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Abstract

Introduction: The introduction of second-generation antipsychotics, with atypical mechanism of action, especially lower dopamine receptors affinity, has met with great expectations among clinicians regarding their potentially lower propensity to cause extrapyramidal syndrome. Numerous studies have examined the incidence and severity of extrapyramidal syndrome with first- and second-generation antipsychotics.

Material and Methods: 100 patients with any psychotic symptoms were taken up in this study. Extra pyramidal symptoms were assessed after taking antipsychotics by applying by –extra pyramidal side effects scale, Barnes akathisia scale and abnormal involuntary moments scale at the interval of 1 week, 2 months, 3 months, 6 months, 9 months & 1 year.

Results: At the end of 1 year treatment based on Extrapyramidal side effects scale that of Bradykinesia – rigidity, observed rigidity, gait and posture, reported tremor, observed tremor, BARS,AIMS scores are more in patients receiving typical antipsychotics than atypical antipsychotics.

Interpretation and Conclusion: EPS are more in patients receiving typical antipsychotics than atypical antipsychotics.
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Introduction

Antipsychotics are used to treat psychosis as well as many other related disorders. Significant adverse effects associated with conventional (typical) antipsychotics and availability of the alternatives, better tolerated medications in other classes like new atypical antipsychotics with their improved adverse effect profiles may make this practice more acceptable.

However, compared to older medications the atypical agents are chemically and pharmacologically different, have fewer side effects and hold the promises of greater clinical efficacy. Typical antipsychotic block D₂ receptor so tightly and persistently that they cause antipsychotics actions and side effects like E.P.S (extra pyramidal side effects) as compare to a typical one.
In PET study approximately 65% occupation of D2 is the group threshold required for resolution of psychotic symptoms. 80% occupancy of D2 for onset of motor side effects in typical antipsychotics. As compared to typical antipsychotics atypical one produce less E.P.S & cognitive deficits, is the basic theme of my study. In sum cognitive deficiency mainly reflects the idea of disorganizations in perception, thought and emotion. Whereas EPS mainly involves Akathisia, Acute Dystonia, Parkinsonism, Perioral Tremor, N.M.S.& T.D.

Aims & Objective
The study aim to assess and compare extra-pyramidal symptoms between the patients taking typical and atypical antipsychotics duration wise.

Material and Methods
1. The study was conducted in the O.P.D & I.P.D Dept. of Psychiatry, Mental health institute, centre of excellence, SCB Medical College Cuttack, Odisha, India
2. The patients diagnosed with –Schizophrenia, Schizoaffective Disorder, Schizophreniform Disorder, Delusional Disorder, Affective Psychosis, other psychosis, as criteria led down in DSM-V, were taken up for the study.
3. The age group between 20 to 60 yr were taken up for the study
4. Both sexes were included
5. Exclusion were done those patients receiving mood stabilizers with anti psychotics, ECT, above 60 yrs patients to rule out organicity, ISOL, substance induced psychosis & irregular patients
6. 100 patients with any psychotics symptoms were taken up
7. All patients gave written informed consents to participate the study
8. 8 patients denied to participate, 10 patients irregularly irregular and 2 patients left without informed. So 80 patents were participate finally.
10. At the beginning of the study socio-demographic data were recorded.
11. 40 patients taking typical anti-psychotics and another 40 patients taken anti-psychotics medication
12. Extra pyramidal symptoms were assessed after taking antipsychotics by applying by –extra-pyramidal side effects scale (McEvoy et. al.1991), barnesakathesia scale (Barnes.1989) and abnormal involuntary moments scale at the interval of 1 week, 2 months, 3 months, 6 months, 9 months & 1 year.

Statistic Analysis were done from observation by using the formula chi-square (2 x 2 fold). In this research the comparison is made between the groups to know whether they are comparable or not.

Observation & Discussing
Table-1 Score of Extra-Pyramidal side effects scale of Study Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>B.S</th>
<th>1 week</th>
<th>1 month</th>
<th>3 month</th>
<th>6 month</th>
<th>1 year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TA  AT</td>
<td>TA  AT</td>
<td>TA  AT</td>
<td>TA  AT</td>
<td>TA  AT</td>
<td>TA  AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Bradykynesia &amp; rigidity</td>
<td>0 13 32.5</td>
<td>3 11 21</td>
<td>7 5 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Observed rigidity</td>
<td>0 12 4</td>
<td>10 2 8</td>
<td>5 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Gait &amp; posture</td>
<td>0 10 3</td>
<td>9 2 7</td>
<td>4 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Reported Tremor</td>
<td>0 10 2</td>
<td>13 4 20</td>
<td>5 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Observed Tremor</td>
<td>0 11 3</td>
<td>12 4 18</td>
<td>4 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.S-Baseline TA-Typical antipsychotics (40 patients) AT- Atypical antipsychotics (40 patients)

Since the scale on Extra pyramidal side effects does not have cut off point as a whole, in order to explain the validity of the study, the scores of the different items have been taken separately and the observations have been correlated with the studies earlier done in this area.
It is revealed that Bradykinesia-rigidity, observed rigidity, gait and posture, observed tremor and reported tremor, components of extra-pyramidal side effects scale scores are more in patients on typical than atypical antipsychotics during the course of treatments.

This is keeping in view with the study of Glazer WM (2000) that most frequent problems associated with the older generation of antipsychotic agents have extra pyramidal side effects and tardive dyskinesia. this can also be compared with the study of Mullen J.et al.(2000) that Quetiapine is as effective as risperidone for the treatment of psychotic symptoms, is more effective for depressive symptoms, may have more favourable EPS profile and has comparable overall tolerability.

Our observation in the area of extra pyramidal side effects between typical and atypical antipsychotics can be compared with the study of Peacock L, et al.(1996,Mar) that Parkinsonian signs were seen in 33% of clozapine patients versus 61% of control patients, mainly as hypokinesia; tremor in 3% versus 11% and rigidity in 0 versus 19%.

**Bradykinesia-Rigidity Scores on EPS Scale of Study Subjects**

A) After 1 WEEK of treatment
\[ \chi^2 = 7.81 \quad \text{df} = 1 \]
P < 0.01, statistically significant.

It was observed that at the end of 1 week treatment 13(32.5%) of study subject receiving typical antipsychotics scored more in Bradykinesia-rigidity of EPSE as compared to 3(7.5%) receiving atypical antipsychotics.

B) After 1 MONTH of treatment
\[ \chi^2 = 7.4 \quad \text{df} = 1 \]
P < 0.01, statistically significant.

It was observed that at the end of 1 month treatment 11(27.5%) of study subject receiving typical antipsychotics scored more in Bradykinesia-rigidity of EPSE as compared to 2(5%) receiving atypical antipsychotics.

**Observed-Rigidity Scores on EPS Scale of Study Subjects**

A) After 1 WEEK of treatment
\[ \chi^2 = 5 \quad \text{df} = 1 \]
P < 0.05, statistically significant.

It was observed that observed –rigidity score on EPSE were more in study subjects receiving typical antipsychotics 12(30%) than atypicals 4 (10%).

B) After 1 MONTH of treatment
\[ \chi^2 = 6.27 \quad \text{df} = 1 \]
P < 0.05, statistically significant.

It was observed that observed –rigidity score on EPSE were more in study subjects receiving typical antipsychotics 10(25%) than atypicals 2 (5%).

**Gait & Posture Scores on EPS Scale of Study Subjects**

A) After 1 WEEK of treatment
\[ \chi^2 = 4.5 \quad \text{df} = 1 \]
P < 0.05, statistically significant.

It was observed that score on gait & posture scores on EPSE were more in study subjects receiving typical antipsychotics 10(25%) than atypicals 3 (7.5%).

B) After 1 MONTH of treatment
\[ \chi^2 = 5.16 \quad \text{df} = 1 \]
P < 0.05, statistically significant.

It was observed that score on gait & posture scores on EPSE were more in study subjects receiving typical antipsychotics 9(22.5%) than atypicals 2 (5%).

**Reported Tremor Scores on EPS Scale of Study Subjects**

A) After 1 WEEK of treatment
\[ \chi^2 = 6.27 \quad \text{df} = 1 \]
P < 0.05, statistically significant.

Out of the subjects taking typical antipsychotics 10(25%) were having reported tremor, then that of atypical having 2(5%). So it was clearly marked that typical antipsychotic agents have more reported tremor than atypical antipsychotics.
B) After 3 MONTHS of treatment

\[ \chi^2 = 13.0 \quad \text{df} = 1 \]

P < 0.01, statistically significant

Out of the subjects taking typical antipsychotics 20(50%) were having reported tremor, then that of atypical having 5(12.5%). So it was clearly marked that typical antipsychotic agents have more reported tremor than atypical antipsychotics.

**Observed Tremor Scores on EPS Scale of Study Subjects**

A) After 1 WEEK of treatment

\[ \chi^2 = 5.5 \quad \text{df} = 1 \]

P < 0.05, statistically significant.

It was concluded that on EPSE scale were more of study subjects taking typical antipsychotics 11(27.5%) than atypical antipsychotics agents 3(7.5%)

B) After 3 MONTHS of treatment

\[ \chi^2 = 12.2 \quad \text{df} = 1 \]

P < 0.01, statistically significant

It was concluded that on EPSE scale were more of study subjects taking typical antipsychotics 18(45.5%) than atypical antipsychotics agents 4(10%)

---

**Table-2 Scores on Barnes Akathisia Rating Scale (Bars) of Study Subjects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>B.S</th>
<th>1 week</th>
<th>1 month</th>
<th>3 month</th>
<th>6 month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Objective</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Subjective</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Global</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S-Baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-Typical antipsychotics (40 patients)</td>
<td>AT- Atypical antipsychotics (40 patients)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the scale on akathisia does not have cut off point as a whole, in order to explain the validity of the study, the scores of the different items have been taken separately and the observations have been correlated with the studies earlier done in this area.

It was observed that akathisia scores (Objective, Subjective and Global) of study subjects on BARS are more on typical antipsychotics. Akathisia appeared within 1 week but it was aggravated within four weeks (1 month)

This is keeping in view of our observation in the area of akathisia between typical and atypical antipsychotics can be compared with the study of seeman P(2003) that the prevalence of akathisia associated with atypical antipsychotics including risperidone and olanzapine, is can also be compared with the study of Peacock L (1996) that psychic Akathisia was found in 14% versus 40% and motor Akathisia in 7% versus 29% of the patients, all differences significantly in favour of clozapine to typical antipsychotics.

**Objectives Scores on Barnes Akathisia Rating Scale (Bars) of Study Subjects**

A) After 1 WEEK of treatment

\[ \chi^2 = 12.6 \quad \text{df} = 1 \]

P < 0.01, statistically significant.

It was observed that the objective scores on BARS of study subjects were more in taking typical antipsychotics 15 (37.5%) that atypical antipsychotic agents 2 (5%)

B) After 1 MONTH of treatment

\[ \chi^2 = 9.83 \quad \text{df} = 1 \]

P < 0.01, statistically significant

It was observed that the objective scores on BARS of study subjects were more in taking typical antipsychotics 19 (47.5%) that atypical antipsychotic agents 6(15%)

**Subjectives Scores on Barnes Akathisia Rating Scale (Bars) of Study Subjects**

A) After 1 WEEK of treatment

\[ \chi^2 = 4.5 \quad \text{df} = 1 \]

P < 0.05, statistically significant.

It was observed that the subjective scores on BARS of study subjects were more in taking
typical antipsychotics 10 (25%) that atypical antipsychotic agents 3(7.5%)
B) After 1 MONTH of treatment

\[ \chi^2 = 13.0 \quad df = 1 \]
P < 0.01, statistically significant

It was observed that the subjective scores on BARS of study subjects were more in taking typical antipsychotics 20 (50%) that atypical antipsychotic agents 5(12.5%)

**Global Scores on Barnes Akathisia Rating Scale (Bars) of Study Subjects**

A) After 1 WEEK of treatment

\[ \chi^2 = 7.81 \quad df = 1 \]
P < 0.01, statistically significant.

It was observed that the global scores on BARS of study subjects were more in taking typical antipsychotics 13 (32.5%) that atypical antipsychotic agents 3(7.5%)
B) After 1 MONTH of treatment

\[ \chi^2 = 9.6 \quad df = 1 \]
P < 0.01, statistically significant

It was observed that the global scores on BARS of study subjects were more in taking typical antipsychotics 16 (40%) that atypical antipsychotic agents 4(10%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>B.S</th>
<th>1 Week</th>
<th>1 Month</th>
<th>3 Month</th>
<th>6 Month</th>
<th>9 Month</th>
<th>1 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Facial &amp; oral movements</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Extremity movement</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Trunk movement</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Global movement</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Patients awareness of abnormal movements</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Dental status</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B.S->Baseline TA->Typical antipsychotics (40 patients) AT-> Atypical antipsychotics (40 patients)
P->Present A->Absent

The scores on AIMS of study subjects from 1 week to 1 year of treatment typical & atypical antipsychotics.

Since the scale on abnormal involuntary movements does not have cut off point as a whole, in order to explain the validity of the study, the scores of the different items have been taken separately and the observations have been correlated with the studies earlier done in this area.

This is keeping with our observation in abnormal involuntary movements between typical & atypical antipsychotics can be compared with the study of Madhu Soodans et al.(1995) that by the use of atypical (Risperidone) antipsychotics, reduces both positive and negative symptoms of schizophrenia and lack of significant EPS, tardive antipsychotics.

**Scores of Facial & Oral Movements on Aims of Study Subjects**

A) After 6 months of treatment

\[ \chi^2 = 4.5 \quad df = 1 \]
P < 0.05, statistically significant.

It was observed that patients taking typical antipsychotics scored more 10(25%) than the patients taking atypical antipsychotics

B) After 1 year of treatment

\[ \chi^2 = 6.05 \quad df= 1 \]
P < 0.05, statistically significant

That means facial and oral movement is present in 13(32.5%) of cases after typical antipsychotics.
treatment and only 4 (10%) of cases after atypical antipsychotics treatment.

Scores of Extremity Movements on aims of Study Subjects

A) After 6 months of treatment
\[ \chi^2 = 4.114 \quad df = 1 \]
P < 0.05, statistically significant

It seems that extremity movement is present with 8(20%) of study subjects after 6 months of typical antipsychotics treatment and only 2(5%) of the study subjects after 6 months atypical antipsychotics treatment. Though the score is high after typical antipsychotics treatment it can be concluded that atypical use gives fewer side effect (extremity movement).

B) After 1 year of treatment
\[ \chi^2 = 6.46 \quad df = 1 \]
P < 0.05, statistically significant

Scores of Trunk Movements on Aims of Study Subjects

A) After 6 months of treatment
\[ \chi^2 = 4.5 \quad df = 1 \]
P < 0.05, statistically significant

It was observed that at the end of 6 months of treatment 10(25%) of subjects receiving typical antipsychotics scored on trunk movement (on AIMS) as compared to 3 (7.5%) receiving atypical antipsychotics. That means atypical can be more safely used than typical antipsychotics in cases of extremity movements adverse effects.

B) After 1 year of treatment
\[ \chi^2 = 8.35 \quad df = 1 \]
P < 0.05, statistically significant

Scores of Global Movements on Aims of Study Subjects

A) After 6 months of treatment
\[ \chi^2 = 5.164 \quad df = 1 \]
P < 0.05, statistically significant

It seems from the table that global movement results more in case of patients taking typical antipsychotics 12(30%) as compared to patients taking atypical 3(7.5%). hence atypical antipsychotics treatment gives lesser side effects on global movement.

Patients Awareness of Abnormal Movements on aims of Study Subjects

A) After 6 months of treatment
\[ \chi^2 = 7.81 \quad df = 1 \]
P < 0.01, statistically significant

The results showed that there is a significant difference between patients taking typical and atypical antipsychotics on patient awerness of abnormal movements (on AIMS). i.e 13(32.5%) patients typical antipsychotics were having awerness of abnormal movements as compared to atypical i.e. 3(7.5%).

B) After 1 year of treatment
\[ \chi^2 = 8.35 \quad df = 1 \]
P < 0.01, statistically significant

It on patient awerness of abnormal movement 15(37.5%) of study subjects taking typical antipsychotics treatment scored more than 4(10%) of study subjects taking atypical antipsychotics treatment.
Scores of Dental Status on aims of Study Subjects
A) After 9 months of treatment
\[ \chi^2 = 5.16 \quad \text{df} = 1 \]
\[ P < 0.05, \text{statistically significant}. \]
From the result it is clear that in 95% of cases we can assess the view as typical antipsychotic treatment causes more dental problems than atypical antipsychotics treatment. Because 22.5% of subjects taking typical antipsychotic were having dental problem whereas only 5% taking atypical were having that.

B) After 1 year of treatment
\[ \chi^2 = 9.8 \quad \text{df} = 1 \]
\[ P < 0.01, \text{statistically significant} \]
Results showed that in 99% of cases atypical antipsychotics treatment causes lesser dental problem with typical antipsychotics treatment and only 2.5% were having that with atypical antipsychotics treatment. Hence we have taken the comparison between 9 months and 1 year because dental problems occur after 6 months of antipsychotics treatment.

It is on patient awarness of abnormal movement 15(37.5%) of study subjects taking typical antipsychotics treatment scored more than 4(10%) of study subjects taking atypical antipsychotics treatment.

Conclusion
1) The new atypical antipsychotics medications represent a major step forward in the treatment of schizophrenia and other psychotic disorders than the typical antipsychotics.
2) The advantage of atypical antipsychotics is their lesser side effect profiles, particularly with regard to EPS and cognitive deficit.
3) Loose binding and medium binding to the D2 receptor have less extra-pyramidal side effects (both acute and chronic) as compared to tight-binding antipsychotics.
4) Long-term use of antipsychotics give more side effects i.e. Extra Pyramidal Side effects than the short term use.
5) Low education sometimes becomes a bar for the treatment procedure.
6) Further refinement of our understanding of the clinical utility of these drugs awaits their widespread use in mainstream clinical setting and further controlled studies comparing them to one another.
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