1	Unveiling the Burden of Drug-Induced Impulsivity:
2	A Network Analysis of the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System.
3	Running Title: The burden of drug-induced Impulsivity
4	
5	Authors: Michele Fusaroli# ^{a[*]} , Stefano Polizzi# ^b , Luca Menestrina# ^c , Valentina Giunchi ^a , Luca
6	Pellegrini ^{d,e} , Emanuel Raschi ^a , Daniel Weintraub ^{f,g} , Maurizio Recanatini ^c , Gastone Castellani ^b ,
7	Fabrizio De Ponti ^a , Elisabetta Poluzzi ^a .
8	#Equally contributed
9	Affiliations:
10	^a Pharmacology Unit, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy.
11	^b Unit of Medical Physics, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, University of Bologna, 40138 Bologna,
12	Italy
13	^c Department of Pharmacy and Biotechnology, Alma Mater Studiorum - University of Bologna, Via Belmeloro 6,
14	40126 Bologna, Italy
15	^d Hertfordshire Partnership NHS University Foundation Trust, Highly Specialised OCD and BDD Service, Rosanne
16	House, Parkway, Welwyn Garden City, Hertfordshire, UK
17	^e School of Life and Medical Sciences, University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield, Hertfordshire, UK
18	^f Perelman School of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA
19	⁹ Parkinson's Disease Research, Education and Clinical Center (PADRECC), Philadelphia Veterans Affairs Medical
20	Center, Philadelphia, PA
21	
22	Figures: 7Tables: 3
23	Word count: 4,657
24	
25 26	^[*] michala fusaroli2@uniho it
27	

Abstract 28

29 Introduction: Impulsivity induced by dopaminergic agents, like pramipexole and 30 aripiprazole, can lead to behavioral addictions impacting social functioning and quality of life 31 of patients and families (e.g., resulting in unemployment, marital problems, anxiety). These 32 secondary effects, interconnected in networks of signs and symptoms, are usually overlooked 33 by clinical trials, not reported in package inserts, and neglected in clinical practice.

34 **Objective:** This study explores the syndromic burden of impulsivity induced by pramipexole

35 and aripiprazole, pinpointing key symptoms for targeted mitigation.

36 Methods: An event-event Information Component (IC) on the FDA Adverse Event Reporting

37 System (January 2004 – March 2022) identified the syndrome of events disproportionally co-38 reported with impulsivity, separately for pramipexole and aripiprazole. A greedy-modularity

39 clustering on composite network analyses (PPMI, Ising, Φ) identified subsyndromes.

40 Bayesian network modeling highlighted possible precipitating events.

41 Results: Suspected drug-induced impulsivity was documented in 7.49% pramipexole and 42 4.50% aripiprazole recipients. The highest IC concerned obsessive-compulsive disorder 43 (reporting rate = 26.77%; IC median = 3.47, 95%CI = 3.33-3.57) and emotional distress 44 (21.35%; 3.42, 3.26-3.54) for pramipexole, bankruptcy (10.58%; 4.43, 4.26-4.55) and divorce 45 (7.59%; 4.38, 4.19-4.53) for aripiprazole. The network analysis identified delusional jealousy 46 and dopamine dysregulation subsyndromes for pramipexole, obesity-hypoventilation and 47 social issues for aripiprazole. The Bayesian network highlighted anxiety and economic 48 problems as potentially precipitating events.

49 Conclusion: The under-explored consequences of drug-induced impulsivity significantly 50 burden patients and families. Network analyses, exploring syndromic reactions and potential 51 precipitating events, complement traditional techniques and clinical judgment. Characterizing

- 52
- 53

the secondary impact of reactions will support informed patient-centered decision-making.

54 **Keywords**: adverse drug reactions; quality of life; pramipexole; aripiprazole; impulse control 55 disorders

- 56
- 57 Highlights

Drug-induced impulsivity significantly impacts patients' lives. Network analyses help 58•

59 characterize reactions as syndromes.

60• We explore the impulsivity syndrome and subsyndromes resulting from pramipexole and aripiprazole. 61

62• The manifestation of drug-induced impulsivity was different for the two drugs. Anxiety and

63 economic problems bridge between other symptoms and could be important therapeutical

64 targets.

65

66 1. Introduction

67 Adverse drug reactions (ADRs) significantly impact patients' well-being [1], 68 extending from organic to psychological and social issues [2,3]. For instance, 69 immunodeficiency perturbs social activities, dysphonia hinders the ability to function in 70 positions requiring extensive vocal communication such as teaching or other public-facing 71 roles, and sexual dysfunction can affect relationships and even personal identity, with further 72 cascading effects on psychological and physical well-being. Despite their profound effects 73 and complex networks of interactions, ADRs are often inadequately recognized, resulting in 74 compromised patient-doctor relationships [4], prolonged hospitalization [5], and a pervasive 75 decline in quality of life (QoL) [6]. Evidence obtained from patient-reported outcomes -76 crucial for QoL assessment and patient-centered care [7] – is equally disregarded and often 77 relegated to the margins in prescribing information or package inserts [8].

78 Drug-induced impulsivity, classified as "impulse control disorders induced by other 79 specified psychoactive substance (6C4E.73)" in the International Classification of Diseases 80 (ICD-11) category of disorders due to substance use, represents a distressing group of 81 conditions marked by a loss of behavioral control. This pathological disinhibition can yield 82 behaviors as pervasive as pathologic gambling, hypersexuality, compulsive shopping, and 83 hyperphagia-the so-called "four knights of Impulse Control Disorder", all with important 84 further repercussions on social relationships, physical and psychological wellbeing [9]. Other 85 behaviors like stealing, hair pulling, and compulsive hoarding, while less acknowledged, can also occur, and further diversify potential manifestations of drug-induced impulsivity [10,11]. 86

87 The first reports of drug-induced impulsivity were linked to dopamine receptor 88 agonists like pramipexole, ropinirole, rotigotine, licensed for treating Parkinson's disease 89 (PD) [12] and restless legs syndrome (RLS) [13,14]. More recently, the role of partial 90 dopamine agonists like aripiprazole, brexpiprazole, cariprazine, licensed for treating 91 psychosis and mood disorders, has also emerged as cause of drug-induced impulsivity [15]. 92 Impulsivity as induced by PD treatment has a complex trajectory and may have a different 93 impact on quality of life depending on underlying susceptibilities and on the occurrence of 94 exacerbating events. The treatment might initially induce a "honeymoon period", in which 95 patients experience heightened motivational drive and often engage in new satisfying hobbies 96 [16]. However, impulsivity can eventually lead to pervasive behaviors and become 97 pathologic. Even when concealed in subclinical forms [17], drug-induced impulsivity holds

the potential to significantly erode patients' QoL [18]. This erosion, appraised through metrics like the PDQ-39 scale [19], encompasses diverse neuropsychiatric and somatic domains including mobility, daily activities, stigma, social support, communication [20], urinary and sexual function, sleep, attention, and cardiovascular symptoms [21]. The impact extends beyond patients as it affects caregivers, who grapple with their own set of health issues, depression, and social impediments due to their duties of care [22].

104 Nevertheless, conventional evaluations focus on simple drug – physical adverse 105 reaction associations, and often ignore neuropsychiatric symptoms, altered behavior patterns, 106 financial hardships, and legal entanglements as emerging from drug-induced impulsivity [23], 107 thus failing to capture the complex network of consequences of its manifestation. This 108 underscores the crucial need for an integrative approach that consider the perspectives of both 109 patients and caregivers and acknowledges the complex interconnections between symptoms 110 [24], including identifying subsyndromes and exacerbating events.

In order to better characterize such networks, we can rely on databases collecting individual case safety reports of suspected ADRs from patients and healthcare professionals. In particular, in this manuscript we will rely on the US FDA Adverse Event Reporting System (FAERS), as it is global and public [25]. Crucially, the patient-produced reports offer impactful insights into the experiences and impacts of ADRs on QoL, beyond those provided by healthcare professionals [26–30].

117 Network analyses provide the means to explore ADRs as complex system consisting 118 of multiple interacting entities. Specifically, they enable the analysis and visualization of 119 ADRs as interwoven symptoms and signs [31]: a composite syndrome encompassing 120 psychosocial implications, clustered into subsyndromes. This approach overcomes the 121 drawbacks of viewing drug-induced impulsivity as an isolated incident. Beyond more 122 descriptive approaches such as those built on measures of association (Ising [32], Φ [33], and 123 PPMI [34]), network approaches can also explore possible causal connections between 124 symptoms, allowing to identify potential exacerbating events [35,36].

In the current manuscript we pursue three goals. First, we want to fully acknowledge the complexity of drug-induced impulsivity as reported not only by clinical researchers, but also by clinicians and patients. We go beyond a pairwise drug to adverse reaction approach and more fully embrace the idea of a syndrome of variously interconnected aspects, from behavioral addictions to their organic and psychosocial sequelae. By examining the network in which symptoms interact and affect each other, we aim to gain a deeper understanding of the impact of drug-induced impulsivity on patients' lives.

132 Second, we want to assess the possibility of distinct sub-syndromes within the broader 133 spectrum of drug-induced impulsivity. For example, when impulsivity manifests as 134 hyperphagia it may have more organic sequelae related to weight increased compared to 135 when it manifests as pathological gambling.

136

Third, we assess the presence of central symptoms, potentially crucially exacerbating 137 the syndrome of drug-induced impulsivity. By pinpointing these key symptoms, we aim to 138 pave the way for targeted interventions that alleviate the adverse effects on patients' lives.

139 In pursuing these goals, our study focuses on recipients of pramipexole and 140 aripiprazole. Pramipexole is a dopamine agonist used in neurological conditions, therefore 141 prescribed to older individual with stronger social support and a lower baseline motivational 142 drive. Aripiprazole is a dopamine partial agonist employed in psychiatric disorders, therefore 143 prescribed to younger and more stigmatized individuals, with a higher baseline motivational 144 drive. Using these two examples will allow us to capture commonalities in drug-induced 145 impulsivity as well as potentially different mechanisms/syndromes that manifest only in a 146 specific indication/patient type. A better understanding of the impact of these ADRs on 147 quality of life could contribute to informed decision-making for patients and caregivers, 148 laying the foundation for interventions capable of alleviating the toll exacted by impulsivity.

149 2. Methods

150 2.0 Study Design

151 The study design is presented in **Figure 1**. We first downloaded and pre-processed 152 FAERS reports from January 1st, 2004, to March 31st, 2022 (Step 1) and selected cases 153 recording impulsivity among the two separate populations of aripiprazole and pramipexole 154 recipients (Step 2). In order to characterize the impulsivity syndrome, we identified the set of 155 events disproportionally co-reported with drug-induced impulsivity, rather than with other 156 suspected reactions of the same drug, using an event-event disproportionality analysis (Step 157 3). To explore potential sub-syndromes, we relied on three parallel commonly used 158 descriptive network analyses and a greedy-modularity algorithm, able to identify more 159 cohesive clusters of co-reported events (Step 4). Finally, to explore possible causal relations 160 within these networks and the secondary impact of drug-induced impulsivity, we relied on a 161 Bayesian network approach, able to estimate conditional probabilities of chained events (Step 162 5). These operations were performed in a standardized and reproducible fashion, made 163 possible by the DiAna R package: an open access toolkit for disproportionality analyses and 164 other pharmacovigilance investigations in the FAERS [37].



166 167

165

168 2.1 Step 1 – Data Preprocessing

We downloaded FAERS quarterly data in ASCII format (January 1st, 2004, to March
 31st, 2022) [25]. Adverse events were coded according to the Medical Dictionary for

171 Regulatory Activities (MedDRA®, version 25.0) preferred terms (PTs) [38], while drugs
172 were standardized according to their active ingredients [39]. The latest report version was
173 retained, and rule-based deduplication was applied to reduce redundancy (cfr.
174 https://github.com/fusarolimichele/DiAna).

175 2.2 Step 2 – Case Retrieval

176 We retrieved aripiprazole and pramipexole recipients separately and identified cases 177 as reports recording impulsivity among the suspected reactions. To identify impulsivity we 178 used a MedDRA PT list specifically curated for investigating drug-induced impulsivity 179 within the FAERS database [10], encompassing heterogenous manifestations including 180 gambling, hypersexuality, compulsive shopping, hyperphagia, gaming, setting fires, stealing, 181 hoarding, excessive exercise, overwork, compulsive wandering, body-focused repetitive 182 behaviors, stereotypy, and impulsivity (see Table S1). MedDRA PTs used for reporting 183 suspected ADRs do not align directly with terms in other frameworks like the Diagnostic and 184 Statistical Manual of mental disorders (DSM-5-TR) and ICD-11 (e.g., referring to 185 "kleptomania" as an idiopathic condition).

To explore potential risk factors for impulsivity, demographic characteristics, outcomes, and reporter contributions (e.g., healthcare practitioners, patients, lawyers) were compared between cases and non-cases within each population, using the Chi-square test for categorical and Mann-Whitney test for continuous variables. To address multiple testing, we applied the Holm-Bonferroni correction with a significance level of 0.05.

191 2.3 Step 3 – Disproportionality Analysis: The drug-induced impulsivity syndrome

192 We conducted an event-event disproportionality analysis to identify events frequently co-193 reported with drug-induced impulsivity, separately for aripiprazole and pramipexole 194 recipients (see Table 1). Disproportionate reporting was assessed using the Information 195 Component (IC) [40], also known as pointwise mutual information (PMI) in information 196 theory [41,42]. The IC compares the actual co-reporting of two events x (i.e., drug-induced 197 impulsivity) and y (i.e., any specific event) with their expected co-reporting if their 198 probability were independent (p(y, x) > p(x) * p(y)) [41]. To mitigate the risk of false 199 positives for infrequent events [43], a shrinkage/smoothing approach was applied by adding 200 k=0.5 to both the numerator and denominator. Significance was determined using $IC_{025} > 0$.

201

Table 1. 2-way contingency table. The table shows the different instances that can be observed when considering pathologic impulsivity and a specific event. Legend: E = event; I = impulsivity; 1 = presence; 0 = lack; N = total

	Event (y)	Other events	Sum
Impulsivity (x)	$n_{I_1E_1}$	$n_{I_1E_0}$	n_{I_1}
Other event	$n_{I_0E_1}$	$n_{I_0E_0}$	n_{I_0}
Sum	n_{E_1}	n_{E_0}	N

204

$$IC(x,y) = PMI(x,y) = \log_2 \frac{p(y,x)}{p(x)p(y)} = \log_2 \frac{n_{I_1E_1} * N}{n_{I_1} * n_{E_1}} \approx \log_2 \frac{n_{I_1E_1} + 0.5}{\frac{n_{I_1} * n_{E_1}}{N} + 0.5}$$
$$IC(x,y)_{025} = IC - 3.3 * (n_{I_1E_1} + 0.5)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - 2 * (n_{I_1E_1} + 0.5)^{-\frac{3}{2}}$$
$$IC(x,y)_{975} = IC + 2.4 * (n_{I_1E_1} + 0.5)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - 0.5 * (n_{I_1E_1} + 0.5)^{-\frac{3}{2}}$$

205 2.4 Step 4 – Network Analysis: sub-syndromes

206 Building on insights from prior studies on drugs [44] and events [31,45,46] co-207 occurrence, our network analysis aimed to unveil, within the drug-induced impulsivity 208 syndrome, sub-syndromes of cohesively clustered events. Together with the Ising estimation 209 [32,47], already implemented in pharmacovigilance because of its ability to obtain a sparser 210 and easily interpretable network (because of fewer links and more definite clusters) [31], we 211 implemented two other more connected network estimations in order to identify broader co-212 reporting patterns (PPMI [34], Ising, ϕ [33]). See **Table 2** for the features of the three 213 networks. We did not consider negative links (i.e., potential mutually exclusive events).

214 Table 2. Network estimations. The table shows the features of the network estimations implemented.

Ising	PPMI	PHI
	(positive pointwise mutual information)	
The Ising model computed partial	Focuses on cases where events	The ϕ coefficient, akin to the traditional
logistic regression coefficients (β)	were reported together (n ₁₁), applying	correlation coefficient, approaches one when
considering the impact of all other events.	additive smoothing (k=1, d=N $^{\circ}$ events).	two events are frequently reported together
Positive coefficients indicated a tendency for	Bootstrap and Bonferroni adjustments	and converges to zero if they are either
two events to be reported together. A	assessed statistical significance, with a	independent or mutually exclusive. The
LASSO method pruned out weak links,	0.01 threshold for higher specificity.	Bonferroni adjustment was applied with a
eliminating spurious associations but	Gives more weight to associations with	significance threshold of 0.01. The p-value
potentially sacrificing weaker genuine	infrequent events.	was computed using a χ^2 probability
relationships, especially triangular type		distribution with one degree of freedom.
interactions.		
$Ising_{x,y} = max\left(\frac{1}{2}\beta_{x,y}\beta_{y,x},0\right)$	$PPMI_{x,y} = \max\left(log_2 \frac{(n_{11} + k) \times (N + kd)}{(n_{1*} + k) \times (n_{*1} + k)}, 0\right)$	$\phi_{x,y} = max\left(\frac{n_{11}n_{00} - n_{10}n_{01}}{\sqrt{n_{1*}n_{0*}n_{*1}n_{*0}}}, 0\right)$

216 Separately for the two population of aripiprazole and pramipexole recipients, the three 217 networks shared identical nodes by definition but different links were inferred due to the 218 different properties of the algorithms. We used modularity maximization [48] and the greedy 219 modularity algorithm [49] to detect clusters of co-reported signs and symptoms. Between 220 networks we compared degree of link overlap (Jaccard similarity index [50]), goodness of 221 partitioning (clustering modularity); cluster agreement (Purity index [51–53]), link density 222 (ratio of actual links to possible links), and interconnectedness among neighbors (small 223 worldness [54]).

224 2.5 Step 5 – Bayesian Network: The secondary impact of drug-induced impulsivity

225 While other methods look only at symmetrical associations, we expect that some events may 226 cause other events. To exploratively identify these potential causal dependencies following 227 drug-induced impulsivity, we estimated the conditional probabilities of chained events 228 [35,36]. The resulting Bayesian network is both directed, offering insights into plausible 229 causal relationships, and acyclic (no chain of arrows loops back to itself). The network was 230 derived through 1000 bootstraps, optimizing the BIC score with the Hill-Climbing algorithm. 231 We computed the average network retaining links exceeding a threshold computed via L_1 232 minimization. Evaluation focused on nodes with the highest out-degree centrality and the 233 main manifestations of drug-induced impulsivity.

234

235 3. Results

236 3.1 Case Retrieval

237 We retrieved 12,030,756 distinct reports: 27,601 pramipexole recipients and 80,238 238 aripiprazole recipients. Suspected drug-induced impulsivity was documented in 7.49% of 239 recipients pramipexole (n=2,066: mainly gambling disorder–n=1,345; 4.87%-, 240 hypersexuality-612; 2.22%-, impulsivity-453; 1.64%-, compulsive shopping-384; 1.39%-, 241 and hyperphagia-334; 1.21%-) and in 4.50% aripiprazole recipients (n=3,609: mainly 242 gambling disorder-n=2,067; 2.58%-, hypersexuality-1,077; 1.34%-, compulsive shopping-243 1,029; 1.28%-, hyperphagia-868; 1.08%-, and impulsivity-730; 0.91%-) (see **Table S2**).

Among pramipexole recipients, drug-induced impulsivity was more frequently reported in males (57.42% vs. 36.99%, p<0.001) and younger patients (56 vs. 67, p<0.001), often recording non-serious outcomes (i.e., no death, disability, or hospitalization; 44.87% vs. 33.58%, p<0.001) and Parkinson's Disease (PD) as indication (see **Figure 2** and **Table S3**). Similarly, among aripiprazole recipients, drug-induced impulsivity was more common in

- 249 males (48.59% vs. 40.72%, p<0.001); peculiarly, hospitalization was more common (33.39%
- vs. 23.39%, p<0.001), and an important portion of reports was submitted by lawyers (34.08%
- 251 vs. 1.10%, p<0.001) (see **Table S4**).





253 Figure 2 - Characteristics of the investigated populations. The figure presents information about two populations 254 extracted from the deduplicated FAERS database - one consisting of reports related to pramipexole and the other consisting 255 of reports related to aripiprazole. Within these populations, cases of pathologic impulsivity were identified. The figure 256 compares drug-induced impulsivity cases and the reference group (other reports recording the drug), considering the 257 indication for use. Only the two most prevalent indications were taken into account. For each drug and indication, the 258 caption describes the percentage of reports with the specified indication, the percent of reports involving males, and the 259 median and interquartile range of ages. In the drug-induced impulsivity cases sections, green and red arrows indicate 260 variables that are respectively higher or lower than expected based on the reference group.

26	1
20	T

262 3.2 Disproportionality Analysis: the drug-induced impulsivity syndrome

263 A total of 56 events were disproportionally reported with pramipexole-related 264 impulsivity. The highest IC was found for obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD, reporting 265 rate = 26.77%; IC median = 3.47, 95%CI = 3.33-3.57), emotional distress (21.35%; 3.42, 266 3.26-3.54), marital problem (1.11%; 3.30, 2.61-3.79), dependence (2.37%; 3.26, 2.79-3.6), 267 economic problems (6.05%; 3.15, 2.85-3.36), compulsions (1.74%; 3.05, 2.49-3.44), fear 268 (4.65%; 2.95, 2.61-3.19), eating disorder (2.47%; 2.95, 2.49-3.28), personality change 269 (2.66%; 2.93, 2.49-3.26), and suicide attempt (5.28%; 2.74, 2.43-2.97). 270 A total of 107 events were disproportionally reported with aripiprazole-related 271 impulsivity. The highest IC was found for bankruptcy (10.58%; 4.43, 4.26-4.55), divorce 272 (7.59%; 4.38, 4.19-4.53), homeless (6.93%; 4.37, 4.16-4.52), shoplifting (5.02%; 4.37, 4.12-273 4.54), neuropsychiatric symptoms (4.74%; 4.35, 4.1-4.53), loss of employment (12.64%; 274 4.33, 4.18-4.44), theft (5.79%; 4.32, 4.09-4.48), economic problems (37.85%; 4.28, 4.19-275 4.34), sexually transmitted disease (3.05%; 4.24, 3.93-4.47), and OCD (33.19%; 4.16, 4.07-276 4.23) (see Figure 3 and Table S5 and S6).



Figure 3 – Secondary impact of drug-induced impulsivity. The dendrogram shows the events disproportionally reported
 with aripiprazole and pramipexole-related impulsivity. Events are gathered by clinical similarity in alternately colored slices,
 labeled on the outer border with a name and an icon. Disproportionalities are shown as dots organized in two colored rings,
 each representing a drug/case population. The dots' size is proportional to the percent of reports showing the event, the color
 is darker for stronger disproportionality (higher median Information Component).

283

284 3.3 Network Analysis and sub-syndromes

In the second step we estimated the networks using three different approaches and identifying clusters of events. We included a total of 120 nodes (107 events disproportionally reported with impulsivity + 13 impulsivity PTs) and 70 nodes (56 + 14) for the aripiprazole and pramipexole network, respectively. Although the nodes remained constant, edges, clusters, and network properties were different in the three mathematical representations (**Table 3**, **S7**, **S10-S11**, **Figure S1-S8**, **S11-S16**). As expected, the degree centrality was highest for the

- most common events in Ising and for the rarest in PPMI. The Jaccard similarity was highest 291 292 between the networks estimated by Ising and ϕ and lowest for the networks estimated by ϕ 293 and PPMI (half of the links being different). The clustering was most overlapping between ϕ -294 PPMI, followed by ϕ -Ising and PPMI-Ising, as captured by the purity index. ϕ and PPMI
- 295 tended to present clusters including multiple clusters from the Ising estimated network
- 296 (Figures S11-S16).
- 297 Table 3. Network properties. The table shows the network properties for the three networks estimated for aripiprazole and
- 298 pramipexole, respectively, and for their comparison. Legend: (-) means that there is also a strong link between the first and
- 299 last element.

Aripiprazole (120 nodes)			
gambling disorder (N=2057), economic problems (1366), obsessive-compulsive disorders (1198)			
	Ising	ϕ	PPMI
Links	301	1186	1254
Central node (1°)	economic problems	Irritability	overwork
Heaviest links (1-3°)	AP below therapeutic – effect	(-)AP below therapeutic-	Kleptomania-overwork-
	variable – effect incomplete	effect variable-toxicity(-)	pyromania
	Theft-shoplifting		Overwork–poriomania
Clusters (N)	10	5	4
Clustering modularity	0.71	0.59	0.46
Small worldness (w)	0.26	0.04	0.03
	ϕ -Ising	ϕ -PPMI	PPMI-Ising
Jaccard (out of max) [†]	0.25 (0.25)	0.56 (0.95)	0.21 (0.24)
Purity index [‡]	0.68	0.89	0.59
	Pramipex	cole (70 nodes)	
gambling of	disorder (N=1340), obsessive-com	pulsive disorders (553), and hy	ypersexuality (543)
	Ising	4	DDMI
	Ising	ψ	1 1 1/11
Links (density %)	85	Ψ 240	576
Links (density %) Central node (1°)	85 gambling disorder	240 mental disorder	576 pyromania
Links (density %) Central node (1°) Heaviest links (1-3°)	85 gambling disorder body-focused disorders–	φ 240 mental disorder Pain–emotional distress–	576 pyromania (–)Poriomania–pyromania–
Links (density %) Central node (1°) Heaviest links (1-3°)	85 gambling disorder body-focused disorders- kleptomania	φ 240 mental disorder Pain–emotional distress– obsessive-compulsive	576 pyromania (–)Poriomania–pyromania– gaming disorder(–)
Links (density %) Central node (1°) Heaviest links (1-3°)	85 gambling disorder body-focused disorders– kleptomania mental impairment–mental	φ 240 mental disorder Pain–emotional distress– obsessive-compulsive disorder	576 pyromania (–)Poriomania–pyromania– gaming disorder(–)
Links (density %) Central node (1°) Heaviest links (1-3°)	85 gambling disorder body-focused disorders– kleptomania mental impairment–mental disorder	φ 240 mental disorder Pain–emotional distress– obsessive-compulsive disorder Hyperphagia–weight	576 pyromania (–)Poriomania–pyromania– gaming disorder(–)
Links (density %) Central node (1°) Heaviest links (1-3°)	85 gambling disorder body-focused disorders– kleptomania mental impairment–mental disorder on and off phenomenon–	φ 240 mental disorder Pain–emotional distress– obsessive-compulsive disorder Hyperphagia–weight increased	576 pyromania (–)Poriomania–pyromania– gaming disorder(–)
Links (density %) Central node (1°) Heaviest links (1-3°)	85 gambling disorder body-focused disorders- kleptomania mental impairment-mental disorder on and off phenomenon- dyskinesia	φ 240 mental disorder Pain-emotional distress- obsessive-compulsive disorder Hyperphagia-weight increased	576 pyromania (–)Poriomania–pyromania– gaming disorder(–)
Links (density %) Central node (1°) Heaviest links (1-3°) Clusters (N)	85 gambling disorder body-focused disorders- kleptomania mental impairment-mental disorder on and off phenomenon- dyskinesia 10	φ 240 mental disorder Pain–emotional distress– obsessive-compulsive disorder Hyperphagia–weight increased 6	576 pyromania (-)Poriomania–pyromania– gaming disorder(–) 4
Links (density %) Central node (1°) Heaviest links (1-3°) Clusters (N) Clustering modularity	85 gambling disorder body-focused disorders- kleptomania mental impairment-mental disorder on and off phenomenon- dyskinesia 10 0.66	φ 240 mental disorder Pain-emotional distress- obsessive-compulsive disorder Hyperphagia-weight increased 6 0.51	576 pyromania (-)Poriomania–pyromania– gaming disorder(–) 4 0.15
Links (density %) Central node (1°) Heaviest links (1-3°) Clusters (N) Clustering modularity Small worldness (ω) §	85 gambling disorder body-focused disorders- kleptomania mental impairment-mental disorder on and off phenomenon- dyskinesia 10 0.66 -0.01	φ 240 mental disorder Pain-emotional distress- obsessive-compulsive disorder Hyperphagia-weight increased 6 0.51 0.29	576 pyromania (-)Poriomania–pyromania– gaming disorder(–) 4 0.15 0.47
Links (density %) Central node (1°) Heaviest links (1-3°) Clusters (N) Clustering modularity Small worldness (ω) §	$\frac{1311g}{85}$ $\frac{85}{gambling disorder}$ body-focused disorders- kleptomania mental impairment-mental disorder on and off phenomenon- dyskinesia 10 0.66 -0.01 ϕ -Ising		576 pyromania (-)Poriomania–pyromania– gaming disorder(–) 4 0.15 0.47 PPMI-Ising
Links (density %) Central node (1°) Heaviest links (1-3°) Clusters (N) Clustering modularity Small worldness (ω) § Jaccard (out of max)	$\frac{1311g}{85}$ $\frac{1}{85}$ $\frac{1}{9}$	$\frac{\varphi}{240}$ mental disorder Pain-emotional distress- obsessive-compulsive disorder Hyperphagia-weight increased 6 0.51 0.29 ϕ -PPMI 0.23 (0.42)	576 pyromania (-)Poriomania–pyromania– gaming disorder(–) 4 0.15 0.47 PPMI-Ising 0.12 (0.15)
Links (density %) Central node (1°) Heaviest links (1-3°) Clusters (N) Clustering modularity Small worldness (ω) § Jaccard (out of max) Purity index	85 gambling disorder body-focused disorders- kleptomania mental impairment-mental disorder on and off phenomenon- dyskinesia 10 0.66 -0.01 ϕ -Ising 0.34 (0.35) 0.44	$\frac{\varphi}{240}$ mental disorder Pain-emotional distress- obsessive-compulsive disorder Hyperphagia-weight increased 6 0.51 0.29 ϕ -PPMI 0.23 (0.42) 0.66	576 pyromania (-)Poriomania–pyromania– gaming disorder(–) 4 0.15 0.47 PPMI-Ising 0.12 (0.15) 0.39

300

301

† (J(A, B) = $\frac{|A \cap B|}{|A \cup B|}$). ‡ Purity = $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{K_{min}} \max_{\pi} n_{k,\pi}$, with K_{min} the minimum clusters and $\max_{\pi} n_{k,\pi}$ the maximum elements. § a small world has $\omega = \frac{L_r}{L} - \frac{c}{c_l} \approx 0$: the shortest path length L is similar to that of an equivalent random network r and the 302

303 clustering coefficient C is similar to that of an equivalent lattice network l.

304

305 The three representations were considered as three different perspectives on the same 306 phenomenon and composed into a single visualization for each population (Figure 4, 5). For

- 307 a detailed description of the identified clusters, contextualized within the existing literature,
- 308 see the discussion (paragraph 4.4).



309

Figure 4. The secondary impact of aripiprazole-induced impulsivity. The network shows the events disproportionally reported with aripiprazole-related impulsivity and their pattern of co-reporting. Drug-induced impulsivity manifestations are shown as squares and other events as circles. Node colors identify clusters from the Ising estimation, dashed contours for the estimation, and colored contours for the 313 PPMI estimation. The link width represents the weight of the links of the Ising, here chosen over the others because they are fewer and more conservative. The layout has been manually adjusted to reduce the overlapping. The layout calculated using a spring model with, as weight, the weights from the individual networks and the average of the weights of the three networks, after rescaling them from 0 to 1, is shown in the supplementary material.



Figure 5. The secondary impact of pramipexole-induced impulsivity. The network shows the events disproportionally reported with pramipexole-related impulsivity and their pattern of co-reporting. Drug-induced impulsivity manifestations are shown as squares and other events as circles. Node colors identify clusters from the Ising estimation, dashed contours for the estimation, and colored contours for the PPMI estimation. The link width represents the weight of the links of the Ising, here chosen over the others because they are fewer and more conservative. The layout has been manually adjusted to reduce the overlapping. The layout calculated using a spring model with, as weight, the weights from the individual networks and the average of the weights of the three networks, after rescaling them from 0 to 1, is shown in the supplementary material.

325

326 3.4 Bayesian Network: The secondary impact of drug-induced impulsivity

The Bayesian Network yielded insights into the directional associations between co-reported events (see **Figure 6** and OSF repository [55]). High out-degree centrality identified pivotal events that likely heightened the likelihood of reporting other events (Figure S9-S10). Since this directed network only generates hypotheses, we preferred temporal terminology (i.e., preceding and following) to causal terminology even if no data on actual temporal sequences was included in the analyses.



333

Figure 6. The secondary impact of the main drug-induced impulsivity, aripiprazole and pramipexole. The ego-networks extracted from the Bayesian Network show the potential direction of the co-reporting relationships between the events, thus providing insight into the direct and indirect impact of drug-induced impulsivity. Nodes linked to hyperphagia, hypersexuality, pathological gambling, and compulsive shopping are represented. Only out-neighbors of order equal or less than 1 are shown here, together with out-neighbors of order 2 considered relevant for clinical interpretation.

339

In pramipexole recipients, anxiety (3.55), emotional distress (2.92), and gambling (2.30) attained the highest out-degree centrality. Anxiety preceded insomnia (with irritability, somnolence, and attention disturbances), stress and depression (with suicide), fear, OCD, and emotional distress. Emotional distress preceded pain and injury (with major depression and economic problems), abnormal thinking and behavior, weight gain, and pathologic gambling.

Furthermore, hypersexuality preceded delusional jealousy and marital difficulties,
 compulsive shopping stealing behaviors, and hyperphagia weight increase.

347 In aripiprazole recipients, economic problems (5.97), gambling (4.15), and hyperphagia 348 (2.33) attained the highest out-degree centrality. Economic problems preceded theft, 349 hoarding, divorce, loss of employment, homelessness, suicide, sex dysfunction, sexually 350 transmitted diseases, and eating disorder. Gambling preceded aggressivity, suicide, cognitive 351 disorders, hyperphagia, and paraphilia. Hyperphagia preceded somnolence and fatigue (with 352 stress, attention disturbances, myalgia, cough), hunger, weight increase (with constipation), 353 obesity (with hypertension), compulsive wandering, and paraphilic disorders. Anxiety 354 preceded depression (with sleep disorders and suicide), fear and panic attacks (with 355 relationship issues), pain and injury (with emotional distress, disability, anhedonia, and 356 economic problems). Hypersexuality preceded sexual dysfunction, sexually transmitted 357 diseases, unintended pregnancy, and loss of employment. Compulsive shopping preceded 358 eating disorders and economic problems.

359

360 4. Discussion

361 4.1 Summary and Key Results

362 We investigated aripiprazole and pramipexole reports to capture the syndromes and sub-363 syndromes related to drug-induced impulsivity.

The event-event disproportionality analysis revealed signs and symptoms commonly reported alongside impulsivity, thus delineating an impulsivity syndrome, separately for aripiprazole and pramipexole recipients. The impulsivity syndrome encompassed mainly psychosocial events but also organic conditions.

The network analysis identified meaningful clusters, such as delusional jealousy (also known as Othello syndrome [56]) and dopamine dysregulation syndrome (i.e., the excessive use of levodopa) in pramipexole recipients, and obesity-hypoventilation syndrome (historically Pickwickian syndrome) and social issues in aripiprazole recipients. In particular, employing more sensitive network analyses like Phi and PPMI generated more interconnected networks, which identified potential macro-clusters combining several smaller clusters identified by the Ising model.

375 Crucially, potential causal mechanisms and secondary consequences of drug-induced 376 impulsivity can be highlighted by Bayesian Network methods, providing targets for potential 377 interventions. Anxiety and economic problems emerged as pivotal events that could be 378 potentially targeted to disrupt the chain of events and alleviate the burden of drug-induced

impulsivity: for instance, monitoring and effectively managing anxiety or providing financial

380 guidance or legal guardianship to prevent wasteful spending. Since marital problems affect

381 caregivers' QoL and increase the risk of early placement in nursing homes [22], addressing

delusional jealousy and economic problems, identified as factors preceding marital problems,

383 may be critical for preserving wellbeing in pramipexole recipients.

In order to better contextualize and qualify these findings, we now discuss in detail the results of case retrieval, disproportionality analysis, network analysis, Bayesian network, and the limits and conclusions of the study.

387 4.2 Case Retrieval

Our findings align with established risk factors, including male gender and younger age [57,58], Parkinson's Disease (PD) [59,60] and depression [61]. Commonly reported impulsivity manifestations included the "four knights"[9] (i.e., gambling, shopping, hyperphagia, and hypersexuality), garnering special attention due to their pronounced impact on QoL. Other manifestations were body-focused repetitive behaviors, paraphilic disorders, and hoarding.

394 4.3 Disproportionality analysis: the drug-induced impulsivity syndrome

By performing the event-event disproportionality analysis within each drug population separately, comparing reports involving impulsivity with those encompassing various reactions – other than impulsivity – to the same drug, we addressed indication bias and other confounding factors. This comparative analysis served as a rigorous filter, allowing us to sift through the complex data and unveil the genuine characteristics associated with impulsivity, as well as those arising from the dynamic interaction between impulsivity and the underlying drug or disease, excluding traits tied solely to the underlying drug or disease.

402 This approach revealed a complex syndrome, characterized by psychosocial, cognitive, 403 psychosomatic, and metabolic events. The syndromes identified for impulsivity within 404 pramipexole and aripiprazole recipients differ significantly. Multiple factors may contribute 405 to the seemingly higher burden on QoL observed with aripiprazole-induced impulsivity, with 406 functional (or psychosomatic) manifestations and social issues impacting work, relationships, 407 and economics. Pramipexole is primarily administered to older patients with 408 hypodopaminergic conditions, characterized by motor impairment and reduced motivational 409 drive. These patients, well managed and supported by caregivers because of the later onset 410 and clear neurologic origin of the disease, may experience a mitigated drug-induced 411 impulsivity burden. Conversely, aripiprazole is prescribed to younger patients with mood and 412 psychotic disorders, often linked to hyperdopaminergic states and a pre-existing diathesis for

413 impulsivity. Challenges for caregivers and social support are heightened in these cases due to 414 earlier onset, psychiatric origins, and stigma, potentially leading to a greater burden. Further, 415 over a third of aripiprazole cases were submitted by lawyers. This may be explained either by 416 a potentially malicious overreporting for legal compensation (cfr., Abilify lawsuit) [62] or by 417 a reaction to underdiagnosis by physicians, who may be hesitant to attribute behavioral 418 changes to the medication when underlying psychiatric conditions are present. In reports filed 419 by lawyers, the desire to win legal compensation may have prompted more detailed 420 descriptions of the impact of impulsivity on QoL, or possibly even exaggerated the impact, 421 thus contributing to the observed differences between the two drugs. Intriguingly, there could 422 also be an ascertainment bias, as neurologists prescribing pramipexole may be less aware of 423 psychiatric issues compared to psychiatrists prescribing aripiprazole.

424 4.4 Network Analysis: sub-syndromes

Network analysis in pharmacovigilance, complementary to other unsupervised approaches such as vigiGroup [63], is a promising tool to detect potential syndromes and subsyndromes, to help the characterization of signals. Employing three estimation methods, the network analysis revealed potential subsyndromes associated with specific impulsivity expressions in the two populations (**Figure 7**). The Ising delineated well-defined clusters, while PPMI and ϕ emphasized inter-clusters relationships.



Figure 7. Drug-induced impulsivity syndrome, aripiprazole and pramipexole. The main syndrome, representing one or more strongly
 interconnected central clusters of symptoms and signs identified through network analysis, is depicted as the central figure. Other potential
 sub-syndromes are shown on the sides highlighted with a colored square.

435

431

436 By incorporating various expressions of impulsivity, we anticipated that the central 437 cluster would encompass the key features of impulsivity regardless of its form, whether they 438 act as risk factors or consequences of impulsivity. In both populations, cognitive and mood 439 disorders (e.g., cognitive and memory impairment, bipolar disorder, depression) were 440 included in the central cluster. Notably, they have been recorded as frequently associated 441 with drug-induced impulsivity and contributing to disability development [64]. Obesity-442 hypoventilation syndrome [65], involving weight gain, cognitive and sleep disorders, and 443 sedation, was consistent in both populations but seemingly heavier in aripiprazole recipients, 444 which also reported obesity, sleep apnoea syndrome, hypertension, and metabolic blood 445 alterations (increased lipids, transaminases, and glucose in the blood), supporting the 446 observed link between hyperphagia and diabetes onset [66].

For aripiprazole recipients (Figure 4), the central cluster also included panic attack and auditory hallucinations, sleep disorders, decreased appetite, and stress. Stress was further connected to a psychosomatic sub-syndrome involving irritability, migraine, back and

abdominal pain, reflux, diarrhoea, constipation, and hyperidrosis. Gambling and shopping
were linked to pervasive social issues (hoarding, unemployment, homeless, bankruptcy,
divorce), theft, and suicidal ideation and attempts (already observed during
hyperdopaminergic impulsive states [67]). Hypersexuality was linked to unintended
pregnancy, sexually transmitted diseases, and sexual dysfunction.

455 Among pramipexole recipients (Figure 5), the central cluster also included apathy, 456 delusion, and economic problems. The dopamine dysregulation sub-syndrome (a 457 manifestation of pathological impulsivity marked by excessive levodopa use [68–70], co-458 administered with dopamine agonists to better control motor symptoms), involved on and off 459 phenomenon (oscillations in effectiveness and motor and motivational symptoms), excessive 460 levodopa use to avoid off phases, and dopamine agonist withdrawal syndromes (DAWS) 461 upon discontinuation [71]. A cluster aligned with paranoid delusional jealousy (false and 462 unwavering belief in the partner's unfaithfulness), often seen in PD with drug-induced 463 hypersexuality [72] and here characterized by delusional jealousy, hallucinations, irritability, 464 crying, and marital problems. Notably, marital problems have been associated with early 465 placement in nursing homes and worse prognosis [73]. We also found a cluster with fear, 466 pain, stress, anxiety, depression, and suicidal ideation, indicative of the transformation of 467 reward-driven impulsivity into stressful risk-averting compulsivity over time [74]. Finally, 468 the co-reporting of two archetypal compulsive symptoms—body-focused repetitive behaviors 469 and stealing behaviors-was evident.

470 4.5 Bayesian Network: the secondary impact of drug-induced impulsivity

This interplay of events within the context of drug-induced impulsivity is intricate and 471 472 multifaceted. Events reported alongside drug-induced impulsivity may result from 473 impulsivity itself (like financial problems from gambling) or predispose individuals to 474 impulsivity (e.g., bipolar disorder). Sometimes, events can both trigger and be exacerbated by 475 drug-induced impulsivity (e.g., anxiety [75,76]). Sometimes events are concomitantly 476 mentioned for precision, such as in cases of semantic overlap (e.g., theft and shoplifting, or 477 injury and brain injury). Events associated with drug-induced impulsivity may even be 478 synonyms for well-known impulsivity expressions (e.g., restlessness, referring to excessive 479 wandering and poriomani), or could be the very reason for prescribing the drug, as seen in the 480 off-label use of aripiprazole to prevent behavioral and cognitive decline in brain injury [77] 481 or to address drug dependence [78,79]. In order to get insights into potential directional 482 associations to attempt the formulation about clinically plausible causal sequences, we 483 implemented a Bayesian Network. Anxiety emerged as a central factor, preceding insomnia,

484 irritability, cognitive impairment, stress, injury, pain (linked to disability and economic
485 problems), depression, and even suicidal ideation. Drug-induced impulsivity manifestations
486 appeared to exacerbate each other. Economic problems had the highest out-degree centrality
487 among aripiprazole recipients, preceding theft, relationship difficulties, and suicidal ideation.

488 The Bayesian Network provides clinicians with valuable insights on the pivotal nodes that 489 could be targeted by interventions to disrupt the cascade of events and ameliorate the 490 secondary impact of drug-induced impulsivity. It also highlighted secondary ramifications of 491 main impulsivity manifestations: hypersexuality precedes marital problems through 492 delusional jealousy in pramipexole recipients, while it precedes unintended pregnancy and 493 sexually transmitted diseases in aripiprazole recipients; hyperphagia precedes weight increase 494 in pramipexole recipients and obesity, somnolence, and cognitive impairment in aripiprazole. 495 Marital problems, following delusional jealousy and economic problems in pramipexole 496 recipients, may be of particular interest since they are associated with an early placement in 497 nursing homes [73]. Finally, the Bayesian Network seems to support the higher secondary 498 impact of drug-induced impulsivity in aripiprazole recipients.

499 4.6 Limitations and Further Developments

500 While this study provides valuable insights into the intricate interplay of events related to 501 drug-induced impulsivity and its subsequent implications, it is crucial to acknowledge its 502 limitations.

503 Spontaneous reports, while uniquely granting access to patients' perspective, are susceptible 504 to biases like under-reporting, missing data, and unverified reliability, preventing reliable 505 incidence or prevalence estimates. The high contribution of reports from lawyers may have 506 influenced the higher psychosocial impact attributed to aripiprazole-induced impulsivity. 507 Nonetheless, this study sets the foundation for further studies and a potential score to assess 508 the impact of ADRs on QoL.

509 Limitations in network analysis methodologies adopted include the Ising estimation's 510 assumptions (pairwise interaction, linear effects, and binary variables), and the inability to 511 account for time and severity in symptom manifestation. The incorporation of negative links 512 could facilitate a more nuanced separation of symptoms that infrequently co-occur. The 513 Bayesian Network lacks bidirectional relationships and cyclic feedback loops and would 514 require the inclusion of all shared causes between any two events (causal Markov condition) 515 to achieve its full capacity to illuminate causality. These limitations could be rectified by 516 integrating clinical longitudinal data and embedding temporal aspects into the network 517 analysis.

Looking ahead, a broader definition of drug-induced impulsivity could improve sensitivity in case retrieval. Conditions like suicide attempts, hypersomnia, obsessivecompulsive symptoms, explosive anger, personality changes, disturbance in attention, and drug dependence might represent different expressions of this underdefined condition, warranting further exploration [10,70].

523 4.7 Conclusion

524 The profound impact of drug-induced impulsivity reverberates across patients and their 525 families, encompassing psychosocial challenges and organic complications such as metabolic 526 syndrome (in the case of hyperphagia), and sexual health issues (in the case of 527 hypersexuality). Recognizing these potential consequences is crucial for informed 528 pharmacological management and diligent patient monitoring. Network analysis has revealed 529 intriguing co-reporting patterns among adverse events, leading to their classification as sub-530 syndromes. Notable examples include the emergency of obesity-hypoventilation syndrome 531 with hyperphagia and associations of hypersexuality with delusional jealousy in pramipexole 532 recipients and unintended pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases in aripiprazole 533 recipients. Our parallel approach effectively avoids the risk of disease-related diathesis 534 compromising analytical integrity, enhancing the robustness of our findings.

535 For clinicians, this study emphasizes the potential burden of drug-induced impulsivity, and 536 therefore the necessity of meticulous scrutiny into patients' medical histories. Factors such as 537 age, gender, pre-existing mood disorders and family history should be red flags, warranting 538 heightened vigilance. While transitioning to an alternative active ingredient may mitigate 539 impulsivity, it is not always feasible or adequate. Monitoring for potential complications, as 540 unveiled in our work (e.g., obesity-hypoventilation syndrome and delusional jealousy), is 541 pivotal when such transitions are not a viable solution. For example, an overlooked 542 delusional jealousy may result in marital problems and early nursing home placement.

543 Central to our findings is the pivotal realization that drug reactions rarely occur in isolation; 544 instead, they manifest as syndromes with diverse signs and symptoms. These can be direct 545 reactions to the drug itself, secondary consequences to the reaction, risk factors for the 546 reaction, or comorbidities. Causal chains and loops can contribute to symptom aggravation 547 and chronicity. Identifying syndromes and sub-syndromes, combining network strategies 548 with traditional techniques and clinical judgment, proves a potent strategy for delving into the 549 secondary impact of adverse drug reactions and fostering heightened awareness within 550 clinical practice.

551 In sum, the intricate relationships between signs and symptoms, coupled with the insights

from the Bayesian Network, underscore the multifaceted nature of drug-induced impulsivity.

553 More significantly, it equips research, and secondarily clinicians, with indispensable tools to

554 identify potential intervention points, decipher causal sequences, and mitigate the cascading

555 secondary effects associated with drug-induced impulsivity. In doing so, this study

556 contributes to advancing our comprehension and management of drug-induced impulsivity,

- 557 ultimately enhancing the well-being and care of affected patients.
- 558

559 Acknowledgements

560 MedDRA®, version 25.0 was developed under the auspices of the International Council for

561 Harmonization of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use.

562 Part of the work was presented orally at the SIF congress, 2023, in Rome.

563 Icons for figures 1, 2, 6, and 7 were obtained using Bing Image Creator.

564

565 Declarations

- **Funding**: No specific funding supported this research.
- 567 **Conflicts of interest**: The authors declare no conflict of interest specific for this research.

568 Ethics approval: not applicable because spontaneous reports of the FAERS are anonymous and

569 publicly available.

570 Consent to participate: not applicable because spontaneous reports of the FAERS are anonymous571 and publicly available.

572 Consent for publication: not applicable because spontaneous reports of the FAERS are anonymous573 and publicly available.

- 574 Software used: Analyses were performed using R (version 4.2.1)[80] and Python (version 3.8.16
- 575)[81]. We relied on several essential packages for network analysis: IsingFit[47], igraph[82],
- 576 *psych*[83], and *bnlearn*[35].

577 Availability of data and material: The data we used comes from the FDA Adverse Event Reporting

578 System (FAERS), and is made publicly available by the FDA as quarterly data downloadable at

579 <u>https://fis.fda.gov/extensions/FPD-QDE-FAERS/FPD-QDE-FAERS.html</u>. The algorithm for cleaning

580 FAERS data is open-source at https://github.com/fusarolimichele/DiAna, and the cleaned database is

- available on an OSF repository[84] and through the R package DiAna[85].
- **582** Code availability: The code for the project is available on an OSF repository[55], the function for the
- 583 Ising network is also available in the DiAna package (cfr. "network_analysis()")[85].
- 584

- 585 Author contributions: MF, SP, LM, conceptualized and designed the study. MF, SP, LM developed
- 586 the methodology. The formal analysis was performed by MF, SP, LM, VG. MF, SP, VG performed
- 587 the visualization. MF, SP, LM, VG wrote the original draft. All the authors strongly contributed to the
- 588 interpretation of results, and to the review and editing of the draft. All the authors read and approved
- the final version.
- 590

591 References

- 592 1. Engel GL. The need for a new medical model: a challenge for biomedicine. Science.593 1977;196:129–36.
- 594 2. Young A. The Anthropologies of Illness and Sickness. Annu Rev Anthropol. 1982;11:257–
 595 85.
- 596 3. Kleinman A, Eisenberg L, Good B. Culture, illness, and care: clinical lessons from 597 anthropologic and cross-cultural research. Ann Intern Med. 1978;88:251–8.
- 4. Lorimer S, Cox A, Langford NJ. A patient's perspective: the impact of adverse drug
 reactions on patients and their views on reporting. J Clin Pharm Ther. 2012;37:148–52.
- 5. Suh D-C, Woodall BS, Shin S-K, Santis ERH-D. Clinical and Economic Impact of
- Adverse Drug Reactions in Hospitalized Patients. Ann Pharmacother. 2000;34:1373–9.
- 602 6. Rolfes L, van Hunsel F, Taxis K, van Puijenbroek E. The Impact of Experiencing Adverse
- 603 Drug Reactions on the Patient's Quality of Life: A Retrospective Cross-Sectional Study in
- 604 the Netherlands. Drug Saf. 2016;39:769–76.
- 7. Calvert M, Kyte D, Mercieca-Bebber R, Slade A, Chan A-W, King MT, et al. Guidelines
 for Inclusion of Patient-Reported Outcomes in Clinical Trial Protocols: The SPIRIT-PRO
 Extension. JAMA. 2018;319:483–94.
- 8. Haag S, Junge L, Lotz F, McGauran N, Paulides M, Potthast R, et al. Results on patient-
- reported outcomes are underreported in summaries of product characteristics for new drugs. JPatient-Rep Outcomes. 2021;5:127.
- 9. Weintraub D. Impulse control disorders in Parkinson's disease: A 20-year odyssey. Mov
 Disord Off J Mov Disord Soc. 2019;34:447–52.
- 613 10. Fusaroli M, Raschi E, Contin M, Sambati L, Menchetti M, Fioritti A, et al. Impulsive
- 614 Conditions in Parkinson's Disease: a pharmacosurveillance-supported list. Parkinsonism
 615 Relat Disord. 2021;90:79–83.
- 616 11. Fusaroli M, Pellegrini L, Fusaroli R, Raschi E, Menchetti M, Poluzzi E. Behavioral
- 617 excess and disruptive conduct: a historical and taxonomical approach to the origin of the
- 618 "Impulse Control Disorders" diagnostic construct. Addiction [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Nov
- 619 21];n/a. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/add.16086
- 620 12. Grall-Bronnec M, Victorri-Vigneau C, Donnio Y, Leboucher J, Rousselet M, Thiabaud E,
- et al. Dopamine Agonists and Impulse Control Disorders: A Complex Association. Drug Saf.
 2018;41:19–75.
- 623 13. Tippmann-Peikert M, Park JG, Boeve BF, Shepard JW, Silber MH. Pathologic gambling
- 624 in patients with restless legs syndrome treated with dopaminergic agonists. Neurology.
- 625 2007;68:301–3.
- 626 14. Cornelius JR, Tippmann-Peikert M, Slocumb NL, Frerichs CF, Silber MH. Impulse
- 627 Control Disorders with the use of Dopaminergic Agents in Restless Legs Syndrome: a Case-
- 628 Control Study. Sleep. 2010;33:81–7.

- 629 15. Fusaroli M, Raschi E, Giunchi V, Menchetti M, Rimondini Giorgini R, De Ponti F, et al.
- 630 Impulse Control Disorders by Dopamine Partial Agonists: A Pharmacovigilance-
- 631 Pharmacodynamic Assessment Through the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System. Int J
- 632 Neuropsychopharmacol. 2022;25:727–36.
- 633 16. Béreau M, Fleury V, Bouthour W, Castrioto A, Lhommée E, Krack P.
- 634 Hyperdopaminergic behavioral spectrum in Parkinson's disease: A review. Rev Neurol
- 635 (Paris). 2018;174:653–63.
- 636 17. Jeyadevan A, Bakeberg M, Byrnes M, Kenna J, McGregor S, Ghosh S, et al. Quality of
- 637 life implications for elevated trait impulsivity in people with Parkinson's disease. Qual Life
- 638 Res. 2023;32:1143–50.
- 639 18. Leplow B, Renftle D, Thomas M, Michaelis K, Solbrig S, Maetzler W, et al.
- 640 Characteristics of behavioural addiction in Parkinson's disease patients with self-reported
- 641 impulse control disorder and controls matched for levodopa equivalent dose: a matched case-
- 642 control study. J Neural Transm. 2023;130:125–33.
- 19. Phu AL, Xu Z, Brakoulias V, Mahant N, Fung VSC, Moore GD, et al. Effect of impulse
- control disorders on disability and quality of life in Parkinson's disease patients. J Clin
 Neurosci. 2014;21:63–6.
- 646 20. Skorvanek M, Rosenberger J, Minar M, Grofik M, Han V, Groothoff JW, et al.
- 647 Relationship between the non-motor items of the MDS–UPDRS and Quality of Life in
- 648 patients with Parkinson's disease. J Neurol Sci. 2015;353:87–91.
- 649 21. Jesús S, Labrador-Espinosa MA, Adarmes AD, Méndel-Del Barrio C, Martínez-Castrillo
- 50 JC, Alonso-Cánovas A, et al. Non-motor symptom burden in patients with Parkinson's
- disease with impulse control disorders and compulsive behaviours: results from the
- 652 COPPADIS cohort. Sci Rep. 2020;10:16893.
- 653 22. Schrag A, Hovris A, Morley D, Quinn N, Jahanshahi M. Caregiver-burden in parkinson's
 654 disease is closely associated with psychiatric symptoms, falls, and disability. Parkinsonism
 655 Relat Disord. 2006;12:35–41.
- Antonini A, Barone P, Bonuccelli U, Annoni K, Asgharnejad M, Stanzione P. ICARUS
 study: prevalence and clinical features of impulse control disorders in Parkinson's disease. J
- 658 Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry. 2017;88:317–24.
- 659 24. Castillon G, Salvo F, Moride Y. The Social Impact of Suspected Adverse Drug
- Reactions: An analysis of the Canada Vigilance Spontaneous Reporting Database. Drug Saf.
 2019;42:27–34.
- 662 25. FAERS Quarterly Data Extract Files [Internet]. [cited 2022 Dec 24]. Available from:
 663 https://fis.fda.gov/extensions/FPD-QDE-FAERS/FPD-QDE-FAERS.html
- 26. Härmark L, van Hunsel F, Grundmark B. ADR Reporting by the General Public: Lessons
 Learnt from the Dutch and Swedish Systems. Drug Saf. 2015;38:337–47.
- 666 27. Härmark L, Raine J, Leufkens H, Edwards IR, Moretti U, Sarinic VM, et al. Patient-
- 667 Reported Safety Information: A Renaissance of Pharmacovigilance? Drug Saf. 2016;39:883–668 90.

- 669 28. Inácio P, Cavaco A, Airaksinen M. The value of patient reporting to the
- 670 pharmacovigilance system: a systematic review. Br J Clin Pharmacol. 2017;83:227–46.
- 671 29. Rolfes L, van Hunsel F, Wilkes S, van Grootheest K, van Puijenbroek E. Adverse drug
- reaction reports of patients and healthcare professionals-differences in reported information.
 Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf. 2015;24:152–8.
- 674 30. Watson S, Chandler RE, Taavola H, Härmark L, Grundmark B, Zekarias A, et al. Safety
- 675 Concerns Reported by Patients Identified in a Collaborative Signal Detection Workshop
- using VigiBase: Results and Reflections from Lareb and Uppsala Monitoring Centre. Drug
 Saf. 2018;41:203–12.
- 678 31. Fusaroli M, Raschi E, Gatti M, De Ponti F, Poluzzi E. Development of a Network-Based
- 679 Signal Detection Tool: The COVID-19 Adversome in the FDA Adverse Event Reporting
 680 System. Front Pharmacol. 2021;12:3542.
- 681 32. Epskamp S, Borsboom D, Fried EI. Estimating psychological networks and their
 682 accuracy: A tutorial paper. Behav Res Methods. 2018;50:195–212.
- 33. Yule GU. On the Methods of Measuring Association Between Two Attributes. J R Stat
 Soc. 1912;75:579–652.
- 685 34. Chen SF, Goodman J. An empirical study of smoothing techniques for language
- modeling. Proc 34th Annu Meet Assoc Comput Linguist [Internet]. USA: Association for
- 687 Computational Linguistics; 1996 [cited 2023 Mar 17]. p. 310–8. Available from:
- 688 https://doi.org/10.3115/981863.981904
- 689 35. Scutari M. Learning Bayesian Networks with the bnlearn R Package. J Stat Softw.
 690 2010;35:1–22.
- 691 36. Briganti G, Scutari M, McNally RJ. A tutorial on Bayesian Networks for
- psychopathology researchers [Internet]. OSF; 2021 [cited 2024 Mar 31]. Available from:
 https://osf.io/h4vxa
- 694 37. Fusaroli M, Giunchi V. DiAna. An open access toolkit for DIsproportionality ANAlysis 695 and other pharmacovigilance investigations in the FAERS. [Internet]. 2024. Available from:
- 696 https://github.com/fusarolimichele/DiAna_package
- 697 38. MedDRA [Internet]. [cited 2023 Feb 4]. Available from: https://www.meddra.org/
- 698 39. Fusaroli M, Giunchi V, Battini V, Puligheddu S, Khouri C, Carnovale C, et al.
- 699 Standardization of drug names in the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System: The DiAna
- 700 dictionary [Internet]. medRxiv; 2023 [cited 2023 Jun 15]. p. 2023.06.07.23291076. Available
- 701 from: https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.06.07.23291076v1
- 40. Norén GN, Hopstadius J, Bate A. Shrinkage observed-to-expected ratios for robust and
 transparent large-scale pattern discovery. Stat Methods Med Res. 2013;22:57–69.
- 41. Church KW, Hanks P. Word Association Norms, Mutual Information, and Lexicography.
 Comput Linguist. 1990;16:22–9.

- 42. Recchia G, Jones MN. More data trumps smarter algorithms: Comparing pointwise
- 707 mutual information with latent semantic analysis. Behav Res Methods. 2009;41:647–56.
- Role F, Nadif M. Handling the Impact of Low Frequency Events on Co-occurrence based
 Measures of Word Similarity A Case Study of Pointwise Mutual Information. 2011.
- 44. Fusaroli M, Pelletti G, Giunchi V, Pugliese C, Bartolucci M, Necibi EN, et al. Deliberate
- 711 Self-Poisoning: Real-Time Characterization of Suicidal Habits and Toxidromes in the Food
- and Drug Administration Adverse Event Reporting System. Drug Saf [Internet]. 2023 [cited
- 713 2023 Feb 2]; Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s40264-022-01269-x
- 45. Pauline O, Robert M, Bernardeau C, Hlavaty A, Fusaroli M, Roustit M, et al. Assessment
- of Reported Adverse Events After Interchanging Between TNF-α Inhibitor Biosimilars in the
- 716 WHO Pharmacovigilance Database. BioDrugs [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Jun 12]; Available
- 717 from: https://doi.org/10.1007/s40259-023-00603-8
- 46. Orre R, Bate A, Norén GN, Swahn E, Arnborg S, Edwards IR. A bayesian recurrent
- neural network for unsupervised pattern recognition in large incomplete data sets. Int J
- 720 Neural Syst. 2005;15:207–22.
- 47. van Borkulo CD, Borsboom D, Epskamp S, Blanken TF, Boschloo L, Schoevers RA, et
- al. A new method for constructing networks from binary data. Sci Rep. 2014;4:5918.
- 48. Newman MEJ, Girvan M. Finding and evaluating community structure in networks. PhysRev E. 2004;69:026113.
- 49. Newman MEJ. Fast algorithm for detecting community structure in networks. Phys RevE. 2004;69:066133.
- 50. Jaccard P. The Distribution of the Flora in the Alpine Zone.1. New Phytol. 1912;11:37–50.
- 51. Rezaei M, Fränti P. Set Matching Measures for External Cluster Validity. IEEE Trans
 Knowl Data Eng. 2016;28:2173–86.
- 52. Gates AJ, Wood IB, Hetrick WP, Ahn Y-Y. Element-centric clustering comparison
 unifies overlaps and hierarchy. Sci Rep. 2019;9:8574.
- 53. Meilä M. Comparing Clusterings by the Variation of Information. In: Schölkopf B,
- Warmuth MK, editors. Learn Theory Kernel Mach. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer; 2003. p.173–87.
- 54. Telesford QK, Joyce KE, Hayasaka S, Burdette JH, Laurienti PJ. The Ubiquity of SmallWorld Networks. Brain Connect. 2011;1:367–75.
- 55. Fusaroli M, Polizzi S, Menestrina L, Giunchi V. Unveiling the Hidden Toll of Drug-
- 739 Induced Impulse Control Disorders. 2023 [cited 2023 Aug 20]; Available from:
- 740 https://osf.io/k9v6s/
- 56. El Otmani H, sabiry S, Bellakhdar S, El Moutawakil B, Abdoh Rafai M. Othello
- syndrome in Parkinson's disease: A diagnostic emergency of an underestimated condition.
- 743 Rev Neurol (Paris). 2021;177:690–3.

- 57. Weintraub D, Koester J, Potenza MN, Siderowf AD, Stacy M, Voon V, et al. Impulse
- control disorders in Parkinson disease: a cross-sectional study of 3090 patients. Arch Neurol.
 2010;67:589–95.
- 58. Santangelo G, Barone P, Trojano L, Vitale C. Pathological gambling in Parkinson's
 disease. A comprehensive review. Parkinsonism Relat Disord. 2013;19:645–53.
- 749 59. Jiménez-Urbieta H, Gago B, Quiroga-Varela A, Rodríguez-Chinchilla T, Merino-Galán
- 750 L, Oregi A, et al. Pramipexole-induced impulsivity in mildparkinsonian rats: a model of
- 751 impulse control disorders in Parkinson's disease. Neurobiol Aging. 2019;75:126–35.
- 60. Riddle JL, Rokosik SL, Napier TC. Pramipexole- and methamphetamine-induced rewardmediated behavior in a rodent model of Parkinson's disease and controls. Behav Brain Res.
 2012 222 15 22
- 754 2012;233:15–23.
- 61. Marín-Lahoz J, Sampedro F, Martinez-Horta S, Pagonabarraga J, Kulisevsky J.
- Depression as a Risk Factor for Impulse Control Disorders in Parkinson Disease. Ann
 Neurol. 2019;86:762–9.
- 62. Blum AW, Jacobson K, Grant JE. Legal settlements and the reporting of adverse drug
- r59 events: Insights from the aripiprazole products liability litigation. Psychiatry Res.
- 760 2022;309:114411.
- 63. Norén GN, Meldau E-L, Chandler RE. Consensus clustering for case series identification
 and adverse event profiles in pharmacovigilance. Artif Intell Med. 2021;122:102199.
- 763 64. Voon V, Sohr M, Lang AE, Potenza MN, Siderowf AD, Whetteckey J, et al. Impulse
- control disorders in parkinson disease: A multicenter case-control study. Ann Neurol.2011;69:986–96.
- 65. Masa JF, Pépin J-L, Borel J-C, Mokhlesi B, Murphy PB, Sánchez-Quiroga MÁ. Obesity
 hypoventilation syndrome. Eur Respir Rev. 2019;28:180097.
- 66. de Jonge P, Alonso J, Stein DJ, Kiejna A, Aguilar-Gaxiola S, Viana MC, et al.
- 769 Associations between DSM-IV mental disorders and diabetes mellitus: a role for impulse
- control disorders and depression. Diabetologia. 2014;57:699–709.
- 67. Evans AH, Strafella AP, Weintraub D, Stacy M. Impulsive and compulsive behaviors in
 Parkinson's disease. Mov Disord Off J Mov Disord Soc. 2009;24:1561–70.
- 68. Okai D, Samuel M, Askey-Jones S, David AS, Brown RG. Impulse control disorders and
- dopamine dysregulation in Parkinson's disease: a broader conceptual framework. Eur J
 Neurol. 2011;18:1379–83.
- 69. De la Casa-Fages B, Grandas F. Dopamine Dysregulation Syndrome and Deep Brain
- 777 Stimulation of the Subthalamic Nucleus in Parkinson's Disease. Neurol Res Int [Internet].
- 778 2011 [cited 2021 Jun 16];2011. Available from:
- 779 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3216377/
- 780 70. Weintraub D, David AS, Evans AH, Grant JE, Stacy M. Clinical spectrum of impulse
- control disorders in Parkinson's disease. Mov Disord Off J Mov Disord Soc. 2015;30:121–7.

- 782 71. Yu XX, Fernandez HH. Dopamine agonist withdrawal syndrome: A comprehensive
 783 review. J Neurol Sci. 2017;374:53–5.
- 784 72. Kataoka H, Sugie K. Delusional Jealousy (Othello Syndrome) in 67 Patients with
 785 Parkinson's Disease. Front Neurol. 2018;9.
- 786 73. Aarsland D, Larsen JP, Tandberg E, Laake K. Predictors of Nursing Home Placement in
- Parkinson's Disease: A Population-Based, Prospective Study. J Am Geriatr Soc.
- 788 2000;48:938–42.
- 789 74. Lopez AM, Weintraub D, Claassen DO. Impulse Control Disorders and Related
- 790 Complications of Parkinson's Disease Therapy. Semin Neurol. 2017;37:186–92.
- 791 75. Goerlich-Dobre KS, Probst C, Winter L, Witt K, Deuschl G, Möller B, et al.
- Alexithymia-an independent risk factor for impulsive-compulsive disorders in Parkinson's
- 793 disease. Mov Disord Off J Mov Disord Soc. 2014;29:214–20.
- 794 76. Vriend C, Pattij T, van der Werf YD, Voorn P, Booij J, Rutten S, et al. Depression and
- impulse control disorders in Parkinson's disease: Two sides of the same coin? Neurosci
- 796 Biobehav Rev. 2014;38:60–71.
- 797 77. Plummer NR, Tam AW, Mulvaney CA, Preston NJ, Laha SK. Dopamine agonists for
- traumatic brain injury. Cochrane Database Syst Rev [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2023 Apr 14];
 Available from:
- 800 https://www.cochranelibrary.com/cdsr/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD013062/full
- 78. Feltenstein MW, Do PH, See RE. Repeated aripiprazole administration attenuates cocaine
 seeking in a rat model of relapse. Psychopharmacology (Berl). 2009;207:401–11.
- 79. Feltenstein MW, Altar CA, See RE. Aripiprazole blocks reinstatement of cocaine seeking
 in an animal model of relapse. Biol Psychiatry. 2007;61:582–90.
- 805 80. R: The R Project for Statistical Computing [Internet]. [cited 2023 Feb 4]. Available from:
 806 https://www.r-project.org/
- 807 81. Welcome to Python.org [Internet]. Python.org. 2023 [cited 2023 Feb 4]. Available from:
 808 https://www.python.org/
- 809 82. Csardi G, Nepusz T. The igraph software package for complex network research.
- 810 83. Revelle W. Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research
- 811 [Internet]. R package version 2.2.9. Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois; 2022.
- 812 Available from: https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych
- 813 84. Fusaroli M, Giunchi V. DiAna: Repository for FAERS cleaning and analysis. 2023 [cited
 814 2023 Aug 20]; Available from: https://osf.io/zqu89/
- 815 85. Fusaroli M, Giunchi V. DiAna R package: Advanced Disproportionality Analysis in the
- 816 FAERS for Drug Safety. [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Oct 21]. Available from:
- 817 https://github.com/fusarolimichele/DiAna_package
- 818

819	Suppo	orting Information
820	•	Table S1. Expressions of pathological impulsivity. MedDRA query and behavioral subqueries used for
821		retrieving drug-induced impulsivity.
822	•	Table S2. Manifestation of impulsivity in the two populations investigated.
823	•	Table S3. Features of pramipexole reports. We compared cases of pramipexole-related pathological impulsivity
824		vs any other report recording pramipexole. Chi-square test was performed for categorical values, Mann-Whitney
825		for continuous ones, and p-values were corrected for multiple comparison using the Holm-Bonferroni method.
826	•	Table S4. Features of aripiprazole reports. We compared cases of aripiprazole-related pathological impulsivity
827		vs any other report recording aripiprazole. Chi-square test was performed for categorical values, Mann-Whitney
828		for continuous ones, and p-values were corrected for multiple comparison using the Holm-Bonferroni method.
829	•	Table S5. Events disproportionally reported with aripiprazole-induced impulsivity. Ordered by N.
830	•	Table S6. Events disproportionally reported with pramipexole-induced impulsivity. Ordered by N.
831	•	Table S7. Nodes with highest degree-centrality.
832	•	Table S8. Aripiprazole edges. The ten strongest links for the three networks of aripiprazole are shown. Note that
833		the links are undirected, therefore the two nodes may be switched.
834	•	Table S9. Pramipexole edges. The ten strongest links for the three networks of pramipexole are shown.
835	•	Note that the links are undirected, therefore the two nodes may be switched.
836	•	Table S10. Aripiprazole clusters obtained from Ising and Phi estimation. Phi and Ising clusters are shown side
837		by side. Ising clusters are color-coded, to show the similiarities with Phi.
838	•	Table S11. Pramipexole clusters obtained from Ising and Phi estimation. Phi and Ising clusters are shown side
839		by side. Ising clusters are color-coded, to show the similiarities with Phi.
840	•	Figure S1. The secondary impact of aripiprazole-induced pathologic impulsivity. The network shows the
841		events disproportionally reported with aripiprazole-related impulsivity. Impulsivity is shown as squares, other
842		events as circles. Node colors and contours identify the clusters for the three methods: Ising (A), Phi (B) and PPMI
843		(C). The layout is calculated using a spring model with, as weight, the average of the three weights calculated,
844		after rescaling them from 0 to 1.
845	•	Figure S2. The secondary impact of aripiprazole-induced pathologic impulsivity, Ising estimation. The
846		network shows the events disproportionally reported with arpiprazole-related inpulsivity. Impulsivity is shown as
84/		squares, other events as circles. Node colors and contours identify the clusters for the Ising estimation. The layout
040 940		is calculated using a spring model with, as weight, the links from the Ising.
849	•	Figure S3. The secondary impact of aripiprazole-induced pathologic impulsivity, Phi estimation. The
0JU 951		network snows the events disproportionally reported with artipiprazoie-related impulsivity. Impulsivity is snown as
852		squares, other events as circles. Node colors and contours identify the clusters for the Phi estimation. The layout is calculated using a carrier model with as uncirclet, the links from the Phi.
853	-	calculated using a spring model with as weight, the mixes non-induced pathologic impulsivity. DDMI astimation. The
854	•	Figure 34. The secondary impact of an inpurator-induced pathologic impusivity, Fivir estimation. The network shows the avants dispersional reported with arbitrary and a dispersional with arbitrary and a second se
855		inclusions and events as circles. Node colors and contrains identify the clusters for the PPMI estimation. The layout
856		squares, other events as energies, note events and consults defining the effects of the FFMT estimation. The layout is calculated using a spring model with as weight the links from the PPMT
857	•	is calculated using a spring model with as weight, the links from the links.
858		events disproportionally reported with pramipavole-related impulsivity. Impulsivity is shown as squares, other
859		events as circles. Node colors and contours identify the clusters for the three methods: Ising (A) Phi (B) and PPMI
860		(C). The layout is calculated using a spring model with as weight, the average of the three weights calculated.
861		after rescaling them from 0 to 1.
862	•	Figure S6. The secondary impact of pramipexole-induced pathologic impulsivity, Ising estimation, The
863		network shows the events disproportionally reported with pramipexole-related impulsivity. Impulsivity is shown as
864		squares, other events as circles. Node colors and contours identify the clusters for the Ising estimation. The layout
865		is calculated using a spring model with, as weight, the links from the Ising.
866	•	Figure S7. The secondary impact of pramipexole-induced pathologic impulsivity, Phi estimation. The
867		network shows the events disproportionally reported with pramipexole-related impulsivity. Impulsivity is shown as
868		squares, other events as circles. Node colors and contours identify the clusters for the Phi estimation. The layout is
869		calculated using a spring model with, as weight, the links from the Phi.
870	•	Figure S8. The secondary impact of pramipexole-induced pathologic impulsivity, PPMI estimation. The
871		network shows the events disproportionally reported with pramipexole-related impulsivity. Impulsivity is shown as
872		squares, other events as circles. Node colors and contours identify the clusters for the PPMI estimation. The layout
8/3		is calculated using a spring model with, as weight, the links from the PPMI.
8/4	٠	Figure S9. Degree centrality, pramipexole.
8/5	•	Figure S10. Degree centrality, aripiprazole.
876	•	Figure S11. Sankey showing comparison between clusters in PPMI and PHI, pramipexole.
877	•	Figure S12. Sankey showing comparison between clusters in PPMI and Ising, pramipexole.
8/8	•	Figure S13. Sankey showing comparison between clusters in Phi and Ising, pramipexole.
879	•	Figure S14. Sankey showing comparison between clusters in PPMI and PHI, aripiprazole.
880	•	Figure S15. Sankey showing comparison between clusters in PPMI and Ising, aripiprazole.
881	•	Figure S16. Sankey showing comparison between clusters in PHI and Ising, aripiprazole.
882		