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ABSTRACT

Objective: To compare longer-term safety and effectiveness of the 4 most commonly used atypical antipsychotics (aripiprazole, olanzapine, quetiapine, and risperidone) in 332 patients, aged > 40 years, having psychosis associated with schizophrenia, mood disorders, posttraumatic stress disorder, or dementia, diagnosed using DSM-IV-TR criteria.

Method: We used equipoise-stratified randomization (a hybrid of complete randomization and clinician’s choice methods) that allowed patients or their treating psychiatrists to exclude 1 or 2 of the study atypical antipsychotics due to past experience or anticipated risk. Patients were followed for up to 2 years, with assessments at baseline, 6 weeks, 12 weeks, and every 12 weeks thereafter. Medications were administered employing open-label design and flexible dosages, but with blind raters. The study was conducted from October 2005 to October 2010.

Outcome Measures: Primary metabolic markers (body mass index, blood pressure, fasting blood glucose, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol, and triglycerides), percentage of patients who stay on the randomly assigned atypical antipsychotic for at least 6 months, psychopathology, percentage of patients who develop metabolic syndrome, and percentage of patients who develop serious and nonserious adverse events.

Results: Because of a high incidence of serious adverse events, quetiapine was discontinued midway through the trial. There were significant differences among patients willing to be randomized to different atypical antipsychotics (P < .01), suggesting that treating clinicians tended to exclude olanzapine and prefer aripiprazole as one of the possible choices in patients with metabolic problems. Yet, the atypical antipsychotic groups did not differ in longitudinal changes in metabolic parameters or on most other outcome measures. Overall results suggested a high discontinuation rate (median duration 26 weeks prior to discontinuation), lack of significant improvement in psychopathology, and high cumulative incidence of metabolic syndrome (36.5% in 1 year) and of serious (23.7%) and nonserious (50.8%) adverse events for all atypical antipsychotics in the study.

Conclusions: Employing a study design that closely mimicked clinical practice, we found a lack of effectiveness and a high incidence of side effects with 4 commonly prescribed atypical antipsychotics across diagnostic groups in patients over age 40, with relatively few differences among the drugs. Caution in the use of these drugs is warranted in middle-aged and older patients.

Trial Registration: ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: NCT00245206
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We hypothesized that there would be significant differences among the 4 atypical antipsychotics in their effects on (1) primary metabolic markers (body mass index [BMI], blood pressure, fasting glucose levels, low-density lipoprotein [LDL] cholesterol, high-density lipoprotein [HDL] cholesterol, and triglycerides), (2) percentage of patients who stay on the randomly assigned atypical antipsychotic treatment for at least 6 months, (3) psychopathology, (4) percentage of patients who develop metabolic syndrome, and (5) percentage of patients who develop serious and nonserious adverse events.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was approved by the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) institutional review board, and all participants provided written informed consent. The study was conducted from October 2005 to October 2010 at the UCSD General Clinical Research Center, the VA Medical Center, and various board and care facilities in San Diego, California. The study is registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (identifier: NCT00245206).

Patients

Inclusion criteria were age > 40 years; schizophrenia/schizoaffective disorder; psychosis associated with mood disorder, PTSD, or dementia; and either receiving atypical antipsychotics at baseline or having a treating psychiatrist propose prescription of an atypical antipsychotic. Diagnoses were based on the DSM-IV-TR.

Exclusion criteria were active substance abuse in the past 30 days, unstable medical conditions, and being treated with multiple antipsychotics at baseline. A total of 568 patients were screened (Figure 1), 406 signed consent, and 332 patients completed a baseline visit. The data reported in this article reflect follow-up for up to 2 years on randomized medication (as proposed a priori).

Equipoise-Stratified Randomization

Our study design was a simplified version of that used in the National Institute of Mental Health–funded STAR*D trial.31 This approach represents a balancing of advantages and disadvantages of a completely randomized design (advantage = randomization; disadvantage = exclusion of patients for whom any one of the study treatments is unacceptable) and clinician’s choice method (advantage = greater treatment flexibility for treating clinician; disadvantage = loss of ability to compare specific treatment options). The patient and his or her treating psychiatrist could exclude 1 or even 2 of the 4 study medications for randomization. (The patients who excluded 3 atypical antipsychotics could not be randomized, and consequently those subjects were excluded from the trial). Thus each patient made a list of the medications to which she or he could be randomized. Depending on the number of atypical antipsychotics excluded, this list included 2, 3, or 4 drugs that were acceptable for randomization and of rough parity to the patient—ie, for him or her, the selected atypical antipsychotics were approximately equal in terms of likelihood of success. This list was called “equipoise stratum.” The numbers of patients in each equipoise stratum are listed in Figure 1. Only 16.6% of the patients agreed to be randomized to all 4 medications—ie, 83.4% of the patients would not have participated in a traditional randomized trial. All the consenting patients were randomly assigned with equal probability to one of the options within their respective lists. This procedure allowed pairwise contrasts of treatments, optimized the available recruitment resources, and enabled the greatest number of patients among different medication options.31 Every pairwise comparison of atypical antipsychotics was evaluated on all patients for whom that choice was acceptable (see Statistical Analysis, below). Randomized atypical antipsychotic was supplied to the patients at no cost, in an open-label manner.

Reasons for Refusing Specific Atypical Antipsychotics for Randomization

The most common reason given for refusing specific atypical antipsychotics was possible side effects, which ranged from 43% for aripiprazole to 78% for olanzapine. The percentages of patients citing lack of effectiveness as the reason for refusal ranged from 8% for olanzapine to 23% for quetiapine.

Clinical Assessment

Study raters were masked to the atypical antipsychotic assignment. For interrater reliability, an intraclass correlation coefficient of ≥ 0.80 for psychopathology measures was established. A summary of our baseline assessments has been published previously.33 Briefly, the baseline evaluation included medical and medication history, physical examination (by trained physician assistants), anthropomorphic measurements including BMI and waist circumference, psychopathology ratings (primarily, the Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale [BPRS]),34 medication side effects,35 and fasting plasma glucose and lipids. A clinical diagnosis of metabolic syndrome was made using standard American Heart Association–modified National Cholesterol Education Program guidelines.36
Follow-Up
The assessments were repeated at 6 weeks, 12 weeks, and then every 12 weeks. Patients were followed for up to 2 years.

Medication Management
After a patient was randomized to a study atypical antipsychotic, starting dosage was determined by the treating psychiatrist, who could alter the dose (or stop medication) anytime to meet the patient’s needs.

Statistical Analysis
We analyzed data on all randomized patients for whom there was a baseline assessment and at least 1 postbaseline evaluation. These patients were stratified into subgroups (strata) defined by the treatments they had chosen to be randomized among. With a total of 4 treatments, there were 11 possible strata (aripiprazole-olanzapine-quetiapine-risperidone [AOQR], aripiprazole-quetiapine-risperidone [AQR], aripiprazole-olanzapine-risperidone [AOR], aripiprazole-olanzapine-quetiapine [AOQ], olanzapine-quetiapine-risperidone [OQR], aripiprazole-risperidone [AR], aripiprazole-quetiapine [AQ], aripiprazole-olanzapine [AO], quetiapine-risperidone [QR], olanzapine-risperidone [OR], and olanzapine-quetiapine [OQ]) (Figure 1). Initially, all baseline characteristics were compared among these 11 strata groups with analyses of variance or χ² analyses, adjusting for multiple comparisons using the Tukey method. Next, data from different strata were pooled using all appropriate strata for each particular contrast for hypothesis testing. Four strata were involved for each pairwise comparison—eg, to compare aripiprazole and risperidone, we pooled data from all the strata that accepted both aripiprazole and risperidone (AOQR, AQR, AOR, and AR). Next, for each pair, the risk difference (difference between the 2 proportions having a particular outcome with those drugs) was calculated. For longitudinal data on metabolic markers (BMI, blood pressure, glucose, LDL, HDL, and triglycerides) as well as BPRS, an individual’s slope across the first 6 months of study treatment was calculated. Group means were adjusted according to different randomization probabilities in different strata. Each pair of medications was compared using Z-test, and a 95% 2-tailed confidence interval was computed. Finally, we used survival analysis technique (Kaplan-Meier survival curves) to determine the cumulative probability of discontinuation for each of the randomized atypical antipsychotics. Kaplan-Meier estimator is nonparametric and requires no parametric assumptions. This survival analysis, which combines data on each atypical antipsychotic from diverse strata, is a simplified version of the more appropriate survival analysis with pairwise comparison, although the conclusions were similar.

RESULTS
The 332 patients who completed baseline visit and the 74 patients who dropped out after signing the consent were
demographically and clinically similar, except that the study sample was older than the dropouts: mean (SD) age = 67 (13) years versus 62 (16) years, respectively ($t_{1,404} = 7.4, P < .007$). The mean (SD) doses of the randomized medications prescribed during the study, in mg/d, were aripiprazole (A) = 10.8 (7), olanzapine (O) = 8.8 (7), quetiapine (Q) = 212 (211), and risperidone (R) = 1.8 (2). The mean daily doses were highest in schizophrenia and lowest in dementia.

### Comparison of Baseline Demographic and Clinical Characteristics Among the 11 Strata

The 11 strata groups (AOQR, AQR, AOR, AOQ, OQR, AR, AQ, AO, QR, OR, OQ) differed from one another in gender, education, body weight, waist circumference, and fasting glucose (Tables 1 and 2). Pairwise strata analyses revealed that patients in stratum AOQR had significantly lower waist circumference than those in AQR, AOQ, and AR, while stratum AQ patients had significantly higher fasting glucose levels that those in AOQR, AQR, AO, OQ, and OR, suggesting that the clinicians tended to exclude olanzapine but include aripiprazole in the list of acceptable medications for randomization among patients at risk for metabolic syndrome. The overall prevalence of metabolic syndrome was 50% at the baseline visit. There was a significant difference in the proportions of people with different diagnoses in terms of those who had versus did not have metabolic syndrome at baseline ($\chi^2_3 = 14.56, P < .002$). Patients with dementia had a significantly lower proportion of those who had metabolic syndrome at baseline compared to those with schizophrenia/schizoaffective disorders ($\chi^2_1 = 8.83, P < .003$), mood disorders ($\chi^2_1 = 10.59, P < .001$), and PTSD ($\chi^2_1 = 8.54, P < .003$). This possibly could be attributed to differences in duration and daily doses of atypical antipsychotics at baseline; however, retrospective information on atypical antipsychotic use prior to baseline assessment was of uncertain reliability.

### Time to Discontinuation of Randomized Drug

The proportion of patients who discontinued their randomized medication before the end of the 2-year follow-up period ranged from 78.6% taking quetiapine to 81.5% taking aripiprazole. The median number of weeks to discontinuation of randomized medication was 26.0 weeks (25th percentile = 6.0; 75th percentile = 75.9). It is possible that the early discontinuation reflected significant clinical improvement or at least adherence to the treatment guidelines for using atypical antipsychotics for as short a period as possible, especially in patients with dementia. However, there was no relationship between diagnosis and duration of atypical antipsychotic treatment. A majority of the patients whose randomized atypical antipsychotic was discontinued were switched to another atypical antipsychotic by their own treating clinicians. Among the patients with known reasons for discontinuation, 51.6% did so due to side effects, 26.9% for lack of effectiveness, and 21.5% for other reasons. Figure 2 shows survival curves for the 4 atypical antipsychotics in terms of time to discontinuation of medication. There were no significant differences among the 4 drugs on this measure.

However, using a cutoff point of 6 months’ duration of atypical antipsychotic use (as included in our a priori hypothesis), the percentage of patients who stayed on the randomized medication for at least 6 months was significantly lower for aripiprazole than for olanzapine (Table 3). There was no significant association between the stratum group and reason for medication discontinuation.

### Discontinuation of Quetiapine During the Trial

Approximately 3.5 years after the study began, our Data and Safety Monitoring Board (consisting of 4 individuals, including a statistician, from outside of UCSD) concluded that there was a significantly higher incidence of serious adverse events with quetiapine (38.5%) than with the other 3 atypical antipsychotics combined (19.0%, $\chi^2_1 = 9.56, P < .002$). These differences were not related to age, prior antipsychotic treatment, medical burden, or duration of treatment. Consequently, the quetiapine arm of the trial was discontinued. These interim data on serious adverse events were published previously as a letter to the editor.38

### Psychopathology

We found no significant main effects of stratum, visit, or medication, or any 2-way or 3-way interactions for BPRS total and psychosis subscale scores, suggesting no significant change in psychopathology with any of the study atypical antipsychotics.

### Effects on Primary Metabolic Markers

There were no significant differences among the drug groups on primary metabolic markers (BMI, blood pressure, glucose, LDL cholesterol, HDL cholesterol, and triglycerides).

### Incidence of Metabolic Syndrome

Cumulative 1-year incidence of metabolic syndrome (among those patients who did not meet the criteria for metabolic syndrome at baseline) was 36.5%. There were no significant differences among the strata-eligible patients in the proportion of subjects developing metabolic syndrome except for the aripiprazole–olanzapine pairwise comparison: 86% of patients taking aripiprazole developed metabolic syndrome compared to 55% taking olanzapine in 1 year (risk difference = 34%, $P < .02$).

### Serious and Nonserious Adverse Events

Overall, 23.7% of the patients treated with different atypical antipsychotics developed serious adverse events including deaths, hospitalizations, and emergency room visits for life threatening conditions ($\chi^2_3 = 13.43, P < .005$), while 50.8% developed nonserious adverse events ($\chi^2_1 = 8.57, P < .04$) within 24 months of follow-up. Pairwise medication comparisons found no significant differences in proportion of subjects developing serious adverse events. However, in comparing nonserious adverse events, 49% of aripiprazole users versus 78% of quetiapine users developed nonserious adverse events ($P < .03$), and 46% of risperidone patients
Table 1. Baseline Demographic Data by Equipoise Stratum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>AOQR (n = 55)</th>
<th>AQR (n = 19)</th>
<th>AOR (n = 38)</th>
<th>AOQ (n = 18)</th>
<th>OQR (n = 17)</th>
<th>AR (n = 60)</th>
<th>AQ (n = 25)</th>
<th>AO (n = 25)</th>
<th>QR (n = 16)</th>
<th>OR (n = 26)</th>
<th>OQ (n = 33)</th>
<th>Total (N = 332)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age, mean (SD), y</td>
<td>64.1 (12.3)</td>
<td>60.3 (8.2)</td>
<td>69.4 (14.2)</td>
<td>63.9 (12.3)</td>
<td>68.7 (15.2)</td>
<td>66.6 (13.4)</td>
<td>64.7 (12.8)</td>
<td>64.4 (12.3)</td>
<td>67 (14.2)</td>
<td>70.7 (12.4)</td>
<td>70.6 (13.9)</td>
<td>66.6 (13.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, male, n (%)</td>
<td>33 (60)</td>
<td>14 (74)</td>
<td>24 (63)</td>
<td>12 (67)</td>
<td>16 (94)</td>
<td>51 (85)</td>
<td>13 (52)</td>
<td>13 (52)</td>
<td>12 (75)</td>
<td>17 (65)</td>
<td>20 (61)</td>
<td>225 (68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education n^b</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD), y</td>
<td>13.3 (2.6)</td>
<td>14.5 (2)</td>
<td>10.6 (5)</td>
<td>14.2 (2.3)</td>
<td>12.5 (2)</td>
<td>13.7 (2.4)</td>
<td>13.4 (3.2)</td>
<td>13.5 (2.4)</td>
<td>13.4 (2.9)</td>
<td>12.6 (2.2)</td>
<td>13.8 (3.1)</td>
<td>13.2 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis, n (%)</td>
<td>21 (38)</td>
<td>8 (42)</td>
<td>16 (42)</td>
<td>7 (39)</td>
<td>3 (18)</td>
<td>22 (37)</td>
<td>15 (60)</td>
<td>12 (48)</td>
<td>6 (38)</td>
<td>10 (38)</td>
<td>8 (24)</td>
<td>128 (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizophrenia, schizoaffective disorders, or BPD</td>
<td>34 (62)</td>
<td>11 (58)</td>
<td>22 (58)</td>
<td>11 (61)</td>
<td>14 (82)</td>
<td>38 (63)</td>
<td>10 (40)</td>
<td>13 (52)</td>
<td>10 (63)</td>
<td>16 (62)</td>
<td>25 (76)</td>
<td>294 (84)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There were significant differences among the strata groups on this variable. Gender, group difference: \( \chi^2_{10} = 22.68, P = .012 \). Post hoc pairwise significant differences: There were higher proportions of male patients in the strata OQR and AR than in a majority of other strata.

^bDifferences in n amounts reflect missing data.

Table 2. Baseline Clinical Data by Equipoise Stratum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>AOQR (n = 55)</th>
<th>AQR (n = 19)</th>
<th>AOR (n = 38)</th>
<th>AOQ (n = 18)</th>
<th>OQR (n = 17)</th>
<th>AR (n = 60)</th>
<th>AQ (n = 25)</th>
<th>AO (n = 25)</th>
<th>QR (n = 16)</th>
<th>OR (n = 26)</th>
<th>OQ (n = 33)</th>
<th>Total (N = 332)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BPRS total score</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>41.2 (11.3)</td>
<td>42.2 (8.3)</td>
<td>38.0 (7.8)</td>
<td>37.4 (7.4)</td>
<td>38.4 (9.5)</td>
<td>38.1 (10.6)</td>
<td>44.9 (10.1)</td>
<td>43.7 (12.2)</td>
<td>41.3 (13.0)</td>
<td>35.4 (6.9)</td>
<td>40.7 (10.0)</td>
<td>40.1 (10.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waist circumference, in^b</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>38.0 (6.3)</td>
<td>43.6 (7.5)</td>
<td>39.2 (5.2)</td>
<td>43.8 (8.2)</td>
<td>40.0 (4.0)</td>
<td>41.9 (5.6)</td>
<td>38.8 (6.9)</td>
<td>38.9 (5.7)</td>
<td>39.4 (4.6)</td>
<td>38.4 (5.4)</td>
<td>39.0 (5.1)</td>
<td>39.9 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body weight, kg^c</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>79.0 (20.6)</td>
<td>96.9 (25.5)</td>
<td>80.8 (24.4)</td>
<td>97.4 (26.3)</td>
<td>84.4 (12.9)</td>
<td>89.7 (18.3)</td>
<td>83.8 (22.1)</td>
<td>81.3 (23.0)</td>
<td>84.7 (19.2)</td>
<td>76.7 (18.0)</td>
<td>80.4 (18.6)</td>
<td>84.1 (21.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasting glucose, mg/dL^d</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>101.0 (26.4)</td>
<td>101.3 (17.0)</td>
<td>120.7 (71.3)</td>
<td>106.4 (32.4)</td>
<td>104.3 (40.9)</td>
<td>117.1 (44.0)</td>
<td>159.4 (120.6)</td>
<td>102.8 (27.6)</td>
<td>110.1 (50.4)</td>
<td>104.4 (21.6)</td>
<td>98.5 (21.3)</td>
<td>111.1 (50.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^dDifferences in n amounts reflect missing data.

*There were significant differences among the strata groups on this variable. Waist circumference, group difference: \( F_{10,315} = 3.089, P < .001 \). Post hoc pairwise significant differences: AR stratum had higher waist circumference than all other strata.

^cDifferences in n amounts reflect missing data.

*There were significant differences among the strata groups on this variable. Education, group difference: \( F_{10,308} = 3.996, P < .001 \). Post hoc pairwise significant differences: AOR < AOQR, AQR, AOQ, AR, AQ, AO, and OQ.

Abbreviations: A = aripiprazole, BPD = bipolar disorder, O = olanzapine, Q = quetiapine, R = risperidone.

Abbreviations: A = aripiprazole, BPD = bipolar disorder, O = olanzapine, Q = quetiapine, R = risperidone.
versus 73% of olanzapine patients developed nonserious adverse events \( (P < .04) \).

The 2 conditions for which there is an FDA warning (cerebrovascular adverse events) or boxed warning (mortality) for atypical antipsychotics in older dementia patients occurred in 6 patients. Two 75-year-old patients with mood disorders (but none with dementia) developed transient ischemic attack or stroke, one taking aripiprazole and one taking quetiapine. Four patients aged 74–89 years died, including 3 with dementia (one each taking aripiprazole, olanzapine, and quetiapine) and a 51-year-old patient with schizophrenia and late-stage cancer (taking quetiapine). There was no consistent underlying cause for cerebrovascular accident or death in these patients.

### Relationship of Outcome Measures to Other Variables

With 1 exception, there was no significant relationship of atypical antipsychotic daily dose with length of time patients stayed on their randomized medication or development of metabolic syndrome, serious adverse events, or nonserious adverse events. The only exception was that higher daily dose of aripiprazole was significantly associated with greater risk of developing serious adverse events and nonserious adverse events \( (F_{1,86} = 6.6, P < .02) \). Development of side effects (metabolic syndrome, serious adverse events, and nonserious adverse events) was not related to diagnosis or concurrent medications. However, older age was significantly associated with a greater incidence of serious adverse events \( (F_{1,323} = 8.080, P < .005) \).

### DISCUSSION

Our results suggested a high discontinuation rate following a relatively short duration of drug treatment (median of 26 weeks), lack of significant improvement in psychopathology (on BPRS), and high incidence of metabolic syndrome (36.5% in 1 year) and serious (23.7%) and nonserious (50.8%) adverse events with atypical antipsychotics. These results are worrisome, since we had given a choice to the patients and their psychiatrists to exclude 1 or 2 of the 4 atypical antipsychotics for possible safety or effectiveness concerns. The clinicians could choose the daily dosage and change it as needed at any time. The daily dosages of the atypical antipsychotics prescribed were relatively low. Thus, we had sought to give all the study atypical antipsychotics the best chance of proving safe and effective, as is done in good clinical practice.

Designing a pragmatic clinical trial involves trade-offs between an ideal experimental design and practical considerations that would enhance its applicability to routine clinical management of patients. There is a certain amount of bias in almost every clinical trial. We believe that the equipoise-stratified randomization provided the least amount of bias for this “real world” type of investigation. Only 16.6% of the patients agreed to be randomized to all 4 medications. Thus, a traditional randomization design would have resulted in exclusion of 83.4% of the patients who participated in this study and thus, the study sample would not have been representative of the population to which clinical decisions are relevant. The conclusions of a traditional randomized trial apply only to those patients who are willing to accept randomization to any one of the drugs in that trial. Therefore, the success or failure rate of a drug when compared to placebo may not be the same as that when compared to an active comparator, not only because the comparator is different, but also because the population sampled is different—eg, patients who refuse a placebo trial are different from those who refuse a trial in which olanzapine is used.

The flexibility that we offered to the patients and their treating psychiatrists in allowing them to exclude 1 or 2 atypical antipsychotics because of past experience or anticipated side effects led to expected differences in baseline characteristics of the medication groups. Thus, the patients who seemed to have a greater risk of developing metabolic syndrome (eg, high BMI) excluded olanzapine as a possible medication due to a fear of additional metabolic problems. Similarly, there is a channeling or allocation bias, when claimed advantages of a new drug channel it to patients with special preexisting morbidity—eg, the reportedly lower propensity of aripiprazole to cause adverse metabolic effects might have resulted in a greater likelihood of its being included in the list of medications acceptable for patients at risk of metabolic syndrome, such as those with abdominal obesity or elevated fasting blood glucose levels. Therefore, our findings of baseline differences among patient groups in different strata support the pragmatic value of the present study—in real life, clinicians prefer aripiprazole to olanzapine for patients at higher risk of metabolic syndrome. Yet, the reported metabolic advantages of aripiprazole compared to olanzapine were not borne out in this study. The higher incidence of metabolic syndrome with aripiprazole likely was related to the fact that the patients who included that drug in their list of acceptable medications were at a greater
Atypical Antipsychotics in Older Patients

Our study has several limitations. This was a sample of patients aged >40 years; hence, our results may not generalize to younger patients. Some patients had been treated previously with different antipsychotics for varying durations, and those drugs might have contributed to metabolic changes seen early in our trial. Our sample included patients with different psychiatric disorders. The sample sizes in individual diagnostic groups were inadequate for testing small to medium size differences. Our study findings may not be applicable to newer antipsychotics such as lurasidone or iloperidone. Although we sought to make our study design mimic clinical practice, the two are not the same, and therefore, our results may not apply fully to everyday care. For example, in the real world, patients are not randomized. Lastly, it is usually not possible to conclude that a serious adverse event observed during the treatment is causally related to that drug.

Notwithstanding the limitations, the results of our study are sobering. One-half of the patients remained on the assigned drug for less than 6 months. Furthermore, there was no significant improvement in BPRS total or psychosis subscale scores over a 6-month period, and there was a high incidence of metabolic syndrome, serious adverse events, and nonserious adverse events. While there were a few significant differences among the 4 atypical antipsychotics included in this study, the overall risk-benefit ratio for the atypical antipsychotics in patients over age 40 was not favorable, irrespective of diagnosis and drug.

The use of atypical antipsychotics in older psychotic patients presents a major clinical dilemma. Psychotic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Randomized Drug A, n</th>
<th>Randomized Drug B, n</th>
<th>Drug A, %b</th>
<th>Drug B, %b</th>
<th>Risk Difference</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aripiprazole, 66</td>
<td>Risperidone, 66</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>−16</td>
<td>−0.37</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>−1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aripiprazole, 42</td>
<td>Quetiapine, 39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>−19</td>
<td>−0.47</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>−1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aripiprazole, 44</td>
<td>Olanzapine, 40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>−31</td>
<td>−0.57</td>
<td>−0.05</td>
<td>−2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risperidone, 30</td>
<td>Quetiapine, 35</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>−0.12</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risperidone, 50</td>
<td>Olanzapine, 41</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>−0.16</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quetiapine, 41</td>
<td>Olanzapine, 40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>−2</td>
<td>−0.33</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>−0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developed metabolic syndrome within 1 y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Randomized Drug A, n</th>
<th>Randomized Drug B, n</th>
<th>Drug A, %b</th>
<th>Drug B, %b</th>
<th>Risk Difference</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aripiprazole, 66</td>
<td>Risperidone, 65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>−2</td>
<td>−0.21</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>−0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aripiprazole, 39</td>
<td>Quetiapine, 38</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>−5</td>
<td>−0.29</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>−0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aripiprazole, 41</td>
<td>Olanzapine, 38</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risperidone, 29</td>
<td>Quetiapine, 34</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>−0.01</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risperidone, 48</td>
<td>Olanzapine, 39</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>−0.21</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quetiapine, 39</td>
<td>Olanzapine, 37</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>−0.14</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developed serious adverse events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Randomized Drug A, n</th>
<th>Randomized Drug B, n</th>
<th>Drug A, %b</th>
<th>Drug B, %b</th>
<th>Risk Difference</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aripiprazole, 63</td>
<td>Risperidone, 64</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>−0.06</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aripiprazole, 40</td>
<td>Quetiapine, 38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>−5</td>
<td>−0.30</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>−0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aripiprazole, 42</td>
<td>Olanzapine, 39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>−5</td>
<td>−0.28</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>−0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risperidone, 29</td>
<td>Quetiapine, 35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>−18</td>
<td>−0.43</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>−1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risperidone, 49</td>
<td>Olanzapine, 40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>−7</td>
<td>−0.28</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>−0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quetiapine, 41</td>
<td>Olanzapine, 39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>−0.22</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Developed nonserious adverse events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Randomized Drug A, n</th>
<th>Randomized Drug B, n</th>
<th>Drug A, %b</th>
<th>Drug B, %b</th>
<th>Risk Difference</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aripiprazole, 63</td>
<td>Risperidone, 64</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>−0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>−0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aripiprazole, 40</td>
<td>Quetiapine, 38</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>−0.022</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aripiprazole, 42</td>
<td>Olanzapine, 39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>−29</td>
<td>−0.55</td>
<td>−0.026</td>
<td>−2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risperidone, 29</td>
<td>Quetiapine, 35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>−0.25</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risperidone, 49</td>
<td>Olanzapine, 40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>−27</td>
<td>−0.53</td>
<td>−0.006</td>
<td>−2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quetiapine, 41</td>
<td>Olanzapine, 39</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>−10</td>
<td>−0.38</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>−0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This table is a pairwise comparison of subjects randomized to a specific drug (randomized drug A) versus subjects randomized to another specific drug (randomized drug B). All potential randomized drug pairs are identified in the table.

*bDrug A percentage is the percentage of patients taking drug A and meeting the outcome criteria.

Drug B percentage is the percentage of patients taking drug B and meeting the outcome criteria.

*Statistically significant at P<.05.

The use of atypical antipsychotics in older psychotic patients presents a major clinical dilemma. Psychotic
disorders, including those associated with conditions other than schizophrenia, have severe adverse consequences for the medical health, career, family, and quality of life of sufferers. Atypical antipsychotics, although not approved for these conditions, are commonly used off-label in these patients, and there are few, if any, evidence-based treatment alternatives in older patients with psychotic disorders. Indeed, Tiihonen et al. reported that no treatment with an antipsychotic was associated with higher mortality than treatment with an atypical antipsychotic. Thus there are risks associated with either no treatment or treatment with other medications including typical antipsychotics and mood stabilizers. At the same time, the low safety and effectiveness of atypical antipsychotics found in our study, along with the high costs of these medications, make their use problematic.

Our findings do not suggest that atypical antipsychotics should be banned in older patients with psychotic disorders. There are currently no safe and effective treatment alternatives in these patients. Short-term use of atypical antipsychotics is often necessary for controlling severe psychotic symptoms. Also, specific atypical antipsychotics in low dosages may be useful for longer treatment of certain patients. However, our results and other reports do indicate that considerable caution is warranted in off-label long-term use of atypical antipsychotics in older persons. Psychosocial treatments should be used whenever appropriate. Pharmacotherapeutic guidelines for “start low and go slow” should be followed along with close monitoring and medical management for metabolic side effects. Shared decision making, involving detailed discussions with the patients and their family members or legal guardians about the risks and benefits of atypical antipsychotics and of possible treatment alternatives, as well as of no pharmacologic treatment, is warranted. Clearly, there is a critical need to develop and test new interventions that are safe and effective in older people with psychotic disorders.

**Drug names:** aripiprazole (Abilify), clozapine (Clozaril, FazaClo, and others), iloperidone (Fanapt), lurasidone (Latuda), olanzapine (Zyprexa and others), quetiapine (Seroquel and others), risperidone (Risperdal and others).

**Author affiliations:** Department of Psychiatry (Drs Jin, Shih, Golshan, and Jeste and Ms Glorioso), Department of Neurosciences (Dr Jeste), and Department of Medicine (Drs Muddaliar and Henry), University of California, San Diego; Division of Medicine, VA San Diego Healthcare System, California (Drs Jin, Muddaliar, and Henry); Department of Psychiatry, University of Iowa, Iowa City (Dr Arndt); and Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University, California and Department of Psychiatry, University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (Dr Kraemer).

**Potential conflicts of interest:** Dr Muddaliar is a consultant to, received grant/research support and honoraria from, and has participated in the speakers bureaus for AstraZeneca and Bristol Myers Squibb, which manufacture the drugs used in this study; Drs Jin, Shih, Golshan, Henry, Arndt, Kraemer, and Jeste and Ms Glorioso and their spouses have had no relevant financial interests or personal affiliations during at least the past 12 months.

**Funding/support:** This study was supported, in part, by the National Institutes of Health grants (MH071536, P30 MH080002-01, K01DK087813-01, NCRS UL1RR031980) and by the Department of Veterans Affairs. It was carried out, in part, by the General Clinical Research Center, University of California, San Diego with funding provided by the National Center for Research Resources, M01RR 000827, United States Public Health Service. AstraZeneca, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Eli Lilly, and Janssen Scientific Affairs, LLC donated quetiapine, aripiprazole, olanzapine, and risperidone, respectively, for this National Institute of Mental Health–funded study.

**Acknowledgment:** We wish to thank Rebecca Daly (Department of Psychiatry, University of California, San Diego), who managed the complex longitudinal dataset. She has had no relevant financial interests or personal affiliations during at least the past 12 months.

**REFERENCES**


