'s empirical work also supports the expected association between slower metabolism and increased side effects while highlighting practical challenges such as retrospective self-reporting, absent serum pharmacokinetics, phenoconversion from co-medication, and the broad therapeutic windows of many SSRIs that may impede detectable efficacy differences.

The studies also differ in their populations, outcome measures, and ability to account for potential confounders. Porcelli et al. and Radosavljevic et al. caution that population stratification and heterogeneity in outcome measures hinder replication, while Sreeja et al. reports relatively consistent 5-HTTLPR effects in Caucasian cohorts but observes weaker or absent correlations in some Asian samples, emphasizing allele-frequency and gene-environment interactions. Although most connections cannot withstand strict correction, Campos et al.'s large sample size provides statistical power to identify modest effects, but these effects remain small and susceptible to unmeasured confounders such as dose, adherence, and concurrent inhibitors or inducers. While genotyping identifies risk and suggests alternative agents (SLC6A4-guided choices) or dose or drug switches (CYP2C19/CYP2D6), few studies translate genotype into clinical decision trees or standardized, prospectively validated dosing algorithms. Porcelli et al. specifically mentions the translation gap and even suggests gene-editing as a radical solution for structural metabolic limitations.

The available evidence supports a consistent conclusion. SSRI tolerability and efficacy variance can be partially explained by biologically plausible and partially replicated signals obtained from the genotyping of metabolic genes (CYP2C19, CYP2D6) and important pharmacodynamic loci (SLC6A4,

ABCB1, and receptor/BDNF variants). However, the immediate clinical power of single-gene tests is limited by retrospective designs, modest per-variant effect sizes, lack of serum PK confirmation, and heterogeneity in allele effects across ancestries. To translate observed genotype–phenotype trends into validated clinical protocols, prospective, randomized trials stratifying dosing or drug choice by genotype with concurrent pharmacokinetic monitoring are necessary. The literature therefore supports two implications for future clinical application. Combinatorial, multi-gene panels and integrated models incorporating genotype, epigenetic factors, and clinical covariates may provide greater clinical utility than single-marker approaches. Prospective, randomized trials that stratify dosing or drug choice by genotype and incorporate concurrent pharmacokinetic monitoring are also required to convert observed genotype–phenotype trends into validated clinical protocols.

Overall, the available research shows that pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic genetic variation, along with additional regulation from epigenetic and environmental variables, contributes to inter-individual variability in SSRI response. Although SLC6A4, CYP2C19, CYP2D6, and receptor/transport genes such as HTR2A and ABCB1 demonstrate biologically plausible associations with drug exposure, tolerability, and efficacy, effect sizes are frequently small, replication varies among populations, and most studies use self-reported or retrospective measures. These gaps underscore the need for larger prospective trials across multiple ancestries that incorporate environmental variables, polygenic risk scores, serum pharmacokinetics, and genotyping. Understanding these genetic processes provides the foundation for evaluating how pharmacogenetic testing may guide individualized antidepressant dosing and selection in clinical practice.

Clinical Application of PGx Testing for Antidepressant Optimization

A common concern among clinical trials assessing pharmacogenetic (PGx) testing in antidepressant prescribing is whether knowing a patient's metabolic genotype significantly improves treatment outcomes compared with standard empirical care. Evidence from observational and randomized studies supports the idea that incorporating PGx data into antidepressant dosing and selection can decrease adverse events, reduce the trial-and-error period, and increase remission rates, especially for patients with unusual metabolic profiles or a history of treatment resistance. Improvements across trials, however, rely not only on genetic data but also on how well clinicians interpret this information within a larger clinical context that takes behavioral variables, phenoconversion, polypharmacy, and prescriber discretion into account.

The randomized controlled study by Xu et al. (2024) offers the most compelling experimental support for the therapeutic benefits of pharmacogenomic-guided antidepressant treatment to date. Compared with patients treated using standard clinician discretion, 665 outpatients with depressive disorders who received genotype-informed treatment showed better response and remission rates at weeks 8 and 12 as well as fewer adverse medication responses. The trial incorporates a randomized design, established objectives including Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (HDRS) remission and ADR inventories, and both pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic markers rather than relying solely on isolated single-gene techniques. These features support the translational relevance of combinatorial testing

panels. However, structural limitations reduce its interpretive power. Short follow-up precludes evaluation of durable remission versus transitory symptom suppression, lack of physician blinding invites expectancy bias, and the single-center study design limits generalizability.

The clinical examination by Zhang & Yue (2025) provides qualitative granularity to the trial's quantitative findings, showing how real-time genotyping, which identified CYP2C19 intermediate and CYP2D6 extensive metabolism, influenced not only the selection of SSRIs but also the tapering of benzodiazepines and the avoidance of inhibitory interactions. Although the case also has interpretive limitations, the rapid remission without adverse events suggested an alignment between pharmacokinetic information and therapeutic sequencing. Symptom improvement may be due to behavioral support or delayed withdrawal stabilization rather than genotype-driven efficacy alone. Lorvellec et al. (2024) add further clinical insight by bridging the gap between anecdotal reports and formal trials. Even though only 22% of CYP2C19/CYP2D6 drug-response combinations in their case series of 40 patients referred for antidepressant failure or intolerance met formal CPIC actionability, over 90% of clinicians still adhered to the report's recommendations, and a significant majority reported perceived improvements in both efficacy (79.5%) and tolerability (71.4%). These results show that, even in situations where formal guidelines do not require intervention, clinicians frequently use PGx as a decision-support framework rather than strictly as a rules-based algorithm.

Each study design contributes different evidence regarding the clinical application of PGx. The case series demonstrates real-world clinical uptake, the case report emphasizes individualized interpretation, and the randomized data demonstrates population-level efficacy, indicating that clinicians may use PGx even when formal actionability is limited. Despite these differences, the studies indicate that genotyping, especially of CYP2C19 and CYP2D6, significantly influences SSRI selection, dosage, and interaction management; however, the efficacy of these methods depends more on how clinicians incorporate them into a larger therapeutic framework than on the genetic information itself. Contextual factors including co-prescribed enzyme inhibitors, phenoconversion from lifestyle or comorbidities, and patient adherence are just as important as whether testing uses a combinatorial or single-locus approach. The studies also contain specific methodological limitations that complicate interpretation. Zhang & Yue's (2025) remission timeline cannot differentiate between pharmacodynamic improvement and withdrawal stabilization, Lorvellec et al.'s (2024) outcome measurements rely on subjective visual analog scales susceptible to confirmation bias, and Xu et al.'s (2024) efficacy advantage may be exaggerated by unblind clinician enthusiasm.

Despite these limitations, all three studies identify several unresolved questions. To what extent can preemptive genotyping help first-line SSRI patients? Should testing be applied consistently or only in high-risk or refractory cases? When is therapeutic drug monitoring or dose modification more appropriate than a complete medication switch due to metabolic mismatch? Another unresolved question is whether optimizing medication selection is sufficient for genetically fixed poor and ultrarapid metabolizers, or if gene-targeted therapies may eventually be needed to overcome inherent pharmacokinetic limitations. In the absence of larger, blinded, multicenter studies that include blood medication levels, cost-effectiveness modeling, and long-term recurrence tracking, PGx-guided therapy will continue to be a useful but targeted adjuvant rather than a general recommendation. However, its growing use as a framework for both

prediction and explanation indicates that, even in the absence of perfect accuracy, genotyping is already changing the practice of prescribing antidepressants from a reactive, trial-and-error approach to a proactive, metabolism-aware one.

Pharmacogenetic-guided SSRI dosing has been shown to increase response rates, decrease side effects, and improve trial-and-error efficiency, especially in patients with atypical metabolic profiles or treatment-resistant depression. However, methodological limitations such as unblinded designs, subjective outcome measures, and small samples restrict generalizability, and apparent benefits are mediated not only by genotype but also by clinician interpretation, patient adherence, co-medication, and phenoconversion. Future research should emphasize prospective, multicenter studies with integrated therapeutic medication monitoring, cost-effectiveness analysis, and standardized clinical decision frameworks. These results suggest that pharmacogenetic testing works best when integrated into a more comprehensive, context-aware clinical workflow. This clinical potential also raises the need to examine the practical obstacles, constraints, and conflicting evidence surrounding PGx implementation.

Barriers, Limitations, and Conflicting Evidence in PGx Implementation

Pharmacogenomic heterogeneity in SSRI treatment reflects a complex interaction among receptor-level pharmacodynamics, metabolic enzyme activity, and practical implementation challenges that limit clinical translation. Grant et al. (2025) provides the broadest perspective, reviewing 390 papers and identifying several genes as significant contributors to inter-individual variability in antidepressant efficacy and tolerance, including CYP2D6, CYP2C19, SLC6A4, HTR2A, BDNF, and ABCB1. The study highlights the potential of pharmacogenomics to inform SSRI selection and dosage, while also identifying inconsistent outcome measures, low repeatability across trials, and inadequate integration of multimodal biological data. Their systematic analysis of pharmacogenomic panels shows that most panels under investigate context-dependent variations and polygenic effects, instead concentrating primarily on cytochrome P450 enzymes and known pharmacodynamic loci. These findings illustrate both the potential of contemporary pharmacogenomic research and its limitations in capturing the full extent of inter-individual variation in SSRI response.

Murphy et al. (2003) show how receptor-level diversity can influence antidepressant response independently of conventional metabolic factors. While CYP2D6 polymorphisms had an insignificant impact on plasma levels or acceptability, the HTR2A 102 C/C genotype predicted greater rates of paroxetine cessation and adverse events in their investigation of older persons. This suggests that, in addition to pharmacokinetic characteristics, pharmacodynamic parameters can have a significant impact on antidepressant effects. Grant et al. (2025) further describe variants such as BDNF Val66Met and ABCB1 C3435T, illustrating how individual variation in drug transport, receptor function, and neuroplasticity contributes to a range of treatment outcomes. These mechanistic findings further support the need for multifaceted pharmacogenomic models that incorporate metabolic and receptor-level indicators to more precisely predict efficacy and adverse effects.

Clinical implementation introduces additional challenges beyond understanding the underlying mechanisms. Even when genetic information is relevant, clinician- and patient-level factors, including test

expense, lack of education, workflow integration problems, and risk of misinterpretation, can hinder its clinical adoption (Jameson et al., 2021). Addressing these obstacles may strengthen the benefits associated with patients' interest in precision medicine, enhanced clinician-patient communication, and decreased adverse reactions. These findings demonstrate that SSRI optimization through genotyping is not only a scientific issue but also a practical one that calls for interdisciplinary teams including genetic counselors and pharmacists, as well as training and standardized reporting.

The evidence also identifies several considerations for improving the clinical application of PGx. Pharmacogenomic-guided strategies need to incorporate pharmacodynamic and metabolic markers while overcoming practical clinical obstacles. Patients at the extremes of metabolic or receptor variability, such as poor or ultrarapid metabolizers or those with receptor hypersensitivity, may experience greater effects from genotype-guided treatment, suggesting a potential role for targeted rather than universal testing. However, methodological drawbacks such as homogeneous or small samples, uneven phenotyping, and the use of single-SNP models highlight the necessity of more extensive, diverse, and well-planned research. To offer practical recommendations, future research should integrate clinician-focused infrastructure with environmental, polygenic, and epigenetic data. These findings suggest that genotype-guided SSRI treatment can improve tolerance and effectiveness; nonetheless, achieving its full potential necessitates a combination of clinical, technical, and biological approaches.

Despite the potential of pharmacogenomic approaches to improve SSRI treatment, methodological, clinical, and systemic factors continue to limit their practical application. The use of single-SNP models, inadequate integration with clinical workflows, limited replication across diverse populations, and a lack of standardized training for patients and clinicians are some of the major limitations. Future developments should prioritize interdisciplinary approaches that integrate polygenic, epigenetic, and environmental data with metabolic and receptor-level genotyping, as well as infrastructure to facilitate reporting, interpretation, and patient counseling. Addressing these obstacles is necessary to transition from proof-of-concept research to routine, scalable precision psychiatry and eventually allow genotype-guided SSRI therapy to realize its full clinical promise. Table 1 summarizes the major pharmacogenomic findings and limitations of the studies discussed throughout this review

Table 1. Summary of Studies Examining Pharmacogenomic Factors in SSRI Response and Clinical Implementation

Study	Genes / Factors Examined	Major Findings	Limitations / Considerations
Radosavljevic et al. (2023)	CYP2D6, CYP2C19, SLC6A4, MAO, COMT, and epigenetic mechanisms	Antidepressant outcomes are influenced by both pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic variability, while mechanisms such as DNA methylation may further modulate response. The authors support multifactorial models incorporating genetic and environmental biology rather than single-marker prediction.	Population stratification and heterogeneity in outcome measures hinder replication.
Sreeja et al. (2024)	SLC6A4, including 5-HTTLPR, STin2, and I425V	5-HTTLPR L/L carriers tend to have greater SERT expression and better SSRI response, while S-allele carriers show slower response and more adverse drug reactions.	Effects are relatively consistent in Caucasian cohorts but weaker or absent in some Asian samples, emphasizing allele-frequency and gene-environment interactions. More research is needed on non-promoter polymorphisms.
Porcelli et al. (2011)	CYP2D6, CYP2C19, 5-HTT, BDNF, TPH, COMT, MAOA, serotonin receptors, and ABCB1	CYP2D6 and CYP2C19 are identified as the most reliable metabolic predictors of exposure and adverse events. Pharmacodynamic candidates are also associated with response but have replication failures.	Poor replication, modest effect sizes, population stratification, and heterogeneity in outcome measures restrict immediate clinical utility.
Campos et al. (2022)	CYP2C19	Among 9,531 Australians, intermediate metabolizers reported more side effects, particularly with sertraline, rapid metabolizers demonstrated greater tolerability, and poor metabolizers reported slightly higher efficacy.	Retrospective self-reporting, missing dosage and serum-level data, European ancestry of the sample, lack of multiple-test significance, and potential unmeasured confounders.
Xu et al. (2024)	Pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic markers	Among 665 outpatients with depressive disorders, genotype-informed treatment was associated with better response and remission rates at weeks 8 and 12 and fewer adverse medication responses compared with standard clinician discretion.	Short follow-up, lack of physician blinding, and single-center study design limit interpretation and generalizability.
Zhang & Yue (2025)	CYP2C19 and CYP2D6	Real-time genotyping influenced SSRI selection, benzodiazepine tapering, and avoidance of inhibitory interactions. Rapid remission without adverse events suggests alignment between pharmacokinetic information and therapeutic sequencing.	Symptom improvement may have resulted from behavioral support or delayed withdrawal stabilization rather than genotype-driven efficacy alone.
Lorvellec et al. (2024)	CYP2C19 and CYP2D6	In a case series of 40 patients, 22% of drug-response combinations met formal CPIC actionability. More than 90% of clinicians adhered to report recommendations, with perceived improvements in efficacy (79.5%) and tolerability (71.4%).	Outcome measurements relied on subjective visual analog scales susceptible to confirmation bias.

Grant et al. (2025)	CYP2D6, CYP2C19, SLC6A4, HTR2A, BDNF, and ABCB1	A review of 390 papers identified these genes as important contributors to inter-individual variability in antidepressant efficacy and tolerance. The review also demonstrates the potential of PGx to inform SSRI selection and dosage.	Inconsistent outcome measures, low repeatability across trials, inadequate integration of multimodal biological data, and limited attention to context-dependent variation and polygenic effects.
Murphy et al. (2003)	CYP2D6 and HTR2A	CYP2D6 polymorphisms had insignificant effects on plasma levels or acceptability, while the HTR2A 102 C/C genotype predicted greater rates of paroxetine cessation and adverse events in older persons.	The findings indicate that pharmacodynamic factors may influence antidepressant effects independently of conventional metabolic considerations.
Jameson et al. (2021)	Clinical implementation of PGx testing	Clinician- and patient-level factors can hinder PGx adoption, while patient interest in precision medicine, enhanced clinician-patient communication, and decreased adverse medication reactions may provide clinical benefits.	Test expense, lack of education, workflow integration problems, and risk of misinterpretation can hinder clinical adoption.

Conclusion

The existing evidence shows that SSRI response variability across individuals is a multifaceted, intricate phenomenon influenced by pharmacokinetic, pharmacodynamic, genetic, and epigenetic factors, all of which interact with behavioral and environmental factors. Although pharmacodynamic loci like SLC6A4, HTR2A, BDNF, and ABCB1 modulate receptor-level sensitivity and treatment outcomes, metabolic genes like CYP2C19 and CYP2D6 consistently affect drug exposure and tolerability. Despite these associations, effect sizes are small, replication varies among populations, and clinical translation is still restricted. Particularly when combinatorial panels are incorporated into a context-aware therapeutic workflow, pharmacogenetic-guided therapies have demonstrated promise in raising response rates, decreasing adverse events, and increasing trial-and-error effectiveness. However, methodological limitations, such as retrospective designs, small or homogeneous populations, subjective outcome measures, and poor integration with therapeutic medication monitoring, continue to limit the generalizability and clinical value of existing findings.

These remaining gaps identify several important directions for further study. Future research should prioritize larger, prospective trials across multiple ancestries that combine serum pharmacokinetics and standardized clinical outcomes with pharmacogenomic, epigenetic, polygenic, and environmental data. Similarly, researchers and clinicians need strong frameworks for converting genotypic data into useful, evidence-based dosage algorithms or decision-support systems to close the gap between research and standard clinical practice. Furthermore, successful implementation will require interdisciplinary approaches involving doctors, pharmacists, and genetic counselors, in addition to professional training and patient education, to guarantee accurate interpretation, workflow integration, and fair access to pharmacogenetic-guided therapy.

Literature therefore supports an important overall finding. Although genotype-guided SSRI prescribing is not yet prepared to completely replace empirical treatment, precision psychiatry is both practical and becoming more significant, shifting antidepressant therapy from a trial-and-error method to

a more proactive, metabolism- and receptor-aware model. By addressing current methodological, clinical, and systemic obstacles, future research and implementation initiatives could revolutionize SSRI therapy and open the door to more individualized, efficient, and bearable treatment plans for depressed patients.

References

Campos, Adrian I., Enda M. Byrne, Brittany L. Mitchell, et al. 2022. "Impact of CYP2C19 Metaboliser Status on SSRI Response: A Retrospective Study of 9500 Participants of the Australian Genetics of Depression Study." The Pharmacogenomics Journal 22 (2): 130–35. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41397-022-00267-7.

Grant, Caroline W., Karina Delaney, Linsey E. Jackson, et al. 2025. "Comprehensive Characterization of Antidepressant Pharmacogenetics: A Systematic Review of Studies in Major Depressive Disorder." Clinical and Translational Science 18 (6): e70255. https://doi.org/10.1111/cts.70255.

Jameson, Adam, Beth Fylan, Greg C. Bristow, et al. 2021. "What Are the Barriers and Enablers to the Implementation of Pharmacogenetic Testing in Mental Health Care Settings?" Frontiers in Genetics 12 (September). https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2021.740216.

Lorvellec, Marie-Agnès, Gilles Sipahimalani, Bertrand Lahutte, Hervé Delacour, Antoine Baldacci, and Emeric Saguin. 2024. "Pharmacogenetics Testing for Poor Response to Antidepressants: A Transnosographic Case Series." Frontiers in Pharmacology 15 (October). https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2024.1440523.

Murphy, Greer M., Charlotte Kremer, Heidi E. Rodrigues, and Alan F. Schatzberg. 2003. "Pharmacogenetics of Antidepressant Medication Intolerance." American Journal of Psychiatry 160 (October): 1830–35. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.160.10.1830.

Porcelli, Stefano, Antonio Drago, Chiara Fabbri, Sara Gibiino, Raffaella Calati, and Alessandro Serretti. 2011. "Pharmacogenetics of Antidepressant Response." Journal of Psychiatry and Neuroscience 36 (2): 87–113. https://doi.org/10.1503/jpn.100059.

Radosavljevic, Milica, Dubravka Svob Strac, Jasna Jancic, and Janko Samardzic. 2023. "The Role of Pharmacogenetics in Personalizing the Antidepressant and Anxiolytic Therapy." Genes 14 (5): 1095. https://doi.org/10.3390/genes14051095.

Sreeja, V., Anju Jose, Shashikant Patel, Bindu Menon, K. V. Athira, and Sumana Chakravarty. 2024. "Pharmacogenetics of Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors (SSRI): A Serotonin Reuptake Transporter (SERT)-Based Approach." Neurochemistry International 173 (February): 105672. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuint.2023.105672.

Xu, Lei, Liyin Li, Qiutang Wang, Bing Pan, Leilei Zheng, and Zheng Lin. 2024. "Effect of Pharmacogenomic Testing on the Clinical Treatment of Patients with Depressive Disorder: A Randomized Clinical Trial." Journal of Affective Disorders 359 (August): 117–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2024.05.063.

Zhang, Ying, and Weihua Yue. 2025. "Optimization of Antidepressant Treatment by Pharmacogenomics: A Case Report." BMC Psychiatry 25 (1): 34. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-025-06481-4.