bei Patienten der beiden Gruppen. 36 Patienten wurden mit Mianserin (Lerivon), Dosis 7.5–15 mg/Tag (max 30 mg/Tag) 46- mit Alprazolam (Cassadan), Dosis 0.06–0.125 mg/Tag (max 0.25 mg/Tag) behandelt. Bei der Behandlung mit Mianserin wurde eine positive Wirkung bei 83.3% der Kranken gefunden, bei der Behandlung mit Alprazolam - bei 78.3% Patienten. Die Dynamik des Patienten-zustandes wahrend der Behandlung war ahnlich. Unterschiedlich war die Auspragung der antidepressiven Wirkung (Mianserin starker, als Alprazolam).

Tues-P39

VENLAFAXINE IN ELDERLY DEPRESSED PATIENTS. A MULTICENTER STUDY

J.L. Ayuso[1]*, J. Giner[2], C. Ballus[3], J.L. Carrasco[4], A. Moreno[1]. *[1]Hospital Clínico San Carlos (Madrid); [2]Hospital Virgen Macarena (Sevilla); [3]University of Barcelona; [4]School of Medicine, Autonomous University of Madrid, Spain*

Objective: To study the possible differences in the management of depression with Venlafaxine between patients aged 65 years and over, and patients under 65.

Design: A nation-wide observational, prospective, longitudinal study.

Subjects: 5012 Out-patients with DSM-IV major depression, with age ranging from 18 to 97 years, 30.6% male and 69.4% female, who received treatment with Venlafaxine for 6 months. 577 patients were[3] 65 years old, of which 75.3% were female and 24.7% male.

Assessment of depression was carried out over a total of 5 visits using Hamilton's 17 items scale and Clinical Global Impression Scale (CGI).

Results: The score in Hamilton's scale at baseline was 22.8 and 5.3 in the final visit at six months for patients[3] 65 versus 23.2 and 5.6, respectively, for patients <65 (NS). Total CGI at 6 months resulted in "a great deal of improvement or much improved" in 84.88% for patients[3] 65 versus 84.36% for patients <65 (NS). Mean dosing was 101.9 mg/day for patients[3] 65 versus 107.8 for patients <65 ($p = 0.006$).

Compliance with treatment was 94% for both age groups.

Out of the total 577 elderly patients, only 63 (10.9%) reported side-effects. For patients <65, the percent of side-effects was 11.8% (NS). The most frequent events were: nausea and vomiting, constipation, nervousness, tremors and dry-mouth.

Conclusions: Outcome of elderly patients being treated for depression does not vary in relation to that of the remaining population, either in terms of efficacy or tolerance.

Tues-P40

OPTIMAL LENGTH OF CONTINUATION THERAPY: A PROSPECTIVE ASSESSMENT DURING FLUOXETINE LONG-TERM TREATMENT OF MAJOR DEPRESSIVE DISORDER

D. Michelson*, M. Wilson, K. Sundell, C. Beasley. *Eli Lilly and Company, Lilly Corporate Center, Indianapolis, Indiana, USA*

Objective: To prospectively determine optimal length of fluoxetine continuation therapy following successful acute treatment of major depressive disorder.

Design: Outpatients were treated for 12 to 14 weeks with fluoxetine (20 mg/day). Patients meeting response criteria were randomized to 50 weeks of double-blind continuation therapy comprised of placebo crossover periods as follows:

- immediate placebo crossover for 50 weeks (crossover group-1);
- fluoxetine for 14 weeks followed by placebo crossover for 36 weeks (crossover group-2);
- fluoxetine for 38 weeks followed by placebo crossover for 12 weeks (crossover group-3);
- fluoxetine for 50 weeks (no crossover).

Actual relapse rates and Kaplan-Meier estimates were determined during three fixed 12-week time intervals following each placebo crossover.

Results: Relapse rates were statistically significantly higher in patients initiating placebo in crossover group-1 (48.6% vs. 26.4% $p < 0.001$) and crossover group-2 (23.2% vs. 9.0% $p < 0.05$) than in patients remaining on fluoxetine. Relapse rates were not statistically significantly higher in patients initiating placebo in crossover group-3 than in patients remaining on fluoxetine (16.2% vs. 10.7%, NS).

Conclusions: These data suggest that following a successful 12-week course of acute therapy, additional protection against relapse is associated with continuation therapy of at least 26 further weeks (38 weeks total).

Tues-P41

ADVERSE EVENT PROFILES ASSOCIATED WITH LONG-TERM FLUOXETINE TREATMENT

D. Michelson*, R. Tamura, K. Sundell, C. Beasley. *Eli Lilly and Company, Indianapolis, Indiana, USA*

Background: The Agency for Health Care Policy and Research Guideline state that "most patients should receive the full therapeutic dosage of antidepressant drug for 4 to 9 months of continuation therapy after symptom remission is achieved." We examined the safety of fluoxetine 20 mg/day in long-term treatment in a large, prospective trial and report a comparison of early and late adverse events (AEs) and the course of AEs over time.

Design: AEs were recorded at each visit in a uniform format by open-ended questioning, regardless of perceived causality. The frequencies of common new/worsened AEs reported in the first four weeks (early) or the 22nd–26th weeks of treatment (late) were compared using McNemar's test.

Results: 299 patients with major depressive disorder responded to 12 weeks of fluoxetine treatment and entered continuation therapy and 174 completed 26 weeks of therapy. All early events which occurred in $\geq$ 5% of patients declined significantly ($p < .05$) over time and no events occurred significantly more frequently during continuation therapy.

Conclusions: Common adverse events associated with initiating fluoxetine in depressed patients resolve in the majority of patients and are significantly less frequent with ongoing treatment. Overall, therapy with fluoxetine 20 mg daily is well tolerated over a 6 month period.

Tues-P42

CHANGES IN INSOMNIA DURING TREATMENT OF DEPRESSION: ANALYSIS OF FLUOXETINE DOUBLE-BLIND, PLACEBO-CONTROLLED TRIALS

Steven J. Romano*, Rosalinda G. Tepner, Bruce R. Basson. *Eli Lilly and Company, Indianapolis, IN, USA*

Objective: Examine the effects of fluoxetine, a nonsedating antidepressant, on depression related insomnia symptoms.

Method: Retrospective analysis of data from 7 double-blind clinical trials of 2456 patients with major depression randomly assigned to fluoxetine or placebo treatment. Baseline HAMD-Sleep Disturbance Factor score was used to categorize patients

https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-9338(99)80492-1 Published online by Cambridge University Press

as having low (<4) or high (≥4) insomnia. Baseline-to-endpoint reduction in this score was used as a measure of improvement. The frequency of treatment-emergent insomnia (appeared or worsened during treatment) was also determined.

Results: Fluoxetine-treated patients with high baseline insomnia experienced significant reductions in their HAMD-Sleep Disturbance Factor score compared with placebo-treated patients (fluoxetine, −2.129; placebo, −1.616; p < .001). Patients with low baseline insomnia showed a slightly decreased (NS) Sleep Disturbance score in both treatment groups (fluoxetine, −0.243; placebo, −0.272). Improvement in mean HAMD total scores for fluoxetine-treated patients (total, high, and low insomnia) was statistically significantly greater compared with placebo-treated patients. Frequency of treatment-emergent insomnia with fluoxetine treatment was similar regardless of baseline Sleep Disturbance score (low insomnia, 15.7%; high insomnia, 16.0%).

Conclusion: These findings demonstrate that fluoxetine-treated patients with high baseline insomnia experience improvement in insomnia symptoms as their overall depression improves. Treatment-emergent insomnia in fluoxetine-treated patients cannot be predicted based on a patient's presenting sleep disturbance.

Tues-P43

FLUOXETINE VERSUS SERTRALINE AND PAROXETINE IN MAJOR DEPRESSION: TOLERABILITY AND EFFICACY IN PATIENTS WITH LOW AND HIGH BASELINE INSOMNIA

M. Fava[1], J.F. Rosenbaum[1], S.L. Hoog[2]*, R.G. Tepner[2], J.B. Kopp[2], M. Sayler[2]. *The Fluoxetine Collaborative Study Group; [1]Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA; [2]Eli Lilly and Company, Indianapolis, IN, USA*

Objective: Assess whether fluoxetine, sertraline, and paroxetine differ in efficacy and tolerability in depressed patients with low or high baseline insomnia.

Methods: Patients (N = 284) with DSM-IV depression were randomized to fluoxetine, paroxetine, or sertraline treatment in double-blind fashion. Using HAMD-Sleep Disturbance Factor score, patients were categorized as having low insomnia (<4) or high insomnia (≥ 4) at baseline. Changes in overall depression and insomnia were assessed.

Results: Within both low/high insomnia subgroups, patients demonstrated similar HAMD-17 improvement (low insomnia: fluoxetine, −10.4, ± 7.1; sertraline, −12.2, ± 7.7; and paroxetine; −11.9, ± 6.6; p = 0.392 and high insomnia: fluoxetine, −13.2, ± 8.2; sertraline, −14.7, ± 7.5; and paroxetine; −12.9, ± 8.5; p = 0.545) and HAMD Sleep Disturbance Factor improvement (low insomnia subgroup: fluoxetine, −0.6, ± 1.5; sertraline, −0.7, ± 1.6; and paroxetine; −0.7, ± 1.8; p = 0.996 and high insomnia: fluoxetine, −3.1, ± 2.0; sertraline, −3.3, ± 1.8; and paroxetine; −2.9, ± 2.4; p = 0.705). There were no significant differences between treatments in percentages of patients with substantial worsening, any worsening, worsening at endpoint, or improvement in the HAMD-Sleep Disturbance Factor score, in either subgroup. Treatments were well tolerated in both subgroups.

Conclusion: These data show no significant differences in efficacy and tolerability of fluoxetine, sertraline, and paroxetine in patients with low or high baseline insomnia during acute treatment of major depression.

Tues-P44

FLUOXETINE VERSUS SERTRALINE AND PAROXETINE IN MAJOR DEPRESSION: TOLERABILITY AND EFFICACY IN PATIENTS WITH HIGH AND LOW BASELINE ANXIETY

M. Fava[1], J.F. Rosenbaum[1], S.L. Hoog[2]*, R.G. Tepner[2], J.B. Kopp[2], M. Sayler[2]. *The Fluoxetine Collaborative Study Group; [1]Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA 02114; [2]Eli Lilly and Company, Indianapolis, IN 46285, USA*

Objective: Assess whether fluoxetine, sertraline, and paroxetine differ in efficacy and tolerability in depressed patients with high/low associated anxiety.

Methods: Patients (N = 284) with DSM-IV depression were randomized to fluoxetine, paroxetine, or sertraline treatment in a double-blind fashion. Using HAMD Anxiety/Somatization Factor score, patients were categorized as having high (≥ 7) or low anxiety (<7) at baseline. Changes in overall depression and anxiety were assessed.

Results: Within both subgroups, patients demonstrated similar HAMD-17 improvement (high anxiety subgroup: fluoxetine, −14.4, ± 7.4; sertraline, −16.8, ± 6.2; and paroxetine; −15.4, ± 7.6; p = 0.323 and low anxiety subgroup: fluoxetine, −9.9, ± 7.2; sertraline, −10.4, ± 7.6; and paroxetine; −11.0, ± 7.1; p = 0.700) and HAMD Anxiety/Somatization Factor improvement (high anxiety subgroup: fluoxetine, −4.7, ± 2.6; sertraline, −5.8, ± 2.6; and paroxetine; −5.3, ± 2.7; p = 0.199 and low anxiety subgroup: fluoxetine, −2.5, ± 2.4; sertraline, −2.6, ± 2.4; and paroxetine; −2.7, ± 2.2; p = 0.935). There were no significant differences between treatments in percentages of patients with substantial emergence, any worsening, worsening at endpoint, or improvement in items 9 (agitation), 10 (psychic anxiety), and 11 (somatic anxiety) in either subgroup. Treatments were well tolerated in patients with both high and low baseline anxiety.

Conclusion: These data showed no significant differences in efficacy and tolerability of fluoxetine, sertraline, and paroxetine in patients with high/low baseline anxiety symptoms during the acute treatment of major depression.

Tues-P45

COMBINED MOCLOBEMID, PROMAZINE ADMINISTRATION — A SAFETY TREATMENT IN ELDERLY DEPRESSIVE AGITATION

D. Marinković. *Institute of Psychiatry, UCC, Belgrade, Serbia, Yugoslavia*

Elderly depressives are often difficult to be treated, due to somatic obstacles. The moclobemide efficasy is proved to be safety choice in the inhibited depressive forms. The sample consisted of endogenous depressives and patients suffering from unipolar and bipolar depressive form. All inpatients were treated with moclobemide, dose range 450–600 mg/day. Due to severe agitation, at the same time was administrated promazine 25–100 mg/day, chlorpromazine 25–100 mg/day and diazepam 15–30 mg/day. Moderate therapeutic effect has been achieved in 22.2% treated. The therapeutic response was good in 66.7%. Because of poor therapy response 11.1% were dropped out. Total HRDS score and CGI analysis pointed out that significant therapeutic effect is achieved yet on 14th day of treatment (p < 0.01). Cluster items monitoring agitation, psychic and somatic anxiety and suicidal tendency demonstrated the significant score reduction at the end of second week following discontinuation of concomitant therapy. There were no severe advers effects. The results pointed out good efficasy and safety of moclobemide in the treatment of agitated, psychotic depression in aged patients.

https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-9338(99)80492-1 Published online by Cambridge University Press