

What Makes an Antipsychotic Atypical?

Stephen M. Stahl, M.D., Ph.D.

Issue: “Atypical” as applied to an antipsychotic can mean different things to different experts. To clinicians it can connote “low extrapyramidal side effects” or “good for negative symptoms”; to a pharmacologist, “5-HT₂ and D₂ receptor antagonism”; to a marketer, “new and different”; and, to an economist, “expensive.”

A flood of new antipsychotics is generating improved treatments for schizophrenia but tangled terminology for clinicians. All of the newer antipsychotics since clozapine have been lumped into a new therapeutic class often referred to as “atypical”¹⁻⁴ (Table 1). This includes not only risperidone, olanzapine, and quetiapine, but also sertindole (marketed only outside the United States) and ziprasidone (expected to be approved in the United States soon). Lumping all of the new agents together helps to distinguish them as a class from most of the older conventional antipsychotics, which are clearly less tolerated and possibly less effective, especially for negative symptoms.¹⁻⁵ These new agents must distinguish themselves

from the older generic agents if they hope to support price premiums.

However, by considering all of the new drugs as one class, differences among newer drugs are obscured. Thus, there are also attempts to distinguish 1 new agent from another. So far, the results are intriguing, even controversial.⁶⁻⁸ It is already clear from anecdotal use—if not yet from controlled clinical trials—that individual patients can show dramatic differences in efficacy as well as tolerability from 1 of the newer agents to another. Furthermore, as new standards in pharmacology and clinical evaluations are applied to the older agents, some surprising findings among those agents are beginning to emerge (Table 2).⁹

All new and old antipsychotics improve positive symptoms and are also D₂ receptor antagonists.⁴ All new antipsychotics block 5-HT_{2A} receptors as well and have fewer extrapyramidal side effects (EPS) at low doses than the conventional antipsychotics have at standard doses.¹⁻⁹ One atypical antipsychotic (quetiapine) has no more EPS than placebo.⁸ So far, at least 2 antipsychotics (olanzapine and risperidone) have shown greater effi-

Take-Home Points

- ◆ There are multiple definitions for an atypical antipsychotic.
- ◆ The “atypical” concept is dependent upon dose: less is more.
- ◆ Some atypicals may be more atypical than others.
- ◆ Even some conventional antipsychotics may be atypical.

cacy than a conventional antipsychotic for negative symptoms, and 2 (olanzapine and quetiapine) do not raise prolactin like the conventional drugs do.⁶⁻⁸ Early indications are that ziprasidone may cause less weight gain compared with all other new and old agents.¹⁻³

How many, if any, of the “atypical” properties are due to 5-HT₂ antagonism remains a quandary, although it is a good bet that it is this

BRAINSTORMS is a monthly section of The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry aimed at providing updates of novel concepts emerging from the neurosciences that have relevance to the practicing psychiatrist.

From the Clinical Neuroscience Research Center in San Diego and the Department of Psychiatry at the University of California San Diego.

Reprint requests to: Stephen M. Stahl, M.D., Ph.D., Editor, BRAINSTORMS, 8899 University Center Lane, Suite 130, San Diego, CA 92122.

Table 1. Types of Antipsychotics

Atypical Antipsychotics	
Clozapine	
Risperidone	
Olanzapine	
Quetiapine	
Sertindole (not available in the United States)	
Ziprasidone (Food and Drug Administration–approval pending)	
Loxapine?	
Examples of Conventional (Typical) Antipsychotics	
Phenothiazines	
Butyrophenones	
Thioxanthenes	

Table 2. What's in a Name?

Drug	Type	Property
Clozapine	Unusual atypical	More efficacy but agranulocytosis
Quetiapine	Most atypical	Lowest extrapyramidal side effects?
Olanzapine, risperidone	More atypical	Better for negative symptoms?
Risperidone	Atypical yet typical?	Elevates prolactin
Ziprasidone	Atypical atypical?	Less weight gain?
Loxapine	Atypical atypical? "Cinderella" antipsychotic	Will 5-HT ₂ -binding prove atypical at low doses?
All	Typical atypical	Dose-dependent atypical properties (less is more)

mechanism that reduces EPS of these drugs at low doses.¹⁰ On the other hand, there are at least 16 receptors where 1 or more of the new drugs interact.¹⁻³ No 2 drugs have an identical profile, suggesting that therein lies the explanation for some of the differences clinicians are observing from 1 drug to another, particularly in certain patients. These ancillary pharmacologic properties, in addition to 5-HT₂ and D₂ antagonism, include binding to D₁, D₃, and D₄ receptors; to 5-HT_{1A}, 5-HT_{2C}, 5-HT₃, 5-HT₆, and 5-HT₇ receptors; to α₁, α₂, H₁, and muscarinic cholinergic receptors; and to serotonin and norepinephrine reuptake pumps.¹⁻⁹

It is well known that many of the old antipsychotics bind α₁, muscarinic, and histamine receptors in addition to D₂ receptors⁴; however, what is not so well known is that a few traditional antipsychotics also bind to

the 5-HT_{2A} receptor just like the new antipsychotics.⁹ These include loxapine as well as chlorpromazine and thioridazine.^{9,11} Positron emission tomography studies of loxapine in schizophrenic patients confirm its significant 5-HT₂ binding properties, but chlorpromazine does not seem to bind to 5-HT₂ receptors except at high doses.^{9,11} Thus, is loxapine the "Cinderella" antipsychotic waiting to be invited to the low-dose atypical antipsychotic ball? Given these provocative data plus the current lack of availability of an intramuscular dosage formulation for any new antipsychotic, another look at this less expensive agent, both orally and in its available parenteral form, appears to be in order.

Research on the antipsychotics is proceeding at a fast and furious pace; some of these preliminary distinctions among agents may be lost and yet oth-

ers proved. No matter what we end up calling the new antipsychotics, it is clear that they represent a significant advance in therapeutics for schizophrenia. ♦

REFERENCES

1. Richelson E. Preclinical pharmacology of neuroleptics: focus on new generation compounds. *J Clin Psychiatry* 1996;57(suppl 11): 4-11
2. Arnt J, Skarsfeldt T. Do more antipsychotics have similar pharmacologic characteristics? a review of the evidence. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 1998;18:63-101
3. Leysen J, Janssen P, Heylen L, et al. Receptor interactions of new antipsychotics: relation to pharmacodynamic and clinical effects. *Int J Psych Clin Pract* 1998;2(suppl 1):S3-S17
4. Stahl SM. Conventional neuroleptic drugs for schizophrenia and novel antipsychotic agents. In: *Essential Psychopharmacology*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press; 1996: 263-288
5. Meltzer HY, Matsubaro S, Lee FC. Classification of typical and atypical antipsychotic drugs on the basis of dopamine D-1, D-2 and serotonin-2 pK_i values. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 1997;251:238-246
6. Peuskens J. Risperidone in the treatment of patients with chronic schizophrenia: a multinational, multi-centre, double-blind, parallel group study versus haloperidol. *Br J Psychiatry* 1995;166:712-726
7. Tollefson GD, Beasley CM Jr, Tran PV. Olanzapine versus haloperidol in the treatment of schizophrenia and schizoaffective and schizophreniform disorders: results of an international collaborative trial. *Am J Psychiatry* 1997;154:457-465
8. Small JG, Hirsch SR, Arvanitis LA, et al. Quetiapine in patients with schizophrenia: a high- and low-dose double-blind comparison with placebo. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1997;54: 549-557
9. Kapur S, Zipursky R, Remington G, et al. PET evidence that loxapine is an equipotent blocker of 5-HT₂ and D-2 receptors: implications for the therapeutics of schizophrenia. *Am J Psychiatry* 1997;154:1525-1529
10. Kapur S, Remington G. Serotonin-dopamine interaction and its relevance to schizophrenia. *Am J Psychiatry* 1996;153:466-476
11. Trichard C, Paillere-Martinot M-L, Attar-Levy D, et al. Binding of antipsychotic drugs to cortical 5-HT_{2A} receptors: a PET study of chlorpromazine, clozapine and amisulpride in schizophrenic patients. *Am J Psychiatry* 1998;155:505-508