


RESEARCH ARTICLE

Factors associated with first- versus second-generation long-acting antipsychotics prescribed under ordinary clinical practice in Italy

Giovanni Ostuzzi^{1*}, Maria Angela Mazzi¹, Samira Terlizzi¹, Federico Bertolini¹, Andrea Aguglia^{2,3}, Francesco Bartoli⁴, Paola Bortolaso⁵, Camilla Callegari⁵, Mariarita Caroleo⁶, Giuseppe Carrà^{4,7}, Mariangela Corbo⁸, Armando D'Agostino^{9,10}, Chiara Gastaldon¹, Claudio Lucii¹¹, Fabio Magliocco⁶, Giovanni Martinotti⁸, Michela Nosé¹, Edoardo Giuseppe Ostinelli^{9,10}, Davide Papola¹, Marco Piero Piccinelli⁵, Alberto Piccoli¹, Marianna Purgato¹, Tommaso Tabacchi⁴, Giulia Turrini¹, Mirella Ruggeri¹, Corrado Barbui¹, the STAR Network Investigators[¶]



1 WHO Collaborating Centre for Research and Training in Mental Health and Service Evaluation, Department of Neuroscience, Biomedicine and Movement Sciences, Section of Psychiatry, University of Verona, Verona, Italy, **2** Department of Neuroscience, Rehabilitation, Ophthalmology, Genetics, Maternal and Child Health, Section of Psychiatry, IRCCS "Policlinico San Martino" Hospital, University of Genoa, Genoa, Italy, **3** "Rita Levi Montalcini" Department of Neuroscience, University of Turin, Turin, Italy, **4** Department of Medicine and Surgery, University of Milano Bicocca, Monza, Italy, **5** Università degli Studi dell'Insubria, Dipartimento di Salute Mentale e Dipendenze-ASST Settelaghi Varese, Varese, Italy, **6** Department of Health Sciences, Psychiatric Unit, University Magna Græcia of Catanzaro, Catanzaro, Italy, **7** Division of Psychiatry, University College of London, London, UK, **8** Department of Neuroscience, Imaging and Clinical Sciences, University "G. d'Annunzio", Chieti, Italy, **9** Department of Health Sciences, Università degli Studi di Milano, Milan, Italy, **10** Department of Mental Health, San Paolo Hospital, Milan, Italy, **11** Mental Health Department, USL Toscana sud-est-Siena, Siena, Italy

[¶] Membership of the STAR Network is provided in the Acknowledgments.

* giovanni.ostuzzi@gmail.com

OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Ostuzzi G, Mazzi MA, Terlizzi S, Bertolini F, Aguglia A, Bartoli F, et al. (2018) Factors associated with first- versus second-generation long-acting antipsychotics prescribed under ordinary clinical practice in Italy. *PLoS ONE* 13(8): e0201371. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0201371>

Editor: Marianna Mazza, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore Sede di Roma, ITALY

Received: May 11, 2018

Accepted: July 13, 2018

Published: August 2, 2018

Copyright: © 2018 Ostuzzi et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: The full dataset is available from the Dryad Digital Repository, doi:[10.5061/dryad.q49p6d8](https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.q49p6d8).

Funding: The authors received no specific funding for this work.

Competing interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Abstract

Background

For many years, long-acting intramuscular (LAI) antipsychotics have been prescribed predominantly to chronic and severe patients, as a last resort when other treatments failed. Recently, a broader and earlier use of LAIs, particularly second-generation LAIs, has been emphasized. To date, few studies attempted to frame how this change in prescribing took place in real-world practice. Therefore, this study aimed to describe the clinical features of patients prescribed with LAIs, and to explore possible prescribing differences between first- and second-generations LAIs under ordinary clinical practice in Italy.

Methods

The STAR Network "Depot" Study is an observational, longitudinal, multicenter study involving 35 centers in Italy. In the cross-sectional phase, patients prescribed with LAIs were consecutively recruited and assessed over a period of 12 months. Descriptive statistics and multivariable logistic regression analyses were employed.

Results

Of the 451 recruited patients, 61% were males. The level of social and working functioning was heterogeneous, as was the severity of disease. Seventy-two per cent of the patients had a diagnosis of the schizophrenia spectrum. Seventy per cent were prescribed with second-generation antipsychotic (SGA) LAIs (mostly paliperidone, aripiprazole and risperidone). Compared to first-generation antipsychotic (FGA) LAIs, patients prescribed with SGA LAIs were more often younger; employed; with a diagnosis of the schizophrenia spectrum or bipolar disorder; with higher levels of affective symptoms; with fewer LAI prescriptions in the past.

Discussion

LAIs' prescribing practices appear to be more flexible as compared to the past, although this change is mostly restricted to SGA LAIs.

Introduction

The problem of non-adherence to medications is a major concern in people with psychotic disorders [1]. Antipsychotic discontinuation, is associated with poorer outcomes, including recurrent relapses and hospitalizations, higher risk of suicide, and earlier social and functional disability [2–4]. This is particularly relevant in early phases of disease, considering that discontinuation is particularly frequent within the first years from the first episode of psychosis (with estimated rates ranging from about 40% to 70%) [5,6], and most of these patients (from about 40% to 60% in most studies) are likely to relapse in the following few years [7,8]. Long-acting intramuscular (LAI) antipsychotics' efficacy in preventing relapses and treatment discontinuation is widely recognized [6,9–11]. Further, LAIs allow a complete tracking of medication intake, promote the regular monitoring of clinical conditions, and lower the risk of self-medication and harmful drug use. Also relevant disadvantages have been highlighted, such as pain on the injection site, lack of flexibility in dose adjustments, and the impossibility of rapid suspension in case of adverse events [12,13].

From their introduction, LAIs have been generally considered as a last-resort for chronic patients with frequent relapses, low insight of disease, poor adherence to treatments, aggressiveness and behavioral issues [12,14–16]. However, in the last decade, various factors contributed to change this scenario. First, in addition to risperidone (marketed since 2001), other second-generation antipsychotic (SGA) LAIs became available: olanzapine pamoate (since 2009), paliperidone palmitate 1-month (since 2009), aripiprazole long-acting (since 2010), and paliperidone palmitate 3-months (since 2015) [12,17]. Second, in the same years, growing evidence emerged in support of the use of antipsychotics (SGAs in particular) not only for schizophrenia, but also for affective disorders [18,19]. Third, as the huge impact of non-adherence on the course of disease became more evident, emphasis has been put on the need to address this issue from the earliest phases of the disease [20,21]. Fourth, studies exploring the subjective experience of patients suggest that the practicality of LAIs can notably ease patients' daily routine, possibly improving attitudes toward medications [22–28]. These findings contributed to progressively overcome the culturally rooted view of LAIs as coercive and stigmatizing medications [12,14,29,30].

On these grounds, many researchers advocated for an earlier and broader use of LAIs [20,21,31–34], and this viewpoint has been accounted by the most influential clinical guidelines [35–38].

Despite the backdrop, few studies attempted to describe how this novel paradigm affected prescribing practices. Available epidemiological data are limited to schizophrenia patients [39–43] and highly selected populations [40,44,45]. In order to fill the gap in the research literature, the cross-sectional phase of the STAR Network “Depot” Study aimed at evaluating how the claimed cultural change in LAIs prescription may have affected real-world practices, by (a) describing the main socio-demographic and clinical features (including symptom profiles, adherence and attitude towards treatments) of a large, representative, unselected population of patients starting a LAI medication, and (b) exploring possible predictors of the class of LAI prescribed.

Materials and methods

Study design

The STAR Network “Depot” Study is an observational, longitudinal, multicenter study. Patients prescribed with any LAI antipsychotic were consecutively recruited over a period of 12 months, and assessed after 6 and 12 months. The present paper is focused on baseline data from the recruitment phase.

Participating centers are part of the STAR Network (*Servizi Territoriali Associati per la Ricerca*—Community Services Associated for Research), a consortium of clinicians and researchers working in Community Psychiatric Services across Italy. The main aim of this group is to gather original data from real-world clinical practice and provide new pragmatic insights for clinicians [46–48]. The STAR Network “Depot” Study was conducted independently from industry funding or support. The study protocol was approved by the Local Ethics Committee of the Ethics Committee of the *Azienda Ospedaliera Universitaria Integrata* of Verona (*Comitato Etico per la Sperimentazione Clinica* (CESC) of the Provinces of Verona and Rovigo, protocol n. 57622 of the 09/12/2015), and was made publicly available at the Open Science Framework (OSF) online repository (<https://osf.io/wt8kx/>). The present study was drawn up following the ‘STrengthening the Reporting of OBservational studies in Epidemiology’ (STROBE) Statement items [49].

Participants

Patients were eligible for the study if they were (a) at least 18 years old; (b) willing to sign the informed consent; and (c) beginning a LAI medication, provided that they did not receive any other LAI in the previous three months. The simultaneous taking of other medications, including oral antipsychotics, was not an exclusion criterion, nor was the setting of recruitment, which might include hospital psychiatric wards, daytime community and residential facilities.

Measures

In order to collect socio-demographic and clinical data, the following measures were administered at the baseline evaluation:

- Recruitment form, which included socio-demographic information, clinical and pharmacological information, and characteristics of the clinician who prescribed the LAI;
- The clinician-rated Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale (BPRS) [50], validated in Italian language [51], which assesses overall psychiatric symptoms. The overall level of symptomatology should be considered mild, moderate and severe for scores ranging respectively from 31 to 40, 41 to 52 and higher than 52 [52]. According to Shafer and colleagues [53],

five subscales were measured, namely affect, positive symptoms, negative symptoms, resistance, and activation;

- The self-administered Drug Attitude Inventory 10 items (DAI-10) [54], validated in Italian language [55], which measures attitudes toward medications. The scores range between -10 and 10, with higher scores indicating a better overall attitude toward medications;
- The clinician-rated Kemp's 7-point scale [56], compiled by the clinician, which assesses overall adherence to treatments. The scores range from 1 to 7, with higher scores indicating equally higher levels of adherence. Scores of 5 and above indicate an overall good acceptance of medications.

Data management

All patients received detailed information on the nature of the study and the use of data on an anonymised format, and were asked to sign an informed consent. The recruiter was required to examine the mental capacity of the patients, by assessing his/her capacity of understand both in a strict sense (i.e. comprehension of the language) and in a broad sense (i.e. the context, the role of the examiner, the content of the research project, etc.), and to communicate his/her decision, in order to determine whether he/she was capable to freely provide written consent. Recruitment data were periodically forwarded from each recruiting center to the Verona center, which had the role of coordination and scientific secretariat. Data were archived and entered into a computerized database. Their correctness and consistency was ensured by the double-entry technique and by a set of electronic and manual edit checks. Patient data were recorded anonymously. A unique number both in the recruitment and follow-up forms and in the database identified patients. Total confidentiality of data was guaranteed throughout the entire course of the study, in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki [57].

Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were performed with STATA 13.0 [58]. Descriptive statistics were used for information on main epidemiological characteristics of the recruited population. Continuous variables were expressed as means and standard deviations, while categorical variables were expressed as percentages. In order to describe possible associations between clinical and socio-demographic characteristics and the class of LAI prescribed, both simple and multivariable logistic regression analyses were performed. A bivariate analysis employing the class of LAI as the dependent variable (0 = first-generation antipsychotic (FGA) LAIs; 1 = SGA LAIs) was applied to a number of variables of clinical relevance. For the aims of the logistic model, we employed the following dichotomous and categorical data: Italians versus non-Italians; poor autonomy level (lives with relatives or in a residential house) versus good autonomy level (lives alone or with partner and/or children); diploma/University degree versus other; employed versus unemployed; schizophrenia spectrum versus bipolar disorder versus other diagnosis; academic versus non-academic centers; Northern Italy versus Central and Southern Italy. We also calculated the ratio between the prescribed daily dose (PDD) in the previous 12 months and the defined daily dose (DDD) [59]. All variables for which a statistically significant association emerged in the bivariate analysis were included as independent variables in a multivariable model. Subsequently, we produced a final multivariable model, including only the independent variables for which a statistically significant association emerged from the previous multivariable model. In order to evaluate the adequacy of the models some indices of goodness of fit were performed. Specifically, the Hosmer-Lemeshow test, based on the

comparison between predicted and observed data by using deciles as stratification size, assesses whether the model is well calibrated; McKelvey & Zavoina's pseudo R^2 , for its interpretation (as percentage of explained variance) closed to the "traditional" way [60]. Finally, Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) was used in the comparison between intermediate and final multivariable models, to determine whether the exclusion of some explanatory variables decreased the explanatory power of the last model. Regression analyses were based on robust estimator of variance (*cluster* option of the STATA *vce* command) to account for the multicenter observational design [61].

Results

Participating centers

Thirty-five Italian Community Psychiatric Centers took part in the study. Recruiting centers included mostly non-academic mental health trusts (73.4%), however, the number of patients recruited was equally distributed between academic and non-academic centers (54.5% vs. 45.4%, respectively). The majority of centers (73.4%) were located in Northern Italy, however the number of patients recruited in these centers was only slightly higher than the number recruited in Central and Southern Italy (59.4% vs. 40.6%, respectively).

Socio-demographic and clinical features

We recruited and included in the analysis 451 patients. All included participants provided an informed, written consent. Sixty-one per cent of patients were males, with a mean age of 42. Most patients lived with relatives (51%). Forty per cent had a diploma and 10% a University degree. About 22% were employed at the time of recruitment. Other socio-demographic details are reported in Table 1.

Fifty-six per cent suffered from schizophrenia, 16.5% from schizoaffective disorder, 18% from bipolar disorder, 6% from personality disorders, and the remaining 3.5% from other conditions, including obsessive-compulsive disorder, substance use disorders, mental retardation, mental organic disorders, and dementia. We found high rates of alcohol and/or substance abuse (27%) and of physical comorbidity (28%). According to the mean BPRS score, the level of psychiatric symptoms was negligible for 12% of patients, mild for 19%, moderate for 26%, and severe for 42%. Fifty-nine per cent of patients showed a positive attitude toward medications according to the mean DAI-10 score, and 61% showed a good acceptance of medications according to the mean Kemp's 7-point score. Ninety-two per cent of patients were taking at least one oral psychotropic medication before introducing the LAI. The mean ratio between the prescribed daily dose (PDD) and the defined daily dose (DDD) of all psychotropic drugs taken in the previous year was 1.8 (sd 2), indicating that the cumulative dose of medications was almost doubled with respect to the average maintenance dose. The majority of patients were prescribed paliperidone palmitate (31%), aripiprazole LAI (25%), haloperidol decanoate (20%) and risperidone LAI (10%) (Fig 1). Other clinical and pharmacological details are reported in Table 2.

Comparison between classes of antipsychotic

Table 3 reports the comparison between FGA LAIs and SGA LAIs for a number of clinically relevant variables. Raw data of each group, the bivariate analysis, and the two subsequent multivariable analyses are reported. The bivariate analysis showed eleven independent variables to be significantly associated with a higher prescription of SGA LAIs, and the two subsequent multivariable models confirmed this significant association for the following variables:

Table 1. Socio-demographic features.

Variables	All LAIs, n = 451
Age, mean (sd)	41.8 (13.4)
Age categories, n (%)	
18–30	111 (24.6)
31–45	161 (35.7)
46–60	144 (31.9)
>61	35 (7.8)
Female, n (%)	177 (39.2)
Italian, n (%)	390 (88.2)
Housing conditions, n (%)	
Alone	100 (22.2)
With partner and/or children	95 (21.1)
With other relatives	229 (50.8)
Any residential home	27 (6)
Marital status, n (%)	
Non-conjugated	383 (85.1)
Conjugated	67 (14.9)
Educational level, n (%)	
Illiterate/no title	7 (1.6)
Primary school	27 (6.1)
Secondary school	189 (42.5)
Diploma	178 (40)
University degree	44 (9.9)
Work, n (%)	
Employed	100 (22.2)
Unemployed	221 (49)
Student	15 (3.3)
Retired	68 (15.1)
Housewife/other	47 (10.4)

LAI = long-acting injection; n = number of patients; sd = standard deviation

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0201371.t001>

younger age (OR 0.97; 95% CI 0.95 to 0.98); being employed (OR 2.01; 95% CI 1.14 to 3.56); having a higher score on the BPRS affective subscale (OR 1.09; 95% CI 1.04 to 1.14); and having a lower number of LAIs prescribed in the past (OR 0.69; 95% CI 0.52 to 0.93). In addition, having a diagnosis other than schizophrenia spectrum and bipolar disorder reduced the probability of receiving SGA LAIs (OR 0.28; 95% CI 0.13 to 0.60).

The goodness-of-fit statistics indicated a moderate relationship between the type of LAIs prescribed and the explanatory variables in both models: McKelvey and Zavoina Pseudo- R^2 explained 18% and 16% of the variability. In calibration view, the models correctly classified 73% and 72% of the patients; the p-values associated with Hosmer–Lemeshow statistics were low even though not significant, confirming moderate agreements between predicted probabilities and observed data. Finally, the comparison between the BIC values showed a substantial difference (25.84), preferring the final model.

Discussion

In general, present data confirm the expectation that a broader spectrum of individuals is currently prescribed LAIs as compared to the past. A wide range of socio-demographic and




Fig 1. Frequency of LAIs prescribed. Legend: SGA = second-generation antipsychotic; FGA = first-generation antipsychotics; LAI = long-acting injection.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0201371.g001>

clinical characteristics emerged. A relevant part of the cohort met the features typically described in older studies (before the broad availability of most SGA LAIs), as patients were mostly males in their middle adulthood, with low educational level, no employment, a long-standing diagnosis of schizophrenia, and moderate-to-severe level of psychiatric symptoms [15,62–65]. At the same time, relatively high functioning levels emerged in a surprisingly large part of the population, considering that about 43% of patients lived alone or with the partner and/or children, more than one out of five patients were employed, and half of the patients had a diploma or a University degree. Similar considerations apply to clinical features, considering that, beside a large number of patients with chronic conditions and severe symptomatology, also patients with mild-to-moderate levels of symptomatology were well represented. Further, data showed a relatively short course of disease (lower than 5 years) in about 36% of patients, and an overall good attitude towards medications as perceived by both patients and clinicians. Interestingly, a variety of diagnoses emerged. High rates of bipolar disorder were expected, considering the recently broadened use of antipsychotics for affective disorders [18,19]. In about 6% of patients, the LAI was probably prescribed to manage severe behavioral symptoms arising from personality disorders or underlying somatic conditions (such as mental retardation or dementia), although the use of antipsychotics in these cases is at least controversial [66,67].

Highly selected populations from previous studies can be barely compared with the present study, which employed a pragmatic, naturalistic approach, aimed at minimizing patients' selection and reflect real-world practice as closely as possible.

Table 2. Clinical features.

Variables	All LAIs, n = 451
Diagnosis, n (%)	
Schizophrenia	251 (55.9)
Schizoaffective disorder	74 (16.5)
Substance-related psychosis	2 (0.4)
Bipolar disorder	81 (18)
Obsessive-compulsive disorder	4 (0.9)
Personality disorder	27 (6)
Mental retardation	4 (0.9)
Mental organic disorder	4 (0.9)
Dementia	2 (0.4)
Time from disease onset, mean years (sd)	11.9 (10)
Alcohol use, n (%)	65 (14.4)
Any substance use, n (%)	90 (19.9)
Polysubstance use, n (%)	14 (3.1)
Substances, n (%)	
Cannabis	69 (76.7)
Cocaine	13 (14.4)
Other	8 (8.9)
At least one medical comorbidity, n (%)	127 (28.2)
Medical comorbidity, n (%)	
Infective disease	8 (6.3)
Endocrine/metabolic disease	48 (37.8)
Cardiovascular disease	23 (18.1)
Neurologic disease	10 (7.9)
Gastrointestinal disease	11 (8.7)
Other	27 (21.2)
BPRS, mean (sd)	49 (14.7)
BPRS positive symptoms, mean (sd)	12.1 (5.4)
BPRS negative symptoms, mean (sd)	7.8 (3.7)
BPRS affective symptoms, mean (sd)	10.5 (4.3)
BPRS resistance, mean (sd)	9.4 (4.5)
BPRS activation, mean (sd)	7.6 (3.3)
DAI-10, mean (sd)	2 (5.3)
Kemp's 7-point scale, mean (sd)	4.8 (1.4)
At least one hospitalization in the last year, n (%)	270 (59.9)
At least one compulsory hospitalization, n (%)	89 (19.7)
Length of hospitalizations, mean days (sd)	22.7 (19.5)
Cumulative dose of psychotropic drugs taken in the last year: PDD/DDD, mean (sd)	1.8 (2)
LAIs PDD/DDD, mean (sd)	1.3 (1.2)
Number of previous LAIs, n (%)	
0	316 (70.1)
1	103 (22.8)
2 or more	32 (7.1)

n = number of patients; sd = standard deviation; BPRS = brief psychiatry rating scale; DAI = drug attitude inventory; PDD = prescribed daily dose; DDD = defined daily dose

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0201371.t002>

Table 3. Bivariate and multivariable comparison between FGAs and SGAs.

Variables	FGAs LAIs, n = 135	SGAs LAIs, n = 316	SGAs vs. FGAs		
			unadjusted OR[95% CI]	adjusted OR* [95% CI]	adjusted OR** [95% CI]
Age, mean (sd)	45.9 (13.2)	40.1 (13.2)	0.97 [0.95 to 0.98]	0.97 [0.95 to 0.99]	0.97 [0.95 to 0.98]
Female, n (%)	60 (44.4)	117 (37.1)	0.73 [0.49 to 1.11]	-	-
Italian, n (%)	122 (91)	268 (87)	1.52 [0.77 to 2.99]	-	-
Lives alone or with partner/children, n (%)	69 (51.1)	126 (39.9)	0.63 [0.42 to 0.95]	0.85 [0.49 to 1.46]	-
Diploma or University degree, n (%)	58 (43.9)	164 (52.4)	1.40 [0.93 to 2.11]	-	-
Employed, n (%)	21 (15.6)	79 (25)	1.81 [1.06 to 3.07]	1.99 [1.02 to 3.90]	2.01 [1.14 to 3.56]
Diagnosis, n (%)					
Schizophrenia spectrum	92 (68.1)	233 (74.2)	ref.	ref.	ref.
Bipolar disorder	21 (15.6)	60 (19.1)	1.13 [0.65 to 1.96]	1.11 [0.53 to 2.30]	1.09 [0.52 to 2.31]
Other	22 (16.3)	21 (6.7)	0.38 [0.20 to 0.72]	0.30 [0.14 to 0.67]	0.28 [0.13 to 0.60]
BPRS, mean (sd)	48.3 (13.1)	49.3 (15.4)	1.00 [0.99 to 1.02]	-	-
BPRS affective symptoms, mean (sd)	9.5 (3.9)	10.9 (4.4)	1.08 [1.03 to 1.14]	1.10 [1.05 to 1.15]	1.09 [1.04 to 1.14]
BPRS positive symptoms, mean (sd)	11.9 (4.8)	12.2 (5.6)	1.01 [0.97 to 1.05]	-	-
BPRS negative symptoms, mean (sd)	7.4 (3.5)	7.9 (3.7)	1.04 [0.98 to 1.10]	-	-
BPRS resistance, mean (sd)	10.1 (4.4)	9.1 (4.5)	0.95 [0.91 to 0.99]	0.96 [0.90 to 1.03]	-
BPRS activation, mean (sd)	7.6 (3.1)	7.6 (3.5)	1.00 [0.94 to 1.06]	-	-
DAI-10, mean (sd)	1.1 (5.5)	2.4 (5.3)	1.05 [1.01 to 1.09]	1.02 [0.96 to 1.07]	-
Kemp's 7-point scale, mean (sd)	4.5 (1.5)	4.9 (1.4)	1.24 [1.08 to 1.44]	1.02 [0.78 to 1.35]	-
N. of hospitalizations in the last year, mean (sd)	1 (1.1)	0.8 (1.1)	0.82 [0.69 to 0.99]	0.86 [0.66 to 1.11]	-
Length of hospitalizations (days), mean (sd)	14.3 (17.3)	13.4 (19.3)	1.00 [0.99 to 1.01]	-	-
At least one compulsory hospitalization, n (%)	33 (35.1)	56 (31.8)	0.86 [0.51 to 1.46]	-	-
Alcohol abuse, n (%)	21 (15.6)	44 (13.9)	0.88 [0.50 to 1.54]	-	-
Substance abuse, n (%)	27 (20)	63 (19.9)	1.00 [0.60 to 1.65]	-	-
At least one medical comorbidity, n (%)	48 (35.6)	79 (25.1)	0.61 [0.39 to 0.94]	0.82 [0.54 to 1.26]	-
Number of previous LAIs, mean (sd)	0.5 (0.7)	0.3 (0.6)	0.67 [0.50 to 0.90]	0.73 [0.55 to 0.96]	0.69 [0.52 to 0.93]
Number of psychotropic drugs in the last year, mean (sd)	1.5 (1.1)	1.3 (1)	0.88 [0.73 to 1.08]	-	-
Cumulative dose of psychotropic drugs taken in the last year: PDD/DDD, mean (sd)	1.6 (1.6)	1.88 (2.2)	1.08 [0.96 to 1.22]	-	-
University center, n (%)	77 (57)	169 (53.5)	0.86 [0.58 to 1.30]	-	-
South-center Italy, n (%)	51 (37.8)	132 (41.8)	1.18 [0.78 to 1.79]	-	-
Prescriber's age, mean (sd)	46.7 (12.3)	45.6 (10.4)	0.99 [0.97 to 1.01]	-	-
Goodness-of-fit					
H-L Chi ² (p-value)				8.09 (0.43)	14.71 (0.06)
M&Z pseudo R ²				0.18	0.16
BIC				566.712	540.875

* the intermediate multivariable model includes only variables for which a statistically significant association emerged in the bivariate analysis

** the final multivariable model includes only variables for which a statistically significant association emerged from the intermediate model

Bold characters indicate a p-value < 0.05.

The % reported in parenthesis refers to the ratio calculated respectively on all LAIs (first column), FGA LAIs (second column), SGA LAIs (third column)

SGA = second-generation antipsychotic; FGA = first-generation antipsychotic; n = number of patients; sd = standard deviation; OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval; BPRS = brief psychiatry rating scale; DAI = drug attitude inventory; PDD = prescribed daily dose; DDD = defined daily dose; H-L Chi² = Chi-squared value of the Hosmer-Lemeshow test; M&Z pseudo R² = McKelvey-Zavoina pseudo R² index; BIC = Bayesian information criterion

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0201371.t003>

The use of LAIs on a broader number of clinical conditions may raise regulatory issues, considering that licensed indications of SGA LAIs are limited only to patients with schizophrenia in a maintenance phase with oral antipsychotics. Therefore, SGA LAIs were prescribed off-

label to all patients without a diagnosis of schizophrenia (almost one out of five patients). On the contrary, indications of FGA LAIs are narrower, often referring to symptom domains rather than specific diagnosis, and may therefore be prescribed to patients with several different diagnoses. The common off-label prescription of LAIs confirms the already well-known trend of oral antipsychotics [68].

Representativeness of the cohort seems warranted also in terms of high prevalence of comorbid physical conditions [69,70] (about one out of four patients had at least one comorbidity, mostly endocrine/metabolic or cardiovascular) and of “dual diagnosis”, considering that one out of four used alcohol or substances [71–73].

In most cases LAIs were prescribed after severe disease relapse, considering the large number of patients hospitalized in the previous year, the high rate of compulsory admissions, and the long mean length of stay. This may suggest that, despite the recommendation of offering LAIs from the early phases of disease [37,38], in many cases these formulations are still chosen after failures with other treatments.

More than two out of three patients were prescribed with SGA LAIs. The most commonly prescribed medications were paliperidone palmitate (31%), aripiprazole LAI (25%) and haloperidol decanoate (20%). These results are in line with data from some of the previous studies [42,74,75], while, in others, prescription rates appeared to be extremely heterogeneous [40,41,44]. This is likely to be associated with a number of factors influencing local prescribing patterns and with the different recruitment periods across studies (and therefore different availability of SGA LAIs). The use of aripiprazole LAI was surprisingly high compared to other recent studies [40–42,75]. The advantages of this medication have been repeatedly stressed: it is relatively safe in terms of motor, metabolic and endocrine side effects (it does not usually alter prolactin levels), and it proved to be comparable to other SGAs in terms of efficacy for the treatment of schizophrenia [76,77]. Further, robust results from a recent meta-analysis showed a better overall acceptability of aripiprazole LAI as compared to the oral counterpart, although the interpretation of this data is still unclear [78]. On the other hand, paliperidone substantially equals olanzapine and risperidone in terms of metabolic effects and prolactin level increase [76]. Its choice over olanzapine and risperidone is likely to be related to its enhanced practicality compared to the biweekly administration of risperidone LAI, and the complex regulatory requirements of olanzapine pamoate. Haloperidol decanoate, besides its possible disadvantages (e.g. motor symptoms, QTc prolongation, locally irritant preparations), remains a widely used medication in clinical practice, possibly because of its relatively safe metabolic profile [76], its low cost, and the flexibility of the LAI in terms of doses and frequency, as compared to other LAIs (including SGAs).

The multivariable logistic model comparing FGA LAIs and SGA LAIs showed that the latter were prescribed significantly more often to younger, employed individuals, with a diagnosis of schizophrenia or bipolar disorder, with higher levels of affective symptoms, and without a previous history of LAI prescription. This profile resembles closely the one pictured by those claiming a cultural change in the clinical use of LAIs. This trend is similar to what emerged from previous studies, although in many cases only FGA LAIs and risperidone LAI were compared [79–81], confounders were not considered [40,42,80], and social and clinical variables possibly associated with the class of LAI were not analyzed. Notably, no significant differences emerged between patients prescribed with FGA LAIs and SGA LAIs in terms of overall psychiatric symptoms, adherence and attitudes towards medications, both as perceived by psychiatrists (Kemp’s 7-point score) and by patients (DAI-10 score). To our knowledge, the study by Singh and colleagues [81] is currently the only available one employing the DAI (in this case, the version with 30 items), and it reached similar conclusions, although only FGA LAIs and LAI risperidone were compared.

As expected according to current research [82–84], SGAs were preferred when targeting affective symptoms. This may also reflect the common idea of FGAs as medications associated with apathy, lack of initiative, anhedonia, indifference, blunted affect (the so-called neuroleptic-induced deficit syndrome) [85,86].

This study has also limitations. First, our cross-sectional design cannot detect a causal association between variables, and all statistical associations discussed should be regarded as merely exploratory. Second, the use of simple rating scales (in accordance to the pragmatic attitude of the study) might have affected the precision in measuring variables, such as psychiatric symptoms and patients' attitudes toward medications. Third, characteristics of recruiting centers were heterogeneous in terms of settings (e.g. community services, hospital wards, rehabilitation facilities), and each site contributed to the recruitment to a different extent. In addition, various local factors may have strongly influenced prescribing attitudes of each center (e.g. local guidelines and long-standing habits, availability of medications). This, along with our wide inclusion criteria, led to heterogeneity in the recruited population. This reflects the complexity of real-world clinical settings, bolstering the external validity of results, but may at the same time affect their internal validity [87]. To address this limitation, we employed statistical techniques accounting for variability between centers.

Conclusions

This study showed a notable change in LAIs prescribing patterns, as compared with previous epidemiological surveys. The advocated cultural change in the use of LAIs is currently under way in Italian Community Psychiatric Services, as showed by more flexible and heterogeneous prescribing patterns, addressing a wider range of clinical conditions and functioning levels. This change appears to be mostly confined to SGA LAIs, while prescribing patterns of FGA LAIs are practically unchanged as compared to the past, as they are mostly reserved to older patients, with lower functioning levels, previous use of LAIs, and, commonly, behavioral issues.

Further research is needed to shed light on how LAIs can improve adherence, attitudes toward medications, and subjective wellbeing of patients in real-world practice. This will be the main goal of the follow-up phase of the STAR Network “Depot” Study.

Acknowledgments

The STAR Network Investigators are: Corrado Barbui (Verona), Michela Nosé (Verona), Marianna Purgato (Verona), Giulia Turrini (Verona), Giovanni Ostuzzi (Verona), Maria Angela Mazzi (Verona), Davide Papola (Verona), Chiara Gastaldon (Verona), Samira Terlizzi (Verona), Federico Bertolini (Verona), Alberto Piccoli (Verona), Mirella Ruggeri (Verona), Pasquale De Fazio (Catanzaro), Fabio Magliocco (Catanzaro), Mariarita Caroleo (Catanzaro), Gaetano Raffaele (Catanzaro), Armando D'Agostino (Milano), Edoardo Giuseppe Ostinelli (Milano), Margherita Chirico (Milano), Simone Cavallotti (Milano), Claudio Lucii (Siena), Simone Bolognesi (Siena), Sara Debolini (Siena), Elisa Pierantozzi (Siena), Francesco Fagnoli (Siena), Maria Del Zanna (Siena), Alessandra Giannini (Siena), Livia Luccarelli (Siena), Alberto De Capua (Siena), Pasqua Maria Annese (Siena), Massimiliano Cerretini (Siena), Fiorella Tozzi (Siena), Nadia Magnani (Grosseto), Giuseppe Cardamone (Grosseto), Francesco Bardicchia (Grosseto), Edvige Facchi (Grosseto), Federica Soscia (Grosseto), Spyridon Zotos (Ferrara), Bruno Biancosino (Ferrara), Filippo Zonta (Treviso), Francesco Pompei (Treviso), Camilla Callegari (Varese), Daniele Zizolfi (Varese), Nicola Poloni (Varese), Marta Ielmini (Varese), Ivano Caselli (Varese), Edoardo Giana (Varese), Aldo Buzzi (Varese), Marcello Diurni (Varese), Anna Milano (Varese), Emanuele Sani (Varese), Roberta Calzolari (Varese), Paola Bortolaso (Varese Verbano), Marco Piccinelli (Varese Verbano), Sara Cazzamalli

(Varese Verbano), Gabrio Alberini (Varese Verbano), Silvia Piantanida (Varese Verbano), Chiara Costantini (Varese Verbano), Chiara Paronelli (Varese Verbano), Angela Di Caro (Varese Verbano), Valentina Moretti (Reggio Emilia), Mauro Gozzi (Reggio Emilia), Chiara D'Ippolito (Reggio Emilia), Silva Veronica Barbanti (Reggio Emilia), Papalini Alessandro (Reggio Emilia), Mariangela Corbo (Chieti), Giovanni Martinotti (Chieti), Ornella Campese (Chieti), Federica Fiori (Chieti), Marco Lorusso (Chieti), Lucia Di Capro (Chieti), Daniela Viceconte (Chieti), Valerio Mancini (Chieti), Francesco Suraniti (Catania), Maria Salvina Signorelli (Catania), Eugenio Rossi (Bologna), Pasqualino Lupoli (Bologna), Marco Menchetti (Bologna), Laura Terzi (Bologna), Marianna Boso (Pavia), Paolo Risaro (Pavia), Giuseppe De Paoli (Pavia), Cristina Catania (Pavia), Iliara Tarricone (Bologna), Valentina Caretto (Bologna), Viviana Storbini (Bologna), Roberta Emiliani (Bologna), Beatrice Balzarro (Bologna), Giuseppe Carrà (Monza), Francesco Bartoli (Monza), Tommaso Tabacchi (Monza), Roberto Nava (Monza), Adele Bono (Monza), Milena Provenzi (Monza), Giulia Brambilla (Monza), Flora Aspesi (Monza), Trotta (Monza), Martina Tremolada (Monza), Gloria Castagna (Monza), Mattia Bava (Monza), Enrica Verrengia (Monza), Sara Lucchi (Monza), Maria Ginevra Orian (Ancona), Michela Barchiesi (Ancona), Monica Pacetti (Forlì), Andrea Aguglia (Genova), Laura Rosa Magni (Brescia), Giuseppe Rossi (Brescia), Rossella Beneduce (Brescia), Giovanni Battista Tura (Brescia), Laura Laffranchini (Brescia), Daniele Mastromo (Milano), Farida Ferrato (Milano), Francesco Restaino (Milano), Emiliano Monzani (Milano), Matteo Porcellana (Milano), Ivan Limosani (Milano), Lucio Ghio (Genova), Maurizio Ferro (Genova), Vincenzo Fricchione Parise (Avellino), Giovanni Balletta (Avellino), Lelio Addeo (Avellino), Elisa De Vivo (Avellino), Rossella Di Benedetto (Avellino), Federica Pinna (Cagliari), Bernardo Carpiniello (Cagliari), Mariangela Spano (Treviso), Marzio Giacomini (Treviso), Damiano Pecile (Mantova), Chiara Mattei (Fermo), Elisabetta Pascolo Fabrici (Trieste), Sofia Panarello (Trieste), Giulia Peresson (Trieste), Claudio Vitucci (Trieste), Tommaso Bonavigo (Trieste), Monica Pacetti (Forlì), Giovanni Perini (Verona), Filippo Boschello (Verona), Stefania Strizzolo (Vicenza), Francesco Gardellin (Vicenza), Massimo di Giannantonio (Chieti), Daniele Moretti (Savona), Carlo Fizzotti (Savona), Edoardo Cossetta (Savona), Luana Di Gregorio (Trento), Francesca Sozzi (Trento), Giancarlo Boncompagni (Bologna), Daniele La Barbera (Palermo), Giuseppe Colli (Palermo), Sabrina Laurenzi (Civitanova Marche), Carmela Calandra (Catania), Maria Luca (Catania).

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Giovanni Ostuzzi, Maria Angela Mazzi, Giuseppe Carrà, Chiara Gastaldon, Claudio Lucii, Giovanni Martinotti, Michela Nosé, Marianna Purgato, Giulia Turrini, Corrado Barbui.

Data curation: Giovanni Ostuzzi, Maria Angela Mazzi, Samira Terlizzi, Federico Bertolini, Davide Papola, Alberto Piccoli, Tommaso Tabacchi, Corrado Barbui.

Formal analysis: Giovanni Ostuzzi, Maria Angela Mazzi, Marianna Purgato, Corrado Barbui.

Investigation: Giovanni Ostuzzi, Samira Terlizzi, Federico Bertolini, Andrea Aguglia, Francesco Bartoli, Paola Bortolaso, Camilla Callegari, Mariarita Caroleo, Giuseppe Carrà, Mariangela Corbo, Armando D'Agostino, Chiara Gastaldon, Claudio Lucii, Fabio Magliocco, Giovanni Martinotti, Michela Nosé, Edoardo Giuseppe Ostinelli, Davide Papola, Marco Piero Piccinelli, Marianna Purgato, Tommaso Tabacchi, Giulia Turrini.

Methodology: Giovanni Ostuzzi, Maria Angela Mazzi, Mariangela Corbo, Claudio Lucii, Michela Nosé, Marianna Purgato, Giulia Turrini, Mirella Ruggeri, Corrado Barbui.

Project administration: Giovanni Ostuzzi, Samira Terlizzi, Federico Bertolini, Mirella Ruggeri, Corrado Barbui.

Resources: Giovanni Ostuzzi, Corrado Barbui.

Software: Giovanni Ostuzzi.

Supervision: Giovanni Ostuzzi, Giuseppe Carrà, Giovanni Martinotti, Marco Piero Piccinelli, Mirella Ruggeri, Corrado Barbui.

Validation: Giovanni Ostuzzi, Mariangela Corbo, Michela Nosé, Marco Piero Piccinelli, Alberto Piccoli, Mirella Ruggeri, Corrado Barbui.

Writing – original draft: Giovanni Ostuzzi, Samira Terlizzi, Federico Bertolini, Giuseppe Carrà, Mirella Ruggeri, Corrado Barbui.

Writing – review & editing: Giovanni Ostuzzi, Samira Terlizzi, Federico Bertolini, Andrea Aguglia, Francesco Bartoli, Paola Bortolaso, Camilla Callegari, Mariarita Caroleo, Giuseppe Carrà, Mariangela Corbo, Armando D’Agostino, Chiara Gastaldon, Claudio Lucii, Fabio Magliocco, Giovanni Martinotti, Michela Nosé, Edoardo Giuseppe Ostinelli, Davide Papola, Marco Piero Piccinelli, Alberto Piccoli, Marianna Purgato, Tommaso Tabacchi, Giulia Turrini, Mirella Ruggeri, Corrado Barbui.

References

1. Nosé M, Barbui C, Tansella M. How often do patients with psychosis fail to adhere to treatment programmes? A systematic review. *Psychol Med*. 2003; 33: 1149–1160. PMID: [14580069](#)
2. Ascher-Svanum H, Faries DE, Zhu B, Ernst FR, Swartz MS, Swanson JW. Medication adherence and long-term functional outcomes in the treatment of schizophrenia in usual care. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2006; 67: 453–460. PMID: [16649833](#)
3. Narasimhan M, Un Pae C, Masand N, Masand P. Partial compliance with antipsychotics and its impact on patient outcomes. *Int J Psychiatry Clin Pract*. 2007; 11: 102–111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13651500600973568> PMID: [24937555](#)
4. Novick D, Haro JM, Suarez D, Perez V, Dittmann RW, Haddad PM. Predictors and clinical consequences of non-adherence with antipsychotic medication in the outpatient treatment of schizophrenia. *Psychiatry Res*. 2010; 176: 109–113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2009.05.004> PMID: [20185182](#)
5. Landolt K, Rössler W, Ajdacic-Gross V, Derks EM, Libiger J, Kahn RS, et al. Predictors of discontinuation of antipsychotic medication and subsequent outcomes in the European First Episode Schizophrenia Trial (EUFEST). *Schizophr Res*. 2016; 172: 145–151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2016.01.046> PMID: [26922655](#)
6. Tiihonen J, Mittendorfer-Rutz E, Majak M, Mehtälä J, Hoti F, Jedenius E, et al. Real-World Effectiveness of Antipsychotic Treatments in a Nationwide Cohort of 29 823 Patients With Schizophrenia. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2017; 74: 686–693. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2017.1322> PMID: [28593216](#)
7. Bowtell M, Ratheesh A, McGorry P, Killackey E, O’Donoghue B. Clinical and demographic predictors of continuing remission or relapse following discontinuation of antipsychotic medication after a first episode of psychosis. A systematic review. *Schizophr Res*. 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2017.11.010> PMID: [29146020](#)
8. Hui CLM, Honer WG, Lee EHM, Chang WC, Chan SKW, Chen ESM, et al. Long-term effects of discontinuation from antipsychotic maintenance following first-episode schizophrenia and related disorders. A 10 year follow-up of a randomised, double-blind trial. *The Lancet Psychiatry*. 2018; 5: 432–442. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(18\)30090-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(18)30090-7) PMID: [29551618](#)
9. Leucht C, Heres S, Kane JM, Kissling W, Davis JM, Leucht S. Oral versus depot antipsychotic drugs for schizophrenia—a critical systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised long-term trials. *Schizophr Res*. 2011; 127: 83–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2010.11.020> PMID: [21257294](#)
10. Kishimoto T, Robenzadeh A, Leucht C, Leucht S, Watanabe K, Mimura M, et al. Long-acting injectable vs oral antipsychotics for relapse prevention in schizophrenia: a meta-analysis of randomized trials. *Schizophr Bull*. 2014; 40: 192–213. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbs150> PMID: [23256986](#)
11. Kishimoto T, Nitta M, Borenstein M, Kane JM, Correll CU. Long-acting injectable versus oral antipsychotics in schizophrenia: a systematic review and meta-analysis of mirror-image studies. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2013; 74: 957–965. <https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.13r08440> PMID: [24229745](#)

12. Brissos S, Veguilla MR, Taylor D, Balanzá-Martínez V. The role of long-acting injectable antipsychotics in schizophrenia: a critical appraisal. *Ther Adv Psychopharmacol*. 2014; 4: 198–219. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2045125314540297> PMID: 25360245
13. Riso A de, Lang AP. History and therapeutic rationale of long acting antipsychotics. *Curr Clin Pharmacol*. 2014; 9: 39–52. PMID: 23343446
14. Waddell L, Taylor M. Attitudes of patients and mental health staff to antipsychotic long-acting injections: systematic review. *Br J Psychiatry Suppl*. 2009; 52: S43–50. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.195.52.s43> PMID: 19880916
15. Shi L, Ascher-Svanum H, Zhu B, Faries D, Montgomery W, Marder SR. Characteristics and use patterns of patients taking first-generation depot antipsychotics or oral antipsychotics for schizophrenia. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2007; 58: 482–488. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ps.2007.58.4.482> PMID: 17412849
16. Samalin L, Charpeaud T, Blanc O, Heres S, Llorca P. Clinicians' attitudes toward the use of long-acting injectable antipsychotics. *J Nerv Ment Dis*. 2013; 201: 553–559. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NMD.0b013e31829829c4> PMID: 23817151
17. Ostuzzi G, Papola D, Gastaldon C, Barbui C. New EMA report on paliperidone 3-month injections: taking clinical and policy decisions without an adequate evidence base. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci*. 2017; 26: 231–233. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2045796016001025> PMID: 28004623
18. Cipriani A, Barbui C, Salanti G, Rendell J, Brown R, Stockton S, et al. Comparative efficacy and acceptability of antimanic drugs in acute mania: a multiple-treatments meta-analysis. *Lancet*. 2011; 378: 1306–1315. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(11\)60873-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60873-8) PMID: 21851976
19. Zhou X, Keitner GI, Qin B, Ravindran AV, Bauer M, Del Giovane C, et al. Atypical Antipsychotic Augmentation for Treatment-Resistant Depression: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-Analysis. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2015; 18: pyv060. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ijnp/pyv060> PMID: 26012350
20. Stahl SM. Long-acting injectable antipsychotics: shall the last be first. *CNS Spectr*. 2014; 19: 3–5. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1092852913001016> PMID: 24512639
21. Stevens GL, Dawson G, Zummo J. Clinical benefits and impact of early use of long-acting injectable antipsychotics for schizophrenia. *Early Interv Psychiatry*. 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1111/eip.12278> PMID: 26403538
22. Walburn J, Gray R, Gournay K, Quraishi S, David AS. Systematic review of patient and nurse attitudes to depot antipsychotic medication. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2001; 179: 300–307. PMID: 11581109
23. Svedberg B, Backenroth-Ohsako G, Lützen K. On the path to recovery: patients' experiences of treatment with long-acting injections of antipsychotic medication. *Int J Ment Health Nurs*. 2003; 12: 110–118. PMID: 12956022
24. Patel MX, Taylor M, David AS. Antipsychotic long-acting injections: mind the gap. *Br J Psychiatry Suppl*. 2009; 52: S1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.195.52.s1> PMID: 19880911
25. Iyer S, Banks N, Roy M, Tibbo P, Williams R, Manchanda R, et al. A qualitative study of experiences with and perceptions regarding long-acting injectable antipsychotics: Part I-patient perspectives. *Can J Psychiatry*. 2013; 58: 14S–22S. PMID: 23945063
26. Das AK, Malik A, Haddad PM. A qualitative study of the attitudes of patients in an early intervention service towards antipsychotic long-acting injections. *Ther Adv Psychopharmacol*. 2014; 4: 179–185. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2045125314542098> PMID: 25360242
27. Pietrini F, Spadafora M, Tatini L, Talamba GA, Andrisano C, Boncompagni G, et al. LAI versus oral: A case-control study on subjective experience of antipsychotic maintenance treatment. *Eur Psychiatry*. 2016; 37: 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eurpsy.2016.05.008> PMID: 27442981
28. Montemagni C, Frieri T, Rocca P. Second-generation long-acting injectable antipsychotics in schizophrenia: patient functioning and quality of life. *Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat*. 2016; 12: 917–929. <https://doi.org/10.2147/NDT.S88632> PMID: 27143893
29. Besenius C, Clark-Carter D, Nolan P. Health professionals' attitudes to depot injection antipsychotic medication: a systematic review. *J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs*. 2010; 17: 452–462. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2850.2010.01550.x> PMID: 20584242
30. Kirschner M, Theodoridou A, Fusar-Poli P, Kaiser S, Jäger M. Patients' and clinicians' attitude towards long-acting depot antipsychotics in subjects with a first episode of psychosis. *Ther Adv Psychopharmacol*. 2013; 3: 89–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2045125312464106> PMID: 24167680
31. Patel MX. Why aren't depot antipsychotics prescribed more often and what can be done about it. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment*. 2005; 11: 203–211. <https://doi.org/10.1192/apt.11.3.203>
32. Maia-de-Oliveira JP, Bressan RA, Elkis H, Machado-de-Sousa JP, Hallak JEC. Why we should use long-acting injectable antipsychotics more frequently. *Rev Bras Psiquiatr*. 2013; 35: 217–218. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1516-4446-2013-3503> PMID: 24142080

33. Heres S. Long-acting injectable antipsychotics: an underutilized treatment option. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2014; 75: 1263–1265. <https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.14com09541> PMID: 25470087
34. Carpenter WT, Buchanan RW. Expanding Therapy With Long-Acting Antipsychotic Medication in Patients With Schizophrenia. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2015; 72: 745–746. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2015.0485> PMID: 26107157
35. Barnes TRE. Evidence-based guidelines for the pharmacological treatment of schizophrenia: recommendations from the British Association for Psychopharmacology. *J Psychopharmacol (Oxford)*. 2011; 25: 567–620. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0269881110391123> PMID: 21292923
36. SIGN. Management of schizophrenia. A national clinical guideline. Edinburgh: Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network; 2013.
37. NICE. Psychosis and schizophrenia in adults: prevention and management. Clinical guideline [CG178]; 2014. Available: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg178>.
38. Galletly C, Castle D, Dark F, Humberstone V, Jablensky A, Killackey E, et al. Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists clinical practice guidelines for the management of schizophrenia and related disorders. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*. 2016; 50: 410–472. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0004867416641195> PMID: 27106681
39. Lin J, Wong B, Offord S, Mirski D. Healthcare cost reductions associated with the use of LAI formulations of antipsychotic medications versus oral among patients with schizophrenia. *J Behav Health Serv Res*. 2013; 40: 355–366. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11414-013-9329-z> PMID: 23579871
40. Marcus SC, Zummo J, Pettit AR, Stoddard J, Doshi JA. Antipsychotic Adherence and Rehospitalization in Schizophrenia Patients Receiving Oral Versus Long-Acting Injectable Antipsychotics Following Hospital Discharge. *J Manag Care Spec Pharm*. 2015; 21: 754–768. <https://doi.org/10.18553/jmcp.2015.21.9.754> PMID: 26308223
41. McCreath J, Larson E, Bharatiya P, Labanieh HA, Weiss Z, Lozovatsky M. Long-Acting Injectable Antipsychotics for Schizophrenia: Sociodemographic Characteristics and Treatment Adherence. *Prim Care Companion CNS Disord*. 2017; 19. <https://doi.org/10.4088/PCC.16m02005> PMID: 28234442
42. Pilon D, Joshi K, Tandon N, Lafeuille M, Kamstra RL, Emond B, et al. Treatment patterns in Medicaid patients with schizophrenia initiated on a first- or second-generation long-acting injectable versus oral antipsychotic. *Patient Prefer Adherence*. 2017; 11: 619–629. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PPA.S127623> PMID: 28356723
43. Gaviria AM, Franco J, Rico G, Muntané G, Sáez C, Sánchez-Gistau V, et al. Noninterventional, Naturalistic, Retrospective Study to Describe Prescription Patterns of Long-Acting Injectable Antipsychotics and the Impact of Introducing a New Atypical Antipsychotic in the Spanish Province of Tarragona Catchment Area. *Prim Care Companion CNS Disord*. 2017; 19. <https://doi.org/10.4088/PCC.16m02044> PMID: 28346773
44. Dimitropoulos E, Drogemuller L, Wong K. Evaluation of Concurrent Oral and Long-Acting Injectable Antipsychotic Prescribing at the Minneapolis Veterans Affairs Health Care System. *J Clin Psychopharmacol*. 2017; 37: 605–608. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JCP.0000000000000755> PMID: 28816923
45. Decuyper F, Sermon J, Geerts P, Deney TR, Vos C de, Malfait B, et al. Treatment continuation of four long-acting antipsychotic medications in the Netherlands and Belgium: A retrospective database study. *PLoS ONE*. 2017; 12: e0179049. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0179049> PMID: 28614404
46. Cipriani A, Accordini S, Nosè M, Purgato M, Girlanda F, Tansella M, et al. Aripiprazole versus haloperidol in combination with clozapine for treatment-resistant schizophrenia: a 12-month, randomized, naturalistic trial. *J Clin Psychopharmacol*. 2013; 33: 533–537. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JCP.0b013e318296884f> PMID: 23775051
47. Girlanda F, Cipriani A, Agrimi E, Appino MG, Barichello A, Beneduce R, et al. Effectiveness of lithium in subjects with treatment-resistant depression and suicide risk: results and lessons of an underpowered randomised clinical trial. *BMC Res Notes*. 2014; 7: 731. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1756-0500-7-731> PMID: 25326163
48. Nosè M, Bighelli I, Castellazzi M, Martinotti G, Carrà G, Lucii C, et al. Prevalence and correlates of QTc prolongation in Italian psychiatric care: cross-sectional multicentre study. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci*. 2016; 25: 532–540. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2045796015000906> PMID: 26467074
49. Elm E von, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening of Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2008; 61: 344–349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.008> PMID: 18313558
50. Overall JE. The Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale in Psychopharmacology Research. In: Pichot P, Olivier-Martin R, editors. *Psychological Measurements in Psychopharmacology*. S. Karger AG; 1974. pp. 67–78.
51. Roncone R, Tozzini C, Mazza M, Risio A de, Giosuè P, Morosini P, et al. Validazione della versione italiana della self-report Insight Scale. *Epidemiol Psichiatri Soc*. 2003; 12: 63–75. PMID: 12723393

52. Leucht S, Kane JM, Kissling W, Hamann J, Etschel E, Engel R. Clinical implications of Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale scores. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2005; 187: 366–371. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.187.4.366> PMID: 16199797
53. Shafer A. Meta-analysis of the brief psychiatric rating scale factor structure. *Psychol Assess*. 2005; 17: 324–335. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.17.3.324> PMID: 16262458
54. Hogan TP, Awad AG, Eastwood R. A self-report scale predictive of drug compliance in schizophrenics: reliability and discriminative validity. *Psychol Med*. 1983; 13: 177–183. PMID: 6133297
55. Rossi A, Arduini L, Cataldo S de, Stratta P. Subjective response to neuroleptic medication. A validation study of the Italian version of the Drug Attitude Inventory (DAI). *Epidemiol Psichiatri Soc*. 2001; 10: 107–114. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1121189X00005182> PMID: 11526792
56. Kemp R, Hayward P, Applewhaite G, Everitt B, David A. Compliance therapy in psychotic patients: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 1996; 312: 345–349. PMID: 8611831
57. WMA. World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. *JAMA*. 2013; 310: 2191–2194. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2013.281053> PMID: 24141714
58. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 13. College Station, TX: StataCorp LP; 2013.
59. Nosè M, Tansella M, Thornicroft G, Schene A, Becker T, Veronese A, et al. Is the Defined Daily Dose system a reliable tool for standardizing antipsychotic dosages. *Int Clin Psychopharmacol*. 2008; 23: 287–290. <https://doi.org/10.1097/YIC.0b013e328303ac75> PMID: 18703938
60. Long JS, Freese J. Regression models for categorical dependent variables using Stata. College Station: Stata Press; 2014.
61. Williams RL. A note on robust variance estimation for cluster-correlated data. *Biometrics*. 2000; 56: 645–646. PMID: 10877330
62. Barnes TRE, Shingleton-Smith A, Paton C. Antipsychotic long-acting injections: prescribing practice in the UK. *Br J Psychiatry Suppl*. 2009; 52: S37–42. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.195.52.s37> PMID: 19880915
63. Citrome L, Jaffe A, Levine J. Treatment of schizophrenia with depot preparations of fluphenazine, haloperidol, and risperidone among inpatients at state-operated psychiatric facilities. *Schizophr Res*. 2010; 119: 153–159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2010.02.1066> PMID: 20347267
64. Crivera C, DeSouza C, Kozma CM, Dirani RD, Mao L, Macfadden W. Resource utilization in patients with schizophrenia who initiated risperidone long-acting therapy: results from the Schizophrenia Outcomes Utilization Relapse and Clinical Evaluation (SOURCE). *BMC Psychiatry*. 2011; 11: 168. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-11-168> PMID: 21999370
65. Haddad P, Lambert T, Lauriello J. Antipsychotic Long-acting Injections: Oxford University Press; 2016.
66. Lieb K, Völlm B, Rücker G, Timmer A, Stoffers JM. Pharmacotherapy for borderline personality disorder: Cochrane systematic review of randomised trials. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2010; 196: 4–12. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.108.062984> PMID: 20044651
67. Maust DT, Kim HM, Seyfried LS, Chiang C, Kavanagh J, Schneider LS, et al. Antipsychotics, other psychotropics, and the risk of death in patients with dementia: number needed to harm. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2015; 72: 438–445. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2014.3018> PMID: 25786075
68. Driessen J, Baik SH, Zhang Y. Trends in Off-Label Use of Second-Generation Antipsychotics in the Medicare Population From 2006 to 2012. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2016; 67: 898–903. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201500316> PMID: 27079991
69. Bartoli F, Carrà G, Crocamo C, Carretta D, Clerici M. Bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, and metabolic syndrome. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2013; 170: 927–928. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2013.13040447> PMID: 23903338
70. Clerici M, Bartoli F, Carretta D, Crocamo C, Bebbington P, Carrà G. Cardiovascular risk factors among people with severe mental illness in Italy: a cross-sectional comparative study. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry*. 2014; 36: 698–702. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2014.08.005> PMID: 25217493
71. Regier DA, Farmer ME, Rae DS, Locke BZ, Keith SJ, Judd LL, et al. Comorbidity of mental disorders with alcohol and other drug abuse. Results from the Epidemiologic Catchment Area (ECA) Study. *JAMA*. 1990; 264: 2511–2518. PMID: 2232018
72. Mitchell AJ, Vancampfort D, Sweers K, van Winkel R, Yu W, Hert M de. Prevalence of metabolic syndrome and metabolic abnormalities in schizophrenia and related disorders—a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Schizophr Bull*. 2013; 39: 306–318. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbr148> PMID: 22207632
73. Carrà G, Crocamo C, Borrelli P, Pota I, Ornaghi A, Montomoli C, et al. Correlates of dependence and treatment for substance use among people with comorbid severe mental and substance use disorders: findings from the "Psychiatric and Addictive Dual Disorder in Italy (PADDI)" Study. *Compr Psychiatry*. 2015; 58: 152–159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.comppsych.2014.11.021> PMID: 25591906

74. Lee SJ, Castella A de, Stafrace S, Keppich-Arnold S, Kulkarni J. Retrospective audit of people treated with long-acting antipsychotic injectable medications: Usage patterns and outcomes. *Schizophr Res*. 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2017.11.015> PMID: 29154000
75. Greene M, Yan T, Chang E, Hartry A, Touya M, Broder MS. Medication adherence and discontinuation of long-acting injectable versus oral antipsychotics in patients with schizophrenia or bipolar disorder. *J Med Econ*. 2017; 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13696998.2017.1379412> PMID: 28895758
76. Leucht S, Cipriani A, Spineli L, Mavridis D, Örey D, Richter F, et al. Comparative efficacy and tolerability of 15 antipsychotic drugs in schizophrenia. A multiple-treatments meta-analysis. *The Lancet*. 2013; 382: 951–962. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(13\)60733-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60733-3)
77. Khanna P, Suo T, Komossa K, Ma H, Rummel-Kluge C, El-Sayeh HG, et al. Aripiprazole versus other atypical antipsychotics for schizophrenia. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2014: CD006569. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD006569.pub5> PMID: 24385408
78. Ostuzzi G, Bighelli I, So R, Furukawa TA, Barbui C. Does formulation matter? A systematic review and meta-analysis of oral versus long-acting antipsychotic studies. *Schizophr Res*. 2017; 183: 10–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2016.11.010> PMID: 27866695
79. Lammers L, Zehm B, Williams R. Risperidone long-acting injection in Schizophrenia Spectrum Illnesses compared to first generation depot antipsychotics in an outpatient setting in Canada. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2013; 13: 155. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-13-155> PMID: 23718192
80. Nielsen J, Jensen SOW, Friis RB, Valentin JB, Correll CU. Comparative effectiveness of risperidone long-acting injectable vs first-generation antipsychotic long-acting injectables in schizophrenia: results from a nationwide, retrospective inception cohort study. *Schizophr Bull*. 2015; 41: 627–636. <https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbu128> PMID: 25180312
81. Singh SM, Haddad PM, Husain N, Heaney E, Tomenson B, Chaudhry IB. Cross-sectional comparison of first-generation antipsychotic long-acting injections vs risperidone long-acting injection: patient-rated attitudes, satisfaction and tolerability. *Ther Adv Psychopharmacol*. 2016; 6: 162–171. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2045125316632458> PMID: 27354904
82. Kapur S, Remington G. Atypical antipsychotics: new directions and new challenges in the treatment of schizophrenia. *Annu Rev Med*. 2001; 52: 503–517. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.med.52.1.503> PMID: 11160792
83. Müller-Spahn F. Current use of atypical antipsychotics. *Eur Psychiatry*. 2002; 17 Suppl 4: 377s–384s.
84. Masan PS. Atypical antipsychotics in the treatment of affective symptoms: a review. *Ann Clin Psychiatry*. 2004; 16: 3–13. PMID: 15147108
85. Schooler NR. Deficit symptoms in schizophrenia: negative symptoms versus neuroleptic-induced deficits. *Acta Psychiatr Scand Suppl*. 1994; 380: 21–26. PMID: 7914043
86. Kirkpatrick B. Developing concepts in negative symptoms: primary vs secondary and apathy vs expression. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2014; 75 Suppl 1: 3–7. <https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.13049su1c.01> PMID: 24581452
87. Carlson MDA, Morrison RS. Study design, precision, and validity in observational studies. *J Palliat Med*. 2009; 12: 77–82. <https://doi.org/10.1089/jpm.2008.9690> PMID: 19284267