

Antidepressants, Other Review

12/18/2007

Copyright © 2004 - 2007 by Provider Synergies, L.L.C. All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, digital scanning, or via any information storage and retrieval system without the express written consent of Provider Synergies, L.L.C.

All requests for permission should be mailed to:

*Attention: Copyright Administrator
Intellectual Property Department
Provider Synergies, L.L.C.
5181 Natorp Blvd., Suite 205
Mason, Ohio 45040*

The materials contained herein represent the opinions of the collective authors and editors and should not be construed to be the official representation of any professional organization or group, any state Pharmacy and Therapeutics committee, any state Medicaid Agency, or any other clinical committee. This material is not intended to be relied upon as medical advice for specific medical cases and nothing contained herein should be relied upon by any patient, medical professional or layperson seeking information about a specific course of treatment for a specific medical condition. All readers of this material are responsible for independently obtaining medical advice and guidance from their own physician and/or other medical professional in regard to the best course of treatment for their specific medical condition. This publication, inclusive of all forms contained herein, is intended to be educational in nature and is intended to be used for informational purposes only. Comments and suggestions may be sent to Editor@providersynergies.com.



Together, we can do more.

Antidepressants, Other Review

Overview

While effectiveness is generally comparable between classes and within classes of antidepressants, the adverse event and safety profiles of the older first generation agents (tricyclic antidepressants, oral monoamine oxidase inhibitors) have greatly reduced their use as first line agents. The second-generation antidepressants, a heterogeneous group of compounds, are now most commonly used as first- and second-line therapy for major depression and related disorders.

The most commonly prescribed antidepressants, the selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), are examined in a separate therapeutic class review. These agents, as their name implies, selectively block the reuptake of the neurotransmitter serotonin at the neuronal membrane. It is thought that this enhancement of serotonin activity is primarily responsible for their antidepressant effect.

Other second generation antidepressants exert their effects by inhibiting the reuptake and/or blocking the receptors of one or more of the neurotransmitters thought to be involved in the etiology of depression - dopamine, norepinephrine and serotonin. Another second-generation antidepressant is actually a transdermal form of an older class of antidepressants, the oral monoamine oxidase inhibitors (MAO-Is). This different route of administration results in a different pharmacodynamic and safety profile than the older oral MAO-Is.

Pharmacology^{1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10}

The predominant therapeutic effects of each drug are indicated by a capitalized YES.

Mechanism of Action	TCAs	SSRIs	MAO-Is selegiline	NDRIs	Norepinephrine- Serotonin modulators	Serotonin modulators	SNRIs	Clinical and Physiological Effects
				bupropion	mirtazapine	nefazodone trazodone	duloxetine venlafaxine	
Acetylcholine receptor blockade	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	xerostomia, constipation, sinus tachycardia, memory impairment
Dopamine uptake inhibition	No	No	No	YES	No	No	No	antidepressant efficacy, euphoria, anti-Parkinson's activity, aggravation of psychosis
Histamine-1 receptor blockade	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	sedation, antipruritic effect
Monoamine oxidase inhibition	No	No	YES	No	No	No	No	antidepressant efficacy, acute hypertension
α ₁ Norepinephrine receptor blockade	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	orthostatic hypotension, sedation
α ₂ Norepinephrine receptor blockade	No	No	No	No	YES	No	No	antidepressant efficacy, sexual effects
Norepinephrine uptake inhibition	Yes	No	No	YES	No	No	YES	antidepressant efficacy, blood pressure, tremors, diaphoresis
Serotonin uptake inhibition	Yes	YES	No	No	No	YES	YES	antidepressant efficacy, nausea, loose stools, insomnia, anorgasmia
Serotonin receptor blockade	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	antinausea
Serotonin-2A receptor blockade	Yes	No	No	No	YES	YES	No	antidepressant efficacy, REM sleep, anxiolysis, anti-EPS
Serotonin-2C receptor blockade	No	No	No	No	YES	No	No	anxiolytic efficacy, appetite, motor restlessness

TCA – tricyclic antidepressant, NDRI – norepinephrine dopamine reuptake inhibitor, SNRI – serotonin norepinephrine reuptake inhibitor

FDA-Approved Indications

Drug	Mfr	Major Depressive Disorder (MDD)	Generalized Anxiety Disorder (GAD)	Social Anxiety Disorder (SAD)	Panic Disorder	Other Indications
bupropion IR	generic	X				
bupropion SR	generic	X				
bupropion ER (Wellbutrin® XL)	generic, GSK	X				prevention of major depressive episodes associated with seasonal affective disorder
duloxetine (Cymbalta®)	Lilly	X	X			diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain
mirtazapine	generic	X				
nefazodone	generic	X				
selegiline (Emsam®)	BMS	X				
trazodone	generic	X				
venlafaxine IR	generic	X				
venlafaxine ER (Effexor® XR)	Wyeth	X	X	X	X	

Pharmacokinetics

Drug	Protein Binding (%)	Half-Life (hr)	Active Metabolites
bupropion (Wellbutrin, Wellbutrin SR, Wellbutrin XL) ^{11,12,13}	84	21	erythrohydrobupropion, hydroxybupropion, threohydrobupropion (half-lives 20-37 hours)
duloxetine (Cymbalta) ¹⁴	>90	12	none
mirtazapine ^{15,16}	85	20 - 40	desmethyl metabolite
nefazodone ¹⁷	>99	11 - 24	hydroxynefazodone, mCPP
selegiline (Emsam) ¹⁸	90	18-25	none
trazodone ¹⁹	--	5 - 9	chlorophenylpiperazine, mCPP
venlafaxine (Effexor, Effexor XR) ^{20,21}	27	5	O-desmethyl-venlafaxine (ODV) (half-life 11 hours)

bupropion: The peak plasma concentration of bupropion sustained-release (SR), the twice-daily dosage form, is 85 percent that of the immediate-release (IR) tablets.²² The once-daily extended-release (ER) dosage form of bupropion (Wellbutrin XL) has been demonstrated to be equivalent to bupropion IR in terms of bioavailability and peak plasma concentrations. Studies have also shown bioequivalence of bupropion SR and bupropion ER (Wellbutrin XL).²³

nefazodone: Food decreases the absorption and bioavailability of nefazodone by 20 percent. Liver cirrhosis increases its bioavailability by 25 percent. Nefazodone has a nonlinear pharmacokinetic profile due to autoinhibition via CYP450 3A.²⁴

selegiline (Emsam): Transdermal administration of selegiline results in significantly higher exposure to selegiline and lower exposure to its metabolites compared to oral dosing, where extensive first-pass metabolism occurs.²⁵

venlafaxine: The ER dosage form (Effexor XR) has a slower rate of absorption and a lower peak plasma concentration than the IR dosage form (Effexor). The extent of absorption of the two dosage forms is equivalent.²⁶

Clinical Trials

Studies were identified through searches performed on PubMed and <http://www.ifpma.org/clinicaltrials.html> and review of information sent by manufacturers. Search strategy included the FDA-approved use of all drugs in this class. Randomized, comparative, controlled trials comparing agents within this class for the approved indications are considered the most relevant in this category. Studies included for analysis in the review were published in English, performed with human participants and randomly allocated participants to comparison groups. In addition, studies must contain clearly stated, predetermined outcome measure(s) of known or probable clinical importance, use data analysis techniques consistent with the study question and include follow-up (endpoint assessment) of at least 80 percent of participants entering the investigation. Despite some inherent bias found in all studies including those sponsored and/or funded by pharmaceutical manufacturers, the studies in this therapeutic class review were determined to have results or conclusions that do not suggest systematic error in their experimental study design. While the potential influence of manufacturer sponsorship/funding must be considered, the studies in this review have also been evaluated for validity and importance.

Studies of less than six weeks' duration were excluded since this short time frame may be insufficient to appropriately evaluate the effects of antidepressant agents. Smaller studies of MDD (fewer than 100 patients) were not included in this evaluation. Due to the high loss of patients in psychotropic studies during follow-up, trials with more than 30 percent loss were still considered for inclusion in this review. Studies focusing specifically on the elderly population or on inpatients were excluded because they are not applicable to the patient population under consideration. Studies that did not use the standard rating scales described below were also excluded.

EFFICACY SCALES

The two most common methods of reporting the efficacy results of antidepressant clinical trials are response rates and remission rates. Response is defined as a 50 percent reduction in severity of the depressive syndrome as measured by a standardized scale or a rating of much or very much improved as assessed by a global assessment method. Remission is a full resolution of the depressive syndrome such that the patient scores in the non-depressed range on such a standardized scale. In clinical trials of antidepressants, the percentage of patients who remit on placebo usually ranges from 20 to 30 percent while the remission rate on active drug is generally 45 to 60 percent. In most studies, response rates are 10 to 15 percent higher than the remission rate.

For MDD, two of the most commonly used standardized rating scales are the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (HAM-D) and the Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS).

HAM-D (Hamilton Depression Rating Scale) – This scale is used to assess the severity of MDD in patients already diagnosed with an affective disorder. It is the most widely used and accepted outcome measure for evaluating depression severity. The HAM-D is the standard depression outcome measure used in clinical trials presented to the Food and Drug Administration by pharmaceutical companies for approval of New Drug Applications. The standard HAM-D-21 contains 21 questions. The more commonly used HAM-D-17 excludes four questions relating to diurnal variation, depersonalization and derealization, paranoid symptoms and obsessional and compulsive symptoms. The remaining 17 questions are related to symptoms such as depressed mood, guilty feelings, suicide, sleep disturbances, anxiety levels and weight loss.²⁷ The HAM-D-17 provides ratings on current DSM-IV symptoms of depression, with the exceptions of hypersomnia, increased appetite and concentration/indecision.

MADRS (Montgomery Asberg Depression Rating Scale) – This scale measures the effect of treatment on depression severity and, as such, requires a baseline assessment before treatment with subsequent assessments during the course of treatment. The MADRS measures the severity of a number of symptoms, including mood and sadness, tension, sleep, appetite, energy, concentration, suicidal ideation and restlessness.²⁸

Other standardized scales used in the evaluation of the drugs in this class include:

HAM-A (Hamilton Anxiety Rating Scale) – This is the most frequently used and accepted outcome measure for the evaluation of anxiety in clinical trials. The HAM-A consists of 14 items, each defined by a series of symptoms such as anxiety, tension, depressed mood, palpitations, breathing difficulties, sleep disturbances, restlessness and other physical symptoms.²⁹ It is included in the National Institute of Mental Health's Early Clinical Drug Evaluation Program Assessment Manual, designed to provide a standard battery of assessments for use in psychotropic drug evaluation.

CGI-I (Clinical Global Impression – Improvement) – This three-item scale assesses the patient's improvement or worsening.³⁰

CGI-S (Clinical Global Impression – Severity) – This three-item scale assesses the clinician's impression of the current state of the patient's illness. The rater is asked to 'consider his total clinical experience with the given population'.³¹

PGI (Patient Global Impression – Improvement) – Patients use this scale to rate his/her own improvement.

VAS (Visual Analog Scale) – This is one of the most frequently used measurement scales in health care research, most commonly used for the measurement of pain.^{32,33,34} This scale measures the intensity or magnitude of sensations and subjective feelings and the relative strength of attitudes and opinions about specific stimuli.

LSAS (Liebowitz Social Anxiety Scale) – This is a questionnaire whose objective is to assess the range of social interaction and performance situations those individuals with social phobia may fear and/or avoid. It is also a popular measurement tool used by researchers to evaluate the efficiency of various social anxiety disorder treatments, including pharmacological trials. A modified social anxiety scale exists for children and adolescents.

SPIN (Social Phobia Inventory) – This self-assessment consists of questions which evaluate fear (of people in authority, of parties and social events, of being criticized, of talking to strangers, of doing things when people are watching, and of being embarrassed), avoidance (of talking to strangers, of speaking to people for fear of embarrassment, of going to parties, of being the center of attention, of making speeches, of being criticized, of speaking to authority), and physiological discomfort (blushing, sweating, palpitations, or shaking and trembling in front of other people).³⁵

BPI (Brief Pain Inventory) – This questionnaire provides information on the intensity of pain (sensory dimension) as well as the degree to which pain interferes with function (reactive dimension). The BPI also asks questions about pain relief, pain quality, and the patient's perception of the cause of pain.

QLDS (Quality of Life in Depression Scale) - This is a 34-item depression-specific health-related quality of life instrument that assesses the ability and capacity of individuals to satisfy their daily needs.^{36,37}

Quality of Life Enjoyment and Satisfaction Questionnaire (Q-LES-Q) – This is a self-report measure designed to enable investigators to easily obtain sensitive measures of the degree of enjoyment and satisfaction experienced by subjects in various areas of daily functioning.³⁸

Sheehan Disability Scale (SDS) - A self-rated, three item rating scale used to measure the degree of disease-related disability in the domains of work, family and social relationships. The limitation of this disability rating scale is that some patients may not accurately recognize their degree of disability until after successful treatment.³⁹

Panic and Anticipatory Anxiety Scale (PAAS) - A rating scale for treatment efficacy assessment obtained from a daily diary maintained by the study participant and used to measure the number of panic attacks experienced, the number of episodes of anticipatory anxiety and the percentage of time in each 24-hours spent worrying about having a panic attack (anticipatory anxiety).⁴⁰

Children's Depression Rating Scale-Revised (CDRS-R) - Modeled after the Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression, the CDRS-R is a clinical interview tool designed for assessing six to 12 year-olds, and it has also been used successfully for adolescents. The CDRS-R helps clinicians rate 17 symptom areas: impaired schoolwork, difficulty having fun, social withdrawal, appetite disturbance, sleep disturbance, excessive fatigue, physical complaints, irritability, excessive guilt, low self-esteem, depressed feelings, morbid ideas, suicidal ideas, excessive weeping,

depressed facial affect, listless speech, and hypoactivity. It is used to diagnose depression and can be repeated to measure response to treatments.⁴¹

MAJOR DEPRESSIVE DISORDER (MDD)

bupropion IR and fluoxetine (Prozac®)

Patients with MDD were, after a one-week placebo phase, randomly assigned to receive bupropion IR 225 to 450 mg/day or fluoxetine 20 to 80 mg/day for six weeks in a double-blind study.⁴² The mean daily dose at the end of this 123 patient study was 382 mg for bupropion IR and 38 mg for fluoxetine. There were no statistically significant differences between treatments on any of the efficacy variables. Response based on HAM-D occurred in 63 percent of bupropion treated patients and 58 percent of fluoxetine treated patients (p=NS). Response based on CGI scores occurred in 68 and 58 percent of patients, respectively (p=NS). HAM-A improved by 59 percent for both treatment groups. There were no significant differences in the improvements in CGI-S and CGI-I. The incidence of treatment-emergent adverse events was low with no statistically significant differences between treatments. The manufacturer of bupropion IR funded this study.

bupropion IR and trazodone

After a one-week placebo lead-in, 124 outpatients with moderate to severe MDD were randomly assigned, in double-blind fashion, to receive bupropion IR 225 to 450 mg/day or trazodone 150 to 400 mg/day for six weeks.⁴³ Data from the 111 patients used in the efficacy analysis showed that the overall efficacy for each of the two drugs was similar. Improvement in the trazodone treatment group was significantly greater on day seven because of its effect on sleep. At the end of treatment, 58 percent of bupropion-treated patients and 46 percent of trazodone-treated patients were CGI responders. This is equivalent to an odds ratio (OR) for bupropion versus trazodone of $1.38 / 0.82 = 1.62$ indicating that, based on this study, the odds are 62 percent better for achieving clinical response with bupropion compared with trazodone.⁴⁴ Anorexia and anxiety were reported significantly more often for the bupropion group. Somnolence, appetite increase and edema were reported significantly more often in the trazodone treatment group.

bupropion XL (Wellbutrin XL), escitalopram (Lexapro) and placebo

In two identical, double-blind, randomized controlled-trials, 830 patients with MDD were randomized to receive bupropion XL (Wellbutrin XL) 300 to 450 mg, escitalopram (Lexapro) 10 to 20 mg or placebo once daily for up to eight weeks.⁴⁵ Pooled data showed a significant difference between escitalopram (Lexapro) and placebo, but not bupropion XL (Wellbutrin XL) and placebo, in HAM-D-17 total scores. There were no significant differences among active treatments with respect to mean change in HAM-D-17, HAM-D-17 response or remission rates, percentage of patients much or very much improved on CGI-I or change in CGI-S.

bupropion and sertraline, paroxetine or escitalopram (Lexapro)

Six double-blind, randomized clinical trials comparing bupropion (n=662) with an SSRI (n=655) for the treatment of MDD were pooled to examine whether the treatment of MDD with bupropion, a NDRI (Norepinephrine Dopamine Reuptake Inhibitor) results in a greater resolution of sleepiness and fatigue than with the SSRIs; sertraline, paroxetine or escitalopram (Lexapro).⁴⁶ Among the six studies pooled, three used sertraline, one used paroxetine and two used escitalopram (Lexapro) as the SSRI comparator. Hypersomnia scores were defined as the sum of scores of the Hamilton Depression Rating Scale (HDRS) items #22, 23 and 24.

Fatigue scores were defined as the score of HDRS item #13. There was a greater improvement in hypersomnia scores among bupropion-treated than SSRI-treated ($p < 0.0001$) or placebo-treated patients ($p = 0.0008$). There was also a greater improvement in fatigue scores among bupropion-treated ($p < 0.0001$) and SSRI-treated ($p = 0.0005$) than placebo-treated patients as well as a greater improvement in fatigue scores among bupropion-treated than SSRI-treated patients ($p = 0.0078$). Fewer bupropion-remitters than SSRI-remitters experienced residual hypersomnia (20.5 percent versus 32.1 percent; $p = 0.0014$) or residual fatigue (19.5 percent versus 30.2 percent; $p = 0.0020$). The manufacturer of bupropion ER (Wellbutrin XL) sponsored the study.

duloxetine (Cymbalta) and placebo

Two-hundred sixty-seven adult patients with MDD were randomly assigned to receive duloxetine (Cymbalta) 60 mg/day or placebo in a nine-week, multi-center, double-blind, parallel-group clinical trial.⁴⁷ Duloxetine (Cymbalta) significantly improved the HAM-D-17 compared with placebo starting at week seven and continuing through the end of the study. Duloxetine (Cymbalta) also reduced overall pain as well as back, shoulder and time in pain while awake significantly more than placebo. PGI-I and QLDS were significantly improved by duloxetine (Cymbalta). Response rates calculated using last-observation-carried forward (LOCF) were 35 and 50 percent for placebo and duloxetine (Cymbalta) treated patients, respectively ($p = 0.017$). LOCF remission rates were 24 and 32 percent for placebo and duloxetine (Cymbalta) treated patients ($p = 0.212$). The estimated probabilities of response were 42 and 65 percent for placebo and duloxetine (Cymbalta) treated patients ($p = 0.004$). Estimated probabilities of remission were 28 and 43 percent for placebo and duloxetine (Cymbalta) treated patients ($p = 0.064$). Discontinuations due to adverse events were more frequent for duloxetine (Cymbalta)-treated patients (12.5 percent) than for placebo-treated patients (4.3 percent). Nausea, dry mouth, dizziness, and constipation were more frequent for duloxetine (Cymbalta) than placebo. The manufacturer of duloxetine (Cymbalta) conducted this study.

A second nine-week study of 245 patients, similar to the one described above, found duloxetine (Cymbalta) 60 mg/day to be superior to placebo in improving HAM-D-17 starting at week two.⁴⁸ At the end of nine weeks, LOCF response rates were 23 and 45 percent for placebo- and duloxetine (Cymbalta)-treated patients, respectively ($p < 0.001$). LOCF remission rates were 15 and 31 percent for placebo and duloxetine (Cymbalta) treated patients ($p = 0.003$). The estimated probabilities of response were 29 and 62 percent for placebo and duloxetine (Cymbalta) treated patients ($p < 0.001$). Estimated probabilities of remission were 16 and 44 percent for placebo and duloxetine (Cymbalta) treated patients ($p < 0.001$). On the VAS for pain, only back pain was significantly reduced as compared to placebo ($p < 0.001$) at the end of nine weeks. Discontinuation due to adverse events for duloxetine (Cymbalta) treated patients was 13.8 percent as compared to 2.5 percent for placebo. The manufacturer of duloxetine (Cymbalta) conducted this study.

In a multicenter, double-blind study, 282 patients with MDD were randomized to receive duloxetine (Cymbalta) 60 mg or placebo daily.⁴⁹ Mean changes in the BPI (Brief Pain Inventory) Average Pain score, the primary efficacy measure, for duloxetine (Cymbalta) and placebo treated patients differed significantly at most visits but were not significantly different at the end of the study. Mean changes at endpoint in the depression rating scales used (HAM-D-17, CGI-S, PGI-I) did not differ significantly between duloxetine (Cymbalta) and placebo treatment groups. Rates of discontinuation due to adverse events were 14.2 percent and 2.1 percent for duloxetine (Cymbalta) and placebo, respectively ($p < 0.001$). Treatment-emergent adverse events reported at a significantly higher rate by duloxetine (Cymbalta)-treated patients included

nausea, dry mouth, fatigue and decreased appetite. The manufacturer of duloxetine (Cymbalta) sponsored this study.

Pooled data from seven randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled studies were utilized to compare the efficacy of duloxetine (Cymbalta) in the treatment of MDD in male and female patients.⁵⁰ These studies represent all available data from United States acute-phase, placebo-controlled studies of duloxetine (Cymbalta) for the treatment of MDD. Patients aged 18 years and older meeting DSM-IV criteria for MDD received duloxetine (Cymbalta) (40-120 mg/day; men, n=318; women, n=578) or placebo (men, n=242; women, n=484) for up to nine weeks. Efficacy measures included the HAM-D-17 total score, HAM-D-17 subscales (core, Maier, anxiety, retardation, sleep), the CGI-S and PGI-I, the QLDS, VAS for pain. In both male and female patients, duloxetine (Cymbalta) produced significantly greater improvement in HAM-D-17, CGI-I, and PGI-I when compared with placebo ($p < 0.05$). Treatment by gender interactions did not reach statistical significance, indicating that the magnitude of effects of treatment with duloxetine (Cymbalta) did not differ significantly between male and female patients.

duloxetine (Cymbalta) and escitalopram (Lexapro)

A randomized, double-blind, placebo- and active comparator-controlled study, in which patients 18 years of age and older meeting DSM-IV criteria for MDD received duloxetine (Cymbalta) 60 mg once daily (n=273), escitalopram (Lexapro) 10 mg once daily (n=274) or placebo (n=137).⁵¹ This eight week study was conducted to compare the speed of onset of antidepressant efficacy for duloxetine (Cymbalta) and escitalopram (Lexapro) and to test whether duloxetine (Cymbalta) was at least as effective as escitalopram (Lexapro). Onset of efficacy was defined as a 20 percent decrease from baseline on the HAM-D-17 Maier subscale at week two that was maintained or exceeded at all subsequent visits. In this study, both duloxetine (Cymbalta) and escitalopram (Lexapro) showed significantly greater improvement on the primary efficacy measure than placebo over the eight-week acute treatment period, while no differences were observed between drugs or between drugs and placebo on response and remission rates at eight weeks. Escitalopram (Lexapro) at a starting dose of 10 mg daily was better tolerated than duloxetine (Cymbalta) at a starting dose of 60 mg daily as noted by more frequent occurrence of nausea, dry mouth, vomiting, yawning and irritability for duloxetine (Cymbalta)-treated patients. This study's pre-defined primary objective was met and showed that duloxetine (Cymbalta) is not inferior to escitalopram (Lexapro) in terms of onset of efficacy.

duloxetine (Cymbalta) and paroxetine

In a randomized, double-blind trial of eight weeks of active treatment, patients with non-psychotic MDD were randomized to duloxetine (Cymbalta) 60 mg (n=238) or paroxetine (n=240) once daily.⁵² Efficacy was primarily measured on change in the HAM-D-17 using a non-inferiority test with a margin of 2.2. Secondary efficacy measures included the HAM-D-17 subscales, HAM-A, CGI-S, PGI-I, Somatic Symptoms Inventory and VAS for pain. Safety measures included treatment-emergent adverse events, vital signs, weight, laboratory analyses and electrocardiograms. Non-inferiority of duloxetine (Cymbalta) to paroxetine was demonstrated because the upper bound of the confidence interval for mean difference in HAM-D-17 change (0.71) was less than the non-inferiority margin. Secondary efficacy endpoints did not differ significantly between treatments with the exception of VAS back pain, where the pooled mean was lower in the duloxetine (Cymbalta) group (17.1) compared with the paroxetine group (20.3, $p = 0.048$). No significant differences were observed in the number of early discontinuations and overall adverse effects; however, a significantly greater proportion of duloxetine (Cymbalta)-treated patients experienced nausea and palpitations. No clinically

relevant changes in other secondary efficacy endpoints were observed with either treatment. This study verifies the utility of duloxetine (Cymbalta) as an efficacious and safe treatment for both emotional and physical symptoms of MDD in this predominantly Asian patient sample.

mirtazapine and paroxetine

A total of 197 patients with MDD were randomized to 24 weeks of therapy with mirtazapine 30 to 45 mg/day or paroxetine 20 to 30 mg/day in a double-blind manner.⁵³ Both treatments were efficacious in improving depressive symptomatology, as assessed by group mean HAM-D-17, percentages of HAM-D responders and remitters and CGI responders. The mirtazapine group showed statistically significantly larger decreases from baseline in the group mean HAM-D-17 at weeks one, two and four. Statistically significant decreases with paroxetine were seen at weeks two and four. Mirtazapine had a significantly higher incidence of fatigue while paroxetine had significantly more patients complaining of increased sweating, headache and nausea.

mirtazapine and sertraline

In a double-blind, multicenter study, 345 patients with MDD were randomized to receive mirtazapine orally dissolving tablets 30 to 45 mg/day or sertraline 50 to 150 mg/day for eight weeks.⁵⁴ The primary efficacy variable, the mean change from baseline in the HAM-D-17, showed that mirtazapine was significantly ($p < 0.05$) more effective than sertraline at all assessments during the first two weeks of the study. After this time, the HAM-D-17 was similar in both groups. Reduction in sleep disturbance was significantly greater in the mirtazapine group ($p \leq 0.01$). Both drugs also yielded similar effects in terms of HAM-D response, HAM-D remission rate, MADRS and CGI. Approximately two-thirds of the patients in each treatment group reported at least one adverse event; 13 percent of patients in the mirtazapine group and three percent of the sertraline group withdrew from the study due to adverse events.

nefazodone and placebo

A total of 165 outpatients with chronic MDD were enrolled in a randomized trial comparing nefazodone (maximum dose 600 mg/day) and placebo.⁵⁵ During this one-year study of maintenance treatment, a committee of research clinicians assessed the occurrence of major depressive episodes with the HAM-D and a blinded review of symptom exacerbations. At the end of one year, the probability of recurrence was 30.3 percent for nefazodone-treated patients and 47.5 percent for patients receiving placebo ($p = 0.043$). Somnolence was significantly greater among the patients taking active medication (15.4 percent) compared with placebo (4.6 percent).

selegiline (Emsam) and placebo

Following a one-week placebo lead-in, 177 adults with MDD were randomly assigned to receive selegiline (Emsam) 6 mg/24 hours or placebo transdermally in a double-blind manner for six weeks.⁵⁶ The patients followed a tyramine-restricted diet during the medication trial and for two weeks after completion of treatment. At the conclusion of the trial, patients in the selegiline (Emsam) group showed significantly greater improvement than placebo in HAM-D-17 ($p = 0.01$), MADRS ($p = 0.005$) and CGI-S ($p = 0.007$). Response rates based on HAM-D-17 were 38 percent for selegiline (Emsam) and 23 percent for placebo ($p = 0.04$). Response rates based on CGI-S were 42 and 27 percent, respectively ($p = 0.03$). Most responders showed improvement after one week of treatment. Five percent of patients in each group withdrew from the study due to adverse events. Application site reactions occurred in 36 percent of patients receiving selegiline

(Emsam) and 17 percent of those receiving placebo ($p=0.006$). Otherwise, there were no significant differences in adverse event profiles of the two groups.

In a double-blind study, 289 adults with MDD (out of 365 enrollees) were randomized to receive selegiline (Emsam) 6 mg/24 hour or placebo transdermal patches daily for up to eight weeks.⁵⁷ Patients were not placed on tyramine-restricted diets. Selegiline (Emsam) was superior to placebo on the MADRS ($p=0.001$), but not on the HAM-D-17 or CGI-S. Side effects were similar in the two groups, with the exception of application site reaction, which occurred in 32 percent of the selegiline (Emsam) treated patients and 15 percent of placebo treated patients ($p=0.001$).

In a similar study, 265 patients with MDD were randomized, in double-blind fashion, to receive selegiline (Emsam) 6 mg/24 hour or placebo transdermal patches for eight weeks.⁵⁸ Doses could be increased per protocol for patients who failed to show therapeutic response. Patients were not placed on tyramine-restricted diets. At the conclusion of this study, selegiline (Emsam) was superior to placebo as measured by the HAM-D-28 and MADRS ($p\leq 0.05$ for both comparisons endpoints).

In a 52-week, double-blind, placebo-substitution, parallel-group clinical trial, the safety and efficacy of initial and continuation selegiline (Emsam) in patients with MDD was assessed.⁵⁹ After ten weeks of treatment with selegiline (Emsam) transdermal 6 mg/24 hr, 322 patients who responded with a HAM-D-17 score of ten or less were randomly assigned to double-blind treatment with selegiline (Emsam) transdermal 6 mg/24 hr or placebo for 52 weeks. Relapse was defined as meeting the following criteria on two consecutive visits: a score of 14 or more on the HAM-D-17 and a score of three or more with a two-point increase from double-blind baseline on the CGI-S with a MDD diagnosis. At study week 52, significantly fewer selegiline (Emsam) patients experienced relapse of MDD episode (25/149 [16.8 percent]) compared with placebo (50/163 [30.7 percent]) ($p=0.0025$). Additionally, patients receiving selegiline (Emsam) transdermal experienced a significantly longer time to relapse compared with those receiving placebo ($p=0.0048$). The safety profile of selegiline (Emsam) transdermal was similar to placebo, with the exception of application-site reactions. No cases of hypertensive crisis were reported despite the lack of requirement for dietary tyramine restrictions.

trazodone and fluoxetine

Outpatients with current nonpsychotic major depressive episodes of at least four weeks duration were given single-blind placebo for one week, after which they were randomized to double-blind treatment with fluoxetine or trazodone for six weeks.⁶⁰ The median sustained doses in the 126 patients in the study were 250 mg/day for trazodone and 20 mg/day for fluoxetine. The HAM-D-21 improved similarly in both treatment groups ($p<0.001$ for each group compared to baseline). There were no differences between the groups in CGI-S, CGI-I or PGI-I. More fluoxetine-treated patients reported rhinitis and tremor ($p\leq 0.05$), and more trazodone-treated patients reported somnolence and dizziness ($p\leq 0.05$). More combined events suggesting activation (agitation, anxiety, nervousness, insomnia) were reported with fluoxetine (15.4 percent) than with trazodone (3.3 percent, $p\leq 0.05$). More combined events suggesting sedation (somnolence, asthenia) were reported with trazodone (42.6 percent) than with fluoxetine (21.5 percent, $p\leq 0.05$). Discontinuation rates for activation and sedation did not differ between treatments. The manufacturers of fluoxetine conducted this study.

venlafaxine IR and fluoxetine

In an eight week, multicenter, double-blind, parallel-group study, 382 outpatients with moderate to severe MDD for at least one month were randomized to treatment with venlafaxine IR 37.5 mg twice daily or fluoxetine 20 mg once daily.⁶¹ Doses could be doubled after three weeks for poor response. Both drugs produced significant improvements from baseline in mean HAM-D and MADRS ($p < 0.05$), but no significant differences were noted between groups. High response rates were noted with 81 percent in the venlafaxine group and 84 percent in the fluoxetine group achieving that endpoint. Remission was observed in 60 percent of the patients in each group. There were no significant differences in the occurrence of adverse events between groups. The manufacturer of venlafaxine IR funded this study.

In a double-blind study, 314 patients with MDD were randomized to venlafaxine 75 to 150 mg/day or fluoxetine 20 mg/day for eight weeks.⁶² Both treatment groups significantly improved HAM-D, MADRS and CGI from baseline. While the HAM-D response at week six was higher in the venlafaxine group (72 percent) than the fluoxetine group (60 percent; $p = 0.023$), there was no significant difference at the conclusion of the study. Significantly more patients reported nausea in the venlafaxine group (28 versus 14 percent; $p = 0.003$). The rate of withdrawal from the study due to adverse events was nine percent in the venlafaxine group and four percent in the fluoxetine group.

In a multicenter double-blind study, 341 patients with MDD and symptoms for more than two weeks were randomized to venlafaxine 75 mg/day or fluoxetine 20 mg/day, each given as fixed doses for 12 weeks.⁶³ Both treatments significantly improved MADRS, HAM-D-21 and CGI; there were no significant differences between groups. Response was noted in 55 percent of venlafaxine patients and 63 percent of fluoxetine patients. Remission occurred in approximately 35 percent of patients in each group. These low active-treatment remission rates are likely due to the use of a more conservative definition of remission (MADRS ≤ 6 rather than the more usual ≤ 10). There were no significant differences in adverse events between groups.

venlafaxine IR and sertraline

In a multicenter double-blind study, 147 patients with MDD were randomized to receive venlafaxine IR 37.5 mg twice daily or sertraline 50 mg once daily for eight weeks.⁶⁴ After two weeks, the doses could be increased to venlafaxine IR 75 mg twice daily or sertraline 50 mg twice daily. There were no significant differences between treatments in mean changes in HAM-D-21, MADRS or CGI-I, although each improved significantly from baseline. At the conclusion of the study, the HAM-D-21 response rate was higher in the venlafaxine IR group (83 percent) than in the sertraline group (68 percent; $p = 0.05$). Similarly, HAM-D-21 remission rates were higher in the venlafaxine IR group than in the sertraline group (68 and 45 percent, respectively; $p = 0.008$); this difference was more pronounced in patients who increased the dose. There were no significant differences observed between treatment groups for adverse events. The manufacturer of venlafaxine IR funded this study.

venlafaxine IR and venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR)

In a double-blind study, 287 patients with MDD were randomized to receive venlafaxine IR 37.5 mg twice daily, venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) 75 mg once daily or placebo for a maximum of 12 weeks.⁶⁵ If the response was inadequate after two weeks of treatment, the daily dose of venlafaxine could be increased to 150 mg. Both dosage forms of venlafaxine were significantly superior to placebo beginning at week two for the HAM-D and at week three for the MADRS.

Significant improvement in CGI-S began at week six for venlafaxine IR and at week four for venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR). Venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) exhibited superiority over venlafaxine IR at week 12 for all efficacy variables.

venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) and escitalopram (Lexapro)

An eight-week, randomized, double-blind study compared the efficacy and tolerability of escitalopram (Lexapro) to venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) in 293 primary care patients with MDD.⁶⁶ The efficacy of escitalopram (Lexapro) 10 to 20 mg was similar to venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) 75 to 150 mg, based on mean change from baseline to week eight in MADRS. Response rates were 80 percent in the venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) group and 77 percent in the escitalopram (Lexapro) group (p=NS). Remission rates were 70 percent in each group, although sustained remission was attained nearly one week earlier in the escitalopram (Lexapro) group compared to the venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) group. More venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR)-treated patients had nausea, constipation, and increased sweating than patients treated with escitalopram (Lexapro) (p<0.05 for each comparison). When treatment was completed after eight weeks, significantly more venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR)-treated patients had discontinuation symptoms (p<0.01).

In a randomized trial, 195 outpatients with MDD received one week of single-blind placebo treatment, followed by eight weeks of double-blind, fixed-dose treatment with either escitalopram (Lexapro) or venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR), rapidly titrated to 20 mg/day and 225 mg/day, respectively.⁶⁷ Mean changes from baseline to endpoint in MADRS for escitalopram (Lexapro) and venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) were similar. Response rates for the escitalopram (Lexapro) and venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) groups were 59 and 48 percent, respectively (p=NS). Remission rates at endpoint were 41 percent for escitalopram (Lexapro) and 37 percent for venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) (p=NS). The venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) group had a higher incidence of treatment-emergent adverse events (85 percent) and discontinuation due to adverse events (16 percent) than the escitalopram (Lexapro) group (68 and four percent, respectively; p<0.05 for both comparisons).

venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) and fluoxetine

In a multicenter double-blind study, 301 patients with MDD were randomized to venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) 75 to 225 mg/day, fluoxetine 20 to 60 mg/day or placebo; doses could be increased after two weeks.⁶⁸ At the eight-week endpoint, there were no significant differences between the two active treatments on HAM-D-21 or MADRS in the LOCF analysis. Both active treatments significantly improved HAM-D-21 compared to placebo. Only venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) improved MADRS and CGI compared to placebo. Venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) patients experienced significantly more dizziness and nausea than fluoxetine or placebo patients (p<0.05). The manufacturer of venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) funded this study.

venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) and sertraline

In an eight-week double-blind study, 163 subjects with MDD were randomized to receive venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) 75 to 225 mg/day or sertraline 50 to 150 mg/day.⁶⁹ There were no significant differences in the effects of the two agents on Q-LES-Q (the primary endpoint), HAM-D, HAM-A or CGI-S. The lack of difference was also noted for two predetermined subgroups – patients with anxious depression and those with severe depression. Withdrawal due to adverse events occurred in 8.4 percent of venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) patients and 3.8 percent of sertraline patients. The manufacturer of sertraline funded this study.

GENERALIZED ANXIETY DISORDER (GAD)

venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) and placebo

In a double-blind study, 251 non-depressed outpatients with GAD requiring treatment were randomly assigned to receive either venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) or placebo for 28 weeks.⁷⁰ The dosage of venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) (75, 150 or 225 mg/day) was based on symptom response. During weeks six through 28, response rates in the venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) group were at least 69 percent compared with 42 to 46 percent in the placebo group ($p < 0.001$). By an evaluable-patient analysis, venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) significantly improved all primary efficacy measures from week one or two through week 28, including the HAM-A, CGI-I and CGI-S ($p < 0.001$ for all comparisons to placebo). The most common treatment-emergent adverse event was nausea, followed by somnolence and dry mouth.

In five multicenter, double-blind, clinical trials, 1,839 adult outpatients with GAD were randomized to receive fixed or flexible doses of venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) 37.5 to 225 mg/day or placebo.⁷¹ Three trials had a duration of eight weeks; two trials had a duration of 24 weeks. On the CGI-I, 66 percent of patients aged 60 years or older responded to venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) compared to 41 percent of patients on placebo ($p < 0.01$). For patients less than 60 years, comparable figures were 67 percent and 44 percent, respectively ($p < 0.001$). In older adults, 23 percent of venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) patients and 31 percent of placebo patients discontinued treatment prematurely; comparable figures for younger adult patients were 27 percent for the venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) group and 28 percent for the placebo group, respectively. Discontinuations due to adverse events were 15 percent and 14 percent for venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) and placebo, respectively, in older adults compared with 15 percent and eight percent for younger adults.

In a 24-week double-blind, parallel-group study, 244 primary care patients with GAD were randomized to receive venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) 75 mg or placebo, each given daily.⁷² After two weeks, the dose could be doubled if the physician considered the response poor. At 24 weeks, the HAM-A trended towards improvement in the venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) group ($p = 0.05$ compared to placebo). Remission rates measured at 24 weeks were 28 percent for the venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) group and 19 percent for the placebo group ($p = 0.11$).

duloxetine (Cymbalta) and placebo

Three independent clinical studies were randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled multicenter trials conducted in adult outpatients with DSM-IV-defined GAD to examine the efficacy of duloxetine (Cymbalta) treatment for improving functional outcomes for patients with GAD.⁷³ One study compared nine-week fixed-dose treatment with duloxetine (Cymbalta) 60 or 120 mg ($n = 168$ and $n = 170$, respectively) with placebo ($n = 175$). The other two studies compared ten-week flexible-dose treatment with duloxetine (Cymbalta) 60-120 mg (study two, $n = 168$; study three, $n = 162$) with placebo (study two, $n = 159$; study three, $n = 161$). The main functional outcome measure for each study was the Sheehan Disability Scale (SDS). Additional measures were the Q-LES-Q Short Form and the European Quality of Life 5 Dimensions. Duloxetine (Cymbalta)-treated patients improved significantly more than placebo-treated patients on SDS global functioning (study one, $p \leq 0.001$; studies two and three, $p \leq 0.01$) and SDS work, social life and family/home responsibilities scores (p values range from ≤ 0.05 to ≤ 0.001). At treatment endpoint, a greater percentage of duloxetine (Cymbalta)-treated patients had obtained SDS global functioning scores in the normative range than placebo-treated patients (p values range from ≤ 0.05 to ≤ 0.001). Duloxetine (Cymbalta)-treated patients also

reported greater increases in quality of life, well-being, and health compared with the placebo group on the other functional measures (p values range from ≤ 0.05 to ≤ 0.001).

SOCIAL ANXIETY DISORDER (SAD)

venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) and placebo

A multicenter, double-blind trial examined the efficacy and safety of venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) in the treatment generalized SAD.⁷⁴ Two hundred seventy-two outpatients were randomly assigned to receive either flexible dose venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) 75 to 225 mg per day or placebo for 12 weeks. Venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) was significantly more effective than placebo as demonstrated by the LSAS at weeks four to 12. Both the CGI-S and CGI-I showed that venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) was significantly more effective than placebo at weeks four to 12. Response rates were significantly higher in the venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) group throughout the last eight weeks of the study.

A double-blind study evaluated the efficacy, safety and tolerability of venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) in adult outpatients with generalized SAD.⁷⁵ Patients were randomly assigned to receive 12 weeks of treatment with a flexible dose of venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) 75 to 225 mg per day or placebo. Data from 271 patients were analyzed for efficacy; 279 patients were analyzed for safety. Overall, 173 patients completed the study. Improvement on the LSAS was significantly greater with venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) treatment than with placebo throughout the last six weeks of the study ($p < 0.05$). CGI-S and SPIN were significantly better with venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) from week eight through the completion of the study. Week 12 response rates based on LSAS were significantly greater in the venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) group (44 percent) than in the placebo group (30 percent; $p = 0.018$). Remission rates were also significantly higher in the active treatment group (20 percent) than the placebo group (seven percent; $p < 0.01$). Patients experienced no unexpected or serious adverse events.

In a multicenter study, 386 outpatients with SAD were randomized to venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) 75 mg/day fixed dose, venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) 150 to 225 mg/day flexible dose or placebo.⁷⁶ In the double-blind study, improvement on the LSAS, the primary outcome, was greater with either regimen of venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) than placebo. This improvement was sustained throughout the six-month trial. Of patients receiving either dose of venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR), 58 percent responded to treatment compared to 33 percent of those receiving placebo ($p < 0.001$). Corresponding remission rates were 31 and 16 percent, respectively ($p < 0.01$). There were no differences in outcome between the two venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) dosage regimens.

venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) and paroxetine

Four-hundred thirty-four adult outpatients with SAD were randomized to receive venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) 75 to 225 mg/day, paroxetine 20 to 50 mg/day or placebo in a double-blind manner for 12 weeks.⁷⁷ Patients with other anxiety or depressive disorders were excluded from this trial. Treatment with venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) or paroxetine was associated with significantly greater improvement in LSAS (primary efficacy variable), CGI-I and SPIN, than treatment with placebo ($p < 0.05$ for all comparisons to placebo). No significant differences in any of the efficacy variables were observed between the venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) and paroxetine groups. The week 12 response rates were similar for the venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) (69 percent) and paroxetine (66 percent) groups and were significantly higher than the placebo group (36 percent; $p < 0.05$). Both active treatments were generally well tolerated and were associated with

a similar incidence of adverse events. The manufacturer of venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) funded this study.

PANIC DISORDER

venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) and placebo

In a double-blind trial, 361 adults with panic disorder were randomized to receive venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) 75 to 225 mg/day or placebo for up to 10 weeks.⁷⁸ In this study, there was no difference between treatment groups in the proportion of patients free from full-symptom panic attacks, although there were fewer limited-symptom panic attacks in the venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) group. Venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) was also associated with a lower mean frequency of panic attacks, as well as higher response and remission rates and improvements in anticipatory anxiety, fear and avoidance.

venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) or paroxetine or placebo

A total of 664 non-depressed adult outpatients who met DSM-IV criteria for panic disorder (with or without agoraphobia) were randomly assigned to 12 weeks of treatment with placebo or fixed-dose venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) 75 mg/day or 150 mg/day, or paroxetine 40 mg/day in a double-blind study in the treatment of panic disorder.⁷⁹ The primary measure was the percentage of patients free from full-symptom panic attacks, assessed with the Panic and Anticipatory Anxiety Scale (PAAS). Secondary measures included the Panic Disorder Severity Scale, CGI-S and CGI-I scales; response (CGI-I rating of very much improved or much improved), remission (CGI-S rating of not at all ill or borderline ill and no PAAS full-symptom panic attacks); and measures of depression, anxiety, phobic fear and avoidance, anticipatory anxiety, functioning, and quality of life. Intent to treat, last observation carried forward analysis showed that mean improvement on most measures was greater with venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) or paroxetine than with placebo. No significant differences were observed between active treatment groups. Panic-free rates at end point with active treatment ranged from 54 to 61 percent, compared with 35 percent for placebo. Approximately 75 percent of patients given active treatment were responders, and nearly 45 percent achieved remission. The placebo response rate was slightly above 55 percent, with remission near 25 percent. Adverse events were similar for active treatment groups and mild to moderate.

NEUROPATHIC PAIN

duloxetine (Cymbalta) and placebo

In a 12-week, multicenter, double-blind study, 457 patients experiencing pain due to diabetic polyneuropathy were randomly assigned to treatment with duloxetine (Cymbalta) 20 mg once daily, 60 mg once daily, 60 mg twice daily or placebo.⁸⁰ The two higher doses of duloxetine (Cymbalta) demonstrated statistically significant greater improvement than placebo in the 24 hour mean VAS for pain, the primary efficacy measure, beginning one week after randomization and continuing throughout the 12-week trial. Significantly more patients in all three active-treatment groups achieved a 50 percent reduction in the 24-hour mean VAS for pain compared with placebo. Duloxetine (Cymbalta) treatment was considered to be safe and well tolerated with less than 20 percent discontinuation due to adverse events.

In a similar study, patients with diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain (DPNP) were randomized to treatment with duloxetine (Cymbalta) 60 mg or placebo once or twice daily for 12 weeks.⁸¹ Both

doses of duloxetine (Cymbalta) were superior to placebo in reducing the 24-hour average pain severity score. Treatment with duloxetine (Cymbalta) also resulted in greater improvement in the secondary endpoints of CGI-S and PGI. This study was performed by the manufacturer of duloxetine (Cymbalta).

venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) and placebo

An eight-week, double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial evaluated the effectiveness and safety of venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) 75 and 150 mg on ongoing pain and quantitative sensory tests in 60 patients with neuropathic pain.⁸² In the 55 patients who completed the study, VAS for pain decreased significantly in all three treatment groups. There were no differences regarding pain intensity and escape medication. While the degree of temporal summation to electrical and heat stimuli decreased significantly in both venlafaxine groups compared to placebo, the study showed no significant effect of venlafaxine on ongoing pain intensity. Venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) is not currently FDA approved for the management of neuropathic pain.

Meta-analyses

One systematic review indicated that, based on fair-to-good evidence, the second-generation antidepressants all have similar efficacy in treating MDD.⁸³ Of 46 RCTs directly comparing agents in this class, all but five reported no statistically significant difference in any outcome measure at the end of the study. Meta-analyses suggest a small, but statistically significant, additional treatment effect for sertraline and venlafaxine compared with fluoxetine.

In another systematic review, researchers analyzed the results of 81 clinical trials involving more than 10,000 adults with MDD that compared newer antidepressants with placebo.⁸⁴ Mirtazapine, venlafaxine, nefazodone and bupropion were among the drugs included in this review, as were several SSRIs. As a group, the newer antidepressants were significantly (60 percent) more effective than placebo. The efficacy of different antidepressant classes was similar, as were the individual agents in each class. A comparison of older antidepressants with newer agents found no significant difference in efficacy with the exception of three studies showing a 20 percent greater effect for an SNRI than for trazodone ($p=0.05$).

A more recent systematic review of 39 placebo-controlled RCTs of duloxetine (Cymbalta), venlafaxine and the SSRI, fluoxetine, used meta-regression analysis to compare the relative treatment effect of duloxetine (Cymbalta) with venlafaxine and fluoxetine in patients with MDD.⁸⁵ This analysis found no significant difference in treatment effect, as measured by HAM-D, between duloxetine (Cymbalta) and fluoxetine. It did, however, identify significantly better efficacy of venlafaxine compared to duloxetine (Cymbalta) with an OR of 2.0 for the number of responders.

Special Populations^{86,87,88,89,90,91,92}

Pediatrics

Although clinical trials with TCAs have failed to show efficacy in pediatric patients, this may be due to the faulty design of many early studies. The low rate of response to TCAs in children may also be due to a lack of effect of these predominantly noradrenergic drugs on the noradrenergic system that is not yet mature in children. Nonetheless, TCAs are indicated for the treatment of MDD in children 12 years and older.

Studies of SSRIs were the first to show antidepressant efficacy in children. As a result, these drugs are used most often in the treatment of children with MDD. The SSRIs are also first-line agents for the treatment of anxiety disorders in children. Non-SSRI antidepressants are most often used as first line therapy in children in the presence of comorbidities, such as attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), where bupropion may be more effective than an SSRI.⁹³

All of the antidepressants in this class have a black box warning regarding suicidality in children adolescents and as recently added, in young adults:

“Antidepressants increased the risk compared to placebo of suicidal thinking and behavior (suicidality) in children, adolescents, and young adults in short-term studies of major depressive disorder (MDD) and other psychiatric disorders. Anyone considering the use of any antidepressant in a child, adolescent, or young adult must balance this risk with the clinical need. Short-term studies did not show an increase in the risk of suicidality with antidepressants compared to placebo in adults beyond age 24; there was a reduction in risk with antidepressants compared to placebo in adults aged 65 and older. Depression and certain other psychiatric disorders are themselves associated with increases in the risk of suicide. Patients of all ages who are started on antidepressant therapy should be monitored appropriately and observed closely for clinical worsening, suicidality, or unusual changes in behavior. Families and caregivers should be advised of the need for close observation and communication with the prescriber.” Drug-specific information indicates that it is not approved for use in pediatric patients.

Further labeling for these drugs states the following:

“All patients being treated with antidepressants for any indication should be observed closely for clinical worsening, suicidality, and unusual changes in behavior, especially during the initial few months of a course of drug therapy, or at times of dose changes, either increases or decreases.”

Families and caregivers of patients being treated with antidepressants for major depressive disorder or other indications, both psychiatric and non-psychiatric, should be alerted about the need to monitor patients for the emergence of agitation, irritability, unusual changes in behavior, and the other symptoms described above, as well as the emergence of suicidality, and to report such symptoms immediately to health care providers. Such monitoring should include daily observation by families and caregivers.”

A FDA research team conducted a meta-analysis of 24 placebo-controlled studies of nearly 4,600 pediatric patients with MDD, OCD and GAD.⁹⁴ The drugs studied included bupropion, mirtazapine, nefazodone and venlafaxine, in addition to several SSRIs. There were 89 primary outcome events of suicidal behavior or ideation and 120 secondary outcome events of possible suicidal behavior or ideation. There were no completed suicides. The overall risk difference between active treatment and placebo was 0.01 for the primary outcome and 0.02 for the secondary outcome ($p < 0.05$ for both outcomes).

A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials assessed the efficacy and risk of reported suicidal ideation/suicide attempt of antidepressants for treatment of pediatric MDD, OCD, and non-OCD anxiety disorders.⁹⁵ Data sources included PubMed 1988 to July 2006, relevant US and British regulatory agency reports, published abstracts of important scientific meetings (1998-2006), clinical trial registries, and information from authors. Studies were published and unpublished randomized, placebo-controlled, parallel-group trials of second-generation antidepressants (SSRIs, nefazodone, venlafaxine, and mirtazapine) in participants younger than

19 years of age with MDD, OCD, or non-OCD anxiety disorders. Selection included 27 trials of pediatric MDD (n=15), OCD (n=six) and non-OCD anxiety disorders (n=six), and risk differences for response and for suicidal ideation/suicide attempt were estimated by random-effects methods. Pooled risk differences in rates of primary study-defined measures of responder status significantly favored antidepressants for MDD (11 percent; [95% CI, 7.1 to 14.9 percent]), OCD (19.8 percent [95% CI, 13 to 26.6 percent]), and non-OCD anxiety disorders (37.1 percent [95% CI, 22.5 to 51.7 percent]), corresponding to a number needed to treat (NNT) of ten (95% CI, 7 to 15), 6 (4 to 8) and 3 (2 to 5), respectively. While there was increased risk difference of suicidal ideation/suicide attempt across all trials and indications for drug versus placebo, the pooled risk differences within each indication were not statistically significant. There were no completed suicides. Age-stratified analyses showed that for children younger than 12 years of age with MDD, only fluoxetine showed benefit over placebo. In MDD trials, efficacy was moderated by age, duration of depression, and number of sites in the treatment trial. Relative to placebo, antidepressants are efficacious for pediatric MDD, OCD, and non-OCD anxiety disorders, although the effects are strongest in non-OCD anxiety disorders, intermediate in OCD, and more modest in MDD. Benefits of antidepressants appear to be much greater than risks from suicidal ideation/suicide attempt across indications, although comparison of benefit to risk varies as a function of indication, age, chronicity and study conditions.

bupropion SR

Of 11 adolescents with MDD enrolled in a study, eight completed an eight-week open-label trial of bupropion SR.⁹⁶ The SIGH-SAD, an expanded HAM-D, improved significantly. Improvement on the CGI-I was found in eight of 11 subjects. The mean daily dose of bupropion SR was 362 mg and was well tolerated; insomnia and weight loss were experienced by 55 percent of patients.

Investigators enrolled 24 adolescents (aged 11 to 16 years) with co-morbid depression and ADHD.⁹⁷ Subjects received twice daily bupropion SR in a flexible dosing regimen up to 6 mg/kg/day; the mean final dose was 3.9 mg/kg/day. By CGI, clinicians rated 58 percent of the children as responders in both depression and ADHD, 29 percent as responders in depression only and four percent as responders in ADHD only. Parents' (p<0.0005) and children's (p=0.16) ratings of symptoms of depression improved significantly. Significant improvement in ADHD symptoms were noted by parents (p<0.0005), but not teachers (p=0.08). No subjects withdrew from the study because of side effects.

mirtazapine

An open-label study was performed to evaluate mirtazapine 30 to 45 mg daily in 24 adolescents (aged 12 to 18 years) with MDD.⁹⁸ The mean daily dose of mirtazapine at the conclusion of the 85 day study was 32.9 mg. Mirtazapine showed efficacy in HAM-D-17 and CGI and had a beneficial effect on sleep. There were no withdrawals due to adverse events, which were similar in type and incidence to those seen in adults.

Twenty-six subjects (aged three to 24 years) with pervasive developmental disorders (20 autistic, one Asperger's, one Rett's and four with unspecified) were treated with open-label mirtazapine 7.5 to 45 mg/day.⁹⁹ All but one of the subjects completed at least four weeks of treatment; the average duration of treatment was 150 days. Primary caregivers rated 35 percent of patients as CGI responders with improvement noted in the symptoms of aggression, self-injury, irritability, hyperactivity, anxiety, depression and insomnia. Mirtazapine did not improve

core symptoms of social or communication impairment. Adverse effects were minimal and included increased appetite, irritability, and transient sedation.

nefazodone

Twenty-eight depressed children and adolescents (aged seven to 17 years) were enrolled in an open-label study in which they were given nefazodone for six weeks.¹⁰⁰ The drug was well tolerated and was associated with significant reductions in depressive symptoms ($p < 0.001$). A similar study administered nefazodone at doses up to 400 mg to 10 adolescents with MDD for an eight-week period.¹⁰¹ In LOCF analysis, significant improvement in both HAM-D and BDI was noted ($p = 0.01$ for both analyses).

In another open-label study, seven treatment-refractory children (mean age 12.4 years), including four with bipolar depression, were given nefazodone at a mean daily dose 3.4 mg/kg for an average of 13 weeks.¹⁰² A retrospective analysis showed that 56 percent of these subjects were CGI responders, including two of the patients with bipolar depression. Adverse events were reported in three subjects.

venlafaxine

A randomized trial of 40 children with MDD compared treatment regimens of psychotherapy with either venlafaxine or placebo.¹⁰³ In this six-week study, children in the venlafaxine treatment group were dosed based on age with children eight to 12 years getting 12.5 to 37.5 mg/day and children 13 to 17 years getting twice that dose. Patients in the venlafaxine and placebo groups showed significant improvement from baseline in HAM-D-17 and three pediatric-specific scales, the Children's Depression Inventory (CDI), Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) and Children's Depression Rating Scale (CDRS). There were no differences between venlafaxine and placebo in any of the outcome measures. There was a higher percentage of patients with adverse effects in the venlafaxine group at all time points.

Two randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trials were conducted at 59 sites in 2000 and 2001 to evaluate the efficacy, safety and tolerability of venlafaxine ER in the treatment of pediatric GAD.¹⁰⁴ Participants six to 17 years of age who met DSM-IV criteria for GAD received a flexible dosage of venlafaxine ER ($n = 157$) or placebo ($n = 163$) for eight weeks. The primary outcome measure was the composite score for nine delineated items from the GAD section of a modified version of the Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia for School-Age Children, and the primary efficacy variable was the baseline-to-endpoint change in this composite score. Secondary outcome measures were overall score on the nine delineated items, Pediatric Anxiety Rating Scale, HAM-A, Screen for Child Anxiety Related Emotional Disorders, and the CGI-I and CGI-S. The venlafaxine ER group showed statistically significant improvements in the primary and secondary outcome measures in Study One and significant improvements in some secondary outcome measures but not the primary outcome measure in Study Two. In a pooled analysis, the venlafaxine ER group showed a significantly greater mean decrease in the primary outcome measure compared with the placebo group (-17.4 versus -12.7). The response rate as indicated by a CGI-I score < 3 was significantly greater with venlafaxine ER than placebo (69 versus 48 percent). Common adverse events were asthenia, anorexia, pain, and somnolence. Statistically significant changes in height, weight, blood pressure, pulse, and cholesterol levels were observed in the venlafaxine ER group. Venlafaxine ER may be an effective, well-tolerated short-term treatment for pediatric GAD.

The safety, efficacy and tolerability of venlafaxine ER in subjects ages seven to 17 years with MDD were evaluated in two multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trials.¹⁰⁵ Participants received venlafaxine ER or placebo for eight weeks. The primary efficacy variable was the change from baseline in the Children's Depression Rating Scale-Revised score at week eight. There were no statistically significant differences between venlafaxine ER and placebo for the primary efficacy variable in either study. A post hoc age subgroup analysis of the pooled data showed greater improvement with venlafaxine ER than with placebo among adolescents (ages 12 to 17 years) but not among children (ages seven to 11). Hostility and suicide-related events were more common in venlafaxine ER-treated participants than in placebo-treated participants. There were no completed suicides.

A long-term, open-label study was used to evaluate long-term effectiveness and safety of treatment with venlafaxine ER in children and adolescents with MDD.¹⁰⁶ Subjects (N=86) seven to 17 years of age with MDD entered a multicenter, open-label study of flexible-dose venlafaxine ER for six weeks of acute treatment, followed by continuation treatment for up to six months total treatment. The primary efficacy variable was the Children's Depression Rating Scale-Revised total score (intent to treat population). Most improvement with venlafaxine ER occurs during the first six weeks of treatment. Prescribers should be alert to signs of suicidal ideation and hostility in pediatric patients.

Pregnancy

Pregnancy - For ethical reasons, double-blind randomized studies of antidepressant drug effects on the fetus and mother are unavailable. Based on animal data, the FDA has classified all of the drugs in this class in pregnancy category C.

Renal Impairment

Bupropion is extensively metabolized in the liver to active metabolites, which are further metabolized and subsequently excreted by the kidneys. It should be used with caution in patients with renal impairment and a reduced frequency and/or dose should be considered.

Duloxetine (Cymbalta) is not recommended for patients with end-stage renal disease or severe renal impairment (estimated creatinine clearance < 30 mL/min).

Caution is indicated in administering mirtazapine to patients with compromised renal function since its elimination is correlated with creatinine clearance.

Hepatic Impairment

Bupropion should be used with extreme caution in patients with severe hepatic cirrhosis. In these patients, a reduced dose and frequency is required. Bupropion should be used with caution in patients with hepatic impairment, including mild to moderate hepatic cirrhosis, and a reduced frequency and/or dose should be considered. All patients with hepatic impairment should be closely monitored for possible adverse effects.

Duloxetine (Cymbalta) should not ordinarily be administered to patients hepatic insufficiency as it increases the risk of elevation of serum transaminase levels. Duloxetine (Cymbalta) should also not ordinarily be administered to patients with substantial alcohol use.

Caution is indicated in administering mirtazapine to patients with compromised hepatic function.

Cases of life-threatening hepatic failure have been reported in patients treated with nefazodone. The physician may consider the value of liver function testing for patients treated with nefazodone and patients should be advised to be alert for signs and symptoms of liver dysfunction such as jaundice, anorexia, gastrointestinal complaints, and malaise and to report them to their doctor immediately should they occur. Nefazodone should be discontinued if clinical signs or symptoms suggest liver failure. Nefazodone should be withdrawn if evidence of hepatocellular injury such as increased serum AST or ALT levels \geq three times the upper limit of normal develops and these patients should be presumed to be at increased risk for liver injury if the drug is reinitiated; therefore, these patients should not be considered for re-treatment.

Dosage adjustment for venlafaxine (Effexor XR) is necessary in hepatically impaired patients as it is well absorbed and extensively metabolized by the liver.

Contraindications/Warnings^{107,108,109,110}

Bupropion is contraindicated in patients with a seizure disorder, in patients with anorexia and/or bulimia and also in patients undergoing abrupt discontinuation of alcohol or sedatives.

Duloxetine (Cymbalta) should not be prescribed for patients with substantial alcohol use or evidence of chronic liver disease. Postmarketing reports indicated that elevated transaminases, bilirubin and alkaline phosphatase have occurred when duloxetine (Cymbalta) has been given to such patients. Duloxetine (Cymbalta) is also contraindicated in patients with uncontrolled narrow-angle glaucoma.

Nefazodone has a black box warning for life-threatening liver failure (risk of one case resulting in death or transplant per 250,000 to 300,000 years of nefazodone treatment).

As a class, MAO-Is have been associated with hypertensive crises caused by the ingestion of foods containing high amounts of tyramine. Data for selegiline (Emsam) transdermal 6 mg/24 hours support the recommendation that a modified diet is not required at this dose. Patients receiving higher doses should follow the standard dietary modifications for patients taking MAO-Is.¹¹¹ MAO-Is, including selegiline (Emsam) transdermal, are contraindicated in patients with pheochromocytoma.

Drug Interactions

Inhibition potential at CYP450 enzyme systems at usual doses^{112,113}

Drug	1A2	2C9/19	2D6	3A4
bupropion (Wellbutrin/ Wellbutrin SR / Wellbutrin XL)	low	low	low	low
duloxetine (Cymbalta)	--	--	moderate	--
mirtazapine	low	low	low	low
nefazodone	low	low	low	high
selegiline (Emsam)	--	--	--	--
venlafaxine (Effexor, Effexor XR)	low	low	low	low

-- = no or negligible inhibition
 Low = 20-50% inhibition
 Moderate = 50-100% inhibition
 High = 100-150% inhibition

bupropion (Wellbutrin SR / Wellbutrin XL)

- drugs metabolized by CYP2D6 – use concurrently with caution; use lower dose of concomitant medication
- levodopa, amantadine – higher incidence of adverse effects
- drugs that lower seizure threshold - increases the incidence of bupropion-related seizures
- other dopamine agonists and norepinephrine antagonists – potentiation and reduction in the effects of these drugs may occur when administered with bupropion

duloxetine (Cymbalta)

- inhibitors of CYP2D6 – concomitant use increases duloxetine (Cymbalta) concentration
- inhibitors of CYP1A2 – concomitant use increases duloxetine (Cymbalta) concentration
- drugs metabolized by CYP2D6 – duloxetine (Cymbalta) is a moderate inhibitor of CYP2D6 and increases the AUC and Cmax of drugs metabolized by this enzyme – use with caution
- drugs that raise the gastric pH – duloxetine (Cymbalta) is enteric coated and drugs that raise gastric pH may lead to early release of duloxetine (Cymbalta)
- drugs that are highly protein bound – duloxetine (Cymbalta) is highly protein bound and administration with another highly protein bound drug may increase free concentrations of the other drug

nefazodone

- drugs that are metabolized by CYP3A4 - nefazodone inhibits the metabolism and increases the bioavailability of drugs metabolized by that enzyme; caution must be used when using nefazodone concurrently with these drugs.
- carbamazepine - the bioavailability of nefazodone is reduced by 95 percent when used concurrently with carbamazepine

selegiline (Emsam)

- Contraindications – SSRIs, SNRIs, mirtazapine, TCAs, bupropion, meperidine, tramadol, methadone, propoxyphene, dextromethorphan, St. John’s wort, cyclobenzaprine, carbamazepine, oxcarbazepine, sympathomimetic amines, general anesthesia

trazodone

- CYP3A4 inhibitors – can inhibit the metabolism of trazodone
- CYP3A4 inducers – can induce the metabolism of trazodone
- Phenytoin – elevated levels of phenytoin have been reported with concurrent use

venlafaxine (Effexor XR)

- haloperidol – the clearance of haloperidol is reduced and bioavailability increased
- ketoconazole – increased concentrations of venlafaxine and ODV

The non-MAO-I drugs in this class should not be used concomitantly within two weeks of stopping an MAO-I. Additionally, when converting from an MAO-I to one of these antidepressants, there must be a washout period of five to 14 days.

Adverse Effects

Drug	Wt Loss	Wt Gain	Dry Mouth	Nausea	Headache	Agitation	Insomnia	Somnolence	Withdrawals due to AE
bupropion IR ¹¹⁴	23-28 (14-23)	9-14 (23)	28 (10-18)	23 (19)	26 (22)	32 (22)	19-29 (16)	nr	10 (<10)
bupropion SR ¹¹⁵	14-19 (6)	2-3 (4)	17-24 (7)	13-18 (8)	25-26 (23)	3-9 (2)	11-16 (6)	2-3 (2)	0-2.4 (0.3)
bupropion XL (Wellbutrin XL) ¹¹⁶	23 (11)	11 (21)	26 (15)	13 (8)	34 (26)	2 (<1)	20 (13)	nr	9 (5)
duloxetine (Cymbalta) ¹¹⁷	2 (1)	nr	5-15 (4-6)	14-38 (7-10)	13-15 (10)	4 (2)	8-13 (4-7)	7-21 (3-5)	10 (4)
mirtazapine ¹¹⁸	nr	12 (2)	25 (15)	nr	nr	nr	nr	54 (18)	1.5-16 (0-7)
nefazodone ¹¹⁹	nr	nr	25 (13)	22 (12)	36 (33)	nr	11 (9)	25 (14)	16 (nr)
selegiline (Emsam) ¹²⁰	nr	nr	8 (6)	nr	18 (17)	nr	12 (7)	nr	7.1 (3.6)
trazodone ¹²¹	6 (3)	5 (2)	34 (20)	13 (10)	20 (16)	nr	6 (12)	up to 40	nr
venlafaxine IR (Effexor) ¹²²	5 (1)	nr	2 (nr)	32.6-58 (14.1)	25 (24)	1.1-4.5 (0)	18 (10)	23 (9)	2-19 (1)
venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR) ¹²³	3-4 (0)	nr	12-17 (4-6)	21-35 (9-14)	34 (33)	3-4 (1)	13.6-22.5 (9.8)	16.9-26.1 (4.3)	1-8 (0-1)

Adverse effects are reported as a percentage. Adverse effects data are obtained from package inserts and are not meant to be comparative. Incidences for the placebo group are indicated in parentheses. nr = not reported.

bupropion: There is a dose-related risk of seizures with the use of bupropion. Seizures occur in roughly 0.1 percent of patients receiving bupropion SR up to 300 mg/day and 0.5 percent of patients receiving bupropion IR up to 450 mg/day. The incidence of seizures raises disproportionately at bupropion IR dosages above 450 mg/day.¹²⁴ In patients receiving bupropion IR 600 mg/day, the risk of seizures was estimated to be 10 times that of patients receiving the maximum daily recommended dose of 450 mg. According to the manufacturer, the incidence of seizures in patients taking bupropion ER (Wellbutrin XL) as a single dose of 450 mg is 0.4 percent. Data from a computerized general practice database in the UK revealed a relative incidence of seizures during the first four weeks of bupropion of 3.62, which is equivalent to one additional seizure per 6,219 first time bupropion users.¹²⁵

duloxetine (Cymbalta): Duloxetine (Cymbalta) increases the risk of elevation of serum transaminase levels. In clinical trials, one percent of patients treated with duloxetine (Cymbalta) had a >3X ULN elevation of ALT compared to 0.2 percent of patients receiving placebo. As a result, duloxetine (Cymbalta) is not recommended for use in patients with hepatic insufficiency or who use substantial amounts of alcohol.

mirtazapine: In premarketing trials, two out of 2,796 patients developed agranulocytosis and a third patient developed severe neutropenia. All three patients recovered upon discontinuation of mirtazapine. These cases yield a crude incidence of severe neutropenia of approximately 1.1 per 1,000 patients (95% CI 0.2-3.1 cases per 1,000). In clinical trials, nonfasting cholesterol increases to 20 percent ULN were observed for 15 percent of patients treated with mirtazapine compared to seven percent of patients treated with placebo. Nonfasting triglyceride increases to 500 mg/dL were observed in six percent of patients treated with mirtazapine, compared to three percent of patient receiving placebo. ALT elevations to 3X ULN were observed in two percent of patients exposed to mirtazapine compared to 0.3 percent of placebo patients.

selegiline (Emsam): Application site reactions have been reported in 24 to 36 percent of patients receiving selegiline transdermal patches, compared to 12 to 17 percent of patients receiving placebo patches; rash occurred in four and two percent of patients, respectively.^{126,127,128}

trazodone: Trazodone is associated with the occurrence of priapism. Permanent impairment of erectile function or impotence has been reported.

venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR): Clinically relevant increases in serum cholesterol were recorded in 5.3 percent of venlafaxine-treated patients and no placebo-treated patients for at least three months.

There have been spontaneous reports of adverse events occurring upon discontinuation (particularly when abrupt) of the SNRIs, venlafaxine (Effexor XR) and duloxetine (Cymbalta). Adverse events include dysphoria, irritability, agitation, dizziness, sensory disturbances, confusion, headache, lethargy, insomnia, hypomania, tinnitus and seizures. While these events are generally self-limiting, there have been reports of serious discontinuation symptoms reported. A gradual reduction in the dose rather than abrupt cessation is recommended whenever possible.

Dosages

For Adults

Drug	Starting Dose	Maintenance Dose	Maximum Dose	Hepatic Impairment	Renal Impairment	Dosage Forms
bupropion IR	100 mg twice daily	100 mg three times daily	150 mg three times daily	↓	↓	Tablets: 75, 100 mg
bupropion SR	150 mg every AM	150 mg twice daily	200 mg twice daily	↓	↓	Tablets: 100, 150, 200 mg
bupropion ER (Wellbutrin XL)	150 mg every AM	300 mg every AM	450 mg every AM	↓	↓	Tablets: 150, 300 mg
duloxetine (Cymbalta)	20 mg twice daily	60 mg/day in one or two doses	60 mg/day in one or two doses	drug not recommended	↓	Capsules: 20, 30, 60 mg
mirtazapine	15 mg every evening	15 to 45 mg every evening	45 mg every evening	↓	↓	Tablets (oral and rapidly dissolving): 15, 30, 45 mg
nefazodone	100 mg twice daily	150 to 300 mg twice daily	300 mg twice daily	↓	↓	Tablets: 50, 100, 150, 200, 250 mg
selegiline (Emsam)	6 mg patch daily	6 mg patch daily	12 mg patch daily	--	--	Patches: 6, 9, 12 mg/24 hours
trazodone	150 mg/day in divided doses	150 to 400 mg/day in divided doses	400 mg/day in divided doses	↓	↓	Tablets: 50, 100, 150, 300 mg
venlafaxine IR (Effexor)	75 mg/day in two or three doses	150 mg/day in two or three doses	375 mg/day in three doses	↓	↓	Tablets: 25, 37.5, 50, 75, 100 mg
venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR)	37.5 to 75 mg once daily	75 to 225 mg once daily	225 mg once daily	↓	↓	Capsules: 37.5, 75, 150 mg

Doses are FDA-approved doses for outpatients.

-- = no dosage change required

↓ = consideration should be given to reducing the dose and/or dosage frequency

bupropion - To minimize the risk of seizures, dose increases should not exceed 100 mg/day in a three day period and the maximum daily dosage of 450 mg should not be exceeded. Increases above 300 mg/day should only be done in patients with no clinical effects after several weeks of treatment at 300 mg/day. The time between doses should be at least four hours for 100 mg IR doses, six hours for 150 mg IR doses and eight hours for SR doses. Cautious dose titration can also minimize agitation, motor restlessness and insomnia.

Venlafaxine has an ascending dose-response curve.¹²⁹ At the starting dosage of 75 mg/day, venlafaxine produces approximately the same number of responders as do the SSRIs. The percentage of responders increases with higher doses in a manner consistent with the drug's dual mechanism of inhibiting the uptake of serotonin initially and then norepinephrine at higher doses. Consistent with its pharmacology, higher doses of venlafaxine can also cause a higher incidence of serotonin- and norepinephrine-mediated adverse effects, including the potential to increase blood pressure.

Summary

While all second-generation antidepressants are effective at reducing symptoms of depression, there are no significant differences in efficacy among these agents. This is borne out in data from individual clinical trials as well as from systematic reviews.

It has been estimated that as many as one-half of all patients with MDD do not experience sufficient symptom improvement despite several adequate trials of antidepressant drugs, with most patients taking a SSRI as initial treatment. Among patients who remit, residual symptoms are common and associated with impaired psychosocial functioning and increased relapse rates. Until recently, known differences among antidepressant drugs were generally limited to safety and tolerability issues. However, over the past few years, a number of studies have emerged to evaluate possible differences among antidepressant classes in their ability to resolve specific symptoms of depression. Each of the groups of drugs in this class has a potential role in the treatment of MDD, primarily as a result of their heterogeneous spectrums of activity. As with many psychotropic drugs, patients failing to respond to one type of antidepressant may respond to a switch to, or augmentation with, an antidepressant with another mechanism of action.

The majority of the data regarding the use of the non-SSRI second-generation antidepressants for indications other than MDD involves the SNRIs, duloxetine (Cymbalta) and venlafaxine. For SAD and panic disorder, the ICGDA (International Consensus Group on Depression and Anxiety) expert panel guidelines recommend SSRIs as first-line therapy with the SNRIs as second-line therapy. For GAD, the ICGDA recommends SSRIs, SNRIs, TCAs and CBT (Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy) as first line treatments.¹³⁰

The role of the non-SSRI antidepressants in the treatment of neuropathic pain is still being defined, although the SNRIs have shown efficacy. Duloxetine (Cymbalta) is the only agent in this group with the treatment of neuropathic pain as an approved indication. Consensus guidelines from the Mayo Clinic recommend duloxetine (Cymbalta), as well as oxycodone CR (Oxycontin[®]), pregabalin (Lyrica[®]) and TCAs as first-tier agents for the treatment of DPNP. Duloxetine (Cymbalta) is not recommended for patients with hepatic insufficiency or where drug interactions are a factor. Venlafaxine ER (Effexor XR), along with tramadol and the antiepileptic drugs carbamazepine, gabapentin and lamotrigine, are identified as second-tier agents. These guidelines were supported by a grant from the manufacturer of duloxetine (Cymbalta).¹³¹

With the similarity in efficacy and overall incidence of adverse events between antidepressants, rates of adherence and discontinuation of the various medications are also generally equivalent. Specific agents, however, have different side effect profiles. Venlafaxine is associated with higher rates of nausea and vomiting than fluoxetine. Venlafaxine is also associated with a higher rate of discontinuation syndrome than the second-generation antidepressants. Bupropion appears to have the lowest risk of sexual adverse effects, although reports are variable. Mirtazapine is most associated with weight gain while bupropion results in a net loss of body weight. Nefazodone and trazodone are more likely to cause sedation, but this may be of benefit in patients with depression-related insomnia. Selegiline transdermal (Emsam) is associated with relatively few systemic effects, but it is associated with a high rate of skin reactions.

There have been reports of adverse liver toxicities with nefazodone. This drug has been removed from the European market based on deaths due to liver failure. Petitions have also been sent to the FDA asking for removal of this product from the US market. The FDA is currently reviewing the petitions. The manufacturer of Serzone brand nefazodone discontinued the manufacturing and sales of Serzone in 2004; generic nefazodone remains available.

All of the antidepressants in this class have a black box warning regarding suicidality in children, adolescents, and as recently added, in young adults through the age of 24 years. Related risks as compared to benefits of therapy in this population continue to be evaluated but appear to indicate greater benefit than risk as long as providers, families and caregivers are aware of the risks, use caution in prescribing these agents and observe patients for signs of these possible adverse effects.

References

- ¹ Bolden-Watson C, Richelson E. Blockade by newly developed antidepressants of biologic amine uptake into rat brain synaptosomes. *Life Sci.* 1993;52:1023-9.
- ² Cusack B, Nelson A, Richelson E. Binding of antidepressants to human brain. *Psychopharmacology (Berl).* 1994;114:559-65.
- ³ de Boer T, Maura G, Raiteri M, et al. Neurochemical and autonomic pharmacological profiles of the 6-aza-analogue of mianserin, ORG 3770 and its enantiomers. *Neuropharmacology.* 1988;27:399-408.
- ⁴ de Boer T, Ruigt G, Berendsen H. The alpha2-selective adrenoceptor antagonist Org 3770 (mirtazapine remeron) enhances noradrenergic and serotonergic transmission. *Hum Psychopharmacol.* 1995;10:107S-18S.
- ⁵ Frazer A. Antidepressants. *J Clin Psychiatry.* 1997;58(suppl 6):9-25.
- ⁶ Preskorn SH. *Clinical Pharmacology of Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors.* Caddo, Okla: Professional Communications, Inc; 1996;48-9.
- ⁷ Golden RN, Dawkins K, Nicholas L, et al. (1998). Trazodone, nefazodone, bupropion, and mirtazapine. In A.F. Schatzberg, & C.B. Nemeroff (Eds.), *Textbook of psychopharmacology* (2nd ed., pp. 549–588). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press, Inc.
- ⁸ Kelsey, J.E. Mood disorders. In R.E. Rakel & E.T. Bope (Eds.), *Conn's current therapy*, 2001, (pp. 1147–1154). Philadelphia: WB Saunders Company.
- ⁹ Fontaine R, Ontiveros A, Elie R, et al. A double-blind comparison of nefazodone, imipramine, and placebo in major depression. *J Clin Psychiatry.* 1994;55:234-41.
- ¹⁰ Eison AS, Eison MS, Torrente JR, et al. Nefazodone: preclinical pharmacology of a new antidepressant. *Psychopharmacol Bull.* 1990;26:311-5.
- ¹¹ Wellbutrin [package insert]. Research Triangle Park, NC; GlaxoSmithKline; August 2007.
- ¹² Wellbutrin SR [package insert]. Research Triangle Park, NC; GlaxoSmithKline; August 2007.
- ¹³ Wellbutrin XL [package insert]. Research Triangle Park, NC; GlaxoSmithKline; August 2007.
- ¹⁴ Cymbalta [package insert]. Indianapolis, IN; Eli Lilly; November 2007.
- ¹⁵ Remeron [package insert]. West Orange, NJ; Organon; May 2007.
- ¹⁶ Remeron SolTab [package insert]. West Orange, NJ; Organon; July 2007.
- ¹⁷ Serzone [package insert]. Princeton, NJ; Bristol Myers Squibb; June 2004.
- ¹⁸ EMSAM [package insert]. Princeton, NJ; Bristol-Myers Squibb; June 2007.
- ¹⁹ Trazodone [package insert]. Corona, CA; Watson; August 2007.
- ²⁰ Effexor XR [package insert]. Philadelphia, PA; Wyeth-Ayerst; November 2007.
- ²¹ Effexor [package insert]. Philadelphia, PA; Wyeth-Ayerst; November 2007.
- ²² Wellbutrin SR [package insert]. Research Triangle Park, NC; GlaxoSmithKline; August 2007.
- ²³ Wellbutrin XL [package insert]. Research Triangle Park, NC; GlaxoSmithKline; August 2007.
- ²⁴ Serzone [package insert]. Princeton, NJ; Bristol Myers Squibb; June 2004.
- ²⁵ EMSAM [package insert]. Princeton, NJ; Bristol-Myers Squibb; June 2007.

- ²⁶ Effexor [package insert]. Philadelphia, PA; Wyeth-Ayerst; November 2007.
- ²⁷ Hamilton M. A rating scale for depression. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 1960;23:56-62.
- ²⁸ Montgomery SA, Asberg M. A new depression scale designed to be sensitive to changes. *Br J Psychiatry*. 1979;134:382-9.
- ²⁹ Hamilton M. The assessment of anxiety states by rating. *Br J Med Psychol*. 1959;32:50-5.
- ³⁰ Leucht S, Engel RR. The Relative Sensitivity of the Clinical Global Impressions Scale and the Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale in Antipsychotic Drug Trials. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2006;31:406-12.
- ³¹ Leucht S, Engel RR. The Relative Sensitivity of the Clinical Global Impressions Scale and the Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale in Antipsychotic Drug Trials. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2006;31:406-12.
- ³² Duggleby W, Lander J. Cognitive status and postoperative pain: Older adults. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 1994;9:19-27.
- ³³ Williams J, Holleman D, Simel D. Measuring shoulder pain with the shoulder pain and disability index. *J Rheumatol*. 1995;22:727-32.
- ³⁴ Valvano M, Leffler S. Comparison of bupivacaine and lidocaine/bupivacaine for local anesthesia/digital nerve block. *Ann Emerg Med*. 1996;27:490-2.
- ³⁵ Connor KM, Davidson JRT, Churchill LE, et al. Psychometric properties of the Social Phobia Inventory (SPIN). *Br J Psychiatry*. 2000;176:379-86.
- ³⁶ Hunt SM, McKenna SP. The QLDS, a scale for the measurement of quality of life in depression. *Health Policy*. 1992;22:307-19.
- ³⁷ McKenna SP, Doward LC, Kohlmann T, et al. International development of the Quality of Life in Depression Scale (QLDS). *J Affect Disord*. 2001;63:189-99.
- ³⁸ Endicott J, Nee J, Harrison W, et al. Quality of Life Enjoyment and Satisfaction Questionnaire: a new measure. *Psychopharmacol Bull*. 1993;29:321-6.
- ³⁹ American Psychiatric Association (APA) OCD Practice Guidelines. Available at: www.psych.org/psych_pract/treatg/pg/OCDPracticeGuidelineFinal05-04-07.pdf. Accessed December 18, 2007.
- ⁴⁰ Nardi AE, Nascimben I, Valenca AM, et al. Respiratory panic disorder subtype: acute and long-term response to nortriptyline, a noradrenergic tricyclic antidepressant. *Psychiatry Research*. 2003;120:283-293.
- ⁴¹ Available at: www.massgeneral.org/schoolpsychiatry/screening_depression.asp#CDRS-R. Accessed December 18, 2007.
- ⁴² Feighner JP, Gardner EA, Johnston JA, et al. Double-blind comparison of bupropion and fluoxetine in depressed outpatients. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 1991;52:329-35.
- ⁴³ Weisler RH, Johnston JA, Lineberry CG, et al. Comparison of bupropion and trazodone for the treatment of major depression. *J Clin Psychopharmacol*. 1994;14:170-9.
- ⁴⁴ Lam RW, Kennedy SH. Using Meta-analysis to Evaluate Evidence: Practical Tips and Traps. *Can J Psychiatry*. 2005;50:167-74.
- ⁴⁵ Clayton AH, Croft HA, Horrigan JP, et al. Bupropion extended release compared with escitalopram: effects on sexual functioning and antidepressant efficacy in 2 randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled studies. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2006;67:736-46.
- ⁴⁶ Papakostas GI, Nutt DJ, Hallett LA, et al. Resolution of sleepiness and fatigue in major depressive disorder: a comparison of bupropion and the selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2006;15;60(12):1350-5.
- ⁴⁷ Detke MJ, Lu Y, Goldstein DJ, et al. Duloxetine 60 mg once daily dosing versus placebo in the acute treatment of major depression. *J Psychiatr Res*. 2002;36:383-90.
- ⁴⁸ Detke MJ, Lu Y, Goldstein DJ, et al. Duloxetine, 60 mg once daily, for major depressive disorder: a randomized double-blind placebo-controlled trial. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2002;63:308-15.
- ⁴⁹ Brannan SK, Mallinckrodt CH, Brown EB, et al. Duloxetine 60 mg once-daily in the treatment of painful physical symptoms in patients with major depressive disorder. *J Psychiatr Res*. 2005;39:43-53.
- ⁵⁰ Kornstein SG, Wohlreich MM, Mallinckrodt CH, et al. Duloxetine efficacy for major depressive disorder in male vs. female patients: data from seven randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trials. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2006;67(5):761-70.
- ⁵¹ Nierenberg AA, Greist JH, Mallinckrodt CH, et al. Duloxetine versus escitalopram and placebo in the treatment of patients with major depressive disorder: onset of antidepressant action, a non-inferiority study. *Curr Med Res Opin*. 2007; 23(2):401-16.
- ⁵² Lee P, Shu L, Xu X, et al. Once-daily duloxetine 60 mg in the treatment of major depressive disorder: multicenter, double-blind, randomized, paroxetine-controlled, non-inferiority trial in China, Korea, Taiwan and Brazil. *Psychiatry Clin Neurosci*. 2007;61(3):295-307.
- ⁵³ Wade A, Crawford GM, Angus M, et al. A randomized, double-blind, 24-week study comparing the efficacy and tolerability of mirtazapine and paroxetine in depressed patients in primary care. *Int Clin Psychopharmacol*. 2003;18:133-41.
- ⁵⁴ Behnke K, Sogaard J, Martin S, et al. Mirtazapine orally disintegrating tablet versus sertraline: a prospective onset of action study. *J Clin Psychopharmacol*. 2003;23:358-64.
- ⁵⁵ Gelenberg AJ, Trivedi MH, Rush AJ, et al. Randomized, placebo-controlled trial of nefazodone maintenance treatment in preventing recurrence in chronic depression. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2003;54:806-17.
- ⁵⁶ Bodkin JA, Amsterdam JD. Transdermal selegiline in major depression: a double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group study in outpatients. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2002;159:1869-75.
- ⁵⁷ Amsterdam JD. A double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of the safety and efficacy of selegiline transdermal system without dietary restrictions in patients with major depressive disorder. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2003;64:208-14.
- ⁵⁸ Feiger AD, Rickels K, Rynn MA, et al. Selegiline transdermal system for the treatment of major depressive disorder: an 8-week, double-blind, placebo-controlled, flexible-dose titration trial. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2006;67:1354-61.
- ⁵⁹ Amsterdam JD, Bodkin JA. Selegiline transdermal system in the prevention of relapse of major depressive disorder: a 52-week, double-blind, placebo-substitution, parallel-group clinical trial. *J Clin Psychopharmacol*. 2006;26(6):579-86.
- ⁶⁰ Beasley CM Jr, Dornseif BE, Pultz JA, et al. Fluoxetine versus trazodone: efficacy and activating-sedating effects. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 1991;52:294-9.
- ⁶¹ Costa e Silva J. Randomized, double-blind comparison of venlafaxine and fluoxetine in outpatients with major depression. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 1998;59:352-7.
- ⁶² Dierick M, Ravizza L, Realini R, et al. A double-blind comparison of venlafaxine and fluoxetine for treatment of major depression in outpatients. *Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry*. 1996;20:57-71.

- ⁶³ Tylee A, Beaumont G, Bowden MW, et al. A double-blind, randomized, 12-week comparison study of the safety and efficacy of venlafaxine and fluoxetine in moderate to severe depression in general practice. *Primary Care Psychiatry*. 1997;3:51-8.
- ⁶⁴ Mehtonen OP, Sogaard J, Roponen P, et al. Randomized, double-blind comparison of venlafaxine and sertraline in outpatients with major depressive disorder. Venlafaxine 631 Study Group. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2000;61:95-100.
- ⁶⁵ Cunningham LA. Once-daily venlafaxine extended release (XR) and venlafaxine immediate release (IR) in outpatients with major depression. Venlafaxine XR 208 Study Group. *Ann Clin Psychiatry*. 1997;9:157-64.
- ⁶⁶ Montgomery SA, Huusom AK, Bothmer J. A randomised study comparing escitalopram with venlafaxine XR in primary care patients with major depressive disorder. *Neuropsychobiology*. 2004;50:57-64.
- ⁶⁷ Bielski RJ, Ventura D, Chang CC. A double-blind comparison of escitalopram and venlafaxine extended release in the treatment of major depressive disorder. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2004;65:1190-6.
- ⁶⁸ Rudolph RL, Feiger AD. A double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial of once-daily venlafaxine extended release (XR) and fluoxetine for the treatment of depression. *J Affect Disord*. 1999;56:171-81.
- ⁶⁹ Sir A, D'Souza RF, Uguz S, et al. Randomized Trial of Sertraline Versus Venlafaxine XR in Major Depression: Efficacy and Discontinuation Symptoms. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2005;66:1312-20.
- ⁷⁰ Gelenberg AJ, Lydiard RB, Rudolph RL, et al. Efficacy of venlafaxine extended-release capsules in nondepressed outpatients with generalized anxiety disorder: A 6-month randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*. 2000;283:3082-8.
- ⁷¹ Katz IR, Reynolds CF, Alexopoulos GS, et al. Venlafaxine ER as a treatment for generalized anxiety disorder in older adults: pooled analysis of five randomized placebo-controlled clinical trials. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2002;50:18-25.
- ⁷² Lenox-Smith AJ, Reynolds A. A double-blind, randomized, placebo controlled study of venlafaxine XL in patients with generalized anxiety disorder in primary care. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2003;53:772-7.
- ⁷³ Endicott J, Russell JM, Raskin J, et al. Duloxetine treatment for role functioning improvement in generalized anxiety disorder: three independent studies. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2007;68(4):518-24.
- ⁷⁴ Rickels K, Mangano R, Khan A. A double-blind, placebo-controlled study of a flexible dose of venlafaxine ER in adult outpatients with generalized social anxiety disorder. *J Clin Psychopharmacol*. 2004;24:488-96.
- ⁷⁵ Liebowitz MR, Mangano RM, Bradwejn J, et al. A randomized controlled trial of venlafaxine extended release in generalized social anxiety disorder. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2005;66:238-47.
- ⁷⁶ Stein MB, Pollack MH, Bystritsky A, et al. Efficacy of low and higher dose extended-release venlafaxine in generalized social anxiety disorder: a 6-month randomized controlled trial. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2005;177:280-8.
- ⁷⁷ Allgulander C, Mangano R, Zhang J, et al. Efficacy of Venlafaxine ER in patients with social anxiety disorder: a double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group comparison with paroxetine. *Hum Psychopharmacol*. 2004;19:387-96.
- ⁷⁸ Bradwejn J, Ahokas A, Stein DJ, et al. Venlafaxine extended-release capsules in panic disorder: flexible-dose, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2005;187:352-9.
- ⁷⁹ Pollack MH, Lepola U, Koponen H, et al. A double-blind study of the efficacy of venlafaxine extended-release, paroxetine, and placebo in the treatment of panic disorder. *Depress Anxiety*. 2007;24(1):1-14.
- ⁸⁰ Goldstein DJ, Lu Y, Detke MJ, et al. Duloxetine vs. placebo in patients with painful diabetic neuropathy. *Pain*. 2005;116:109-18.
- ⁸¹ Wernicke JF, Pritchett YL, D'Souza DN, et al. A randomized controlled trial of duloxetine in diabetic peripheral neuropathic pain. *Neurology*. 2006;67:1411-20.
- ⁸² Yucel A, Ozyalcin S, Koknel Talu G, et al. The effect of venlafaxine on ongoing and experimentally induced pain in neuropathic pain patients: a double blind, placebo controlled study. *Eur J Pain*. 2005;9:407-16.
- ⁸³ Hansen RA, Gartlehner G, Lohr KN, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Second-Generation Antidepressants in the Treatment of Major Depressive Disorder. *Ann Intern Med*. 2005;143:415-26.
- ⁸⁴ Williams JW, Mulrow CD, Chiquette E, et al. A Systematic Review of Newer Pharmacotherapies for Depression in Adults: Evidence Report Summary. *Ann Intern Med*. 2000;132:743-56.
- ⁸⁵ Eckert L, Lancon C. Duloxetine compared with fluoxetine and venlafaxine: use of meta-regression analysis for indirect comparisons. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2006;6:30.
- ⁸⁶ Wellbutrin [package insert]. Research Triangle Park, NC; GlaxoSmithKline; August 2007.
- ⁸⁷ Cymbalta [package insert]. Indianapolis, IN; Eli Lilly; November 2007.
- ⁸⁸ Remeron [package insert]. West Orange, NJ; Organon; May 2007.
- ⁸⁹ Serzone [package insert]. Princeton, NJ; Bristol Myers Squibb; June 2004.
- ⁹⁰ EMSAM [package insert]. Princeton, NJ; Bristol-Myers Squibb; June 2007.
- ⁹¹ Trazodone [package insert]. Corona, CA; Watson; August 2007.
- ⁹² Effexor [package insert]. Philadelphia, PA; Wyeth-Ayerst; November 2007.
- ⁹³ American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry Official Action. Practice parameters for the assessment and treatment of children, adolescents and adults with depressive disorders. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 1998;37(10 Suppl):63S.
- ⁹⁴ Hammad TA, Laughren T, Racoosin J. Suicidality in pediatric patients treated with antidepressant drugs. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2006; 63:332-9.
- ⁹⁵ Bridge JA, Iyengar S, Salary CB, et al. Clinical response and risk for reported suicidal ideation and suicide attempts in pediatric antidepressant treatment: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *JAMA*. 2007;297(15):1683-96.
- ⁹⁶ Glod CA, Lynch A, Flynn E, et al. Open trial of bupropion SR in adolescent major depression. *J Child Adolesc Psychiatr Nurs*. 2003;16:123-30.
- ⁹⁷ Daviss WB, Bentivoglio P, Racusin R, et al. Bupropion sustained release in adolescents with comorbid attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder and depression. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2001;40:307-14.
- ⁹⁸ Haapasalo-Pesu KM, Vuola T, Lahelma L, et al. Mirtazapine in the treatment of adolescents with major depression: an open-label, multicenter pilot study. *J Child Adolesc Psychopharmacol*. 2004;14:175-84.
- ⁹⁹ Posey DJ, Guenin KD, Kohn AE, et al. A naturalistic open-label study of mirtazapine in autistic and other pervasive developmental disorders. *J Child Adolesc Psychopharmacol*. 2001;11:267-77.

- ¹⁰⁰ Findling RL, Preskorn SH, Marcus RN, et al. Nefazodone pharmacokinetics in depressed children and adolescents. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2000;39:1008-16.
- ¹⁰¹ Goodnick PJ, Jorge CA, Hunter T, Kumar AM. Nefazodone treatment of adolescent depression: an open-label study of response and biochemistry. *Ann Clin Psychiatry*. 2000;12:97-100
- ¹⁰² Wilens TE, Spencer TJ, Biederman J, Schleifer D. Case study: nefazodone for juvenile mood disorders. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 1997;36:481-5
- ¹⁰³ Mandoki MW, Tapia MR, Tapia MA, et al. Venlafaxine in the treatment of children and adolescents with major depression. *Psychopharmacol Bull*. 1997;33:149-54.
- ¹⁰⁴ Rynn MA, Riddle MA, Yeung PP, et al. Efficacy and safety of extended-release venlafaxine in the treatment of generalized anxiety disorder in children and adolescents: two placebo-controlled trials. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2007;164(2):290-300.
- ¹⁰⁵ Emslie GJ, Findling RL, Yeung PP, et al. Venlafaxine ER for the treatment of pediatric subjects with depression: results of two placebo-controlled trials. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2007;46(4):479-88.
- ¹⁰⁶ Emslie GJ, Yeung PP, Kunz NR. Long-term, open-label venlafaxine extended-release treatment in children and adolescents with major depressive disorder. *CNS Spectr*. 2007;12(3):223-33.
- ¹⁰⁷ Wellbutrin [package insert]. Research Triangle Park, NC; GlaxoSmithKline; August 2007.
- ¹⁰⁸ Cymbalta [package insert]. Indianapolis, IN; Eli Lilly; November 2007.
- ¹⁰⁹ Remeron [package insert]. West Orange, NJ; Organon; May 2007.
- ¹¹⁰ Serzone [package insert]. Princeton, NJ; Bristol Myers Squibb; June 2004.
- ¹¹¹ EMSAM [package insert]. Princeton, NJ; Bristol-Myers Squibb; June 2007.
- ¹¹² Harvey A, Preskorn SH. Cytochrome P450 enzymes: interpretation of their interactions with selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors. Part II. *J Clin Psychopharmacol*. 1996;16:344-55.
- ¹¹³ Shad MU, Preskorn SH. In: Levy R, et al, eds. Philadelphia, Pa: Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins; 2000:563-77.
- ¹¹⁴ Wellbutrin [package insert]. Research Triangle Park, NC; GlaxoSmithKline; August 2007.
- ¹¹⁵ Wellbutrin SR [package insert]. Research Triangle Park, NC; GlaxoSmithKline; August 2007.
- ¹¹⁶ Wellbutrin XL [package insert]. Research Triangle Park, NC; GlaxoSmithKline; August 2007.
- ¹¹⁷ Cymbalta [package insert]. Indianapolis, IN; Eli Lilly; November 2007.
- ¹¹⁸ Remeron [package insert]. West Orange, NJ; Organon; May 2007.
- ¹¹⁹ Serzone [package insert]. Princeton, NJ; Bristol Myers Squibb; June 2004.
- ¹²⁰ EMSAM [package insert]. Princeton, NJ; Bristol-Myers Squibb; June 2007.
- ¹²¹ Trazodone [package insert]. Corona, CA; Watson; August 2007.
- ¹²² Effexor [package insert]. Philadelphia, PA; Wyeth-Ayerst; November 2007.
- ¹²³ Effexor XR [package insert]. Philadelphia, PA; Wyeth-Ayerst; November 2007.
- ¹²⁴ Skowron DM, Stimmel GL. Antidepressants and the risk of seizures. *Pharmacotherapy*. 1992;12:18-22.
- ¹²⁵ R Hubbard, S Lewis, J West, et al. Bupropion and the risk of sudden death: a self-controlled case-series analysis using The Health Improvement Network. *Thorax*. 2005;60:848-50.
- ¹²⁶ Amsterdam JD. A double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of the safety and efficacy of selegiline transdermal system without dietary restrictions in patients with major depressive disorder. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2003;64:208-14.
- ¹²⁷ EMSAM [package insert]. Princeton, NJ; Bristol-Myers Squibb; June 2007.
- ¹²⁸ Bodkin JA, Amsterdam JD. Transdermal selegiline in major depression: a double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group study in outpatients. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2002;159:1869-75.
- ¹²⁹ Preskorn SH. Recent dose-effect studies regarding antidepressants. In: Balant LP, Benitez J, Dahl SG, et al., eds. *European Cooperation in the Field of Scientific and Technical Research*. Belgium: European Commission; 1998:45-61.
- ¹³⁰ Bandelow B, Zohar J, Hollander E, et al. World Federation of Societies of Biological Psychiatry (WFSBP) guidelines for the pharmacological treatment of anxiety, obsessive-compulsive and posttraumatic stress disorders. *World J Biol Psychiatry*. 2004;19:96-101.
- ¹³¹ Consensus Guidelines: Assessment, Diagnosis, and Treatment of Diabetic Peripheral Neuropathic Pain. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*. 2006;81:S1-32.