

Oral presentation

Comparison of second generation antipsychotics: are there any differences in efficacy?

George Papageorgiou*

Address: Department of Psychiatry, Evangelismos General Hospital, Athens, Greece

* Corresponding author

from International Society on Brain and Behaviour: 2nd International Congress on Brain and Behaviour
Thessaloniki, Greece. 17–20 November 2005

Published: 28 February 2006

Annals of General Psychiatry 2006, **5**(Suppl 1):S37 doi:10.1186/1744-859X-5-S1-S37

Since the re-introduction of clozapine in 1988, the so-called atypical or second generation antipsychotics (SGAs) have contributed considerably to the treatment of schizophrenia. The term "atypical" was at first given to clozapine because of its low propensity to cause extrapyramidal symptoms. This term has been applied uncritically to a series of drugs despite their striking differences in chemistry, pharmacology and specific clinical action profile. Their use also may be limited because of various existing controversies. At first, there is the question whether SGAs have to be preferred over the older, conventional first generation antipsychotics (FGAs). Secondly, there has been an ongoing debate to differentiate between them in terms of efficacy and safety.

The initial enthusiasm that most of the second generation antipsychotics (SGAs) showed a better efficacy and tolerability profile over the FGAs was subsided over the publication of a series of meta-analyses, the most recent being the first results of the CATIE study. These showed that there was no clear evidence of the advantage of SGAs compared to the FGAs. Treatment guidelines from various institutions issued analogous and equivocating recommendations between the two antipsychotic groups. Therefore, the clinician has remained free to make his own choice.

There have been many publications comparing SGAs with FGAs, in the regulatory process of the drugs. For example, a meta-analysis comparing SGAs over FGAs found reduced dropout and treatment failure rates with risperidone in comparison with haloperidol. Other efficacy trials have tried to find differences in efficacy between the SGAs but with conflicting results. In one study, clozapine proved more effective than risperidone in treatment resistant schizophrenia but methodological flaws prompt for caution for the interpretation of the results. A big issue

was raised with two studies comparing the efficacy of risperidone versus olanzapine. The first showed an advantage of olanzapine over risperidone and the second showed the opposite. Two studies comparing ziprasidone with olanzapine and ziprasidone with risperidone didn't disclose any advantage in efficacy of either agent over the other. A better tolerability profile was found with ziprasidone. Studies involving quetiapine showed that this agent had similar efficacy to risperidone and olanzapine. Switch studies showed that the use of aripiprazole maintained the clinical effect acquired by the previous agent. In another study, aripiprazole showed similar efficacy with risperidone. Amisulpride, an atypical antipsychotic with a different mechanism of action than the other SGAs, is an effective agent for the treatment of acute exacerbations as well as for the chronic treatment of positive and especially negative symptoms of schizophrenia. Compared with haloperidol in two studies, showed at least the same rate of improvement in positive symptoms and a clear advantage in long term over haloperidol in negative, suggested no efficacy differences between them, when the haloperidol equivalent didn't exceed 12 mg/day. In the light of most recent evidence comparing the relative efficacy of the SGAs, there are no clear-cut differences between them. It is up to the clinician to weigh the risks, the benefits and the cost of each drug and choose the most appropriate therapy for the individual patient.

References

1. Davis JM, Chen N, Glick ID: **A Meta-analysis of the Efficacy of Second Generation Antipsychotics.** *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2003, **60**:553-4.
2. McKeage K, Plosker GL: **Amisulpride: A Review of its Use in the Management of Schizophrenia.** *CNS Drugs* 2004, **18**:933-56.
3. Gardner DM, Baldessarini RJ, Waraich P: **Modern Antipsychotic Drugs: a Critical Review.** *CMAJ* 2005, **172**:1703-9.

4. Lieberman JA, et al.: **Effectiveness of Antipsychotic Drugs in Patients with Chronic Schizophrenia.** *N Engl J Med* 2005, **353**:1209-23.

Publish with **BioMed Central** and every scientist can read your work free of charge

"BioMed Central will be the most significant development for disseminating the results of biomedical research in our lifetime."

Sir Paul Nurse, Cancer Research UK

Your research papers will be:

- available free of charge to the entire biomedical community
- peer reviewed and published immediately upon acceptance
- cited in PubMed and archived on PubMed Central
- yours — you keep the copyright

Submit your manuscript here:
http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/publishing_adv.asp

