## Neuropsychobiology

Editors: J. Mendlewicz, Brussels; B. Saletu, Vienna; P. Netter, Giessen; W.M. Herrmann, Berlin

## Reprint

Publisher: S. Karger AG, Basel Printed in Switzerland

## **Pharmacopsychiatry**

Main Editor: B. Saletu (Vienna)

## **Original Paper**

Neuropsychobiology 1995;31:130-134

- L. Rampelloa
- G. Nicoletti<sup>b</sup> R. Raffaele<sup>a</sup>
- F. Dragoc

Institutes of

- a Neurological Sciences,
- <sup>b</sup> Neurosurgery and
- <sup>c</sup> Pharmacology, University of Catania, School of Medicine, Catania, Italy

# Comparative Effects of Amitriptyline and Amineptine in Patients Affected by Anxious Depression

#### **Key Words**

Anxious depression Amitriptyline Amineptine

### Abstract

In a double-blind, placebo-controlled study, the therapeutic efficacy of two antidepressants with different neurochemical mechanisms of action, amitriptyline and amineptine, was investigated in patients affected by anxious depression. Sixty-six patients with the primary dignosis of major depression or bipolar affective disorder (DSM-III-R) and meeting additional operational clinical criteria such as anxiety, trepidation, restlessness, early and/or late insomnia, impulsivity, hostility, dysphoria, compulsivity, hyperperspiration, palpitation, pollakiuria and phobias were included. They were randomly assigned to three groups (n = 22) and treated either with placebo, amitriptyline (up to 100 mg/day) or amineptine (up to 200 mg/day) for 6 weeks. Patients showed better response to amitriptyline, a preferential inhibitor of serotonin reuptake, than to amineptine, a selective inhibitor of dopamine reuptake. The present results suggest that alterations in serotonergic rather than dopaminergic transmission contribute to the pathophysiology of anxious depression.

## Introduction

Depression is a complex neuropsychoendocrinological syndrome which includes a wide range of clinical conditions resulting from alterations in monoaminergic neurotransmission. The diagnostic criteria proposed by the DSM-III-R [1] do not provide any reference to therapeutic indications and the biological markers are not useful predictors of antidepressant outcome [2–4].

Although clinical depressive pictures present some common symptoms, such as depressive mood (suicidal thoughts, hopelessness, sense of guilt, underrating oneself, despair), they exhibit different profiles that justify the use of antidepressants with selective or preferential activity on distinct monoaminergic systems [2, 5–11].

It was recently shown that amineptine, a specific dopamine reuptake inhibitor, is effective in a subgroup of patients affected by 'delayed depression' defined by a prevalence of negative symptoms [12]. We have assessed the therapeutic efficacy of amineptine (a selective dopamine, DA, uptake inhibitor) [13–15] and amitriptyline (a preferential serotonin, 5-HT, uptake blocker) on patients affected by anxious depression defined on the basis of DSM-III-R criteria and of additional operational clinical criteria.

#### **Material and Methods**

The present study includes 66 depressed outpatients (36 women and 30 men, age range 18-62 years), with a psychiatric diagnosis of primary major unipolar depression or bipolar affective disorders, according to DSM-III-R [1]. Based upon additional operational subtype criteria, patients were diagnosed as being affected by anxious depression. All patients exhibited at least 8 of the following symptoms: anxiety, trepidation (as internal tremor feeling), restlessness, early and/or late insomnia, impulsivity, hostility, dysphoria, compulsivity, hyperperspiration, palpitation, pollakiuria, phobias. Patients included needed a minimum score of 20 on either the Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression (HDRS) [19] or the Hamilton Anxiety Rating Scale (HARS) [20]. Patients with alcoholism, organic brain syndromes, serious cardiac, hepatic, renal or endocrinological diseases, convulsive disorders, Parkinson disease, prostate hypertrophy or glaucoma and pregnant or lactating women were excluded. Psychotropic medication was withdrawn for at least 14 days prior to entering the study. Patients were advised against alcohol intake while participating in the study. Informed consent was obtained from each patient. Patients were randomly assigned to three groups (n = 22) and treated double-blindly with amitriptyline, amineptine and placebo for 6 weeks. No statistically significant difference was present in all parameters evaluated among the three

Medication of each patient was precoded and provided in numbered packages according to systematized randomization. During the 1st week, the initial dose was 25 mg once per day and, after 4 days, twice per day for amitriptyline, or 100 mg once in the morning for amineptine. During the 2nd week the dose was increased to 100 mg per day in three administrations (25 + 25 + 50 mg) for amitriptyline and to 200 mg (twice per day, in the morning and afternoon) for amineptine. Patients were evaluated at the beginning of the study (time 0), then after 2, 4, and 6 weeks of treatment, by using the HDRS, HARS and the evaluation of the above-reported symptoms. Statistical analysis was performed by using paired t test or one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) associated with Dunnet's t test. Blood pressure and laboratory tests (blood count, S-GOT, S-GPT and urinalysis) were monitored continuously during the study.

#### Results

Six amineptine patients in the 2nd week and 3 placebo patients in the 4th week dropped out of the study, because of side effects (amineptine) or worsening of symptoms (amineptine or placebo) (table 1). None of the amitriptyline patients dropped out, although moderate anticholinergic side effects (such as dryness of the mouth, blurred vision, constipation) or sedation, menstrual problems, oversleeping, bitterness of the mouth, weight gain, tachycardia, occurred singly or in association in most of the patients (table 1). Repeated administration of amitriptyline led to a significant decrease in the mean total HDRS and HARS scores after 2–3 weeks of treatment. Placebo also reduced the above-mentioned scores, albeit to a lesser extent (table 2). In contrast amineptine did not affect sig-

Table 1. Individual side effects observed at the end of treatment

	Placebo (n = 19)	Amitriptyline (n = 22)	Amineptine (n = 16)
Dry mouth	0	11	2
Bitter mouth	0	10	0
Drowsiness	1	8	0
Sedation	1	6	0
Weight gain	0	5	0
Tachycardia	1	3	1
Constipation	2	4	1
Visual disturbance	0	2	0
Insomnia	3	2	7
Anxiety	2	1	6
Menstrual problems	0	2	0

Table 2. Total HDRS and HARS during treatment with placebo, amitriptyline or amineptine

	HDRS				HARS			
	baseline	week 2	week 4	week 6	baseline	week 2	week 4	week 6
Placebo	$23.34 \pm 0.3$ (n = 22)	$21.76 \pm 0.2$ (n = 22)	$19.67 \pm 0.3$ (n = 19)	17.43±0.2* (n = 19)	$24.40 \pm 1$ (n = 22)	$22.82 \pm 1.2$ (n = 22)	$20.12 \pm 0.4$ (n = 19)	$19.24 \pm 1.3*$ $(n = 19)$
Amitriptyline	$\begin{array}{c} (n - 22) \\ 22.48 \pm 1.1 \\ (n = 22) \end{array}$	$18.97 \pm 0.7$ (n = 22)	(n = 19) $13.43 \pm 0.5$ (n = 22)	$9.65 \pm 0.6^{*,+}$ (n = 22)	(n - 22) 25.26 ± 1.1 (n = 22)	(n = 22) 21.32 ± 0.6 (n = 22)	$16.3 \pm 0.5$ (n = 22)	$10.13 \pm 0.8^{*,+}$ $(n = 22)$
Amineptine	$21.33 \pm 0.8$ (n = 22)	$(22.85 \pm 1.2)$ (n = 16)	$20.28 \pm 1.3$ (n = 16)	$16.35 \pm 0.8^{*, NS}$ (n = 16)	$23.2 \pm 0.7$ (n = 22)	$24.65 \pm 0.9$ (n = 16)	$23.21 \pm 1.1$ (n = 16)	$24.41 \pm 0.6^{NS}$ (n = 16)

Values are means  $\pm$  SEM of 16-22 determinations.

NS vs. placebo (one-way ANOVA applied to the difference week 6-baseline, associated with Dunnett's test to isolate the differences).

<sup>\*</sup> p < 0.01 vs. the respective baseline (paired t test); † p < 0.01 vs. amineptine and placebo.

Table 3. Mean total scores at baseline and after 6 weeks of treatment with placebo or amitriptyline or amineptine

Symptoms	Placebo		Amitriptyline		Amineptine		
	baseline (n = 22)	week 6 (n = 19)	baseline (n = 22)	week 6 (n = 22)	baseline (n = 22)	week 6 (n = 16)	
Anxiety	14.62 ± 1.8	13.45 ± 1.9	15.41 ± 1.8	6.15±0.7*	14.22 ± 1.1	16.40 ± 1.2	
Impulsivity	$10.21 \pm 0.7$	$9.25 \pm 1.2$	$12.69 \pm 1.3$	$5.04 \pm 1.3*$	$9.35 \pm 0.8$	$10.16 \pm 0.6$	
Compulsivity	$6.31 \pm 0.9$	$5.94 \pm 1.3$	$10.99 \pm 1.7$	$4.6 \pm 0.7 *$	$7.49 \pm 1.4$	$5.28 \pm 0.5$	
Restlessness	$12.75 \pm 1.1$	$10.1 \pm 0.8$	$9.25 \pm 0.5$	$4.25 \pm 0.2*$	$11.46 \pm 0.9$	$12.07 \pm 2.2$	
Palpitation	$7.11 \pm 1.5$	$6.33 \pm 0.6$	$8.03 \pm 1.4$	$6.32 \pm 0.9$	$6.03 \pm 0.4$	$7.11 \pm 0.7$	
Hyperperspiration	$5.21 \pm 1.9$	$5.71 \pm 1.4$	$6.47 \pm 1.2$	$5.12 \pm 1.1$	$4.24 \pm 0.6$	$3.21 \pm 0.5$	
Hostility	$9.9 \pm 1.8$	$8.1 \pm 0.3$	$11.62 \pm 1.4$	$6.21 \pm 1.9*$	$10.66 \pm 1.3$	$11.9 \pm 0.6$	
Insomnia	$17.16 \pm 1.6$	$16.15 \pm 0.5$	$16.95 \pm 1.6$	$7.06 \pm 1.3*$	$15.24 \pm 1.5$	$16.21 \pm 1.8$	
Dysphoria	$10.44 \pm 0.2$	$10.01 \pm 0.7$	$9.33 \pm 1.1$	$5.03 \pm 1*$	$8.73 \pm 1.6$	$10.35 \pm 2.1$	
Pollakiuria	$8.55 \pm 1.3$	$7.54 \pm 1.8$	$7.25 \pm 1.4$	$4.71 \pm 0.7*$	$9.94 \pm 2.5$	$9.29 \pm 1.8^{\circ}$	
Trepidation	$8.24 \pm 0.5$	$7.25 \pm 0.7$	$14.13 \pm 1.4$	$5.29 \pm 1.4*$	$6.6 \pm 1.7$	$8.64 \pm 0.5$	
Phobias	$6.14 \pm 1.3$	$6.89 \pm 1.3$	$7.55 \pm 0.5$	$4.44 \pm 0.8*$	$5.7 \pm 1.1$	$5.3 \pm 1.6$	

For each symptom 0 = absent, 10 = mild, 20 = severe.

**Table 4.** Synoptic table of two critical symptomatologic clusters (1–13 and 14–26) for predicting antidepressant response

Syr	nptoms	Supposed biochemical dysfunction			
		DA	5-HT		
1	Anergia	+++	+/0		
2	Hypokinesia	+++	0		
3	Reduction of speech	+++	+/0		
4	Hypophonia	+++	0		
5	Salivation	+++	0		
6	Hypersomnia	+++	0		
7	Parinaud	++	0		
8	Slowness	+++	+/0		
9	Hypomimia	+++	+/0		
10	Red. of sexual activity	+++	+/0		
11	Hypotension	++	0		
12	Dysphagia	++/+	0		
13	Drowsiness	+++	+/0		
14	Anxiety	0	+++		
15	Dysphoria	0	++		
16	Impulsivity	0	+++/++		
17	Compulsivity	0	++/+		
18	Early insomnia	+/0	+++		
19	Late insomnia	+/0	+++/++		
20	Hostility	0	+++/++		
21	Hyperperspiration	0	+++/+		
22	Palpitation	0	++/+		
23	Pollakiuria	0	++/+		
24	Restlessness	0	+++/++		
25	Phobias	0	++/0		
26	Trepidation	0	+++		

+++ = Severe; ++ = moderate; + = mild; 0 = absent.

Values are means  $\pm$  SEM of 16-22 determinations.

<sup>\*</sup> p < 0.01 vs. the respective baseline (paired t test).

nificantly the HDRS or HARS scores but even worsened some symptoms (table 3), such as insomnia, agitation, and hostility, and produced significant signs of psychomotor excitement. Interestingly, these symptoms were improved by amitriptyline (table 3). None of the treatments affected laboratory data or vital signs, with the exception of a mild tachycardia that occurred in 5 amitriptyline patients.

#### **Discussion**

Patients affected by anxious depression exhibit a low cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) level of 5-hydroxyindoleacetic acid (5-HIAA) as compared to normal controls and respond promptly to antidepressant drugs that increase serotonergic transmission [22]. The efficacy of buspirone, a partial agonist of 5-HT1 a subtype of serotonergic receptors, on generalized anxiety disorders [23, 24], and the antidepressant effect of selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors [25, 26] further support the relation between 5-HT, anxiety and depression.

A therapeutic efficacy of amitriptyline, which inhibits serotonergic reuptake and thereby down-regulates 5-HT receptors, has been demonstrated in numerous clinical investigations [11, 18, 27–34]. In our study amitriptyline exhibited a greater efficacy than amineptine and placebo in a defined subtype of depression, anxious depression, the pathophysiology of which has been related to a reduced central serotonergic transmission [22]. Amineptine, which increases dopaminergic transmission by selec-

tively inhibiting dopamine reuptake, was ineffective in improving most of the symptoms of anxious depression. Our results support the view that serotonergic transmission is a preferential target for antidepressant agents effective in improving anxious depression, although a role for the anticholinergic activity of amitriptyline and the noradrenergic effect of its metabolite, nortriptyline, cannot be excluded (an investigation with a pure 5-HT and NA compound would be necessary to clarify this matter). The reported efficacy of amineptine in patients affected by retarded depression suggests that a balance between serotonergic and dopaminergic transmission regulates the relative proportion of anxiety or negative symptoms in depressed patients (table 4). The presence of symptoms related to anxiety may thus predict a favorable clinical response in depressed patients treated with drugs that enhance serotonergic transmission. This may help the outcome prediction for serotonergic antidepressant, which is often difficult to make due to the low reliability of the common biological markers, such as low CSF or plasma 5-HIAA levels, platelet MAO activity, <sup>3</sup>H-imipramine binding, abnormal dexamethasone suppression test or total plasma MHPG levels in anxious and nonanxious depressed patients [35].

### **Acknowledgements**

The authors wish to thank all the neuropsychiatrists (I. Vecchio, F. Lepira et al.), and the general practitioners (especially the Drs A. Genazzani, N. Impallomeni, N. Milazzo, B. Scalone) who have consented to collaborate on the present study.

#### References

- American Psychiatric Association: Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, ed
   Washington, American Psychiatric Association, 1987.
- 2 Brotman AM, Falk WE, Gelenberg AJ: Pharmacological treatment of acute depressive subtype; in Meltzer HY (ed): Psychopharmacology. The Third Generation of Progress. New York, Raven Press, 1987, pp 1031-1040.
- 3 Balon R: Biological predictor of antidepressant treatment outcome. Clin Neuropharmacol 1989:12:195-214.
- 4 Balon R: Monoamine specificity of antidepressants and prediction of therapeutic response. Encéphale 1991;17:121-122.
- 5 Fuxe K, Ungersted U: Histochemical studies on the effects of (+)-amphetamine, drugs of the imipramine group and tyramine on central catecholamine and 2-hydroxytryptamine neurons after intraventricular injection of catecholamines and 5-hydroxytryptamine. Eur J Pharmacol 1968;4:135-144.
- 6 Carlsson A, Fuxe K, Hamberger B, et al: Biochemical and histochemical studies on the effects of imipramine-like drugs and (+)-amphetamine on central and peripheral catecholamine neurons. Acta Physiol Scand 1966;67:481–497.
- 7 Horn AS, Coyle JT, Snyder SH: Catecholamine uptake by synaptosomes from rat brain. Structure-activity relationships of drugs with differential effects on dopamine and norepinephrine neurons. Mol Pharmacol 1971;7:66-80.

- 8 Banerjee PL, Kung LS, Riggi ST, et al: Development of beta-adrenergic receptor subsensitivity by antidepressant. Nature 1977;268: 455-456
- 9 Rampello L, Patti F, Condorelli DF, et al: Effects of some typical and atypical antidepressants on GAD activity in various brain regions. Encéphale 1982;8:89-94.
- 10 Hall H, Ogren SO: Effects of antidepressant drugs on different receptors in the brain. Eur J Pharmacol 1981;70:393-407.
- 11 Goodman WK, Chaney DS: Therapeutic applications and mechanisms of action of monoamine oxidase inhibitors and heterocyclic antidepressant drugs. J Clin Psychiatry 1985;46:6– 22.

- 12 Rampello L, Nicoletti G, Raffaele R: Dopaminergic hypothesis for retarded depression: a symptom profile for predicting therapeutical responses. Acta Psychiatr Scand 1991;84:552-554.
- 13 Samanin R, Jori A, Bernasconi S, Morpurgo E, Garattini S: Biochemical and pharmacological studies on amineptine (S 1694) and (+)-amphetamine in the rat. J Pharm Pharmacol 1977;29:555-558.
- 14 Garattini S, Samanin R: The pharmacological profile of some psychomotor stimulant drugs including chemical, neurophysiological, biochemical and toxicological aspects; in Hoffmeister F, Stillie G (eds): Psychotropic Aspects, Part II. Berlin, Springer, 1981, pp 545-586.
- 15 Garattini S, Mennini T: Pharmacology of amineptine: Synthesis and updating. Clin Neuro-pharmacol 1989;12(suppl 2):S13–S18.
- 16 Bryant SG, Brown CS: Current concepts in clinical therapeutics: major affective disorders, part 1. Clin Pharm 1986;5:304-318.
- 17 Fuxe K, Ogren SO, Agnati LF, Gustafsson JA, Jonsson G: On the mechanisms of action of the antidepressant drugs amitriptyline and nortriptyline. Evidence for 5-hydroxytryptamine receptor blocking activity. Neurosci Lett 1977;6: 339-343.
- 18 Coppen A, Rama Rao VA, Swade C, Wood K: Inhibition of 5-hydroxytryptamine reuptake by amitriptyline and zimelidine and its relationship to their therapeutic action. Psychopharmacology 1979;63:125-129.

- 19 Hamilton M: Development of a rating scale for primary depressive illness. Br J Clin Psychol 1967;6:278–296.
- 20 Hamilton M: The assessment of anxiety states by rating. Br J Med Psychol 1959;32:50-58.
- 21 Lloyd KG, Farley IJ, Deck JHN, Hornykiewicz O: Serotonin and 5-hydroxyindoleacetic acid in discrete areas of the brainstem of suicide victims and control patients. Adv Biochem 1974; 2:387-398.
- 22 Meltzer HY, Lowy MT: The serotonin hypothesis of depression; in Meltzer HY (ed): Psychopharmacology: The Third Generation of Progress. New York, Raven Press, 1987, pp 513–526.
- 23 Feighner JP, Meredith CH, Hendrikson GA: A double blind comparison of buspirone and diazepam in outpatients with generalized anxiety disorder. J Clin Psychiatry 1982;43:103-107.
- 24 Westenberg HGM: Differential involvement of 5-HT in anxiety states. Eur Neuropsychopharmacol 1992;2:181–183.
- 25 Feighner JP: Clinical overview of serotonin reuptake inhibitors. Nord J Psychiatry 1992; 46(27):7-16.
- 26 Bolden-Watson C, Richelson E: Blockade by newly-developed antidepressants of biogenic amine uptake into rat brain synaptosomes. Life Sci 1993;52:1023–1026.
- 27 Coppen A, Ghose K, Montgomery S, et al: Amitriptyline plasma concentration and clinical effect. Lancet, 1978;i:63-66.
- 28 Paykel ES, Rowan PR, Parker PR, Bhat AV: Response to phenelzine and amitriptyline in subtype of neurotic depression. Arch Gen Psychiatry 1982;39:1041-1049.

- 29 Lingjaerde O: From cliomipramine to mianserin: Therapeutic relevance of interactions with serotonin uptake and storage, as studied in the blood platelet model. Acta Psychiatr Scand 1985(suppl 320):10-19.
- 30 Iversen LL, Mackay AVP: Pharmacodynamics of antidepressants and antimanic drugs: in Paykel ES, Coppen A (eds): Psychopharmacology of Affective Disorders. Oxford, University Press, 1979.
- 31 Garattini S, Samanin R: Biochemical hypotheses on antidepressant drugs: A guide for clinicians or a toy for the pharmacologist? Psychol Med 1988;18:287-304.
- 32 Lumia AR, Teicher MH, Salchli F, Ayers E, Possidente B: Olfactory bulbectomy as a model for agitated hyposerotonergic depression. Brain Res 1992;587(2):181–185.
- 33 Moller HJ, Berzeweski H, Leckman F, Gonzalves N, Kissling W, Knorr W, Ressler P, Rudolf GA, Steinmeyer EM, et al: Double-blind multicenter study of paroxetine and amitriptyline in depressed inpatients. Pharmacopsychiatry 1993;26(2):75-78.
- 34 Gurevich EV, Aleksandrova IA, Utmakhova NA, Katkov YA, Nesterova IV, Bobkova NV: Effects of bulbectomy and subsequent antidepressant treatment on brain 5-HT2 and 5-HT1a receptor in mice. Pharmacol Biochem Behav 1993;45(1):65-70.
- 35 Karege F, Bovier P, Hilleret H, Gaillard J-M: Lack of effect of anxiety on total plasma MHPG in depressed patients. J Affect Disord 1993;28:211-217.