

Unveiling the Hidden Toll of Drug-Induced Impulsivity:

A Network Analysis of the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System.

Running Title: The burden of drug-induced Impulsivity

Authors:

Michele Fusaroli*¹ MD 0000-0002-0254-2212 michele.fusaroli2@unibo.it (corresponding author)

Stefano Polizzi*² MPhys, MBiostat, PhD 0000-0002-5264-5156 stefano.polizzi@unibo.it

Luca Menestrina*³ MPharm 0000-0002-3397-7737 luca.menestrina2@unibo.it

Valentina Giunchi¹ MStat 0000-0001-5841-8520 valentina.giunchi2@unibo.it

Luca Pellegrini^{4,5} MD 0000-0002-2855-2865 luca.pellegrini@nhs.net

Emanuel Raschi¹ MD, PhD 0000-0003-0487-7996 emanuel.raschi@unibo.it

Daniel Weintraub^{6,7} MD 0000-0003-0633-7168 Daniel.Weintraub@pennmedicine.upenn.edu

Maurizio Recanatini³ MChem, PhD 0000-0002-0039-0518 maurizio.recanatini@unibo.it

Gastone Castellani² MPhys, MBio, PhD 0000-0003-4892-925X gastone.castellani@unibo.it

Fabrizio De Ponti¹ MD, PhD 0000-0002-0367-9595 fabrizio.deponti@unibo.it

Elisabetta Poluzzi¹ MPharm, PhD 0000-0002-7209-0426 elisabetta.poluzzi@unibo.it

*Equally contributed

Affiliations:

¹Pharmacology Unit, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy.

²Unit of Medical Physics, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, University of Bologna, 40138 Bologna, Italy

³Department of Pharmacy and Biotechnology, Alma Mater Studiorum - University of Bologna, Via Belmeloro 6, 40126 Bologna, Italy

⁴Hertfordshire Partnership NHS University Foundation Trust, Highly Specialised OCD and BDD Service, Rosanne House, Parkway, Welwyn Garden City, Hertfordshire, UK

⁵School of Life and Medical Sciences, University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield, Hertfordshire, UK

⁶Perelman School of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

⁷Parkinson's Disease Research, Education and Clinical Center (PADRECC), Philadelphia Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Philadelphia, PA

Figures: 7 **Tables:** 2

Word count: 4,249

Fields: social psychiatry and epidemiology; neuropsychopharmacology

34 Abstract

35 **Introduction:** Adverse drug reactions significantly impact patients' lives, yet their influence
36 is often underestimated in treatment decisions and monitoring. Impulsivity induced by
37 dopaminergic agents can lead to impaired social functioning and quality of life.

38 **Aim:** This study assesses impulsivity burdens from pramipexole and aripiprazole,
39 pinpointing key symptoms for targeted mitigation.

40 **Method:** Leveraging data from the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System (January 2004 -
41 March 2022), we employed the Information Component to identify the syndrome of signs and
42 symptoms disproportionately co-reported with drug-induced impulsivity. Using composite
43 network analyses (PPMI, Ising, ϕ) we characterized clusters of co-reported events (i.e.,
44 subsyndromes). Finally, we assessed the secondary impact of drug-induced impulsivity
45 modeling our dataset as a chain of directed connections (Bayesian network).

46 **Results:** The drug-induced impulsivity syndrome (respectively 56 and 107 events in
47 pramipexole and aripiprazole recipients), primarily encompassed psychiatric, social, and
48 metabolic events, segregated into subsyndromes such as delusional jealousy and dopamine
49 dysregulation syndromes among pramipexole recipients, and obesity-hypoventilation
50 syndrome and social issues among aripiprazole recipients. Anxiety and economic problems
51 emerged as pivotal nodes in the exacerbation of the syndromes.

52 **Conclusion:** Drug-induced impulsivity places a substantial burden on patients and their
53 families, with manifestations shaped by the underlying disease. Network approaches,
54 exploring intricate symptom connections and identifying pivotal symptoms, complement
55 traditional techniques and clinical judgment, providing a foundation for informed prescription
56 and targeted interventions to alleviate the burden of adverse drug reactions.

57

58 **Keywords:** drug-induced impulsivity; adverse drug reactions; quality of life; pramipexole;
59 aripiprazole; impulse control disorders

60 1. Introduction

61 Adverse drug reactions (ADRs) significantly impact patients' well-being¹ by
62 extending beyond organic diseases and trespassing into psychological illness² and social
63 sickness³. For instance, immunodeficiency perturbs social activities, dysphonia hinders
64 teaching roles, and sexual dysfunction intricately affects relationships and personal identity.
65 Despite their profound effects, ADRs are often inadequately recognized, resulting in
66 compromised patient-doctor relationships⁴, prolonged hospitalization⁵, and a pervasive
67 decline in Quality of Life (QoL)⁶. This disregard extends to patient-reported outcomes—
68 crucial for QoL assessment and patient-centered care⁷—often relegated to the margins in
69 prescribing information or package inserts⁸.

70 Drug-induced impulsivity, classified as 'impulse control disorders induced by other
71 specified psychoactive substance (6C4E.73)' in the International Classification of Diseases
72 (ICD-11) category of disorders due to substance use, represents a distressing group of
73 conditions marked by a loss of behavioral control. This pathological disinhibition can yield
74 behaviors as pervasive as pathologic gambling, hypersexuality, compulsive shopping, and
75 hyperphagia—the so-called “four knights of Impulse Control Disorder”⁹. Additionally,
76 behaviors like stealing, hair pulling, and compulsive hoarding^{10,11} contribute to the intricate
77 tapestry of drug-induced impulsivity. The first reports of drug-induced impulsivity were
78 linked to dopamine receptor agonists like pramipexole, ropinirole, rotigotine, licensed for
79 treating Parkinson's disease (PD)¹² and restless legs syndrome (RLS)^{13,14}. More recently, the
80 role of partial dopamine agonists like aripiprazole, brexpiprazole, cariprazine, licensed for
81 treating psychosis and mood disorders, has also emerged¹⁵.

82 Within the landscape of PD, drug-induced impulsivity unfurls a complex narrative.
83 Initially, it may manifest as heightened motivation and hobbyism, known as “honeymoon
84 period”¹⁶. However, even when concealed in subclinical forms¹⁷, drug-induced impulsivity
85 holds the potential to significantly erode patients' QoL¹⁸. This erosion, appraised through
86 metrics like the PDQ-39 scale¹⁹, encompasses diverse neuropsychiatric and somatic domains
87 including mobility, daily activities, stigma, social support, communication²⁰, urinary and
88 sexual function, sleep, attention, and cardiovascular symptoms²¹. The impact extends beyond
89 patients to affect caregivers, who grapple with their own set of health issues, depression, and
90 social impediments²².

91 Nevertheless, conventional evaluations frequently fall short in encompassing
92 neuropsychiatric symptoms, altered behavior patterns, financial hardships, and legal

93 entanglements²³, failing to capture the full spectrum of these disorders. This underscores the
94 crucial need for an integrative approach, considering the perspectives of both patients and
95 caregivers and acknowledging the complex interconnections between symptoms²⁴.

96 The US FDA Adverse Event Reporting System (FAERS), a public global repository
97 gathering spontaneous reports on suspected ADRs from patients and healthcare professionals,
98 stands as a powerful data source for this purpose²⁵. Remarkably, patients offer unique
99 insights into the experiences and impacts of ADRs on QoL, surpassing the information
100 provided by healthcare professionals²⁶⁻³⁰.

101 Moreover, network analyses, providing the means to investigate complex systems
102 consisting of multiple interacting entities, present a promising avenue. Specifically, they
103 enable the analysis and visualization of ADRs as interwoven symptoms and signs rather than
104 isolated events³¹—a composite syndrome encompassing psychosocial implications.

105 Our investigation into the intricacies of drug-induced impulsivity aligns with three
106 overarching goals. The first is to untangle the components of the syndrome of drug-induced
107 impulsivity. Through examining the interplay of symptoms and their consequences, we aim
108 to gain a deeper understanding of how these syndromes manifest and affect patients' lives.

109 Our second goal is to identify distinct sub-syndromes within the broader spectrum of
110 drug-induced impulsivity, i.e., whether symptoms fall into distinct clusters, with different
111 clinical consequences.


112 Our third goal is to identify pivotal symptoms that centrally contribute to exacerbating
113 the syndrome of drug-induced impulsivity. By pinpointing these key symptoms, we aim to
114 pave the way for targeted interventions that alleviate the adverse effects on patients' lives.

115 In pursuing these goals, our study focuses on recipients of pramipexole and
116 aripiprazole, chosen as representative instances: pramipexole, a dopamine agonist used in
117 neurological conditions, and aripiprazole, a dopamine partial agonist employed in psychiatric
118 disorders. Through this focused investigation, we aim to illuminate the complexities of drug-
119 induced impulsivity, exploring how the same ADR might manifest differently in various
120 populations. Specifically, we anticipate that younger and more stigmatized individuals taking
121 aripiprazole may bear a heavier burden compared to older individuals with stronger social
122 support prescribed pramipexole. A better understanding of the impact of these ADRs on
123 quality of life could contribute to informed decision-making for patients and caregivers,
124 laying the foundation for interventions capable of alleviating the toll exacted by impulsivity.

125 2. Materials and Methods

126 2.0 Study Design

127 The study design (**Figure 1**) involved downloading and cleaning FAERS reports
128 (Step 1), identifying aripiprazole and pramipexole recipients, and selecting cases recording
129 drug-induced impulsivity within these two populations (Step 2). Disproportionality analysis
130 defined the syndrome as events statistically co-reported with drug-induced impulsivity, rather
131 than with other suspected reactions of the same drug (Step 3). Subsequently, three parallel
132 network analyses identified sub-syndromes as clusters of co-reported events (Step 4). Finally,
133 a Bayesian Network (Step 5) provided insights into the potential direction of associations and
134 the secondary impact of drug-induced impulsivity (Step 5).



135

136

137

Figure 1. Pipeline of the study, showing step-by-step the study design.

138 2.1 Step 1 – Data Preprocessing

139 We downloaded quarterly FAERS data in ASCII format (January 1st, 2004, to March
140 31st, 2022)³². Adverse events were coded to the Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities
141 (MedDRA®, version 25.0) preferred terms (PTs)³³, while drugs were standardized to active
142 ingredients³⁴. The latest report version was retained, and rule-based deduplication was
143 applied to reduce redundancy (cfr. <https://github.com/fusarolimichele/DiAna>).

144 2.2 Step 2 – Case Retrieval

145 Analyzing aripiprazole and pramipexole recipients separately, we identified cases as
146 reports recording impulsivity. Following FAERS coding of events to MedDRA, we employed
147 PTs that were specifically curated for investigating drug-induced impulsivity within the
148 FAERS database¹⁰. These PTs encompassed a range of manifestations, including gambling,
149 hypersexuality, compulsive shopping, hyperphagia, gaming, setting fires, stealing, hoarding,
150 excessive exercise, overwork, compulsive wandering, body-focused repetitive behaviors,
151 stereotypy, and impulsivity (see **Table S1**). A cautious approach is imperative during
152 interpretation, as MedDRA terms used for reporting suspected ADRs may not align directly
153 with terms in other frameworks like the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of mental disorders
154 (DSM-5-TR) and ICD-11, which may refer to idiopathic conditions.

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

160 2.3 Step 3 – Disproportionality Analysis: The drug-induced impulsivity syndrome

161 We conducted a disproportionality analysis to identify events frequently co-reported with
162 drug-induced impulsivity, separately for aripiprazole and pramipexole recipients (see **Table**
163 **1**).

164 **Table 1. 2-way contingency table.** The table shows the different instances that can be observed when considering
165 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

166 Disproportionate reporting was assessed using the Information Component (IC)³⁵, also
167 known as pointwise mutual information (PMI) in information theory^{36,37}. The IC compares
168 the actual co-reporting of two events x (i.e., drug-induced impulsivity) and y (i.e., any
169 specific event) with their expected co-reporting if their probability were independent³⁶. To
170 mitigate the risk of false positives for infrequent events³⁸, a shrinkage or smoothing approach
171 was applied by adding $k=0.5$ to both the numerator and denominator. Significance was
172 determined using $IC_{0.25} > 0$ ($p(y, x) > p(x) * p(y)$).

$$IC(x, y) = PMI(x, y) = \log_2 \frac{p(y, x)}{p(x)p(y)} = \log_2 \frac{n_{I_1 E_1} * N}{n_{I_1} * n_{E_1}} \approx \log_2 \frac{n_{I_1 E_1} + 0.5}{\frac{n_{I_1} * n_{E_1} + 0.5}{N}}$$

$$IC(x, y)_{0.25} = IC - 3.3 * (n_{I_1 E_1} + 0.5)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - 2 * (n_{I_1 E_1} + 0.5)^{-\frac{3}{2}}$$

$$IC(x, y)_{0.975} = IC + 2.4 * (n_{I_1 E_1} + 0.5)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - 0.5 * (n_{I_1 E_1} + 0.5)^{-\frac{3}{2}}$$

173 2.4 Step 4 – Network Analysis: sub-syndromes

174 Building on insights from prior studies on drugs³⁹ and events^{31,40,41} co-occurrence, our
175 network analysis aimed to unveil sub-syndromes. Using three established network
176 estimations as distinct mathematical representations (PPMI, Ising, ϕ) and excluding negative
177 links (i.e., potential mutually exclusive events), we explored co-reporting patterns.

178 The positive pointwise mutual information (PPMI) focused on cases where events
179 were reported together (the n_{11} case), applying additive smoothing ($k=1$, $d=N^\circ$ events⁴²).
180 Bootstrap and Bonferroni adjustments assessed statistical significance, with a 0.01 threshold.

$$PPMI_{x,y} = \max \left(\log_2 \frac{(n_{11} + k) \times (N + kd)}{(n_{1*} + k) \times (n_{*1} + k)}, 0 \right)$$

181 The Ising model computed partial logistic regression coefficients (β) considering the
182 impact of all other events⁴³. Positive coefficients indicated a tendency for two events to be
183 reported together. A LASSO method pruned out weak links, eliminating spurious
184 associations but potentially sacrificing weaker genuine relationships⁴⁴.

$$Ising_{x,y} = \max \left(\frac{1}{2} \beta_{x,y} \beta_{y,x}, 0 \right)$$

185 The ϕ coefficient⁴⁵, akin to the traditional correlation coefficient, approaches one when two
186 events are frequently reported together and converges to zero if they are either independent or
187 mutually exclusive. The Bonferroni adjustment was applied with a significance threshold of
188 0.01. The p-value was computed using a χ^2 probability distribution with one degree of
189 freedom⁴⁵.

$$\phi_{x,y} = \max\left(\frac{n_{11}n_{00} - n_{10}n_{01}}{\sqrt{n_{1*}n_{0*}n_{*1}n_{*0}}}, 0\right)$$

190 For each population, the three networks shared identical nodes but varied in links. We
191 used modularity maximization⁴⁶ and the greedy modularity algorithm⁴⁷ to detect clusters of
192 co-reported signs and symptoms. Between networks we compared degree of link overlap
193 (Jaccard similarity index⁴⁸), goodness of partitioning (clustering modularity); cluster
194 agreement (Purity index⁴⁹⁻⁵¹), link density (ratio of actual links to possible links), and
195 interconnectedness among neighbors (small worldness⁵²).

196 2.5 Step 5 – Bayesian Network: The secondary impact of drug-induced impulsivity

197 To uncover potential ramifications following drug-induced impulsivity, we estimated the
198 conditional probabilities of chained events. The resulting Bayesian network is both directed,
199 offering insights into plausible causal relationships, and acyclic, ensuring that any chain
200 originating from a node does not loop back to itself. The network was derived through 1000
201 bootstraps, optimizing the BIC score with the Hill-Climbing algorithm. We computed the
202 average network retaining links exceeding a threshold computed via L_1 minimization.
203 Evaluation focused on nodes with the highest out-degree centrality and the main
204 manifestations of drug-induced impulsivity.

205


206 3. Results

207 3.1 Case Retrieval

208 After preprocessing FAERS quarterly data, we retrieved 12,030,756 distinct reports:
209 27,601 pramipexole recipients and 80,238 aripiprazole recipients. Suspected drug-induced
210 impulsivity was documented in 7.49% of pramipexole recipients (n=2,066: mainly gambling
211 disorder–n=1,345; 4.87%–, hypersexuality–612; 2.22%–, impulsivity–453; 1.64%–,
212 compulsive shopping–384; 1.39%–, and hyperphagia–334; 1.21%–) and in 4.50%
213 aripiprazole recipients (n=3,609: mainly gambling disorder–n=2,067; 2.58%–,
214 hypersexuality–1,077; 1.34%–, compulsive shopping–1,029; 1.28%–, hyperphagia–868;
215 1.08%–, and impulsivity–730; 0.91%–) (see **Table S2**).

216 Among pramipexole recipients, drug-induced impulsivity was more frequently
217 reported in males (57.42% vs. 36.99%, p<0.001), with lower median age (56 vs. 67,
218 p<0.001), often non-serious outcomes (i.e., no death, disability, or hospitalization; 44.87%
219 vs. 33.58%, p<0.001), and PD as indication (see **Figure 2** and **Table S3**). Similarly, among
220 aripiprazole recipients, drug-induced impulsivity was more common in males (48.59% vs.

221 40.72%, $p < 0.001$), but with hospitalization more common (33.39% vs. 23.39%, $p < 0.001$),
 222 and an important portion of reports submitted by lawyers (34.08% vs. 1.10%, $p < 0.001$) (see
 223 **Table S4**).



224
 225 **Figure 2 – Characteristics of the investigated populations.** The figure presents information about two populations
 226 extracted from the deduplicated FAERS database - one consisting of reports related to pramipexole and the other consisting
 227 of reports related to aripiprazole. Within these populations, cases of pathologic impulsivity were identified. The figure
 228 compares drug-induced impulsivity cases and the reference group (other reports recording the drug), considering the
 229 indication for use. Only the two most prevalent indications were taken into account. For each drug and indication, the
 230 caption describes the percentage of reports with the specified indication, the percent of reports involving males, and the
 231 median and interquartile range of ages. In the drug-induced impulsivity cases sections, green and red arrows indicate
 232 variables that are respectively higher or lower than expected based on the reference group.


233

234 3.2 Disproportionality Analysis: the drug-induced impulsivity syndrome

235 A total of 56 events were disproportionately reported with pramipexole-related
236 impulsivity. The highest IC was found for obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD, reporting
237 rate = 26.77%; IC median = 3.47, 95%CI = 3.33-3.57), emotional distress (21.35%; 3.42,
238 3.26-3.54), marital problem (1.11%; 3.30, 2.61-3.79), dependence (2.37%; 3.26, 2.79-3.6),
239 economic problems (6.05%; 3.15, 2.85-3.36), compulsions (1.74%; 3.05, 2.49-3.44), fear
240 (4.65%; 2.95, 2.61-3.19), eating disorder (2.47%; 2.95, 2.49-3.28), personality change
241 (2.66%; 2.93, 2.49-3.26), and suicide attempt (5.28%; 2.74, 2.43-2.97).

242 A total of 107 events were disproportionately reported with aripiprazole-related
243 impulsivity. The highest IC was found for bankruptcy (10.58%; 4.43, 4.26-4.55), divorce
244 (7.59%; 4.38, 4.19-4.53), homeless (6.93%; 4.37, 4.16-4.52), shoplifting (5.02%; 4.37, 4.12-
245 4.54), neuropsychiatric symptoms (4.74%; 4.35, 4.1-4.53), loss of employment (12.64%;
246 4.33, 4.18-4.44), theft (5.79%; 4.32, 4.09-4.48), economic problems (37.85%; 4.28, 4.19-
247 4.34), sexually transmitted disease (3.05%; 4.24, 3.93-4.47), and OCD (33.19%; 4.16, 4.07-
248 4.23) (see **Figure 3 and Table S5 and S6**).

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



249

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

255

256 3.3 Network Analysis: sub-syndromes

257 In the second step we estimated the networks using three different approaches and identifying
 258 clusters of events. We included a total of 120 nodes (107 events disproportionately reported
 259 with impulsivity + 13 impulsivity-related terms) and 70 nodes (56 + 14) for the aripiprazole
 260 and pramipexole network, respectively. Although the nodes remained constant, edges,
 261 clusters, and network properties were different (**Table 2-S7-S10-S11**). The most central
 262 nodes (degree centrality) were the ones with the highest occurrence in Ising and the lowest
 263 occurrence in PPMI. The Jaccard similarity was higher for Ising-, while for -PPMI half of
 264 the links were different. The clustering was more overlapping between -PPMI, followed by

265 ϕ -Ising and PPMI-Ising, as captured by the purity index. ϕ and PPMI tended to group
 266 together multiple Ising clusters (Figures S11-S16).

267

268 **Table 2. Network properties.** The table shows the network properties for the three networks estimated for aripiprazole and
 269 pramipexole, respectively, and for their comparison. Legend: (-) means that there is also a strong link between the first and
 270 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 variable – effect incomplete Theft–shoplifting	(-)AP below therapeutic–effect variable–toxicity(-)	Kleptomania–overwork–pyromania Overwork–poriomania
Clusters (N)	10	5	4
Clustering modularity	0.71	0.59	0.46
Small worldness (ω)	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
Pramipexole (70 nodes)			
gambling disorder (N=1340), obsessive-compulsive disorders (553), and hypersexuality (543)			
	Ising	ϕ	PPMI
Links (density %)	85	240	576
Central node (1°)	gambling disorder	mental disorder	pyromania
Heaviest links (1-3°)	body-focused disorders–kleptomania mental impairment–mental disorder on and off phenomenon–dyskinesia	Pain–emotional distress–obsessive-compulsive disorder Hyperphagia–weight increased	(-)Poriomania–pyromania–gaming disorder(-)
Clusters (N)	10	6	4
Clustering modularity	0.66	0.51	0.15
Small worldness (ω) §	-0.01	0.29	0.47
	ϕ -Ising	ϕ -PPMI	PPMI-Ising
Jaccard (out of max)	0.34 (0.35)	0.23 (0.42)	0.12 (0.15)
Purity index	0.44	0.66	0.39

271 † $J(A, B) = \frac{|A \cap B|}{|A \cup B|}$.

272 ‡ 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.

273 § 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


274 network r and the clustering coefficient C is similar to that of an equivalent lattice network l .

275

276 For both drugs, the central clusters included cognitive disorders (e.g., cognitive impairment,
 277 memory impairment), bipolar disorder, and depression. Among aripiprazole recipients
 278 (**Figure 4**), the prominent cluster also includes stress and its psychophysical manifestations
 279 (irritability, headache, sleep disorders, decreased appetite, weight loss, constipation, and
 280 myalgia), together with panic attack and auditory hallucinations. Another stress-related sub-

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

281 syndrome included migraine, nightmares, back and abdominal pain, arthralgia, reflux,
282 diarrhoea, and hyperhidrosis. Gambling and shopping were strictly related to social issues
283 (hoarding, unemployment, homeless, bankruptcy, divorce, theft), suicide attempts, and
284 through hypersexuality with unintended pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases.
285 Hyperphagia was co-reported with obesity, sleep apnoea syndrome, sedation, amnesia, and
286 hypertension. Blood alterations, such as increased lipids, transaminases, and glucose in the
287 blood, were reported together.




288
289 **Figure 4. The secondary impact of aripiprazole-induced impulsivity.** The network shows the events disproportionately reported with
290 aripiprazole-related impulsivity and their pattern of co-reporting. Drug-induced impulsivity manifestations are shown as squares and other
291 events as circles. Node colors identify clusters from the Ising estimation, dashed contours for the Ising estimation, and colored contours for the
292 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
293 conservative. The layout has been manually adjusted to reduce the overlapping. The layout calculated using a spring model with, as weight,
294 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
295 the supplementary material.

296

297 Among pramipexole recipients (**Figure 5**), the prominent cluster also includes apathy,
298 delusion, and economic problems. A sub-syndrome included terms related to dopamine

299 dysregulation syndrome (a manifestation of pathological impulsivity marked by excessive
300 levodopa use⁵³, which can be co-administered with dopamine agonists to better control motor
301 symptoms), such as drug dependence and withdrawal, and on and off phenomenon.
302 Hallucinations, irritability, and crying were reported with delusional jealousy, hypersexuality,
303 and marital problems. Hyperphagia was associated with weight increase, somnolence,
304 insomnia, and disturbance in attention. Fear, anxiety, pain, stress, and depression were
305 associated with suicide attempts. Finally, body-focused repetitive behaviors and stealing
306 behaviors showed strong co-reporting.




307
308 **Figure 5. The secondary impact of pramipexole-induced impulsivity.** The network shows the events disproportionately reported with
309 pramipexole-related impulsivity and their pattern of co-reporting. Drug-induced impulsivity manifestations are shown as squares and other
310 events as circles. Node colors identify clusters from the Ising estimation, dashed contours for the Ising estimation, and colored contours for the
311 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
312 conservative. The layout has been manually adjusted to reduce the overlapping. The layout calculated using a spring model with, as weight,
313 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
314 the supplementary material.

315

316 3.4 Bayesian Network: The secondary impact of drug-induced impulsivity

317 The Bayesian Network yielded insights into the directional associations between co-reported
318 events (see **Figure 6** and OSF repository⁵⁴).



319

320

321

322

323

324

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.

325

326 High out-degree centrality identified pivotal events that likely heightened the likelihood of
327 reporting other events (Figure S9-S10). Since this directed network only generates
328 hypotheses, we preferred temporal terminology (i.e., preceding and following) to causal
329 terminology even if no temporality was taken into account.

330 In pramipexole recipients, anxiety (3.55), emotional distress (2.92), and gambling (2.30)
331 attained the highest out-degree centrality. Anxiety preceded insomnia (with irritability,
332 somnolence, and attention disturbances), stress and depression (with suicide), fear, OCD, and
333 emotional distress. Emotional distress preceded pain and injury (with major depression and
334 economic problems), abnormal thinking and behavior, weight gain, and pathologic gambling.
335 Furthermore, hypersexuality preceded delusional jealousy and marital difficulties,
336 compulsive shopping stealing behaviors, and hyperphagia weight increase.

337 In aripiprazole recipients, economic problems (5.97), gambling (4.15), and hyperphagia
338 (2.33) attained the highest out-degree centrality. Economic problems preceded theft,
339 hoarding, divorce, loss of employment, homelessness, suicide, sex dysfunction, sexually
340 transmitted diseases, and eating disorder. Gambling preceded aggressivity, suicide, cognitive
341 disorders, hyperphagia, and paraphilia. Hyperphagia preceded somnolence and fatigue (with
342 stress, attention disturbances, myalgia, cough), hunger, weight increase (with constipation),
343 obesity (with hypertension), compulsive wandering, and paraphilic disorders. Anxiety
344 preceded depression (with sleep disorders and suicide), fear and panic attacks (with
345 relationship issues), pain and injury (with emotional distress, disability, anhedonia, and
346 economic problems). Furthermore, hypersexuality preceded sexual dysfunction, sexually
347 transmitted diseases, unintended pregnancy, and loss of employment, compulsive shopping
348 eating disorders and economic problems.

349

350

351 4. Discussion

352 4.1 Summary and Key Results

353 Patients and caregivers should be informed about the potential impact of drugs inducing
354 impulsivity on their QoL. Investigating aripiprazole and pramipexole, we captured the main
355 clinical scenarios at risk of drug-induced impulsivity. Disproportionality analysis revealed
356 features of the impulsivity syndrome for each scenario, encompassing mainly psychosocial
357 events but also organic conditions. Network analysis identified sub-syndromes such as
358 delusional jealousy (also known as Othello syndrome⁵⁵) and dopamine dysregulation

359 syndrome (i.e., the excessive use of levodopa) in pramipexole recipients, and obesity-
360 hypoventilation syndrome (historically Pickwickian syndrome) and social issues in
361 aripiprazole recipients. The Bayesian Network highlighted directional associations,
362 potentially suggesting secondary consequences of drug-induced impulsivity. Anxiety and
363 economic problems emerged as pivotal events that could be potentially targeted to disrupt the
364 chain of events and alleviate the burden of drug-induced impulsivity: for instance, monitoring
365 and effectively managing anxiety or providing financial guidance or legal guardianship to
366 prevent wasteful spending. Since marital problems affect caregivers' QoL and increase the
367 risk of early placement in nursing homes²², addressing delusional jealousy and economic
368 problems, identified as factors preceding marital problems, may be critical for preserving
369 wellbeing in pramipexole recipients.

370 While aripiprazole and pramipexole offer clear benefits, the substantial impact on patients'
371 and caregivers' QoL should be acknowledged and considered in the monitoring and
372 management of dopamine agonist therapies.

373 4.2 Case Retrieval

374 Our findings align with established risk factors, including male gender and younger age^{56,57},
375 Parkinson's Disease (PD)^{58,59} and depression⁶⁰. Commonly reported impulsivity
376 manifestations included the "four knights"⁹ (i.e., gambling, shopping, hyperphagia, and
377 hypersexuality), garnering special attention due to their pronounced impact on QoL. Other
378 manifestations were body-focused repetitive behaviors, paraphilic disorders, and hoarding.

379 4.3 Disproportionality analysis: the drug-induced impulsivity syndrome

380 Pramipexole and aripiprazole recipients differ significantly. Pramipexole is primarily
381 administered to older patients with hypodopaminergic conditions, characterized by motor
382 impairment and reduced motivational drive. These patients, well managed and supported by
383 caregivers because of the later onset and clear neurologic origin of the disease may
384 experience a mitigated drug-induced impulsivity burden. Conversely, aripiprazole is
385 prescribed to younger patients with mood and psychotic disorders, often linked to
386 hyperdopaminergic states and a pre-existing diathesis for impulsivity. Challenges for
387 caregivers and social support are heightened in these cases due to earlier onset, psychiatric
388 origins, and stigma, potentially leading to a greater burden. Over a third of aripiprazole cases
389 were submitted by lawyers, suggesting potential overreporting for legal compensation (cfr.,
390 Abilify lawsuit)⁶¹, but also a response to underdiagnosis by physicians hesitant to attribute
391 behavioral changes to the drug in the presence of underlying psychiatric conditions.
392 Intriguingly, an ascertainment bias may also arise because neurologists prescribing


393 pramipexole may be less attuned to psychiatric issues than psychiatrists prescribing
394 aripiprazole, further underscoring the contrast in the reported impact on QoL for these two
395 drugs.

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

403 This approach revealed a complex syndrome, characterized by psychosocial, cognitive,
404 psychosomatic, and metabolic events. The burden of drug-induced impulsivity appears more
405 pronounced in aripiprazole recipients, with functional (or psychosomatic) manifestations and
406 social issues impacting work, relationships, and economics.

407 4.4 Network Analysis: sub-syndromes

408 Network analysis, employing three estimation methods, revealed potential subsyndromes
409 associated with specific impulsivity expressions in the two populations (**Figure 7**). The Ising
410 delineated well-defined clusters, while PPMI and ϕ emphasized inter-clusters relationships.



411 **Figure 7. Drug-induced impulsivity syndrome, aripiprazole and pramipexole.** The main syndrome, representing one or more strongly
 412 interconnected central clusters of symptoms and signs identified through network analysis, is depicted as the central figure. Other potential
 413 sub-syndromes are shown on the sides highlighted with a colored square.
 414
 415

416 In both populations, cognitive and mood disorders, significant in their association with
 417 drug-induced impulsivity and contribution to disability development⁶² played central role.
 418 Obesity-hypoventilation syndrome⁶³, involving weight gain, cognitive and sleep disorders,
 419 and sedation, was consistent in both populations, but seemingly heavier in aripiprazole
 420 recipients (also reporting obesity, sleep apnoea syndrome, hypertension, and metabolic blood
 421 alterations, highlighting the link between hyperphagia and diabetes onset⁶⁴).

422 For aripiprazole recipients, the prominent cluster included sleep disorders and stress,
 423 connected to a psychosomatic sub-syndrome involving migraine, back and abdominal pain,
 424 reflux, diarrhoea, constipation, and hyperhidrosis. Gambling and shopping were linked to
 425 pervasive social issues, theft, and suicidal ideation (expected during hyperdopaminergic
 426 impulsive states⁶⁵). Hypersexuality was linked to unintended pregnancy, sexually transmitted
 427 diseases, and sexual dysfunction.

428 Among pramipexole recipients, the prominent cluster included apathy, delusion, and
429 economic problems. The dopamine dysregulation sub-syndrome⁶⁶, closely related to
430 impulsivity but primarily associated with levodopa and apomorphine⁶⁷, involved on and off
431 phenomenon (oscillations in effectiveness and motor and motivational symptoms), excessive
432 levodopa use to avoid off phases, and dopamine agonist withdrawal syndromes (DAWS)
433 upon discontinuation⁶⁸. A cluster aligned with paranoid delusional jealousy (false and
434 unwavering belief in the partner's unfaithfulness), often seen in PD with drug-induced
435 hypersexuality⁶⁹ presented challenges in marital relationships, potentially resulting in early
436 placement in a nursing home⁷⁰. We also found a cluster with fear, pain, stress, anxiety,
437 depression, and suicidal ideation, indicative of the transformation of reward-driven
438 impulsivity into stressful risk-averting compulsivity over time⁷¹. Finally, the co-reporting of
439 two archetypal compulsive symptoms—body-focused repetitive behaviors and stealing
440 behaviors—was evident.

441 4.5 Bayesian Network: the secondary impact of drug-induced impulsivity

442 The interplay of events within the context of drug-induced impulsivity is intricate and
443 multifaceted. Events reported alongside drug-induced impulsivity may result from
444 impulsivity itself (like financial problems from gambling) or predispose individuals to
445 impulsivity (e.g., bipolar disorder). Sometimes, events can both trigger and be exacerbated by
446 drug-induced impulsivity (e.g., anxiety^{72,73}). Sometimes events are concomitantly mentioned
447 for precision, such as in cases of semantic overlap (e.g., theft and shoplifting, or injury and
448 brain injury). Events associated with drug-induced impulsivity may even be synonyms for
449 well-known impulsivity expressions (e.g., restlessness, referring to excessive wandering and
450 poriomania⁶⁹), or could be the very reason for prescribing the drug, as seen in the off-label use
451 of aripiprazole to prevent behavioral and cognitive decline in brain injury⁷⁴ or to address drug
452 dependence^{75,76}.

453 The Bayesian Network a directed acyclic graph representing our dataset, revealed potential
454 directional associations, enabling formulation of hypotheses about clinically plausible causal
455 sequences. Anxiety emerged as a central factor, preceding insomnia, irritability, cognitive
456 impairment, stress, injury, pain (linked to disability and economic problems), depression, and
457 even suicidal ideation. Drug-induced impulsivity manifestations appeared to exacerbate each
458 other. Economic problems had the highest out-degree centrality among aripiprazole
459 recipients, preceding theft, relationship difficulties, and suicidal ideation.

460 The Bayesian Network provides clinicians with valuable insights on the pivotal nodes that
461 could be targeted by interventions to disrupt the cascade of events and ameliorate the

462 secondary impact of drug-induced impulsivity. It also highlighted secondary ramifications of
463 main impulsivity manifestations: hypersexuality precedes marital problems through
464 delusional jealousy in pramipexole recipients, while it precedes unintended pregnancy and
465 sexually transmitted diseases in aripiprazole recipients; hyperphagia precedes weight increase
466 in pramipexole recipients and obesity, somnolence, and cognitive impairment in aripiprazole.
467 Marital problems, following delusional jealousy and economic problems in pramipexole
468 recipients, may be of particular interest since they are associated with an early placement in
469 nursing homes⁷⁰. Finally, the Bayesian Network seems to support the higher secondary
470 impact of drug-induced impulsivity in aripiprazole recipients.

471 4.6 Limitations and Further Developments

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

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

481 Limitations in network analysis methodologies adopted include the Ising estimation's
482 assumptions (pairwise interaction, linear effects, and binary variables), and the inability to
483 account for time and severity in symptom manifestation. The incorporation of negative links
484 could facilitate a more nuanced separation of symptoms that infrequently co-occur. The
485 Bayesian Network lacks bidirectional relationships and cyclic feedback loops and would
486 require the inclusion of all shared cause between any two events (causal Markov condition)
487 limiting its capacity to illuminate causality. These limitations could be rectified by integrating
488 clinical longitudinal data and embedding temporal aspects into the network analysis.

489 Looking ahead, a broader definition of drug-induced impulsivity could improve
490 sensitivity in case retrieval. Conditions like suicide attempts, hypersomnia, obsessive-
491 compulsive symptoms, explosive anger, personality changes, disturbance in attention, and
492 drug dependence might represent different expressions of this underdefined condition,
493 warranting further exploration^{10,67}.

494

495 5. Conclusion

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

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

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

523 In sum, the intricate relationships between signs and symptoms, coupled with the insights
524 from the Bayesian Network, underscore the multifaceted nature of drug-induced impulsivity.
525 More significantly, it equips clinicians with indispensable tools to discern intervention points,
526 decipher causal sequences, and mitigate the cascading secondary effects associated with
527 drug-induced impulsivity. In doing so, this study contributes to advancing our

528 comprehension and management of drug-induced impulsivity, ultimately enhancing the well-
529 being and care of affected patients.

530

531 [Acknowledgements](#)

532 MedDRA®, version 25.0 was developed under the auspices of the International Council for
533 Harmonization of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use.

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

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

536

537 [Declarations](#)

538 **Funding:** No specific funding supported this research.

539 **Conflicts of interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest specific for this research.

540 **Ethics approval:** not applicable because spontaneous reports of the FAERS are anonymous and
541 publicly available.

542 **Consent to participate:** not applicable because spontaneous reports of the FAERS are anonymous
543 and publicly available.

544 **Consent for publication:** not applicable because spontaneous reports of the FAERS are anonymous
545 and publicly available.

546 **Software used:** Analyses were performed using R (version 4.2.1)⁷⁷ and Python (version 3.8.16)⁷⁸.
547 We relied on several essential packages for network analysis: *IsingFit*⁴³, *igraph*⁷⁹, *psych*⁸⁰, and
548 *bnlearn*⁸¹.

549 **Availability of data and material:** The data we used comes from the FDA Adverse Event Reporting
550 System (FAERS), and is made publicly available by the FDA as quarterly data downloadable at
551 <https://fis.fda.gov/extensions/FPD-QDE-FAERS/FPD-QDE-FAERS.html>. The algorithm for cleaning
552 FAERS data is open-source at <https://github.com/fusarolimichele/DiAna>, and the cleaned database is
553 available on an OSF repository⁸² and through the R package DiAna⁸³.

554 **Code availability:** The code for the project is available on an OSF repository⁵⁴, the function for the
555 Ising network is also available in the DiAna package (cfr. “network_analysis()”)⁸³.

556

557 **Author contributions:** MF, SP, LM, conceptualized and designed the study. MF, SP, LM developed
558 the methodology. The formal analysis was performed by MF, SP, LM, VG. MF, SP, VG performed
559 the visualization. MF, SP, LM, VG wrote the original draft. All the authors strongly contributed to the
560 interpretation of results, and to the review and editing of the draft. All the authors read and approved
561 the final version.

562 References

- 563 1. Engel GL. The need for a new medical model: a challenge for biomedicine. *Science*.
564 1977; 196: 129–36.
- 565 2. Kleinman A, Eisenberg L, Good B. Culture, illness, and care: clinical lessons from
566 anthropologic and cross-cultural research. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 1978; 88: 251–8.
- 567 3. Young A. The Anthropologies of Illness and Sickness. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 1982; 11:
568 257–85.
- 569 4. Lorimer S, Cox A, Langford NJ. A patient’s perspective: the impact of adverse drug
570 reactions on patients and their views on reporting. *J. Clin. Pharm. Ther.* 2012; 37: 148–
571 52.
- 572 5. Suh D-C, Woodall BS, Shin S-K, Santis ERH-D. Clinical and Economic Impact of
573 Adverse Drug Reactions in Hospitalized Patients. *Ann. Pharmacother.* 2000; 34: 1373–
574 9.
- 575 6. Rolfes L, van Hunsel F, Taxis K, van Puijenbroek E. The Impact of Experiencing
576 Adverse Drug Reactions on the Patient’s Quality of Life: A Retrospective Cross-
577 Sectional Study in the Netherlands. *Drug Saf.* 2016; 39: 769–76.
- 578 7. Calvert M, Kyte D, Mercieca-Bebber R, Slade A, Chan A-W, King MT, et al. Guidelines
579 for Inclusion of Patient-Reported Outcomes in Clinical Trial Protocols: The SPIRIT-
580 PRO Extension. *JAMA.* 2018; 319: 483–94.
- 581 8. Haag S, Junge L, Lotz F, McGauran N, Paulides M, Potthast R, et al. Results on patient-
582 reported outcomes are underreported in summaries of product characteristics for new
583 drugs. *J. Patient-Rep. Outcomes.* 2021; 5: 127.
- 584 9. Weintraub D. Impulse control disorders in Parkinson’s disease: A 20-year odyssey. *Mov.*
585 *Disord. Off. J. Mov. Disord. Soc.* 2019; 34: 447–52.
- 586 10. Fusaroli M, Raschi E, Contin M, Sambati L, Menchetti M, Fioritti A, et al. Impulsive
587 Conditions in Parkinson’s Disease: a pharmacosurveillance-supported list. *Parkinsonism*
588 *Relat. Disord.* 2021; 90: 79–83.
- 589 11. Fusaroli M, Pellegrini L, Fusaroli R, Raschi E, Menchetti M, Poluzzi E. Behavioral
590 excess and disruptive conduct: a historical and taxonomical approach to the origin of the
591 “Impulse Control Disorders” diagnostic construct. *Addiction.* 2022; n/a. [Cited 2022
592 Nov 21] Available from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/add.16086>
- 593 12. Grall-Bronnec M, Victorri-Vigneau C, Donnio Y, Leboucher J, Rousselet M, Thiabaud
594 E, et al. Dopamine Agonists and Impulse Control Disorders: A Complex Association.
595 *Drug Saf.* 2018; 41: 19–75.
- 596 13. Tippmann-Peikert M, Park JG, Boeve BF, Shepard JW, Silber MH. Pathologic gambling
597 in patients with restless legs syndrome treated with dopaminergic agonists. *Neurology.*
598 2007; 68: 301–3.
- 599 14. Cornelius JR, Tippmann-Peikert M, Slocumb NL, Frerichs CF, Silber MH. Impulse
600 Control Disorders with the use of Dopaminergic Agents in Restless Legs Syndrome: a
601 Case-Control Study. *Sleep.* 2010; 33: 81–7.
- 602 15. Fusaroli M, Raschi E, Giunchi V, Menchetti M, Rimondini Giorgini R, De Ponti F, et al.
603 Impulse Control Disorders by Dopamine Partial Agonists: A Pharmacovigilance-
604 Pharmacodynamic Assessment Through the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System. *Int.*
605 *J. Neuropsychopharmacol.* 2022; 25: 727–36.
- 606 16. Béreau M, Fleury V, Bouthour W, Castrioto A, Lhommée E, Krack P.
607 Hyperdopaminergic behavioral spectrum in Parkinson’s disease: A review. *Rev. Neurol.*
608 *(Paris).* 2018; 174: 653–63.

- 609 17. Jeyadevan A, Bakeberg M, Byrnes M, Kenna J, McGregor S, Ghosh S, et al. Quality of
610 life implications for elevated trait impulsivity in people with Parkinson's disease. *Qual.*
611 *Life Res.* 2023; 32: 1143–50.
- 612 18. Leplow B, Renftle D, Thomas M, Michaelis K, Solbrig S, Maetzler W, et al.
613 Characteristics of behavioural addiction in Parkinson's disease patients with self-
614 reported impulse control disorder and controls matched for levodopa equivalent dose: a
615 matched case–control study. *J. Neural Transm.* 2023; 130: 125–33.
- 616 19. Phu AL, Xu Z, Brakoulias V, Mahant N, Fung VSC, Moore GD, et al. Effect of impulse
617 control disorders on disability and quality of life in Parkinson's disease patients. *J. Clin.*
618 *Neurosci.* 2014; 21: 63–6.
- 619 20. Skorvanek M, Rosenberger J, Minar M, Grofik M, Han V, Groothoff JW, et al.
620 Relationship between the non-motor items of the MDS–UPDRS and Quality of Life in
621 patients with Parkinson's disease. *J. Neurol. Sci.* 2015; 353: 87–91.
- 622 21. Jesús S, Labrador-Espinosa MA, Adarmes AD, Méndel-Del Barrio C, Martínez-Castrillo
623 JC, Alonso-Cánovas A, et al. Non-motor symptom burden in patients with Parkinson's
624 disease with impulse control disorders and compulsive behaviours: results from the
625 COPPADIS cohort. *Sci. Rep.* 2020; 10: 16893.
- 626 22. Schrag A, Hovris A, Morley D, Quinn N, Jahanshahi M. Caregiver-burden in parkinson's
627 disease is closely associated with psychiatric symptoms, falls, and disability.
628 *Parkinsonism Relat. Disord.* 2006; 12: 35–41.
- 629 23. Antonini A, Barone P, Bonuccelli U, Annoni K, Asgharnejad M, Stanzione P. ICARUS
630 study: prevalence and clinical features of impulse control disorders in Parkinson's
631 disease. *J. Neurol. Neurosurg. Psychiatry.* 2017; 88: 317–24.
- 632 24. Castillon G, Salvo F, Moride Y. The Social Impact of Suspected Adverse Drug
633 Reactions: An analysis of the Canada Vigilance Spontaneous Reporting Database. *Drug*
634 *Saf.* 2019; 42: 27–34.
- 635 25. Research C for DE and. FDA Adverse Event Reporting System (FAERS): Latest
636 Quarterly Data Files. *FDA.* 2019; [Cited 2023 Jul 13] Available from
637 [https://www.fda.gov/drugs/questions-and-answers-fdas-adverse-event-reporting-system-](https://www.fda.gov/drugs/questions-and-answers-fdas-adverse-event-reporting-system-faers/fda-adverse-event-reporting-system-faers-latest-quarterly-data-files)
638 [faers/fda-adverse-event-reporting-system-faers-latest-quarterly-data-files](https://www.fda.gov/drugs/questions-and-answers-fdas-adverse-event-reporting-system-faers/fda-adverse-event-reporting-system-faers-latest-quarterly-data-files)
- 639 26. Härmark L, van Hunsel F, Grundmark B. ADR Reporting by the General Public: Lessons
640 Learnt from the Dutch and Swedish Systems. *Drug Saf.* 2015; 38: 337–47.
- 641 27. Härmark L, Raine J, Leufkens H, Edwards IR, Moretti U, Sarinic VM, et al. Patient-
642 Reported Safety Information: A Renaissance of Pharmacovigilance? *Drug Saf.* 2016;
643 39: 883–90.
- 644 28. Inácio P, Cavaco A, Airaksinen M. The value of patient reporting to the
645 pharmacovigilance system: a systematic review. *Br. J. Clin. Pharmacol.* 2017; 83: 227–
646 46.
- 647 29. Rolfes L, van Hunsel F, Wilkes S, van Grootheest K, van Puijenbroek E. Adverse drug
648 reaction reports of patients and healthcare professionals-differences in reported
649 information. *Pharmacoepidemiol. Drug Saf.* 2015; 24: 152–8.
- 650 30. Watson S, Chandler RE, Taavola H, Härmark L, Grundmark B, Zekarias A, et al. Safety
651 Concerns Reported by Patients Identified in a Collaborative Signal Detection Workshop
652 using VigiBase: Results and Reflections from Lareb and Uppsala Monitoring Centre.
653 *Drug Saf.* 2018; 41: 203–12.
- 654 31. Fusaroli M, Raschi E, Gatti M, De Ponti F, Poluzzi E. Development of a Network-Based
655 Signal Detection Tool: The COVID-19 Adversome in the FDA Adverse Event
656 Reporting System. *Front. Pharmacol.* 2021; 12: 3542.
- 657 32. FAERS Quarterly Data Extract Files. [Cited 2022 Dec 24] Available from
658 <https://fis.fda.gov/extensions/FPD-QDE-FAERS/FPD-QDE-FAERS.html>

- 659 33. MedDRA. [Cited 2023 Feb 4] Available from <https://www.meddra.org/>
- 660 34. Fusaroli M, Giunchi V, Battini V, Puligheddu S, Khouri C, Carnovale C, et al.
- 661 Standardization of drug names in the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System: The
- 662 DiAna dictionary. 2023; : 2023.06.07.23291076. [Cited 2023 Jun 15] Available from
- 663 <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.06.07.23291076v1>
- 664 35. Norén GN, Hopstadius J, Bate A. Shrinkage observed-to-expected ratios for robust and
- 665 transparent large-scale pattern discovery. *Stat. Methods Med. Res.* 2013; 22: 57–69.
- 666 36. Church KW, Hanks P. Word Association Norms, Mutual Information, and Lexicography.
- 667 *Comput. Linguist.* 1990; 16: 22–9.
- 668 37. Recchia G, Jones MN. More data trumps smarter algorithms: Comparing pointwise
- 669 mutual information with latent semantic analysis. *Behav. Res. Methods.* 2009; 41: 647–
- 670 56.
- 671 38. Role F, Nadif M. Handling the Impact of Low Frequency Events on Co-occurrence based
- 672 Measures of Word Similarity - A Case Study of Pointwise Mutual Information. 2011.
- 673 39. Fusaroli M, Pelletti G, Giunchi V, Pugliese C, Bartolucci M, Necibi EN, et al. Deliberate
- 674 Self-Poisoning: Real-Time Characterization of Suicidal Habits and Toxidromes in the
- 675 Food and Drug Administration Adverse Event Reporting System. *Drug Saf.* 2023;
- 676 [Cited 2023 Feb 2] Available from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40264-022-01269-x>
- 677 40. Pauline O, Robert M, Bernardeau C, Hlavaty A, Fusaroli M, Roustit M, et al. Assessment
- 678 of Reported Adverse Events After Interchanging Between TNF- α Inhibitor Biosimilars
- 679 in the WHO Pharmacovigilance Database. *BioDrugs.* 2023; [Cited 2023 Jun 12]
- 680 Available from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40259-023-00603-8>
- 681 41. Orre R, Bate A, Norén GN, Swahn E, Arnborg S, Edwards IR. A bayesian recurrent
- 682 neural network for unsupervised pattern recognition in large incomplete data sets. *Int. J.*
- 683 *Neural Syst.* 2005; 15: 207–22.
- 684 42. Chen SF, Goodman J. An empirical study of smoothing techniques for language
- 685 modeling. **In:** Proceedings of the 34th annual meeting on Association for Computational
- 686 Linguistics. USA: Association for Computational Linguistics; 1996 [Cited 2023 Mar
- 687 17]. p. 310–8. [Cited 2023 Mar 17] Available from
- 688 <https://doi.org/10.3115/981863.981904>
- 689 43. van Borkulo CD, Borsboom D, Epskamp S, Blanken TF, Boschloo L, Schoevers RA, et
- 690 al. A new method for constructing networks from binary data. *Sci. Rep.* 2014; 4: 5918.
- 691 44. Epskamp S, Borsboom D, Fried EI. Estimating psychological networks and their
- 692 accuracy: A tutorial paper. *Behav. Res. Methods.* 2018; 50: 195–212.
- 693 45. Yule GU. On the Methods of Measuring Association Between Two Attributes. *J. R. Stat.*
- 694 *Soc.* 1912; 75: 579–652.
- 695 46. Newman MEJ, Girvan M. Finding and evaluating community structure in networks.
- 696 *Phys. Rev. E.* 2004; 69: 026113.
- 697 47. Newman MEJ. Fast algorithm for detecting community structure in networks. *Phys. Rev.*
- 698 *E.* 2004; 69: 066133.
- 699 48. Jaccard P. The Distribution of the Flora in the Alpine Zone.1. *New Phytol.* 1912; 11: 37–
- 700 50.
- 701 49. Rezaei M, Fränti P. Set Matching Measures for External Cluster Validity. *IEEE Trans.*
- 702 *Knowl. Data Eng.* 2016; 28: 2173–86.
- 703 50. Gates AJ, Wood IB, Hetrick WP, Ahn Y-Y. Element-centric clustering comparison
- 704 unifies overlaps and hierarchy. *Sci. Rep.* 2019; 9: 8574.
- 705 51. Meilă M. Comparing Clusterings by the Variation of Information. **In:** Schölkopf B,
- 706 Warmuth MK (eds.). *Learning Theory and Kernel Machines.* Berlin, Heidelberg:
- 707 Springer; 2003. p. 173–87.

- 708 52. Telesford QK, Joyce KE, Hayasaka S, Burdette JH, Laurienti PJ. The Ubiquity of Small-
709 World Networks. *Brain Connect.* 2011; 1: 367–75.
- 710 53. Okai D, Samuel M, Askey-Jones S, David AS, Brown RG. Impulse control disorders and
711 dopamine dysregulation in Parkinson’s disease: a broader conceptual framework. *Eur. J.*
712 *Neurol.* 2011; 18: 1379–83.
- 713 54. Fusaroli M, Polizzi S, Menestrina L, Giunchi V. Unveiling the Hidden Toll of Drug-
714 Induced Impulse Control Disorders. 2023; [Cited 2023 Aug 20] Available from
715 <https://osf.io/k9v6s/>
- 716 55. El Otmani H, sabiry S, Bellakhdar S, El Moutawakil B, Abdoh Rafai M. Othello
717 syndrome in Parkinson’s disease: A diagnostic emergency of an underestimated
718 condition. *Rev. Neurol. (Paris).* 2021; 177: 690–3.
- 719 56. Weintraub D, Koester J, Potenza MN, Siderowf AD, Stacy M, Voon V, et al. Impulse
720 control disorders in Parkinson disease: a cross-sectional study of 3090 patients. *Arch.*
721 *Neurol.* 2010; 67: 589–95.
- 722 57. Santangelo G, Barone P, Trojano L, Vitale C. Pathological gambling in Parkinson’s
723 disease. A comprehensive review. *Parkinsonism Relat. Disord.* 2013; 19: 645–53.
- 724 58. Jiménez-Urbieto H, Gago B, Quiroga-Varela A, Rodríguez-Chinchilla T, Merino-Galán
725 L, Oregi A, et al. Pramipexole-induced impulsivity in mildparkinsonian rats: a model of
726 impulse control disorders in Parkinson’s disease. *Neurobiol. Aging.* 2019; 75: 126–35.
- 727 59. Riddle JL, Rokosik SL, Napier TC. Pramipexole- and methamphetamine-induced reward-
728 mediated behavior in a rodent model of Parkinson’s disease and controls. *Behav. Brain*
729 *Res.* 2012; 233: 15–23.
- 730 60. Marín-Lahoz J, Sampedro F, Martínez-Horta S, Pagonabarraga J, Kulisevsky J.
731 Depression as a Risk Factor for Impulse Control Disorders in Parkinson Disease. *Ann.*
732 *Neurol.* 2019; 86: 762–9.
- 733 61. Blum AW, Jacobson K, Grant JE. Legal settlements and the reporting of adverse drug
734 events: Insights from the aripiprazole products liability litigation. *Psychiatry Res.* 2022;
735 309: 114411.
- 736 62. Voon V, Sohr M, Lang AE, Potenza MN, Siderowf AD, Whetteckey J, et al. Impulse
737 control disorders in parkinson disease: A multicenter case-control study. *Ann. Neurol.*
738 2011; 69: 986–96.
- 739 63. Masa JF, Pépin J-L, Borel J-C, Mokhlesi B, Murphy PB, Sánchez-Quiroga MÁ. Obesity
740 hypoventilation syndrome. *Eur. Respir. Rev.* 2019; 28: 180097.
- 741 64. de Jonge P, Alonso J, Stein DJ, Kiejna A, Aguilar-Gaxiola S, Viana MC, et al.
742 Associations between DSM-IV mental disorders and diabetes mellitus: a role for
743 impulse control disorders and depression. *Diabetologia.* 2014; 57: 699–709.
- 744 65. Evans AH, Strafella AP, Weintraub D, Stacy M. Impulsive and compulsive behaviors in
745 Parkinson’s disease. *Mov. Disord. Off. J. Mov. Disord. Soc.* 2009; 24: 1561–70.
- 746 66. De la Casa-Fages B, Grandas F. Dopamine Dysregulation Syndrome and Deep Brain
747 Stimulation of the Subthalamic Nucleus in Parkinson’s Disease. *Neurol. Res. Int.* 2011;
748 2011. [Cited 2021 Jun 16] Available from
749 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3216377/>
- 750 67. Weintraub D, David AS, Evans AH, Grant JE, Stacy M. Clinical spectrum of impulse
751 control disorders in Parkinson’s disease. *Mov. Disord. Off. J. Mov. Disord. Soc.* 2015;
752 30: 121–7.
- 753 68. Yu XX, Fernandez HH. Dopamine agonist withdrawal syndrome: A comprehensive
754 review. *J. Neurol. Sci.* 2017; 374: 53–5.
- 755 69. Kataoka H, Sugie K. Delusional Jealousy (Othello Syndrome) in 67 Patients with
756 Parkinson’s Disease. *Front. Neurol.* 2018; 9.

- 757 70. Aarsland D, Larsen JP, Tandberg E, Laake K. Predictors of Nursing Home Placement in
758 Parkinson's Disease: A Population-Based, Prospective Study. *J. Am. Geriatr. Soc.* 2000;
759 48: 938–42.
- 760 71. Lopez AM, Weintraub D, Claassen DO. Impulse Control Disorders and Related
761 Complications of Parkinson's Disease Therapy. *Semin. Neurol.* 2017; 37: 186–92.
- 762 72. Goerlich-Dobre KS, Probst C, Winter L, Witt K, Deuschl G, Möller B, et al.
763 Alexithymia-an independent risk factor for impulsive-compulsive disorders in
764 Parkinson's disease. *Mov. Disord. Off. J. Mov. Disord. Soc.* 2014; 29: 214–20.
- 765 73. Vriend C, Pattij T, van der Werf YD, Voorn P, Booij J, Rutten S, et al. Depression and
766 impulse control disorders in Parkinson's disease: Two sides of the same coin? *Neurosci.*
767 *Biobehav. Rev.* 2014; 38: 60–71.
- 768 74. Plummer NR, Tam AW, Mulvaney CA, Preston NJ, Laha SK. Dopamine agonists for
769 traumatic brain injury. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* 2018; [Cited 2023 Apr 14]
770 Available from
771 <https://www.cochranelibrary.com/cdsr/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD013062/full>
- 772 75. Feltenstein MW, Do PH, See RE. Repeated aripiprazole administration attenuates
773 cocaine seeking in a rat model of relapse. *Psychopharmacology (Berl.)*. 2009; 207: 401–
774 11.
- 775 76. Feltenstein MW, Altar CA, See RE. Aripiprazole blocks reinstatement of cocaine seeking
776 in an animal model of relapse. *Biol. Psychiatry*. 2007; 61: 582–90.
- 777 77. R: The R Project for Statistical Computing. [Cited 2023 Feb 4] Available from
778 <https://www.r-project.org/>
- 779 78. Welcome to Python.org. *Python.org*. 2023; [Cited 2023 Feb 4] Available from
780 <https://www.python.org/>
- 781 79. Csardi G, Nepusz T. The igraph software package for complex network research.
- 782 80. Revelle W. *Procedures for Psychological, Psychometric, and Personality Research*. R
783 package version 2.2.9. Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois: 2022. Available
784 from <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=psych>
- 785 81. Scutari M. Learning Bayesian Networks with the bnlearn R Package. *J. Stat. Softw.* 2010;
786 35: 1–22.
- 787 82. Fusaroli M, Giunchi V. DiAna: Repository for FAERS cleaning and analysis. 2023;
788 [Cited 2023 Aug 20] Available from <https://osf.io/zqu89/>
- 789 83. Fusaroli M, Giunchi V. DiAna R package: Advanced Disproportionality Analysis in the
790 FAERS for Drug Safety. 2023; [Cited 2023 Oct 21] Available from
791 https://github.com/fusarolimichele/DiAna_package
792