

Oral and long-acting antipsychotics for relapse prevention in schizophrenia-spectrum disorders: a network meta-analysis of 92 randomized trials including 22,645 participants

Giovanni Ostuzzi¹, Federico Bertolini¹, Federico Tedeschi¹, Giovanni Vita¹, Paolo Brambilla^{2,3}, Lorenzo del Fabro^{2,3}, Chiara Gastaldon¹, Davide Papola¹, Marianna Purgato¹, Guido Nosari^{2,3}, Cinzia Del Giovane^{4,5}, Christoph U. Correll⁶⁻⁸, Corrado Barbui¹

¹WHO 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; ²Department of Pathophysiology and Transplantation, University of Milan, Milan, Italy; ³Department of Neurosciences and Mental Health, Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italy; ⁴Institute of Primary Health Care, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland; ⁵Population Health Laboratory, University of Fribourg, Fribourg, Switzerland; ⁶Department of Psychiatry, Zucker Hillside Hospital, Glen Oaks, NY, USA; ⁷Department of Psychiatry and Molecular Medicine, Zucker School of Medicine at Hofstra/Northwell, Hempstead, NY, USA; ⁸Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany

According to current evidence and guidelines, continued antipsychotic treatment is key for preventing relapse in people with schizophrenia-spectrum disorders, but evidence-based recommendations for the choice of the individual antipsychotic for maintenance treatment are lacking. Although oral antipsychotics are often prescribed first line for practical reasons, long-acting injectable antipsychotics (LAIs) are a valuable resource to tackle adherence issues since the earliest phase of disease. Medline, EMBASE, PsycINFO, CENTRAL and CINAHL databases and online registers were searched to identify randomized controlled trials comparing LAIs or oral antipsychotics head-to-head or against placebo, published until June 2021. Relative risks and standardized mean differences were pooled using random-effects pairwise and network meta-analysis. The primary outcomes were relapse and dropout due to adverse events. We used the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool to assess study quality, and the CINeMA approach to assess the confidence of pooled estimates. Of 100 eligible trials, 92 (N=22,645) provided usable data for meta-analyses. Regarding relapse prevention, the vast majority of the 31 included treatments outperformed placebo. Compared to placebo, "high" confidence in the results was found for (in descending order of effect magnitude) amisulpride-oral (OS), olanzapine-OS, aripiprazole-LAI, olanzapine-LAI, aripiprazole-OS, paliperidone-OS, and ziprasidone-OS. "Moderate" confidence in the results was found for paliperidone-LAI 1-monthly, iloperidone-OS, fluphenazine-OS, brexpiprazole-OS, paliperidone-LAI 1-monthly, asenapine-OS, haloperidol-OS, quetiapine-OS, cariprazine-OS, and lurasidone-OS. Regarding tolerability, none of the antipsychotics was significantly worse than placebo, but confidence was poor, with only aripiprazole (both LAI and OS) showing "moderate" confidence levels. Based on these findings, olanzapine, aripiprazole and paliperidone are the best choices for the maintenance treatment of schizophrenia-spectrum disorders, considering that both LAI and oral formulations of these antipsychotics are among the best-performing treatments and have the highest confidence of evidence for relapse prevention. This finding is of particular relevance for low- and middle-income countries and constrained-resource settings, where few medications may be selected. Results from this network meta-analysis can inform clinical guidelines and national and international drug regulation policies.

Key words: Relapse prevention, maintenance treatment, schizophrenia-spectrum disorders, oral antipsychotics, long-acting antipsychotics, olanzapine, aripiprazole, paliperidone

(*World Psychiatry* 2022;21:295–307)

Schizophrenia-spectrum disorders are considered to be major drivers of the global burden of disease, as measured in prevalence, disability-adjusted life-years, and years lived with disability. More than 50% of diagnosed individuals have long-term, intermittent symptoms of psychosis, and around 20% have chronic symptoms and disability¹. According to currently available evidence, regular pharmacological treatment since the early phases of disease may represent a key element for preserving neurocognitive abilities, preventing structural brain changes, and hindering the progression towards chronic functional deterioration²⁻⁴.

Many randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have compared oral antipsychotics for the treatment of acute symptoms of schizophrenia and related disorders⁵, while fewer studies are available for long-term, maintenance treatment⁶⁻⁸. According to a recent Cochrane review⁹ and a network meta-analysis (NMA) on long-acting injectable antipsychotics (LAIs)¹⁰, maintenance treatment with antipsychotics prevents relapse to a significantly greater extent than placebo for up to two years of follow-up, although long-term adverse effects must be carefully monitored over time^{11,12}.

Current guidelines agree in recommending maintenance treatment for at least one year after the first episode of psychosis, while intermittent treatment is discouraged^{13,14}. However, it has been estimated that up to one half of individuals suffering from schizophrenia may not take their medications as prescribed and even less are fully adherent to antipsychotic treatment^{15,16}, and that non-adherence is among the most important predictors of relapse¹⁷⁻¹⁹. For this reason, an earlier and wider use of LAIs has been suggested in order to prevent discontinuation, relapse and hospitalization since the earliest phases of disease^{10,20-22}. Still, individuals who begin antipsychotic treatment are usually prescribed oral formulations, as they allow easier titration, as well as more rapid tapering and discontinuation in case of adverse events. At such an early illness phase, future levels of adherence are difficult to predict, and switching to an LAI formulation might be needed without delay if the issue of non-adherence arises. Thus, it is of clinical relevance to identify which antipsychotics, including those available in both oral and LAI formulations, are the most tolerable, effective, and supported by the highest certainty of evidence.

Systematic reviews of studies assessing the comparative effectiveness and tolerability of both oral antipsychotics and LAIs vs. placebo and head-to-head for the prevention of relapse are relatively sparse. One systematic review and meta-analysis each compared the long-term effectiveness of first- vs. second-generation antipsychotics⁸ and of second-generation antipsychotics between each other⁷, and one NMA attempted to pool together both formulations⁶. However, several new studies have been conducted since then, and some existing studies were not included^{9,10}. Furthermore, prior meta-analyses mixed together studies where patients were randomized during the acute exacerbation with studies where patients were randomized after clinical stabilization had occurred, which could have yielded biased results due to differential rates of stabilization across treatment arms.

This study aimed to assess the differential effectiveness and tolerability of oral antipsychotics and LAIs for the maintenance treatment of schizophrenia-spectrum disorders by applying a NMA approach, eliminating trials where randomization had occurred during the acute phase.

METHODS

This study was conducted and reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines specific for NMA²⁴. The study protocol was registered in advance in the Open Science Forum (<https://osf.io/3nb4s>).

Study selection and data extraction

We searched for RCTs including adults (≥ 18 years old) diagnosed with schizophrenia-spectrum disorders (including schizophrenia, schizoaffective disorder, schizophreniform disorder, delusional disorder, and psychotic disorders not otherwise specified), according to validated diagnostic systems (DSM or ICD), and requiring antipsychotic maintenance treatment. We considered only studies randomizing clinically stable patients at baseline. Whenever this was not clearly stated by the study authors, clinical stability was ascertained on the basis of the mean score on a rating scale at baseline, according to validated cut-offs for severity – i.e., Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale (BPRS): ≤ 44 ; Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS): ≤ 78 ; Clinical Global Impression-Severity (CGI-S): ≤ 4 ^{25,26}.

All available oral antipsychotics and LAIs, according to the Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical with Defined Daily Dose (ATC/DDD) classification (https://www.whocc.no/atc_ddd_index), were eligible. Studies comparing an antipsychotic with a mix of different antipsychotics were excluded. We excluded RCTs lasting < 12 weeks, as previously suggested²⁷.

We searched without time or language restrictions the Medline, EMBASE, PsycINFO, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), and Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL) electronic databases. We per-

formed additional searches in databases of regulatory agencies (e.g., US Food and Drug Administration, European Medicines Agency), online trial registers (e.g., clinicaltrials.gov; controlled-trials.com; World Health Organization (WHO)'s International Clinical Trials Registry Platform) and websites of pharmaceutical companies producing antipsychotics. We searched records from database inception to June 8, 2021 (for full search strategy, see supplementary information).

Two authors independently assessed titles, abstracts and full texts of potentially relevant articles, and two others extracted data following recommendations of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions²⁸. Two authors assessed the methodological quality of included studies using the Cochrane Risk of Bias version 2 (RoB2) tool²⁹. Disagreements were resolved by discussion and consensus with a third author.

Outcomes

Two co-primary outcomes were analyzed: relapse (i.e., the number of participants experiencing at least one relapse by the end of the trial, as a proportion of the total of randomized participants) and tolerability (i.e., the number of participants who dropped out by the end of the trial because of an adverse event, as a proportion of the total of randomized participants). The definition of relapse provided by each study was considered. If data were not available, the number of relapses was imputed according to commonly used cut-off scores on validated rating scales measuring psychopathology (i.e., PANSS increase $\geq 25\%$; BPRS increase $\geq 30\%$; CGI-S increase ≥ 2 points)³⁰⁻³², using a validated methodology³³.

Secondary outcomes included: a) mean change score on validated rating scales measuring psychopathology at the end of the trials (“efficacy”); b) number of participants who dropped out by the end of the trial for any cause; c) number of participants who were admitted to hospital for psychiatric relapse by the end of the trial; d) mean change score on validated rating scales measuring quality of life at the end of the trial; e) mean change score on validated rating scales measuring the level of functioning at the end of the trial; f) common antipsychotic-related adverse events, including sedation, insomnia, QTc prolongation, anticholinergic symptoms, weight gain, hyperprolactinaemia, extrapyramidal symptoms, akathisia, and tardive dyskinesia.

Statistical analysis

We performed a standard pairwise, random-effects meta-analysis for every comparison, and, for each outcome, we also conducted a NMA with a random-effects model in a frequentist framework, using the R software³⁴ *netmeta* package and the Stata³⁵ *mvmeta* package. For dichotomous outcomes, we calculated and pooled relative risks (RRs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). For continuous outcomes, we pooled the mean differences (MDs) between treatment arms at the end of the study if all trials

used the same rating scale; otherwise, we pooled standardized mean differences (SMDs).

We calculated dichotomous data on a strict intention-to-treat (ITT) basis, considering the total number of randomized participants as the denominator. For continuous variables, we applied a modified ITT analysis, whereby participants with at least one post-baseline measurement were represented by their last observation carried forward (LOCF). When a study included different arms of the same antipsychotic (oral or LAI) at different doses, we pooled these arms into a single one²⁸, provided that they were administered within a therapeutic dose range^{36,37}. Very low doses of antipsychotics were considered as pseudo-placebo, as endorsed by regulatory agencies³⁸, and pooled together with placebo in the analysis. Furthermore, following a pragmatic approach and considering their pharmacological similarity³⁹, fluphenazine enanthate and decanoate, as well as clopenthixol and zuclopenthixol decanoate, were pooled together in the analysis.

We asked trial authors to supply missing data or, alternatively, we imputed them with validated statistical methods²⁸. Particularly, we calculated missing standard deviations (SDs) based on the standard error (SE), t-statistics or p values⁴⁰. If this was not possible, we substituted missing SDs with a weighed mean of SDs reported in the other included trials⁴¹. As a last option, we used the SD of the mean baseline score.

For pairwise meta-analyses, we assessed heterogeneity by visual inspection of forest plots, and by the I-squared statistics. For the NMA, common heterogeneity across all comparisons was assumed and estimated in each network^{42,43}.

We assessed global heterogeneity by using the τ^2 and the I^2 statistics. As previously suggested²³, we compared the common τ^2 to the empirical distributions of heterogeneity found in meta-analyses of pharmacological treatments for mental health outcomes, showing a median of the τ^2 distribution of 0.049 and an inter-quartile range (IQR) of 0.010 to 0.242⁴⁴, and considered heterogeneity low when the estimated τ^2 was below the 25% quartile, moderate between the 25% and the 50% quartile, and high above 50% quartile. The I^2 statistics was interpreted according to the Cochrane handbook: 0-40%: might not be important; 30-60%: may represent moderate heterogeneity; 50-90%: may represent substantial heterogeneity; 75- 100%: considerable heterogeneity²⁹.

According to the assumption of transitivity, effect modifiers should be equally distributed across the comparisons. We extracted the key study characteristics judged to be potential effect modifiers, i.e. sample size, year of publication, follow-up duration, blinding (double-blind vs. open-label), industry sponsorship, placebo relapse rate, overall dropout rate, mean age, percentage of female participants, mean score of overall psychopathology at baseline, and dose of medication (expressed as a ratio between prescribed daily dose and defined daily dose)⁴⁵. By comparing the distribution of these possible effect modifiers across treatments included in the NMA using the Kruskal-Wallis test, and assessing their actual impact on the treatment effect through meta-regression analyses, we formulated a judgment on

whether distribution differences were large enough to threaten the validity of the analysis⁴⁶.

We evaluated the presence of inconsistency by comparing direct and indirect evidence within each closed loop by applying the separating indirect from direct evidence (SIDE) approach^{47,48}. We further compared the goodness of fit for a NMA model assuming consistency with a model allowing for inconsistency in a “design-by-treatment interaction model” framework⁴⁹⁻⁵¹, using the *decompose.design* function in R package *netmeta*⁵².

For the co-primary outcomes, we calculated the probability of each treatment of being at each possible rank, and produced a treatment hierarchy by means of surface under the cumulative ranking curve (SUCRA) and mean ranks with the R *gemtc* package⁵³.

If ≥ 10 studies were included in a primary outcome, we assessed publication bias by visually inspecting the funnel plot, testing for asymmetry with the Egger’s regression test⁵⁴, and investigating possible reasons for funnel plot asymmetry.

For each co-primary outcome, we assessed the confidence of evidence by using the Confidence in Network Meta-Analysis (CINeMA) methodology^{55,56} and its web-based application (<http://cinema.ispm.ch>).

For the co-primary outcomes, we conducted sensitivity analyses excluding trials: a) not employing double-blind design; b) with overall high risk of bias according to RoB2; c) for which information about clinical stability was assumed based on mean rating scale scores at baseline; d) with follow-up duration <1 year; e) where treatment effectiveness was not the primary outcome; and f) placebo-controlled.

We performed meta-regression analyses to assess if the following covariates acted as moderators of treatment effect: sample size, year of publication, follow-up duration, blinding (double-blind vs. open-label), industry sponsorship, placebo relapse rate, overall dropout rate, mean age, percentage of female participants, mean score of overall psychopathology at baseline, and dose of medication. In particular, for each potential effect modifier, we first tested the hypothesis of equality of parameters related to interaction terms between the covariate and treatment indicators; then, in case of non-rejection of such hypothesis, we evaluated statistical significance of the common covariate parameter; otherwise, we assessed the global significance of each covariate-treatment interaction.

RESULTS

We identified 3,418 records after database and hand-search. After removing duplicates and examining titles and abstracts, we selected 514 records for full-text assessment. Of these, 100 primary studies were eligible for inclusion (corresponding to 99 full-text articles⁵⁷⁻¹⁵⁵, as one paper reported on two trials). Of these, 92 studies, including 22,645 participants, provided data for ≥ 1 outcome of interest (see Figure 1). The list of included and excluded studies, and the detailed characteristics of included studies, are provided in the supplementary information.

The mean sample size of included studies was 274 individuals (range: 49 to 1,098; median: 134), with 42 studies (45.6%) including




Figure 1 PRISMA flow chart

≤50 participants. The mean age of included participants was 39.2 years (range: 21.5 to 69.6; median: 39.7). Four studies included only males. In the remaining studies, the mean proportion of included women was 38.1% (range: 8 to 74%; median: 39%). According to the RoB2, 34.1% of the studies had an overall high risk of bias for the outcome relapse, and 16.7% for the outcome tolerability (see supplementary information).

Table 1 describes the characteristics of studies included in the two primary analyses, and Figures 2 and 3 show the corresponding network plots. Figures 4 and 5 show the forest plots comparing each antipsychotic with placebo for the two primary outcomes. Results were grouped according to the level of confidence as assessed by CINeMA. The transitivity assumption was not violated for any of the potential effect modifiers analyzed (see supplementary information).

In terms of relapse prevention, all antipsychotics – with the exception of clopenthixol-oral (OS), haloperidol-LAI and (zu) clopenthixol-LAI – were significantly more effective than placebo. “High” confidence was found for the following antipsychotics (ordered from the largest to the smallest point estimate): amisulpride-OS, olanzapine-OS, aripiprazole-LAI, olanzapine-LAI, aripiprazole-OS, paliperidone-OS, and ziprasidone-OS. “Moderate” confidence was found for the following antipsychotics (ordered from the largest to the smallest point estimate): paliperidone-LAI 1-monthly, iloperidone-OS, fluphenazine-OS,

brexpiprazole-OS, paliperidone-LAI 1-monthly, asenapine-OS, haloperidol-OS, quetiapine-OS, cariprazine-OS, and lurasidone-OS. For the remaining antipsychotics, the confidence in the estimate was “low” or “very low” (see Figure 4).

Head-to-head comparisons showed relatively few statistically significant differences between antipsychotics. Among those with moderate-to-high confidence according to CINeMA, aripiprazole-LAI was more effective than lurasidone-OS; olanzapine-OS than cariprazine-OS, chlorpromazine-OS, haloperidol-OS and lurasidone-OS; paliperidone-LAI 3-monthly than cariprazine-OS, chlorpromazine-OS, lurasidone-OS and ziprasidone-OS; risperidone-LAI than lurasidone-OS (see supplementary information).

In the pairwise meta-analyses, moderate heterogeneity (i.e., $I^2 > 50\%$) was detected for the following pairwise comparisons: aripiprazole-OS, olanzapine-OS, quetiapine-OS and trifluoperazine-OS vs. placebo; olanzapine-OS vs. asenapine-OS. Substantial heterogeneity (i.e., $I^2 > 75\%$) was detected for risperidone-OS vs. quetiapine-OS. Overall, the NMA showed low-to-moderate heterogeneity ($\tau^2 = 0.056$; $I^2 = 32.8\%$, 95% CI: 9.8% to 49.9%), and no overall incoherence emerged according to the global approach (design-by-treatment test, $p = 0.089$), while the local SIDE approach showed significant inconsistency of two comparisons (placebo vs. pimozide-OS; pimozide-OS vs. trifluoperazine-OS).

Fluphenazine-LAI, penfluridol-OS, paliperidone-LAI 3-monthly, flupenthixol-LAI, olanzapine-OS and amisulpride-OS

Table 1 Characteristics of randomized controlled trials included in each network of primary outcomes

	Relapse network	Tolerability network
Number of studies	89	81
Number of individuals included	22,275	21,504
Age (years, mean±SD)	39.0±11.9	38.9±11.9
Gender (% women)	36.4	37.7
Mean follow-up (% studies)		
12 to 26 weeks	37.1	37.0
27 to 52 weeks	44.9	44.4
53 weeks or more	18.0	18.6
Blinding (% studies)		
Double-blind	73.0	74.1
Open-label	27.0	25.9
Year of publication (% studies)		
Until 1989	28.1	25.9
1990 to 2009	33.7	34.6
2010 to 2019	38.2	39.5
Type of studies (% studies)		
Placebo-controlled	33.7	33.3
Only active comparator	66.3	66.7
Including oral formulation	73.0	72.8
Including LAI formulation	49.4	49.4
Setting (% studies)		
Inpatients	20.2	18.5
Outpatients	56.2	55.6
Mixed	23.6	25.9

LAI – long-acting injectable antipsychotic

ranked best according to the mean SUCRA. However, only for paliperidone-LAI 3-monthly, olanzapine-OS and amisulpride-OS the confidence in the evidence was “moderate” or “high” compared to placebo. In most cases, “low” or “very low” estimates were due to incoherence and within-study bias (see Figure 4 and supplementary information).

Sensitivity analyses suggested that placebo-controlled studies might have been responsible for most of the observed heterogeneity. Removing studies with high risk of bias, those for which stability was imputed, those with less than one year of follow-up, and placebo-controlled studies reduced the observed local and global inconsistency. Despite this, effect estimates from sensitivity analyses did not change significantly compared to the primary analysis (see supplementary information).

Meta-regression analyses showed that only the clinical severity at baseline was a statistically significant effect modifier, with studies randomizing more severely ill individuals showing a smaller effect size. However, results of a *post-hoc* sensitivity analysis excluding people who were markedly ill at baseline were not significantly different from the primary analysis (see supplementary information).

Compared to placebo, none of the antipsychotics included showed significant differences in terms of tolerability (dropouts due to adverse events), with the only exception of olanzapine-OS, which was more tolerable than placebo. However, only for aripiprazole-LAI and aripiprazole-OS the confidence according to the CiNeMA assessment was “moderate”, while it was “low” or “very low” for all remaining treatments (see Figure 5).

Head-to-head analyses showed olanzapine-OS to be more tolerable than haloperidol-OS, iloperidone-OS and lurasidone-OS; and olanzapine-LAI to be more tolerable than iloperidone-OS and fluphenazine-LAI.

Substantial heterogeneity (i.e., $I^2 > 75\%$) was detected for two pairwise comparisons (olanzapine-OS vs. placebo; ziprasidone-OS vs. haloperidol-OS). Overall, the NMA showed moderate heterogeneity ($\tau^2 = 0.078$; $I^2 = 20.9\%$, 95% CI: 0% to 42.8%). Incoherence was detected according to the global approach (design-by-treatment test, $p = 0.01$), while the local SIDE approach showed significant inconsistency between placebo and asenapine-OS, fluphenazine-LAI and haloperidol-OS, olanzapine-OS and quetiapine-OS. Pimozide-OS, flupenthixol-LAI, (zu)clopenthixol-LAI, olanzapine-OS and amisulpride-OS ranked best according to the mean SUCRA. However, for all of these comparisons, the confidence in the evidence was “low” or “very low”. In most cases, “low” or “very low” estimates were due to incoherence, imprecision and within-study bias (see Figure 5 and supplementary information).

Sensitivity analyses suggested that placebo-controlled studies were the main source of the observed heterogeneity. Local and global inconsistency was notably reduced when removing studies with less than one year of follow-up (global approach: from $p = 0.09$ to $p = 0.51$; local SIDE approach: from two to zero inconsistent comparisons) and placebo-controlled studies (global approach: from $p = 0.09$ to $p = 0.88$; local SIDE approach: from two to zero inconsistent comparisons). Despite this, effect estimates from sensitivity analyses did not change significantly compared to the primary analysis (see supplementary information).

With regard to efficacy-related secondary outcomes, in descending ranking order of effect as compared to placebo, sertindole-OS, olanzapine-LAI, risperidone-LAI, olanzapine-OS, paliperidone-LAI 3-monthly, risperidone-LAI and fluphenazine-LAI showed lower risk of hospitalization for psychiatric relapse; bexiprazole-OS, lurasidone-OS, pimozide-OS, sertindole-OS, ziprasidone-OS, iloperidone-OS, olanzapine-OS, asenapine-OS, risperidone-OS, cariprazine-OS, paliperidone-OS, risperidone-LAI, aripiprazole-OS, olanzapine-LAI, haloperidol-OS, aripiprazole-OS, paliperidone-LAI 3-monthly, paliperidone-LAI 1-monthly and quetiapine-OS showed larger reduction of mean rating scale scores at study endpoint; (zu)clopenthixol-LAI, pimozide-OS, olanzapine-OS, aripiprazole-LAI, trifluoperazine-OS, paliperidone-LAI 3-monthly, haloperidol-LAI, olanzapine-LAI, amisulpride-OS, asenapine-OS, aripiprazole-OS, fluphenazine-LAI, haloperidol-OS and risperidone-OS showed lower risk of total dropouts.

With regard to tolerability-related secondary outcomes, in descending ranking order of effect as compared to placebo, risperidone-LAI, paliperidone-OS, lurasidone-OS and risperidone-OS




Figure 2 Network plot of evidence for relapse. The thickness of lines is proportional to the number of studies comparing the two treatments, and the size of circles is proportional to the number of individuals for each treatment. LAI – long-acting injectable antipsychotic, OS – oral antipsychotic




Figure 3 Network plot of evidence for tolerability. The thickness of lines is proportional to the number of studies comparing the two treatments, and the size of circles is proportional to the number of individuals for each treatment. LAI – long-acting injectable antipsychotic, OS – oral antipsychotic




Figure 4 Forest plot comparing each antipsychotic with placebo for relapse, with the corresponding ranking probability (SUCRA) and certainty of evidence (CINeMA). LAI – long-acting injectable antipsychotic, OS – oral antipsychotic, RR – relative risk, SUCRA – surface under the cumulative ranking, CINeMA – Confidence In Network Meta-Analysis

showed significantly higher risk of sedation; aripiprazole-OS, olanzapine-LAI, olanzapine-OS, paliperidone-LAI 1-monthly and paliperidone-LAI 3-monthly showed significantly higher risk of weight gain; haloperidol-OS, fluphenazine-LAI and pipothiazine-LAI showed significantly higher risk of extrapyramidal symptoms; haloperidol-OS, haloperidol-LAI and trifluoperazine-OS showed significantly higher risk of akathisia; olanzapine-OS, olanzapine-LAI, paliperidone-LAI 1-monthly, paliperidone-LAI 3-monthly, risperidone-LAI, risperidone-OS and paliperidone-OS showed significantly higher risk of hyperprolactinaemia; olanzapine-OS, olanzapine-LAI, asenapine-OS, paliperidone-LAI 3-monthly and risperidone-OS showed significantly lower risk of insomnia. No antipsychotics showed higher risk of QTc prolongation and tardive dyskinesia as compared to

placebo, although CIs were imprecise for most comparisons. For anticholinergic symptoms, a NMA could not be carried out, as data were relatively few and the network poorly connected (four sub-networks were identified); pairwise meta-analyses showed a higher risk for risperidone-LAI and quetiapine-OS as compared to placebo (see supplementary information).

Efficacy measured with rating scales, hospitalization rates and dropouts due to any cause was generally in line with findings from the primary analysis, while data on quality of life, functioning, and some common adverse events (particularly anticholinergic symptoms, QTc change, tardive dyskinesia) were relatively scarce. Significant incoherence and high heterogeneity were not detected for any of these outcomes, with the only exception of efficacy measured with rating scales (see supplementary information).




Figure 5 Forest plot comparing each antipsychotic with placebo for tolerability, with the corresponding ranking probability (SUCRA) and certainty of evidence (CINeMA). LAI - long-acting antipsychotic, OS - oral antipsychotic, RR - relative risk, SUCRA - surface under the cumulative ranking, CINeMA - Confidence In Network Meta-Analysis

DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, this is the largest and most updated systematic review and NMA comparing data on the maintenance treatment of individuals with schizophrenia-spectrum disorders.

Use of LAIs from the earliest phase of disease has been recommended^{10,20,22}. However, in real-world practice, most individuals begin with an oral treatment for practical reasons. Thus, from a strictly clinical perspective, choosing an antipsychotic for which both oral and LAI formulation are available would be valuable, in order to facilitate a switch to the LAI when required. According to this viewpoint, our analyses suggest that olanzapine, aripiprazole and paliperidone are the most reasonable choices, as they are: a) among the best-performing treatments in terms of relapse prevention according to the effect estimate and the SUCRA

ranking; b) supported by the highest confidence of evidence according to the CINeMA approach; and c) available in both oral and LAI formulation.

Regarding tolerability (dropouts due to adverse events), no antipsychotic was significantly worse than placebo, although the certainty of evidence was generally low, being “moderate” only for aripiprazole-OS and aripiprazole-LAI. Although dropouts due to intolerability reflect the overall burden of adverse events, this information alone cannot be exhaustive when tailoring the choice of antipsychotics to individual patients, for which detailed knowledge of specific adverse events might be more useful. However, analyses of common adverse events were limited and imprecise in many cases, calling for greater attention to measuring and reporting these adverse effects in maintenance/relapse prevention trials of antipsychotics.

Overall, the finding that most LAIs and oral antipsychotics are effective in preventing relapse and re-hospitalization as compared to inactive treatment (as in placebo-controlled trials) or no treatment/treatment “as usual” (as in observational studies) is consistent with existing large observational database studies^{22,156} and with meta-analyses of observational and randomized studies^{6,9,157} on the maintenance treatment of schizophrenia.

Our results are generally in line with those from a previous NMA on oral antipsychotics in acutely ill individuals²³. Compared with placebo, the ranking and the magnitude of effect of treatments are roughly comparable between the two NMAs, with few exceptions, such as risperidone-OS, sertindole-OS and lurasidone-OS apparently performing better in the “acute” population, and fluphenazine-OS performing better in the “maintenance” population. However, these differences are of relatively small magnitude, and the confidence of evidence for these treatments was rated as “low” or “very low” in at least one of the two NMAs. Furthermore, it needs to be recognized that differences in populations and trial design across several decades when the acute and maintenance studies were conducted could also have affected the results, limiting the indirect comparability of antipsychotic effectiveness, both within and across illness stage (acute vs. maintenance).

This NMA did not detect clear advantages of LAIs over oral antipsychotic formulations in terms of relapse and re-hospitalization. This is in line with the observation that, in general, LAIs have shown clearer advantages over oral antipsychotics in observational studies^{21,22,158,159} rather than in randomized trials^{6,21,160}. As previously suggested, observational studies might have greater external validity because of less restrictive patient selection, although the lack of blinding might increase the risk of bias (e.g., detection, performance and prescribing bias)¹⁶¹.

The results of this NMA should be interpreted in the light of some possible limitations. First, for some studies, clinical stability was not clearly described, and we imputed this information by using baseline scores of rating scales measuring psychopathology, according to validated cut-offs. This information can be considered as a valid proxy of clinical stabilization, although it may lack precision. However, after removing these studies in a sensitivity analysis, results did not change remarkably. Second, several studies lacked relevant information, and we used imputation techniques which have been empirically validated⁴¹, but might nonetheless be imprecise.

Third, included RCTs employed different study designs and diagnostic criteria, and had different primary outcomes, settings of recruitment, and follow-up periods. Despite that, the overall coherence of the networks appeared to be preserved for the primary analyses and for most secondary outcomes. Fourth, we included placebo-controlled trials, which have possible limitations^{162,163}, and had probably a prominent role in introducing heterogeneity and incoherence, as shown by sensitivity analyses, which, however, did not show substantial changes of overall results.

Fifth, overall risk of bias was relevant for many studies. However, after removing these studies by means of sensitivity analyses, primary results did not change remarkably. Sixth, some sec-

ondary outcomes, such as quality of life and functioning, which might play a considerable role in helping clinicians to tailor their choice to individual patients, were insufficiently reported by the original studies, leading to poorly populated and connected networks, and imprecise results.

Seventh, effectiveness need to be put into the context of tolerability, especially during long-term treatment. However, adverse effect outcomes were only partially and inconsistently reported, not allowing a detailed benefit-to-risk assessment. Nevertheless, we used the outcome of intolerability-related discontinuation as a proxy of clinically relevant adverse effects and found similar performance of the meta-analyzable antipsychotics and no difference to placebo. Thus, although individual long-term adverse effects of antipsychotics can be potentially problematic^{12,164}, overall, patients do not seem to discontinue antipsychotic maintenance treatment more than those randomized to placebo. Moreover, effective long-term antipsychotic treatment facilitates healthier lifestyle choices and adherence to medical treatments prescribed to mitigate illness- and/or medication-related cardiometabolic burden^{165,166}.

Finally, as no comparison included ≥ 10 studies, the risk of publication bias could not be ruled out, although this is expected to be less relevant compared to other classes of psychotropic drugs¹⁶⁷.

Despite these limitations, to our knowledge, this is the largest and most comprehensive meta-analysis of antipsychotics for the maintenance treatment of people with schizophrenia. As such, findings of this NMA might have significant implications for clinical practice, policy and research. Current guidelines agree in recommending long-term maintenance treatment for at least one year after the first episode^{13,14,168,169}. However, clear information on which antipsychotic to choose is lacking. According to the UK National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines, current evidence cannot guide the choice between antipsychotics in the maintenance phase¹⁷⁰, while the recently updated American Psychiatric Association guidelines suggest using the same treatment which provided benefit in the acute phase¹⁶⁸, as it is implicitly recommended also by the WHO mental health Gap Action Programme (mhGAP) guidelines¹⁶⁹. Data from this NMA show that, although the magnitude of benefit is apparently similar between antipsychotics, they are not all equal, because the confidence in this estimate can largely vary, which is of paramount relevance for making evidence-based choices.

Both oral and LAI formulations of olanzapine, aripiprazole and paliperidone proved to be effective and are supported by moderate-to-high confidence of evidence, and should therefore be given priority when initiating a pharmacological maintenance treatment in people with schizophrenia-spectrum disorders, although differences in adverse effect profiles should also be considered in the decision-making process. Moreover, identifying antipsychotics allowing a switch between oral and LAI formulations might be particularly useful in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), and in constrained-resource settings in general, where only a limited number of medications may be selected for inclusion in national formularies. Although costs might be an issue, this should not prevent the inclusion of

evidence-based treatments in such contexts. From this standpoint, these data call for an effort to produce more affordable second-generation LAIs, as it has been done for other treatments in LMICs¹⁷¹.

Taken together, results from this NMA can inform clinical practice guidelines as well as national and international drug regulation policies, including the WHO Essential Medicines List.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Y. Zhang and G.P. Morgano (Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence and Impact, McMaster University Health Sciences Centre, Hamilton, ON, Canada) for helping with the retrieval and translation of full-text papers. C.U. Correll and C. Barbui contributed equally to this work. Supplementary information on the study is available at <http://doi.org/10.23728/b2share.412cc348acb34b35950bd812b9458c36>.

REFERENCES

- Owen MJ, Sawa A, Mortensen PB. Schizophrenia. *Lancet* 2016;388:86-97.
- McEvoy JP. The importance of early treatment of schizophrenia. *Behav Healthc* 2007;27:40-3.
- Correll CU, Rubio JM, Kane JM. What is the risk-benefit ratio of long-term antipsychotic treatment in people with schizophrenia? *World Psychiatry* 2018; 17:149-60.
- Fountoulakis KN, Moeller HJ, Kasper S et al. The report of the joint WPA/CINP workgroup on the use and usefulness of antipsychotic medication in the treatment of schizophrenia. *CNS Spectr* 2021;26:562-86.
- Huhn M, Nikolakopoulou A, Schneider-Thoma J et al. Comparative efficacy and tolerability of 32 oral antipsychotics for the acute treatment of adults with multi-episode schizophrenia: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2019;394:939-51.
- Zhao YJ, Lin L, Teng M et al. Long-term antipsychotic treatment in schizophrenia: systematic review and network meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *BJPsych Open* 2016;2:59-66.
- Kishimoto T, Hagi K, Nitta M et al. Long-term effectiveness of oral second-generation antipsychotics in patients with schizophrenia and related disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis of direct head-to-head comparisons. *World Psychiatry* 2019;18:208-24.
- Kishimoto T, Agarwal V, Kishi T et al. Relapse prevention in schizophrenia: a systematic review and meta-analysis of second-generation antipsychotics versus first-generation antipsychotics. *Mol Psychiatry* 2013;18:53-66.
- Ceraso A, Lin JJ, Schneider-Thoma J et al. Maintenance treatment with antipsychotic drugs for schizophrenia. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2020;8: CD008016.
- Ostuzzi G, Bertolini F, Del Giovane C et al. Maintenance treatment with long-acting injectable antipsychotics for people with nonaffective psychoses: a network meta-analysis. *Am J Psychiatry* 2021;178:424-36.
- Solmi M, Murru A, Pacchiarotti I et al. Safety, tolerability, and risks associated with first- and second-generation antipsychotics: a state-of-the-art clinical review. *Ther Clin Risk Manag* 2017;13:757-77.
- Correll CU, Detraux J, De Lepeleire J et al. Effects of antipsychotics, antidepressants and mood stabilizers on risk for physical diseases in people with schizophrenia, depression and bipolar disorder. *World Psychiatry* 2015;14: 119-36.
- Gaebel W, Stricker J, Riesbeck M. The long-term antipsychotic treatment of schizophrenia: a selective review of clinical guidelines and clinical case examples. *Schizophr Res* 2020;225:4-14.
- Correll CU, Patel C, Benson C et al. A systematic literature review of schizophrenia clinical practice guidelines: recommendations for the acute and maintenance management with antipsychotics. *NPJ Schizophr* 2022;8:5.
- Nosé M, Barbui C, Tansella M. How often do patients with psychosis fail to adhere to treatment programmes? A systematic review. *Psychol Med* 2003; 33:1149-60.
- Marder SR. Overview of partial compliance. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2003;64(Suppl. 16):3-9.
- Chen EY, Hui CL, Dunn EL et al. A prospective 3-year longitudinal study of cognitive predictors of relapse in first-episode schizophrenic patients. *Schizophr Res* 2005;77:99-104.
- Kane JM, Kishimoto T, Correll CU. Non-adherence to medication in patients with psychotic disorders: epidemiology, contributing factors and management strategies. *World Psychiatry* 2013;12:216-26.
- Carbon M, Correll CU. Clinical predictors of therapeutic response to antipsychotics in schizophrenia. *Dialogues Clin Neurosci* 2014;16:505-24.
- Rubio JM, Taipale H, Tanskanen A et al. Long-term continuity of antipsychotic treatment for schizophrenia: a nationwide study. *Schizophr Bull* 2021; 47:1611-20.
- Kishimoto T, Hagi K, Kurokawa S et al. Long-acting injectable versus oral antipsychotics for the maintenance treatment of schizophrenia: a systematic review and comparative meta-analysis of randomised, cohort, and pre-post studies. *Lancet Psychiatry* 2021;8:387-404.
- Taipale H, Mehtala J, Tanskanen A et al. Comparative effectiveness of antipsychotic drugs for rehospitalization in schizophrenia - a nationwide study with 20-year follow-up. *Schizophr Bull* 2018;44:1381-7.
- Huhn M, Nikolakopoulou A, Schneider-Thoma J et al. Comparative efficacy and tolerability of 32 oral antipsychotics for the acute treatment of adults with multi-episode schizophrenia: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2019;394:939-51.
- Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM et al. The PRISMA extension statement for reporting of systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses of health care interventions: checklist and explanations. *Ann Intern Med* 2015;162:777-84.
- Leucht S, Kane JM, Kissling W et al. Clinical implications of Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale scores. *Br J Psychiatry* 2005;187:366-71.
- Leucht S, Kane JM, Kissling W et al. What does the PANSS mean? *Schizophr Res* 2005;79:231-8.
- Miura T, Noma H, Furukawa TA et al. Comparative efficacy and tolerability of pharmacological treatments in the maintenance treatment of bipolar disorder: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Lancet Psychiatry* 2014;1:351-9.
- Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J et al (eds). *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. 2nd ed. Chichester: Wiley, 2019.
- Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J et al (eds). *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 6.1* (updated September 2020). Cochrane, 2020.
- Wang D, Gopal S, Baker S et al. Trajectories and changes in individual items of positive and negative syndrome scale among schizophrenia patients prior to impending relapse. *NPJ Schizophr* 2018;4:10.
- Leucht S, Rothe P, Davis JM et al. Equipercntile linking of the BPRS and the PANSS. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 2013;23:956-9.
- Correll CU, Kishimoto T, Nielsen J et al. Quantifying clinical relevance in the treatment of schizophrenia. *Clin Ther* 2011;33:B16-39.
- Furukawa TA, Cipriani A, Barbui C et al. Imputing response rates from means and standard deviations in meta-analyses. *Int Clin Psychopharmacol* 2005; 20:49-52.
- R Core Team. *R: a language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2020.
- StataCorp. *Stata statistical software: release 17*. College Station: StataCorp LLC, 2021.
- Gardner DM, Murphy AL, O'Donnell H et al. International consensus study of antipsychotic dosing. *Am J Psychiatry* 2010;167:686-93.
- Leucht S, Samara M, Heres S et al. Dose equivalents for second-generation antipsychotics: the minimum effective dose method. *Schizophr Bull* 2014; 40:314-26.
- European Medicines Agency. EMA/737723/2013 - Assessment report ABILIFY MAINTENA. London: European Medicines Agency, 2013.
- Haddad P, Lambert T, Lauriello J (eds). *Antipsychotic long-acting injections*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Altman DG, Bland JM. Detecting skewness from summary information. *BMJ* 1996;313:1200.
- Furukawa TA, Barbui C, Cipriani A et al. Imputing missing standard deviations in meta-analyses can provide accurate results. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2006; 59:7-10.
- Lu G, Ades AE. Combination of direct and indirect evidence in mixed treatment comparisons. *Stat Med* 2004;23:3105-24.
- Shim SR, Kim SJ, Lee J et al. Network meta-analysis: application and practice using R software. *Epidemiol Health* 2019;41:e2019013.
- Rhodes KM, Turner RM, Higgins JP. Predictive distributions were developed for the extent of heterogeneity in meta-analyses of continuous outcome data. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2015;68:52-60.
- Nosé M, Tansella M, Thornicroft G et al. Is the Defined Daily Dose system a reliable tool for standardizing antipsychotic dosages? *Int Clin Psychopharmacol* 2008;23:287-90.

46. Cipriani A, Higgins JP, Geddes JR et al. Conceptual and technical challenges in network meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2013;159:130-7.
47. Bucher HC, Guyatt GH, Griffith LE et al. The results of direct and indirect treatment comparisons in meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1997;50:683-91.
48. Shih MC, Tu YK. An evidence-splitting approach to evaluation of direct-indirect evidence inconsistency in network meta-analysis. *Res Synth Methods* 2021;12:226-38.
49. Higgins JP, Jackson D, Barrett JK et al. Consistency and inconsistency in network meta-analysis: concepts and models for multi-arm studies. *Res Synth Methods* 2012;3:98-110.
50. Veroniki AA, Vasiladiadis HS, Higgins JP et al. Evaluation of inconsistency in networks of interventions. *Int J Epidemiol* 2013;42:332-45.
51. Jackson D, Barrett JK, Rice S et al. A design-by-treatment interaction model for network meta-analysis with random inconsistency effects. *Stat Med* 2014;33:3639-54.
52. Rucker G, Krahn U, König J et al. netmeta: network meta-analysis using frequentist methods. <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/netmeta/netmeta.pdf>.
53. Van Valkenhoef G, Kuiper J. gemtc: network meta-analysis using Bayesian methods. <https://rdrr.io/cran/gemtc>.
54. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M et al. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ* 1997;315:629-34.
55. Salanti G, Del Giovane C, Chaimani A et al. Evaluating the quality of evidence from a network meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2014;9:e99682.
56. Nikolakopoulou A, Higgins JPT, Papakonstantinou T et al. CINeMA: an approach for assessing confidence in the results of a network meta-analysis. *PLoS Med* 2020;17:e1003082.
57. Alvarez E, Ciudad A, Olivares JM et al. A randomized, 1-year follow-up study of olanzapine and risperidone in the treatment of negative symptoms in outpatients with schizophrenia. *J Clin Psychopharmacol* 2006;26:238-49.
58. Arato M, O'Connor R, Meltzer HY. A 1-year, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of ziprasidone 40, 80 and 160 mg/day in chronic schizophrenia: the Ziprasidone Extended Use in Schizophrenia (ZEUS) study. *Int Clin Psychopharmacol* 2002;17:207-15.
59. Bai YM, Yu SC, Chen JY et al. Risperidone for pre-existing severe tardive dyskinesia: a 48-week prospective follow-up study. *Int Clin Psychopharmacol* 2005;20:79-85.
60. Beasley CM, Sutton VK, Hamilton SH et al. A double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial of olanzapine in the prevention of psychotic relapse. *J Clin Psychopharmacol* 2003;23:582-94.
61. Berwaerts J, Liu Y, Gopal S et al. Efficacy and safety of the 3-month formulation of paliperidone palmitate vs placebo for relapse prevention of schizophrenia: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2015;72:830-9.
62. Bozzatello P, Bellino S, Mancini I et al. Effects on satisfaction and service engagement of paliperidone palmitate compared with oral paliperidone in patients with schizophrenia: an open label randomized controlled trial. *Clin Drug Investig* 2019;39:169-78.
63. Buchanan RW, Panagides J, Zhao J et al. Asenapine versus olanzapine in people with persistent negative symptoms of schizophrenia. *J Clin Psychopharmacol* 2012;32:36-45.
64. Charalampous KD, Thornby J, Ford BK et al. Penfluridol versus oral fluphenazine in the maintenance treatment of chronic schizophrenics. *Curr Ther Res Clin Exp* 1977;21:215-23.
65. Chen EY, Hui CL, Lam MM et al. Maintenance treatment with quetiapine versus discontinuation after one year of treatment in patients with remitted first episode psychosis: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2010;341:c4024.
66. Chouinard G, Annable L, Campbell W et al. A double-blind, controlled clinical trial of haloperidol decanoate and fluphenazine decanoate in the maintenance treatment of schizophrenia. *Psychopharmacol Bull* 1984;20:108-9.
67. Chue P, Eerdeken M, Augustyns I et al. Comparative efficacy and safety of long-acting risperidone and risperidone oral tablets. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 2005;15:111-7.
68. Citrome L, Cucchiaro J, Sarma K et al. Long-term safety and tolerability of lurasidone in schizophrenia: a 12-month, double-blind, active-controlled study. *Int Clin Psychopharmacol* 2012;27:165-76.
69. Crespo-Facorro B, Rodríguez-Sánchez JM, Pérez-Iglesias R et al. Neurocognitive effectiveness of haloperidol, risperidone, and olanzapine in first-episode psychosis: a randomized, controlled 1-year follow-up comparison. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2009;70:717-29.
70. Csernansky JG, Mahmoud R, Brenner R. A comparison of risperidone and haloperidol for the prevention of relapse in patients with schizophrenia. *N Engl J Med* 2002;346:16-22.
71. Daniel DG, Wozniak P, Mack RJ et al. Long-term efficacy and safety comparison of sertindole and haloperidol in the treatment of schizophrenia. *Psychopharmacol Bull* 1998;34:61-9.
72. De Hert M, Mittoux A, He Y et al. Metabolic parameters in the short- and long-term treatment of schizophrenia with sertindole or risperidone. *Eur Arch Psychiatry Clin Neurosci* 2011;261:231-9.
73. Deberdt W, Lipkovich I, Heinloth AN et al. Double-blind, randomized trial comparing efficacy and safety of continuing olanzapine versus switching to quetiapine in overweight or obese patients with schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder. *Ther Clin Risk Manag* 2008;4:713-20.
74. Giudice JD, Clark WG, Gocka EF. Prevention of recidivism of schizophrenics treated with fluphenazine enanthate. *Psychosomatics* 1975;16:32-6.
75. Dencker SJ, Frankenberg K, Malm U et al. A controlled one-year study of pipotiazine palmitate and fluphenazine decanoate in chronic schizophrenic syndromes. Evaluation of results at 6 and 12 months' trial. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 1973;49(Suppl. 241):101-18.
76. Dencker SJ, Lepp M, Malm U. Clopenthixol and flupenthixol depot preparations in outpatient schizophrenics. I. A one year double-blind study of clopenthixol decanoate and flupenthixol palmitate. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 1980;61(Suppl. 279):10-28.
77. Detke HC, Weiden PJ, Llorca PM et al. Comparison of olanzapine long-acting injection and oral olanzapine: a 2-year, randomized, open-label study in outpatients with schizophrenia. *J Clin Psychopharmacol* 2014;34:426-34.
78. Durgam S, Earley W, Li R et al. Long-term cariprazine treatment for the prevention of relapse in patients with schizophrenia: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Schizophr Res* 2016;176:264-71.
79. Fleischhacker WW, Baker RA, Eramo A et al. Effects of aripiprazole once-monthly on symptoms and functioning of patients with an acute episode of schizophrenia stratified by age. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2014;39:S375.
80. Freeman LS, Alson E. Prolonged withdrawal of chlorpromazine in chronic patients. *Dis Nerv Syst* 1962;23:522-5.
81. Fu DJ, Turkoz I, Simonson RB et al. Paliperidone palmitate once-monthly reduces risk of relapse of psychotic, depressive, and manic symptoms and maintains functioning in a double-blind, randomized study of schizoaffective disorder. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2015;76:253-62.
82. Gaebel W, Schreiner A, Bergmans P et al. Relapse prevention in schizophrenia and schizoaffective disorder with risperidone long-acting injectable vs quetiapine: results of a long-term, open-label, randomized clinical trial. *Neuropsychopharmacology* 2010;35:2367-77.
83. Gallant DM, Mielke DH, Spirtes MA et al. Penfluridol: an efficacious long-acting oral antipsychotic compound. *Am J Psychiatry* 1974;131:699-702.
84. Gerlach J, Kramp P, Kristjansen P et al. Peroral and parenteral administration of long-acting neuroleptics: a double-blind study of penfluridol compared to flupenthixol decanoate in the treatment of schizophrenia. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 1975;52:132-44.
85. Gitlin M, Nuechterlein K, Subotnik KL et al. Clinical outcome following neuroleptic discontinuation in patients with remitted recent-onset schizophrenia. *Am J Psychiatry* 2001;158:1835-42.
86. Good WW, Sterling M, Holtzman WH. Termination of chlorpromazine with schizophrenic patients. *Am J Psychiatry* 1958;115:443-8.
87. Goldberg JF, Ng-Mak D, Siu C et al. Remission and recovery associated with lurasidone in the treatment of major depressive disorder with subthreshold hypomanic symptoms (mixed features): post-hoc analysis of a randomized, placebo-controlled study with longer-term extension. *CNS Spectr* 2017;22:220-7.
88. Green AI, Brunette MF, Dawson R et al. Long-acting injectable vs oral risperidone for schizophrenia and co-occurring alcohol use disorder: a randomized trial. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2015;76:1359-65.
89. Gross HS. A double-blind comparison of once-a-day pimozide, trifluoperazine, and placebo in the maintenance care of chronic schizophrenic outpatients. *Curr Ther Res Clin Exp* 1974;16:696-705.
90. Hershon HI, Kennedy PF, McGuire RJ. Persistence of extra-pyramidal disorders and psychiatric relapse after withdrawal of long-term phenothiazine therapy. *Br J Psychiatry* 1972;120:41-50.
91. Hirsch SR, Kissling W, Bäuml J et al. A 28-week comparison of ziprasidone and haloperidol in outpatients with stable schizophrenia. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2002;63:516-23.
92. Hirsch SR, Gained R, Rohde PD et al. Outpatient maintenance of chronic schizophrenic patients with long-acting fluphenazine: double-blind placebo trial. Report to the Medical Research Council Committee on Clinical Trials in Psychiatry. *Br Med J* 1973;1:633-7.
93. Hirsch SR KA, Okasha MS, Salih MA. Maintenance therapy in out-patient schizophrenics: a report of a double-blind trial comparison of fluphenazine decanoate and flupenthixol decanoate. *Br J Psychiatry* 1978;133:370-1.

94. Hogarty GE, Goldberg SC. Drug and sociotherapy in the aftercare of schizophrenic patients. One-year relapse rates. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1973;28:54-64.
95. Hogarty GE, Schooler NR, Ulrich R et al. Fluphenazine and social therapy in the aftercare of schizophrenic patients. Relapse analyses of a two-year controlled study of fluphenazine decanoate and fluphenazine hydrochloride. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1979;36:1283-94.
96. Hollister LE, Erickson GV, Motzenbecker FP. Trifluoperazine in chronic psychiatric patients. *J Clin Exp Psychopathol Q Rev Psychiatry Neurol* 1960;21:15-24.
97. Hough D, Gopal S, Vijapurkar U et al. Paliperidone palmitate maintenance treatment in delaying the time-to-relapse in patients with schizophrenia: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Schizophr Res* 2010;116:107-17.
98. Ishigooka J, Nakamura J, Fujii Y et al. Efficacy and safety of aripiprazole once-monthly in Asian patients with schizophrenia: a multicenter, randomized, double-blind, non-inferiority study versus oral aripiprazole. *Schizophr Res* 2015;161:421-8.
99. Jolley AG, Hirsch SR, Morrison E et al. Trial of brief intermittent neuroleptic prophylaxis for selected schizophrenic outpatients: clinical and social outcome at two years. *BMJ* 1990;301:837-42.
100. Kamijima K, Higuchi T, Ishigooka J et al. Aripiprazole augmentation to antidepressant therapy in Japanese patients with major depressive disorder: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study (ADMIRE study). *J Affect Disord* 2013;151:899-905.
101. Kane JM. Ziprasidone in schizophrenia: from acute treatment to long-term management. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2003;64(Suppl. 19):3-5.
102. Kane JM, Mackle M, Snow-Adami L et al. Double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of asenapine in prevention of relapse after long-term treatment of schizophrenia. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol* 2010;13:223.
103. Kane JM, Mackle M, Snow-Adami L et al. A randomized placebo-controlled trial of asenapine for the prevention of relapse of schizophrenia after long-term treatment. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2011;72:349-55.
104. Kane JM, Sanchez R, Perry PP et al. Aripiprazole intramuscular depot as maintenance treatment in patients with schizophrenia: a 52-week, multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2012;73:617-24.
105. Kaneno S, Okuma T, Yamashita et al. A double-blind comparative study on the efficacy and safety of fluphenazine decanoate (SQ10, 733) and oral haloperidol in the treatment of schizophrenic patients. *Clinical Evaluation* 1991;19:15-45.
106. Kelly HB, Freeman HL, Banning B et al. Clinical and social comparison of fluphenazine decanoate and flupenthixol decanoate in the community maintenance therapy of schizophrenia. *Int Pharmacopsychiatry* 1977;12:54-64.
107. Kern RS, Green MF, Cornblatt BA et al. The neurocognitive effects of aripiprazole: an open-label comparison with olanzapine. *Psychopharmacology* 2006;187:312-20.
108. Kissling W, Möller HJ, Walter K et al. Double-blind comparison of haloperidol decanoate and fluphenazine decanoate effectiveness, side-effects, dosage and serum levels during a six months' treatment for relapse prevention. *Pharmacopsychiatry* 1985;18:240-5.
109. Kramer M, Simpson G, Maciulis V et al. Paliperidone extended-release tablets for prevention of symptom recurrence in patients with schizophrenia: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *J Clin Psychopharmacol* 2007;27:6-14.
110. Suresh Kumar PN, Anish PK, Rajmohan V. Olanzapine has better efficacy compared to risperidone for treatment of negative symptoms in schizophrenia. *Indian J Psychiatry* 2016;58:311-6.
111. Laties AM, Flach AJ, Baldycheva I et al. Cataractogenic potential of quetiapine versus risperidone in the long-term treatment of patients with schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder: a randomized, open-label, ophthalmologist-masked, flexible-dose, non-inferiority trial. *J Psychopharmacol* 2015;29:69-79.
112. Lecrubier Y, Quintin P, Bouhassira M et al. The treatment of negative symptoms and deficit states of chronic schizophrenia: olanzapine compared to amisulpride and placebo in a 6-month double-blind controlled clinical trial. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 2006;114:319-27.
113. Leong OK, Wong KE, Tay WK et al. A comparative study of pipothiazine palmitate and fluphenazine decanoate in the maintenance of remission of schizophrenia. *Singapore Med J* 1989;30:436-40.
114. Lundin L, Dencker SJ, Malm U. Community-based rehabilitation of schizophrenia. *Nord J Psychiatry* 1992;46:121-7.
115. Macfadden W, Ma Y-W, Haskins JT et al. A prospective study comparing the long-term effectiveness of injectable risperidone long-acting therapy and oral aripiprazole in patients with schizophrenia. *Psychiatry* 2010;73:23-31.
116. Marder SR, Glynn SM, Wirshing WC et al. Maintenance treatment of schizophrenia with risperidone or haloperidol: 2-year outcomes. *Am J Psychiatry* 2003;160:1405-12.
117. McEvoy JP, Byerly M, Hamer RM et al. Effectiveness of paliperidone palmitate vs haloperidol decanoate for maintenance treatment of schizophrenia: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2014;311:1978-87.
118. Naber D, Peuskens J, Schwarzmann N et al. Subjective well-being in schizophrenia: a randomised controlled open-label 12-month non-inferiority study comparing quetiapine XR with risperidone (RECOVER). *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 2013;23:1257-69.
119. Németh G, Laszlovszky I, Czobor P et al. Cariprazine versus risperidone monotherapy for treatment of predominant negative symptoms in patients with schizophrenia: a randomised, double-blind, controlled trial. *Lancet* 2017;389:1103-13.
120. Nielsen J, Matz J, Mittoux A et al. Cardiac effects of sertindole and quetiapine: analysis of ECGs from a randomized double-blind study in patients with schizophrenia. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 2015;25:303-11.
121. Noordsy DL, Glynn SM, Sugar CA et al. Risperidone versus olanzapine among patients with schizophrenia participating in supported employment: eighteen-month outcomes. *J Psychiatr Res* 2017;95:299-307.
122. Odejide OA, Aderounmu AF. Double-blind placebo substitution: withdrawal of fluphenazine decanoate in schizophrenic patients. *J Clin Psychiatry* 1982;43:195-6.
123. Ota KY, Kurland AA. A double-blind comparison of haloperidol oral concentrate, haloperidol solutabs and placebo in the treatment of chronic schizophrenia. *J Clin Pharmacol New Drugs* 1973;13:99-110.
124. Peuskens J, Trivedi J, Malyarov S et al. Prevention of schizophrenia relapse with extended release quetiapine fumarate dosed once daily: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial in clinically stable patients. *Psychiatry* 2007;4:34-50.
125. Pigott TA, Carson WH, Saha AR et al. Aripiprazole for the prevention of relapse in stabilized patients with chronic schizophrenia: a placebo-controlled 26-week study. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2003;64:1048-56.
126. Pinto R, Bannerjee A, Ghosh N. A double-blind comparison of flupenthixol decanoate and fluphenazine decanoate in the treatment of chronic schizophrenia. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 1979;60:313-22.
127. Potkin SG, Loze JY, Forray C et al. Multidimensional assessment of functional outcomes in schizophrenia: results from QUALIFY, a head-to-head trial of aripiprazole once-monthly and paliperidone palmitate. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol* 2017;20:40-9.
128. Potkin SG, Weiden PJ, Loebel AD et al. Remission in schizophrenia: 196-week, double-blind treatment with ziprasidone vs. haloperidol. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol* 2009;12:1233-48.
129. Prien RF, Levine J, Cole JO. High dose trifluoperazine therapy in chronic schizophrenia. *Am J Psychiatry* 1969;126:305-13.
130. Purdon SE, Jones BD, Stip E et al. Neuropsychological change in early phase schizophrenia during 12 months of treatment with olanzapine, risperidone, or haloperidol. The Canadian Collaborative Group for research in schizophrenia. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2000;57:249-58.
131. Quitkin F, Rifkin A, Kane J et al. Long-acting oral vs injectable antipsychotic drugs in schizophrenics: a one-year double-blind comparison in multiple episode schizophrenics. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1978;35:889-92.
132. Rifkin A, Quitkin F, Klein DF. Fluphenazine decanoate, oral fluphenazine, and placebo in treatment of remitted schizophrenics. II. Rating scale data. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1977;34:1215-9.
133. Ritchie CW, Chiu E, Harrigan S et al. The impact upon extra-pyramidal side effects, clinical symptoms and quality of life of a switch from conventional to atypical antipsychotics (risperidone or olanzapine) in elderly patients with schizophrenia. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* 2003;18:432-40.
134. Rui Q, Wang Y, Liang S et al. Relapse prevention study of paliperidone extended-release tablets in Chinese patients with schizophrenia. *Prog Neuropsychopharmacol Biol Psychiatry* 2014;53:45-53.
135. Savitz AJ, Xu H, Gopal S et al. Efficacy and safety of paliperidone palmitate 3-month formulation for patients with schizophrenia: a randomized, multicenter, double-blind, noninferiority study. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol* 2016;19:pyw018.
136. Schooler NR, Levine J, Severe JB et al. Prevention of relapse in schizophrenia. An evaluation of fluphenazine decanoate. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1980;37:16-24.
137. Schneider SJ, Kirby EJ, Itil TM. Clinical blood chemistry values and long acting phenothiazines. *Pharmacopsychiatry* 1981;14:107-14.
138. Schlosberg A SM. A comparative controlled study of two long-acting phenothiazines: pipothiazine palmitate and fluphenazine decanoate. *Curr Ther Res* 1978;23:642-54.

139. Schreiner A, Niehaus D, Shuriquie NA et al. Metabolic effects of paliperidone extended release versus oral olanzapine in patients with schizophrenia: a prospective, randomized, controlled trial. *J Clin Psychopharmacol* 2012; 32:449-57.
140. Serafetinides EA, Collins S, Clark ML. Haloperidol, clopenthixol, and chlorpromazine in chronic schizophrenia. Chemically unrelated antipsychotics as therapeutic alternatives. *J Nerv Ment Dis* 1972;154:31-42.
141. Shrivastava A, Gopa S. Comparative study of risperidone and haloperidol on clinical and psychosocial parameters in treatment of schizophrenia: a randomized open trial. *Indian J Psychiatry* 2000;42: 52-6.
142. Song Y. A double-blind control study on the effect of pipotiazine palmitate and fluphenazine decanoate in the treatment of schizophrenia. *Chinese J Neurol Psychiatry* 1993;26:137-40.
143. Speller JC, Barnes TR, Curson DA et al. One-year, low-dose neuroleptic study of in-patients with chronic schizophrenia characterised by persistent negative symptoms. Amisulpride v. haloperidol. *Br J Psychiatry* 1997;171:564-8.
144. Subotnik KL, Casaus LR, Ventura J et al. Long-acting injectable risperidone for relapse prevention and control of breakthrough symptoms after a recent first episode of schizophrenia. A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2015;72:822-9.
145. Tandon R, Cucchiari J, Phillips D et al. A double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized withdrawal study of lurasidone for the maintenance of efficacy in patients with schizophrenia. *J Psychopharmacol* 2016;30:69-77.
146. Voruganti LP, Awad AG, Parker G et al. Cognition, functioning and quality of life in schizophrenia treatment: results of a one-year randomized controlled trial of olanzapine and quetiapine. *Schizophr Res* 2007;96:146-55.
147. Wani RA, Dar MA, Chandel RK et al. Effects of switching from olanzapine to aripiprazole on the metabolic profiles of patients with schizophrenia and metabolic syndrome: a double-blind, randomized, open-label study. *Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat* 2015;11:685-93.
148. Weiden PJ, Manning R, Wolfgang CD et al. A randomized trial of iloperidone for prevention of relapse in schizophrenia: the REPRIEVE study. *CNS Drugs* 2016;30:735-47.
149. Wistedt B, Koskinen T, Thelander S et al. Zuclopenthixol decanoate and haloperidol decanoate in chronic schizophrenia: a double-blind multicentre study. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 1991;84:14-21.
150. Wistedt BP. A comparative trial of haloperidol decanoate and fluphenazine decanoate in chronic schizophrenic patients. *Int Clin Psychopharmacol* 1986;1(Suppl. 1):15-23.
151. Woggon B, Dick P, Fleischhauer HJ et al. Comparison of the effects of pipotiazine palmitate and fluphenazine decanoate. Results of a multicenter double-blind trial. *Int Pharmacopsychiatry* 1977;12:193-209.
152. Ely Lilly. NCT00190749. Safety study of olanzapine and a comparator in patients with schizophrenia and schizoaffective disorder. <https://clinicaltrials.gov>.
153. Janssen Ltd. NCT00236379. A study of the effects of risperidone and olanzapine on blood glucose (sugar) in patients with schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder. <https://clinicaltrials.gov>.
154. Janssen Ltd. NCT00253110. A comparison of risperidone with haloperidol in patients with schizophrenia and schizoaffective disorder. <https://clinicaltrials.gov>.
155. Janssen Korea Ltd. NCT00992407. An efficacy and safety study of long acting injectable risperidone and oral risperidone in participants with schizophrenia or schizoaffective disorder. <https://clinicaltrials.gov>.
156. Tiihonen J, Mittendorfer-Rutz E, Majak M et al. Real-world effectiveness of antipsychotic treatments in a nationwide cohort of 29823 patients with schizophrenia. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2017;74:686-93.
157. Kishimoto T, Nitta M, Borenstein M et al. Long-acting injectable versus oral antipsychotics in schizophrenia: a systematic review and meta-analysis of mirror-image studies. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2013;74:957-65.
158. Tiihonen J, Taipale H, Mehtälä J et al. Association of antipsychotic polypharmacy vs monotherapy with psychiatric rehospitalization among adults with schizophrenia. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2019;76:499-507.
159. Kishimoto T, Hagi K, Nitta M et al. Effectiveness of long-acting injectable vs oral antipsychotics in patients with schizophrenia: a meta-analysis of prospective and retrospective cohort studies. *Schizophr Bull* 2018;44:603-19.
160. Kishimoto T, Robenzadeh A, Leucht C 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.
161. Haddad PM, Kishimoto T, Correll CU et al. Ambiguous findings concerning potential advantages of depot antipsychotics: in search of clinical relevance. *Curr Opin Psychiatry* 2015;28:216-21.
162. Ostuzzi G, Barbui C. Comparative effectiveness of long-acting antipsychotics: issues and challenges from a pragmatic randomised study. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci* 2016;25:21-3.
163. Ostuzzi G, Papola D, Gastaldon C et al. New EMA report on paliperidone 3-month injections: taking clinical and policy decisions without an adequate evidence base. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci* 2017;26:231-3.
164. Correll CU, Solmi M, Veronese N et al. Prevalence, incidence and mortality from cardiovascular disease in patients with pooled and specific severe mental illness: a large-scale meta-analysis of 3,211,768 patients and 113,383,368 controls. *World Psychiatry* 2017;16:163-80.
165. Solmi M, Tiihonen J, Lähteenvuo M et al. Antipsychotics use is associated with greater adherence to cardiometabolic medications in patients with schizophrenia: results from a nationwide, within-subject design study. *Schizophr Bull* 2022;48:166-75.
166. Taipale H, Tanskanen A, Mehtälä J et al. 20-year follow-up study of physical morbidity and mortality in relationship to antipsychotic treatment in a nationwide cohort of 62,250 patients with schizophrenia (FIN20). *World Psychiatry* 2020;19:61-8.
167. Turner EH, Knoepfelmacher D, Shapley L. Publication bias in antipsychotic trials: an analysis of efficacy comparing the published literature to the US Food and Drug Administration database. *PLoS Med* 2012;9:e1001189.
168. American Psychiatric Association. Practice guideline for the treatment of patients with schizophrenia. Washington: American Psychiatric Association, 2020.
169. World Health Organization. mhGAP intervention guide for mental, neurological and substance use disorders in non-specialized health settings: mental health Gap Action Programme (mhGAP) – version 2.0. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2019.
170. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Psychosis and schizophrenia in adults. Treatment and management. National Clinical Guideline Number 178. London: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2014.
171. Burrone E, Gotham D, Gray A et al. Patent pooling to increase access to essential medicines. *Bull World Health Organ* 2019;97:575-7.

DOI:10.1002/wps.20972