TECHNICAL COMMENTARY

Trifluoperazine

NeuRA Discover. Conquer. Cure.

SCHIZOPHRENIA LIBRARY

Introduction

First generation 'typical' antipsychotics are an older class of antipsychotic than second generation 'atypical' antipsychotics. They are used primarily to treat positive symptoms including the experiences of perceptual abnormalities (hallucinations) and fixed, false, irrational beliefs (delusions).

First generation antipsychotics may cause side effects which can differ depending on which antipsychotic is being administered and on individual differences in reaction to the drug. Reactions may include dyskinesias such as repetitive, involuntary, and purposeless body or facial movements, Parkinsonism (cogwheel muscle rigidity, pill-rolling tremor and reduced or slowed movements), akathisia (motor restlessness, especially in the legs, and resembling agitation) and dystonias such as muscle contractions causing unusual twisting of parts of the body, most often in the neck. These effects are caused by the dopamine receptor antagonist action of these drugs.

This table summarises overall group effectiveness of trifluoperazine from information gained from randomised controlled trials (RCTs). Individual treatment programs need to be tailored by trained clinicians as response - both in symptoms and adverse effects - can vary between individuals.

Method

Owing to the vast number of reviews on antipsychotics, we have included only information reported in the abstracts of Cochrane systematic reviews[1]. This is because the Cochrane internal review process ensures a high level of scientific rigor and meta-analyses are usually conducted, giving treatment effect sizes. Data from the abstracts were supplemented from the full text when clarification was required. We have included only Cochrane reviews that have been published from the year 2000 to date to ensure the latest available evidence is presented. When multiple copies of reviews were found and/or when findings conflict, we present the most recent version and the most recent conclusions.

Evidence was graded using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) Working Group approach where high quality evidence such as that gained from RCTs may be downgraded to moderate or low if review and study quality is limited, if there is inconsistency in results, indirect comparisons, imprecise or sparse data and high probability of reporting bias. It may also be downgraded if risks associated with the intervention or other matter under review are high. Conversely, low quality evidence such as that gained from observational studies may be upgraded if effect sizes are large, there is a dose dependent response or if results are reasonably consistent, precise and direct with low associated risks[2]. The resulting table represents an objective summary of the evidence, although the conclusions are solely the opinion of staff of NeuRA (Neuroscience Research Australia).

Results

We found three reviews that met our inclusion criteria[3-5].

Margarete Ainsworth Building, Barker Street, Randwick NSW 2031. Phone: 02 9399 1000. Email: info@neura.edu.au

To donate, phone 1800 888 019 or visit www.neura.edu.au/donate/schizophrenia

TECHNICAL COMMENTARY

Trifluoperazine

NeuRA Discover. Conquer. Cure.

SCHIZOPHRENIA LIBRARY

Trifluoperazine	
Compared to placebo **Efficacy: Moderate to low quality evidence (consistent, imprecise, direct, authors report many of the studies are of low quality) shows trifluoperazine may improve global state more than placebo. There may be fewer people leave the study early with trifluoperazine due to relapse or worsening of symptoms.** **Adverse effects: Moderate to low quality evidence (imprecise) suggests trifluoperazine may increase drowsiness and the use of antiparkinsonian drugs.** **Compared to other first generation antipsychotics** **Efficacy: High quality evidence (consistent, precise, direct) shows no differences in global state. Moderate quality evidence (imprecise) suggests no differences in response to treatment or study retention.** **Adverse effects: Moderate quality evidence (imprecise) suggests no differences in adverse events, apart from more extrapyramidal side effects with trifluoperazine in comparison with low potency chlorpromazine.** **See below for detailed results from three reviews.**	
Marques LDO, Soares B, Silva de Lima M. Trifluoperazine for schizophrenia. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2004, Issue 1. Art. No.: CD003545. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD003545.pub2	
This review includes 13 RCTs (N = 1162). Compared to placebo, trifluoperazine improved global state in the short term (< 3 months, N = 95, 3 RCTs, RR 0.62 CI 0.49 to 0.78 NNT 3 CI 2 to 4, I^2 = 0%, *p* = 0.96). There were no differences in leaving the study early (< 3 months, N = 280, 7 RCTs, RR 0.94 CI 0.59 to 1.48, I^2 = 0%, *p* = 0.85). Compared to other first generation antipsychotics, there were no differences in global state (N = 1016, 27 RCTs, RR 1.06 CI 0.98 to 1.14 I^2 = 0%, *p* = 0.86) or leaving the study early (N = 930, 22 RCTs, RR 1.15 CI 0.83 to 1.58, I^2 = 0%, *p* = 0.95).	
Risks	Compared to placebo, more people allocated to trifluoperazine used antiparkinson drugs to alleviate movements disorders (N = 195, 4 RCTs, RR 5.06 CI 2.49 to 10.27, NNH 4 CI 2 to 9, I^2 = 0%, *p* = 0.85). More drowsiness was reported in the trifluoperazine groups (N = 119, 3 RCTs, RR 2.94 CI 1.42 to 6.10, I^2 = 0%, *p* = 0.38). Compared to other first generation antipsychotics, there were no differences in the overall number of adverse events (~60% in each group N = 585, 14 RCTs, RR 0.99 CI 0.87 to 1.13, I^2 = 33%, *p* = 0.12). However when compared to low potency chlorpromazine trifluoperazine was more likely to cause extrapyramidal adverse

Margarete Ainsworth Building, Barker Street, Randwick NSW 2031. Phone: 02 9399 1000. Email: info@neura.edu.au

To donate, phone 1800 888 019 or visit www.neura.edu.au/donate/schizophrenia

	effects (N = 130, 3 RCTs, RR 1.66 CI 1.03 to 2.67, NNH 6 CI 3 to 121, I^2 = 0%, *p* = 0.83).
Consistency in results‡	Consistent
Precision in results§	Precise for global improvement and number of adverse events only.
Directness of results‖	Direct

Koch K, Mansi K, Haynes E, Adams CE, Sampson S, Furtado VA. Trifluoperazine versus placebo for schizophrenia. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2014, Issue 1. Art. No.: CD010226. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD010226.pub2.

This review includes 10 RCTs (N = 686)

Compared to placebo, trifluoperazine improved global state in the medium term (3-6 months, 3 RCTs, N = 417, RR 4.61, 95%CI 1.54 to 13.84, I^2 = 0%, *p* = 0.93). Significantly fewer people receiving trifluoperazine left the studies early due to relapse or worsening of symptoms in the medium term (2 RCTs, N = 381, RR 0.34, 95%CI 0.23 to 0.49, I^2 = 0%, *p* = 0.65)

There were no differences between groups for leaving the study early for any reason (2 RCTs, N = 391, RR 0.80, 95%CI 0.17 to 3.81, I^2 = 77%, *p* = 0.004) or due to severe adverse effects (2 RCTs, N = 391, RR 1.54, 95%CI 0.56 to 4.24, I^2 = 0%, *p* = 0.91) in the medium term.

There were no differences in clinically significant response to treatment (4 RCTs, N = 139, RR 0.75, 95%CI 0.32 to 1.74, I^2 = 24%, *p* = 0.27), or agitation or distress in the medium term (1 RCT, N = 52, RR 2.00, 95%CI 0.19 to 20.72).

Authors report no differences in results of low-dose trifluoperazine vs. placebo and high-dose trifluoperazine for any outcome.

There was an estimated saving of £3488.30 in favour of trifluoperazine over placebo. However, these savings need to be interpreted in light of assumptions made.

Authors report that results were generally low or very low quality evidence.

Risks	Authors report more extrapyramidal adverse effects in the short term (< 3 months, 2 RCTs, N = 92, RR 4.89, 95%CI 1.36 to 17.59, I^2 = 11%, *p* = 0.33), but not the medium term (3-6 months, 2 RCTs, N = 92, RR 2.08, 95%CI 0.86 to 5.02, I^2 = 48%, *p* = 0.17). Use of antiparkinson drugs was more prevalent in the longer term with trifluoperazine (1 RCT, N = 50, RR 8.50, 95%CI 2.78 to 25.97).
Consistency in results	Consistent for all apart from leaving the study early for any reason.
Precision in results	Imprecise for all apart from leaving the study early due to relapse or worsening of symptoms.
Directness of results	Direct

Margarete Ainsworth Building, Barker Street, Randwick NSW 2031. Phone: 02 9399 1000. Email: info@neura.edu.au

To donate, phone 1800 888 019 or visit www.neura.edu.au/donate/schizophrenia

Tardy M, Dold M, Engel RR, Leucht S. Trifluoperazine versus low-potency first-generation antipsychotic drugs for schizophrenia. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2014, Issue 7. Art. No.: CD009396. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD009396.pub2.	
This review includes 7 RCTs, N = 422 No differences in response to treatment between trifluoperazine and low-potency antipsychotic drugs (3 RCTs, N = 120, RR 0.96, CI 0.59 to 1.56, I^2 = 0%, *p* = 0.47), or in acceptability of treatment (leaving the study early; 3 RCTs, N = 239, RR 1.25, CI 0.72 to 2.17, I^2 = 0%, *p* = 0.73).	
Risks	At least one movement disorder was significantly more frequent in the trifluoperazine group (2 RCTs, N = 123, RR 2.08, CI 0.78 to 5.55, I^2 = 0%, *p* = 0.73), incoordination (1 RCT, N = 60, RR 7.00, CI 1.60 to 30.66) and rigor (1 RCT, N = 60, RR 4.50, CI 1.58 to 12.84).
Consistency in results	Consistent
Precision in results	Imprecise
Directness of results	Direct

Explanation of acronyms

CI = Confidence Interval, I^2 = the percentage of the variability in effect estimates that is due to heterogeneity rather than sampling error (chance), N = number of participants, NNH = number of patients needed to treat for one to show one negative effect, NNT = number of patients needed to treat for one to show a positive effect, *p* = statistical probability of obtaining that result ($p < 0.05$ generally regarded as significant), RR = relative risk, vs. = versus

Explanation of technical terms

† Different effect measures are reported by different reviews.

Weighted mean difference scores refer to mean differences between treatment and comparison groups after treatment (or occasionally pre to post treatment) and in a randomised trial there is an assumption that both groups are comparable on this measure prior to treatment. Standardised mean differences are divided by the pooled standard deviation (or the standard deviation of one group when groups are homogenous) which allows results from different scales to be combined and compared. Each study's mean difference is then given a weighting depending on the size of the sample and the variability in the data. 0.2 represents a small effect, 0.5 a medium effect, and 0.8 and over represents a large effect[1].

Odds ratio (OR) or relative risk (RR) refers to the probability of a reduction (< 1) or an increase (> 1) in a particular outcome in a treatment group, or a group exposed to a risk factor, relative to the comparison group. For example, a RR of 0.75 translates to a reduction in risk of an outcome of 25% relative to those not receiving the treatment or not exposed to the risk factor. Conversely, a RR of 1.25 translates to an increased risk of 25% relative to those not receiving treatment or not having been exposed to a risk factor. A RR or OR of 1.00 means there is no difference between groups. A medium effect is considered if RR > 2 or < 0.5 and a large effect if RR > 5 or < 0.2[6]. lnOR stands for logarithmic OR where a lnOR of 0 shows no difference between groups. Hazard ratios measure the effect of an explanatory variable on the hazard or risk of an event.

Correlation coefficients (eg, r) indicate the strength of association or relationship between variables. They are an indication of prediction, but do not confirm causality due to possible and often unforseen confounding variables. An r of 0.10 represents a weak association, 0.25 a medium association and 0.40 and over represents a strong association. Unstandardised (*b*) regression coefficients indicate the average change in the dependent variable associated with a 1 unit change in the independent variable, statistically controlling for the other independent variables. Standardised regression coefficients represent the change being in units of standard deviations to allow comparison across different scales.

---

‡ Inconsistency refers to differing estimates of effect across studies (i.e. heterogeneity or variability in results) that is not explained by subgroup analyses and therefore reduces confidence in the effect estimate. I^2 is the percentage of the variability in effect estimates that is due to heterogeneity rather than sampling error (chance) - 0% to 40%: heterogeneity might not be important, 30% to 60%: may represent moderate heterogeneity, 50% to 90%: may represent considerable heterogeneity and over this is considerable heterogeneity. I^2 can be calculated from Q (chi-square) for the test of heterogeneity with the following formula[1];

$$I^2 = \left(\frac{Q - df}{Q}\right) \times 100\%$$

---

§ Imprecision refers to wide confidence intervals indicating a lack of confidence in the effect estimate. Based on GRADE recommendations, a result for continuous data (standardised mean differences, not weighted mean differences) is considered

Margarete Ainsworth Building, Barker Street, Randwick NSW 2031. Phone: 02 9399 1000. Email: info@neura.edu.au

To donate, phone 1800 888 019 or visit www.neura.edu.au/donate/schizophrenia

imprecise if the upper or lower confidence limit crosses an effect size of 0.5 in either direction, and for binary and correlation data, an effect size of 0.25. GRADE also recommends downgrading the evidence when sample size is smaller than 300 (for binary data) and 400 (for continuous data), although for some topics, these criteria should be relaxed[7].

‖ Indirectness of comparison occurs when a comparison of intervention A versus B is not available but A was compared with C and B was compared with C, which allows indirect comparisons of the magnitude of effect of A versus B. Indirectness of population, comparator and/or outcome can also occur when the available evidence regarding a particular population, intervention, comparator, or outcome is not available and is therefore inferred from available evidence. These inferred treatment effect sizes are of lower quality than those gained from head-to-head comparisons of A and B.

Margarete Ainsworth Building, Barker Street, Randwick NSW 2031. Phone: 02 9399 1000. Email: info@neura.edu.au

To donate, phone 1800 888 019 or visit www.neura.edu.au/donate/schizophrenia

References

1. CochraneCollaboration. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. 2008: Accessed 24/06/2011.
2. GRADEWorkingGroup. Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *British Medical Journal*. 2004; **328**: 1490.
3. Marques L, Soares B. Trifluoperazine for schizophrenia. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2004; (1).
4. Koch K, Mansi K, Haynes E, Adams CE, Sampson S, Furtado VA. Trifluoperazine versus placebo for schizophrenia. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2014; **1**: CD010226.
5. Tardy M, Dold M, Engel RR, Leucht S. Trifluoperazine versus low-potency first-generation antipsychotic drugs for schizophrenia. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2014; **7**: CD009396.
6. Rosenthal JA. Qualitative Descriptors of Strength of Association and Effect Size. *Journal of Social Service Research*. 1996; **21**(4): 37-59.
7. GRADEpro. [Computer program]. Jan Brozek, Andrew Oxman, Holger Schünemann. *Version 32 for Windows*. 2008.