



This is an abridged version; the full version is on [bmj.com](http://bmj.com)

# Rapid tranquillisation for agitated patients in emergency psychiatric rooms: a randomised trial of midazolam versus haloperidol plus promethazine

TREC Collaborative Group

Correspondence to: G Huf, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Núcleo de Estudos de Saúde Coletiva, Av. Brigadeiro Trompowsky s/n, Edifício Hospital Universitário 5 andar, ala sul - Ilha do Fundão, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 21941-590, Caixa Postal 68037 [gisele@ensp.fiocruz.br](mailto:gisele@ensp.fiocruz.br)

BMJ 2003;327:708-11

## Abstract

**Objective** To compare two widely used drug treatments for people with aggression or agitation due to mental illness.

**Design** Pragmatic, randomised clinical trial.

**Setting** Three psychiatric emergency rooms in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

**Subjects** 301 aggressive or agitated people.

**Interventions** Open treatment with intramuscular midazolam or intramuscular haloperidol plus promethazine.

**Main outcome measures** Patients tranquil or sedated at 20 minutes. Secondary outcomes: patients tranquil or asleep by 40, 60, and 120 minutes; restrained or given extra drugs within 2 hours; severe adverse events; another episode of agitation or aggression; needing extra visits from doctor during first 24 hours; overall antipsychotic load in first 24 hours; and not discharged by two weeks.

**Results** 151 patients were randomised to midazolam, and 150 to haloperidol-promethazine mix. Follow up for the primary outcome was available for 298 (99%): 134/151 (89%) of patients given midazolam were tranquil or asleep after 20 minutes compared with 101/150 (67%) of those given haloperidol plus promethazine (relative risk 1.32 (95% confidence interval 1.16 to 1.49)). By 40 minutes, midazolam still had a statistically and clinically significant 13% relative advantage (1.13 (1.01 to 1.26)). After 1 hour, about 90% of both groups were tranquil or asleep. One important adverse event occurred in each group: a patient given midazolam had transient respiratory depression, and one given haloperidol-promethazine had a grande mal seizure.

**Conclusions** Both treatments were effective. Midazolam was more rapidly sedating than haloperidol-promethazine, reducing the time people are exposed to aggression. Adverse effects and resources to deal with them should be considered in the choice of the treatment.

## Introduction

Agitated or violent behaviour among patients is particularly prevalent in emergency psychiatric services (10%),<sup>1</sup> where most incidents are secondary to severe illnesses such as schizophrenia or substance misuse.<sup>2</sup> Any drugs used to calm such patients should work safely and swiftly. Guidelines differ on which drugs to use,<sup>3,4</sup> as do surveys of clinicians' preferred drug treatments,<sup>5,6</sup> although the broad class of older generation antipsychotics and benzodiazepines are often used.<sup>1,7</sup> Given the limited and unconvincing evidence in this subject, variations in guidance and practice are understandable.

In Rio de Janeiro a relatively low dose mixture of haloperidol, a typical neuroleptic, plus promethazine, an antihistamine with sedative and anticholinergic properties, is used for 80% of severe psychiatric emergencies, and a benzodiazepine is a second choice, both treatments given intramuscularly.<sup>7,8</sup> Of the two rapidly acting benzodiazepines, midazolam and lorazepam, only midazolam is available in Brazil as lorazepam is unstable at high temperatures. Haloperidol, promethazine, and midazolam are on Rio's list of essential drugs, and haloperidol and promethazine are on the World Health Organization's model list of essential drugs.<sup>9</sup>

Although new, atypical antipsychotic drugs may become available for use in psychiatric emergencies. These drugs are expensive and unlikely to affect the care of most people in need of emergency tranquillisation living in low or middle income countries.

## Methods

TREC (tranquilização rápida-ensaio clínico [rapid tranquillisation-clinical trial]) was a randomised controlled trial performed in three public psychiatric hospitals in the city of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.<sup>10</sup> These hospitals cover about 3.5 million people. We designed TREC not to interfere with the routine care of people in the participating centres, so eligibility criteria were simple and data collection limited to the minimum.

### Selection of patients

Patients were eligible for trial entry if the treating doctor considered that they needed acute intramuscular sedation because of agitation and dangerous behaviour and if the doctor was uncertain which treatment to use. Patients were ineligible if the clinician believed that one treatment represented an additional risk for the patient.

### Intervention and randomisation

We compared the standard treatment, haloperidol plus promethazine (drawn into the same syringe), with midazolam, both given by intramuscular injection. Doses were at the treating doctors' discretion. We made flumazenil, a benzodiazepine antagonist, available at each centre for use in the event of midazolam toxicity.

The drugs were randomly packed into identical cardboard boxes, sealed firmly with tape, and consecutively numbered. They contained either one ampoule of midazolam 15 mg or two ampoules of haloperidol 5 mg plus one of promethazine 50 mg, along with a syringe, needle, swabs, and a follow up form. Verification of order of allocated treatment was monitored throughout the study.<sup>10</sup> If a patient met the eligibility criteria, the treating clinician took the next consecutive box.

Members of the TREC Collaborative Group are listed at the end of the article

## Outcomes

The primary outcome of interest for emergency tranquillisation was "tranquillised or asleep by 20 minutes," chosen by an earlier survey.<sup>7</sup> Patients were considered tranquillised when they were calm and peaceful—that is, neither agitated nor restless, and not showing threatening verbal behaviour or physical aggression against objects, other people, or themselves.

Secondary outcomes were patients asleep by 20 minutes; tranquil or asleep by 40, 60, and 120 minutes; physically restrained or given additional drugs within two hours; severe adverse events; having another episode of agitation or aggression; needing extra visits from the treating doctor during the subsequent 24 hours; overall antipsychotic load in the first 24 hours; and still in hospital after two weeks. As this study was designed not to burden routine practice, we were restricted to the information reliably recorded in medical notes, such as those adverse effects considered dangerous.

## Procedures

Before opening a TREC box, and while still blind to the allocated treatment, a participating doctor completed the form printed on its top. This constituted trial entry. This form recorded the doctor's estimate of the severity and cause of the episode of agitation or aggression.<sup>10</sup> The box was then opened, the treatment given, and the outcomes assessed every 20 minutes for the first hour by the attending nurse. Other data were extracted from the patient's notes.

The accuracy of assessment of primary outcome was checked by other staff not involved in the management of the emergency. Blind to the allocated treatment, and unknown to the clinicians looking after the patient, they timed the period between injection and tranquillisation or sleep for 10% of patients.

## Statistical analysis

We assessed randomisation by comparing socio-demographic and clinical characteristics between the two treatment groups and calculated relative risks and

number needed to treat (with 95% confidence intervals) for primary and secondary outcomes.

## Results

Between June and December 2001, 301 patients were randomised to treatment, 95% between 8 am and mid-night, and 16% at the weekend. For the primary outcome, data were available for 298 (99%) people.

Patients in the two treatment groups had similar baseline characteristics and estimated severity of agitation, suggesting that randomisation was successful. The experienced staff estimated most patients to be markedly disturbed as a result of psychosis. The patients' demographic and diagnostic characteristics were as expected from the characteristics of the client population who receive emergency psychiatric intervention in the three hospitals in Rio de Janeiro.

The time from injection to tranquillisation or sleep was checked by independent observers for 24 (8%) of the patients. For 22 of these patients there was full agreement. The two discrepancies resulted from an observer's estimate being 10 minutes greater than that of the attending nurse, and from a tranquillised patient being roused to become aggressive again by another patient.

Of the 148 patients given haloperidol-promethazine mix, 77 were given 5 mg of haloperidol and 71 were given 10 mg, while 147 were given 50 mg of promethazine and one was given 25 mg. Of the 150 patients given midazolam, 124 were given 15 mg and 26 were given 7.5 mg.

## Outcomes

The table shows the outcomes for the two treatments. By 20 minutes after injection, 32% more of the patients given midazolam were tranquil or asleep compared with those given haloperidol-promethazine (number needed to treat for one extra patient to be tranquillised = 5 (95% confidence interval 3 to 8)). By 40 minutes, although most patients were tranquil or asleep, midazolam still had a statistically and clinically

Outcomes for 301 patients given emergency intramuscular sedation with midazolam or haloperidol-promethazine mix because of agitation and dangerous behaviour. Values are number (percentage) of patients unless stated otherwise

Patient outcomes	Midazolam (n=151)	Haloperidol-promethazine (n=150)	Relative risk (CI)*	Difference in % risk (CI)*
<b>By 20 minutes after injection</b>				
Tranquil or asleep	134 (89)	101 (67)	1.32 (1.16 to 1.49)	22 (12 to 30)
Asleep	93 (62)	43 (29)	2.15 (1.48 to 3.11)	33 (19 to 47)
Serious adverse effect	1 (1)	1 (1)		
Unknown	1 (1)	2 (1)		
<b>By 40 minutes after injection</b>				
Tranquil or asleep	141 (93)	124 (83)	1.13 (1.01 to 1.26)	10 (1 to 20)
Asleep	118 (78)	69 (46)	1.70 (1.32 to 2.19)	32 (18 to 46)
Unknown	1 (1)	2 (1)		
<b>By 60 minutes after injection</b>				
Tranquil or asleep	141 (93)	131 (87)	1.07 (0.97 to 1.18)	6 (-3 to 15)
Asleep	120 (79)	83 (55)	1.44 (1.16 to 1.78)	24 (11 to 38)
Unknown	1 (1)	2 (1)		
<b>By 120 minutes after injection</b>				
Tranquil or asleep	144 (95)	138 (92)	1.04 (0.96 to 1.12)	3 (-4 to 11)
Asleep	125 (83)	95 (63)	1.31 (1.08 to 1.57)	20 (7 to 32)
No additional tranquillising drugs	149 (99)	143 (95)	1.04 (0.98 to 1.09)	4 (-2 to 8)
Not needing restraints	118 (78)	110 (73)	1.07 (0.90 to 1.26)	5 (-8 to 18)
Unknown	1 (1)	2 (1)		

\*99% confidence intervals, except for primary outcome (tranquil or asleep by 20 minutes), which is 95%.

significant 13% relative advantage. By an hour, about 90% of both groups were tranquil or asleep.

Twice as many of the patients given midazolam were asleep by 20 minutes as were those given haloperidol-promethazine. This difference remained statistically and clinically significant up to two hours after injection. Midazolam rapidly sedated patients and kept most sedated for up to two hours. The haloperidol-promethazine mix tranquillised and sedated patients, but with a slower onset of action.

Two severe adverse events were reported, one in each group and both within the first 20 minutes after drug administration. One aggressive woman who had epilepsy was given haloperidol (5 mg) plus promethazine (50 mg) and had a grande mal seizure 15 minutes after injection. With benzodiazepines, she settled and recovered swiftly. A man with alcohol induced, and perhaps also cocaine induced, aggression was given midazolam (15 mg). His respiratory rate fell immediately, and he became cyanotic; by 15 minutes his respiratory rate was 32 breaths/minute. He recovered fully after being given flumazenil 0.25 mg intravenously.

Additional tranquillising drugs were rarely needed in the first two hours, and no difference between the groups was apparent. Restraints were used for 73 people, with no statistically significant difference between the groups, though the fact that 5% fewer people in the midazolam group needed restraints by two hours may be considered clinically significant.

During the first 24 hours, 74 people had another significant episode of aggression. Although there was no statistically significant difference between the two treatments, 6% more of the patients given midazolam experienced a second episode of aggression.

Most of the patients accepted oral medication, and giving a benzodiazepine did not seem to affect patients' total load of antipsychotic drugs in the first 24 hours. The mean doses in chlorpromazine equivalents during the first 24 hours were 368 mg (SD 283, median 333) for the midazolam group, and 355 mg (SD 267, median 333) for the haloperidol-promethazine group (two sided permutation test  $P = 0.67$ ).

After two weeks, 73 (48%) of the patients who had been given midazolam were discharged, compared with 69 (46%) of those given haloperidol-promethazine (relative risk 1.05 (0.77 to 1.44)).

## Discussion

This study evaluated the effect of two widely available and inexpensive drug treatments for emergency tranquillisation of aggressive or agitated patients with mental illness. Relatively low doses of both treatments were rapidly effective. However, about a third more people given midazolam were tranquil or asleep by 20 minutes compared with those given haloperidol-promethazine. One in five people remained disturbed for 40-60 minutes longer if given haloperidol-promethazine rather than midazolam. Tranquillisation to sleep was more common with midazolam than with haloperidol-promethazine. Use of the benzodiazepine had no apparent consequences for long term care.

Both drug regimens seemed reasonably safe. The results of this study are applicable to general emergency rooms and inpatients in psychiatric and

### What is already known on this topic

Emergency tranquillisation of violent mentally ill people is sometimes necessary

Guidelines differ on which drugs to use, and the evidence is limited and unconvincing

### What this study adds

This large pragmatic randomised study in Rio de Janeiro compared midazolam with a mixture of haloperidol plus promethazine

By 20 minutes after injection, midazolam tranquillised 89% of people compared with 67% tranquillised by haloperidol-promethazine

Serious adverse effects for both treatments were rare, but resources to deal with them should be considered in the choice of the treatment

other settings, but the resources available for managing adverse effects should be considered.

Few of the patients required additional drugs in the first two hours after treatment, but a fifth of patients were restrained during this period. In Rio de Janeiro it is more common to put patients who are still not tranquillised in restraints rather than giving them more drugs.<sup>7</sup>

### Strengths and limitations of study

Trials evaluating the management of aggressive or violent people are rare and usually small. TREC is large in comparison, with a completeness of data collection not seen even in short duration randomised trials for psychoses. The pragmatic design, rare in mental health trials, simplified rather than complicated everyday practice. This strategy increased the chance of selecting a sample of patients representative of those who usually attend the emergency rooms.

This study evaluated the open giving of the two treatments. Blinding of outcome was never envisaged, and the experienced healthcare professionals who participated could accurately tell if and when a person was asleep or tranquil.

### Conclusions

Both treatments worked, but midazolam was clearly more effective than haloperidol-promethazine in terms of rapid sedation. Serious adverse effects for both treatments were rare, and should never threaten life. Health professionals might prefer to use midazolam in circumstances where rapid sedation is necessary and after which good observation is possible. Where good observation is impossible, or rapid sedation not paramount, the haloperidol-promethazine mix might be preferred.

The success of this trial is due to the work, skill, and enthusiasm of 37 doctors and 96 nurses and clerks from the psychiatric hospitals of Rio de Janeiro—Instituto Phillippe Pinel, Hospital Municipal Jurandyr Manfredini, and Instituto Municipal de Assistência à Saúde Nise da Silveira. We thank Lelia Duley and Gill Rizzello for help with the final manuscript.

The members of the TREC Collaborative Group are: Gisele Huf (Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil); Evandro S F Coutinho (Fundação Osvaldo Cruz, Rio de Janeiro); Clive E Adams (University of Leeds, Leeds); Raul V S

Borges, Marco A V Ferreira, Francisco J F Silva, André J C R Pereira, Francisca M Abreu, Simone M Lugão (Instituto Municipal Philippe Pinel, Rio de Janeiro); Marcelo P C P Santos, Marcio Gewandszajder, Valéria R P Mercadante (Hospital Municipal Jurandyr Manfredini, Rio de Janeiro); Walmor Lange Jr, Carla L Dias (Instituto Municipal de Assistência à Saúde Nise da Silveira, Rio de Janeiro). The members of the TREC Steering Committee and Data Monitoring Committee are listed on bmj.com.

Contributors: See bmj.com

Funding: No participating centre directly received funds for involvement in TREC. GH undertook TREC as part of her work funded by the Ministry of Health, Brazil. TREC was jointly funded by Fundação Osvaldo Cruz, the Cochrane Schizophrenia Group, the British Council, CAPES (Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior), and FAPERJ (Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Rio de Janeiro). All salary funding was intramural. Drugs used in the trial were supplied by the local government through Secretaria Municipal de Saúde do Rio de Janeiro. A computer was given by the Resource Centre for Randomised Controlled Trials ([www.rcrt.ox.ac.uk/](http://www.rcrt.ox.ac.uk/)).

Competing interests: None declared.

Ethical approval: TREC was approved by ethics committees from Escola Nacional de Saúde Pública Fundação Osvaldo Cruz, Instituto Philippe Pinel, and Hospital Municipal Jurandyr Manfredini, Instituto Municipal de Assistência à Saúde Nise da Silveira and by the members of the Consumer Advocate Group of Rio de Janeiro (SOSINTRA—Society of family and friends of

the mentally ill in Rio de Janeiro). TREC was also approved by the National Council of Ethics in Research.

- McAllister-Williams RH, Ferrier IN. Rapid tranquillisation: time for a reappraisal of options for parenteral therapy. *Br J Psychiatry* 2002;180:485-9.
- Kaplan HI, Sadock BJ, Grebb JA. *Kaplan and Sadock's synopsis of psychiatry*. 7th ed. Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1994.
- Expert Consensus Guideline Group. Treatment of schizophrenia 1999. The expert consensus guideline series. *J Clin Psychiatry* 1999;60(suppl 11):3-80.
- Wing JK, Marriott S, Palmer C, Thomas V. *The management of imminent violence: clinical practice guidelines to support mental health services*. London: Royal College of Psychiatrists, 1998. (Occasional paper OP41.)
- Cunnane JG. Drug management of disturbed behaviour by psychiatrists. *Psychiatr Bull* 1994;18:138-9.
- Binder RL, McNiel DE. Emergency psychiatry: contemporary practices in managing acutely violent patients in 20 psychiatric emergency rooms. *Psychiatr Serv* 1999;50:1553-4.
- Huf G, da Silva Freire Coutinho E, Fagundes HM Jr, Oliveira ES, Lopez JR, Gewandszajder M, et al. Current practices in managing acutely disturbed patients at three hospitals in Rio de Janeiro-Brazil: a prevalence study. *BMC Psychiatry* 2002;2:4. [www.biomedcentral.com/1471-244X/2/4](http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-244X/2/4)
- Dorevitch A, Katz N, Zemishlany Z, Aizenberg D, Weizman A. Intramuscular flunitrazepam versus intramuscular haloperidol in the emergency treatment of aggressive psychotic behavior. *Am J Psychiatry* 1999;156:142-4.
- World Health Organization. The WHO model list of essential drugs (EDL 1999). [www.who.int/medicines/organization/par/edl/infedlmain.shtml](http://www.who.int/medicines/organization/par/edl/infedlmain.shtml) (accessed 3 Apr 2002).
- Huf G, Coutinho ES, Adams CE. TREC-Rio trial: a randomised controlled trial for rapid tranquillisation for agitated patients in emergency psychiatric rooms [ISRCTN44153243]. *BMC Psychiatry* 2002;2:11. [www.biomedcentral.com/1471-244X/2/11](http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-244X/2/11)

(Accepted 10 July 2003)

## Drug points

### Fatal lactic acidosis associated with tenofovir

Pablo Rivas, Jorge Polo, Miguel de Górgolas, Manuel L Fernández-Guerrero

Recently introduced, tenofovir disoproxil is the first nucleotide analogue for treating HIV-1 infection.<sup>1</sup> We report a fatal case of lactic acidosis during treatment with tenofovir.

A 45 year old woman presented with vomiting, abdominal pain, and obtundation. She was HIV positive and had been recently treated with a combination of didanosine, stavudine, and nevirapine and had chronic hepatitis C. Because concentrations of liver enzymes had increased eight weeks before admission, nevirapine was stopped; concentrations then returned to initial values. Admitting doctors prescribed enteric coated didanosine (250 mg a day), stavudine (30 mg twice a day), and tenofovir (300 mg a day).

Three days before admission she had developed vomiting, abdominal pain, and then confusion and obtundation. On admission she was jaundiced and disoriented, and we felt tender hepatomegaly. Laboratory values were serum aspartate aminotransferase 2.35  $\mu$ kat/l (normal range 0.18-0.58  $\mu$ kat/l), serum alanine aminotransferase 2.68 (0.08-0.72)  $\mu$ kat/l, total bilirubin 215.46 (1.71-22.23)  $\mu$ mol/l, amylase 9.35 (0-1.67)  $\mu$ kat/l, lipase 57.58 (1.9-4.77)  $\mu$ kat/l, international normalised ratio for prothrombin time 2.12, blood pH 7.24,  $P_{CO_2}$  2.38 (4.66-5.99) kPa, sodium bicarbonate 11.4 (22-26) mmol/l, and lactic acid 16.38 (0.6-1.7) mmol/l. Computed tomography showed fatty infiltration of the liver and slight enlargement of pancreas.

We discontinued antiretrovirals and gave her bicarbonate, vitamin K, thiamin, and riboflavin. Unfortunately, lactic acidosis worsened; she developed severe bleeding and died 36 hours later.

Tenofovir is being increasingly used even though its safety is not certain.<sup>2</sup> Because of its low affinity for mitochondrial DNA polymerase  $\gamma$ , tenofovir may be less toxic to mitochondria than nucleoside analogues and less likely to cause hyperlacticaemia.<sup>3-4</sup> But we believe that tenofovir was central to the onset of hyperlacticaemia because the woman died soon after taking the drug.

The woman had taken stavudine and didanosine without side effects. Tenofovir may have directly caused lactic acidosis or may have affected the toxicity of the other drugs. Taking tenofovir and didanosine together can increase didanosine concentrations by 60%, leading to hyperlacticaemia.<sup>5</sup> Patients who take tenofovir and didanosine should be closely monitored. Doses of didanosine should allow for simultaneous use of tenofovir.

Funding: None.

Competing interests: None declared.

- FDA approves Viread for HIV-1 infection. *FDA Consum* 2002;36:5.
- Cheng A, Barriere S, Coackley DF, Chen SS, Wulfsohn M, Toole JJ. Safety profile of Tenofovir DF in antiretroviral treatment-experienced patients from randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled clinical trials. 14th International AIDS Conference, Barcelona, July 2002. (Abstract No TuPeB4460.)
- Birkus G, Hitchcock MJ, Cihlar T. Assessment of mitochondrial toxicity in human cells treated with tenofovir: comparison with other nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2002;46:716-23.
- Kakuda TN. Pharmacology of nucleoside and nucleotide reverse transcriptase inhibitor-induced mitochondrial toxicity. *Clin Ther* 2000;22:685-708.
- Kearney BP, Damle B, Plummer A, Sayre J, Zhang X, Ryan K, et al. Tenofovir DF (TDF) and Didanosine EC (ddl EC): investigation of pharmacokinetic (PK) drug-drug and drug-food interactions. 14th International AIDS Conference, Barcelona, July 2002. (Abstract No LbPeB9026.)

(Accepted 4 June 2003)

Division of Infectious Diseases, Fundación Jiménez Díaz, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Avda Reyes Católicos 2, 28040, Madrid, Spain

Pablo Rivas  
medical doctor

Jorge Polo  
medical doctor

Miguel de Górgolas  
medical doctor

Manuel L Fernández-Guerrero  
medical doctor

Correspondence to:  
P Rivas  
pablorigas@  
hotmail.com

BMJ 2003;327:711