

1 slga A deep sight on Chronic i somnia

Nuove prospettive di gestione dell'insonnia cronica ANDREA ROMIGI Centro di Medicina del Sonno IRCCS Neuromed Pozzilli (IS)



Outline

European and AASM guidelines

CBTi

Acute treatment: BDZ, Z-drug

• Long term effects/risks

DORA

- Orexin receptors and pharmacodynamic
- Flip-flop model
- FDA/EMA Approved DORA
- Daridorexant:
 - phase 3 data
 - Special populations: long duration; elderly



Review Paper

European guideline for the diagnosis and treatment of insomnia

Clinical algorithm for the diagnosis and treatment of insomnia









Non Pharmacological Management of insomnia: CBT-I ... «an old-new strategy»



• Long term efficacy

not satisfactory results (19-26%)
Sleep restriction & stimulus

 Sleep restriction & stimulus control transient discomfort

> Edinger et al., 2021 JCSM AASM Guideline Wu et al., 2015 JAMA Baglioni et al., 2019 JSR Eur Guidelines CBTi



Baglioni et al., 2019 JSR Eur Guidelines CBTi



CBT-I Cognitive Component





Relaxation (C&B)





	Sleep Medicine Reviews 48 (2019) 101208
	Contents lists available at ScienceDirect
P EA	Sleep Medicine Reviews
SEVIER	journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/smrv

CLINICAL REVIEW

海海海の

E

Cognitive behavioral therapy for insomnia: A meta-analysis of long-term effects in controlled studies

Tanja van der Zweerde $^{\rm a,\,*}$, Lampros Bisdounis $^{\rm b}$, Simon D. Kyle $^{\rm c}$, Jaap Lancee $^{\rm b,\,d}$, Annemieke van Straten $^{\rm a}$

Efficacy

- Lower Insomnia Severity Index
- Lower Sleep Onset Latency (SOL)
- Higher Sleep efficiency (SE)

LONG TERM (3-6-12 months)

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Author and Year	N	FU in weeks	Mean group differece	Hedges g [95% CI]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	2-month Ell autoomar				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Armedt 2013 [45]	20	12.00	2.20	0.30[-0.43, 1.03]
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Coccult 2015 [45]	29	12.00	2.50	0.30 [0.43, 1.03]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Currie 2000 [30]	55	13.00	0.21	0.05 [0.14, 1.52]
Friedman 2000 [31] ± 7 1300 ± 300 ± 700 Fundra 2016 [51] 56 17.33 860 $-0.21 - 98$, 6.61 Invin 2014 [46] 55 17.33 860 $0.57 - 0.57$ $0.27 - 0.97$, 0.97 Invin 2014 [47] 88 13.00 7.50 $0.27 - 0.97$, 0.631 $0.75 - 0.57$ $0.75 - 0.57$ $0.75 - 0.57$ $0.75 - 0.57$ $0.75 - 0.57$ $0.75 - 0.57$ $0.57 - 0.57$ $0.57 - 0.57$ $0.57 - 0.57$ $0.57 - 0.57$ $0.57 - 0.57$ $0.57 - 0.57$ $0.51 - 0.15$ $0.51 - 0.15$ $0.51 - 0.15$ $0.51 - 0.15$ $0.51 - 0.15$ $0.51 - 0.15$ $0.51 - 0.15$ $0.51 - 0.15$ $0.51 - 0.15$ $0.51 - 0.15$ $0.51 - 0.17$ $0.52 - 0.37$ $0.51 - 0.17$ $0.52 - 0.37$ $0.51 - 0.17$ $0.52 - 0.37$ $0.51 - 0.17$ $0.52 - 0.37$ $0.51 - 0.17$ $0.51 - 0.17$ $0.52 - 0.37$ $0.51 - 0.17$ $0.52 - 0.37$ $0.51 - 0.17$ $0.52 - 0.37$ $0.52 - 0.37$ $0.52 - 0.37$ $0.52 - 0.37$ $0.52 - 0.37$ $0.52 - 0.37$ $0.52 - 0.37$ $0.52 - 0.37$ $0.51 - 0.17$ $0.52 - 0.37$ $0.51 - 0.17$ $0.52 - 0.37$ $0.51 - 0.17$ </td <td>Eriodman 2000 [31]</td> <td>22</td> <td>13.00</td> <td>-0.20</td> <td>-0.02[-0.84,0.80]</td>	Eriodman 2000 [31]	22	13.00	-0.20	-0.02[-0.84,0.80]
Full 2016 [13] 1	Friedman 2000 [31]	23	13,00	-3.00	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Fuller 2016 [53]	36	13.00	3 30	0.29 [-0.37, 0.94]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Irwin 2014 [46]	75	17.33	8 60	0.65[0.16, 1.14]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Jernelov 2012 [43]	89	13.00	2 30	0.22 [-0.19, 0.64]
Lichstein 2000 [12] 44 13 00 9.60 Lova 2014 [47] 118 13 00 7.63 McCurry 2016 [54] 93 16.00 4.40 Fybarcy k 202 [34] 23 17.33 16.00 McCurry 2016 [54] 93 16.00 4.40 Fybarcy k 202 [34] 23 17.33 15.70 Sward 2016 [48] 161 13.00 3.15 Sward 2016 [48] 162 13.00 6.47 Fybarcy k 202 [34] 162 13.00 7.70 Fybarcy k 202 [34] 162 13.00 7.70 Fybarcy k 202 [34] 162 13.00 7.70 Fybarcy k 202 [34] 151 13.00 7.40 Fybarcy k 202 [38] 35 13.00 7.40 Fybarcy k 202 [38] 35 13.00 7.40 Fybarcy k 202 [38] 35 13.00 18.20 Fybarcy k 202 [38] 152 20.00 5.50 F-month FU outcomes Alessi 2016 [51] 35 20.00 5.50 Fybarcy k 202 [36] 13 26.00 7.70 Fybarcy k 200 [36] 10 10 9.07, 07.21 Fybarcy k 200 [36] 10 20.00 4.20 Fybarcy k 200 [36] 10 10 0.20, 0.31 Fybarcy k 200 [36] 10 20.00 4.20 Fybarcy k 200 [38] 35 34.67 5.60 Fybarcy k 200 [38] 35 34.67	Jernelov 2012 [43]	88	13.00	7 20	0.75 [0.32, 1.19]
Lorate 2014 $[47]$ 118 13.00 7.65 147 18 13.00 7.65 147 18 15.00 147 1 18 13.00 7.65 147 1 18 13.00 15 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Lichstein 2000 [32]	44	13.00	9.60	0.75 [0.13, 1.36]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Lovato 2014 [47]	118	13.00	7.65	0.55 [0.13, 0.96]
Ryburszyk 2002 [34] 26 17.33 10.60 9.91 [0.10, 17] Ryburszyk 2002 [34] 23 17.33 15.70 1.52 [0.58, 2.45] Saward 2016 [48] 162 13.00 3.15 Saward 2016 [48] 162 13.00 6.47 Smith 2015 [50] 100 13.00 0.07 Swith 2012 [14] 151 13.00 8.18 Wa 2006 [18] 35 13.00 7.40 Wu 2006 [18] 36 13.00 18.20 Wu 2006 [18] 36 13.00 18.20	McCurry 2016 [54]	93	16.00	4.40	0.02 [-0.39, 0.43]
Rybaczyk 2002 [34] 23 17.33 15.70 I.52 [0.58, 2.45] Sward 2016 [48] 161 13.00 3.15 0.315 0.316 Sward 2016 [48] 162 13.00 6.47 0.76 [0.44, 1.08] Smith 2015 [50] 100 13.00 6.47 0.76 [0.44, 1.08] Smith 2015 [51] 196 13.00 7.40 0.76 [0.44, 1.08] Wa 2006 [38] 35 13.00 18.20 0.22 [-0.50, 0.06] 0.22 [-0.50, 0.06] Genouth FU outcomes 0.39 [-0.28, 1.06] 1.29 [0.58, 2.01] RE 0.39 [-0.28, 1.06] Access 2016 [52] 159 20.00 5.80 0.51 [0.17, 0.84] Camaut 2015 [51] 35 26.00 5.90 0.67 [-0.01, 1.35] Edinger 2009 [36] 13 26.00 7.70 0.48 [-0.41, 1.37] Edinger 2009 [41] 66 26.00 1.10 0.26 [-0.2, 0.54] Espic 2007 [39] 201 26.00 1.30 0.40 [-0.2, 0.54] Espic 2007 [39] 201 26.00 1.30 0.40 [-0.2, 0.54] Sward 2016 [48] 161 26.00 1.30<	Rybarczyk 2002 [34]	26	17.33	10.60	0.91 [0.10, 1.71]
Saward 2016 [48] 161 13.00 3.15 Saward 2016 [48] 162 13.00 6.47 Smith 2015 [50] 100 13.00 0.07 Weng 2017 [55] 196 13.00 7.40 Wu 2006 [38] 35 13.00 7.40 Wu 2006 [38] 35 13.00 7.40 Wu 2006 [38] 35 13.00 7.40 Here	Rybarczyk 2002 [34]	23	17.33	15.70	1.52 [0.58, 2.45]
Sawad 2016 [48] 162 13.00 6.47 Sinit 2015 [50] 100 13.00 0.07 Wa 2020 [141] 151 13.00 8.18 Wa 2006 [38] 35 13.00 7.40 Wa 2006 [38] 35 13.00 7.40 Wa 2006 [38] 35 13.00 18.20 <i>G</i> -month FU (Q = 58.99, df = 20, p = 0.00; f ² = 63.0%) <i>G</i> -month FU outcomes Alessi 2016 [52] 159 20.00 5.80 <i>G</i> -month FU outcomes Alessi 2016 [52] 159 20.00 4.00 Edmagr 2009 [41] 66 26.00 4.00 Edmagr 2009 [41] 66 26.00 4.10 Edmagr 2009 [41] 66 26.00 4.10 Espic 2007 [39] 201 26.00 4.20 H=H 0.21 (-0.2, 0.41] Espic 2007 [37] 122 (0.60 0.420 H=H 0.21 (-0.2, 0.41] Sawad 2016 [48] 161 26.00 3.14 Wa 2006 [38] 35 34.67 11.50 H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.71] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.72] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.72] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.72] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.73] H=H 0.26 (-0.02, 0.54] Mari 2005 [37] 192 201 26.00 4.20 H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.72] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.72] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.73] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.73] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.73] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.73] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.74] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.73] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.73] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.74] H=H	Savard 2016 [48]	161	13.00	3.15	0.34 [0.03, 0.65]
Smith 2015 [50] 100 13.00 0.07 Swith 2012 [44] 151 13.00 8.18 $\bullet \bullet $	Savard 2016 [48]	162	13.00	6.47	0.76 [0.44, 1.08]
Swift 2012 [44] 151 13.00 8.18 Weng 2017 [55] 196 13.00 -3.40 Wa 2006 [38] 35 13.00 7.40 Wa 2006 [38] 35 13.00 7.40 Wa 2006 [38] 35 13.00 7.40 Wa 2006 [38] 35 13.00 7.40 BE Model for SE a -month FU (Q = 58.99, df = 20, p = 0.00; $l^2 = 63.0\%$) 6-month FU outcomes Alessi 2016 [52] 159 20.00 5.80 Casant 2015 [51] 35 26.00 5.90 Casant 2015 [51] 35 26.00 7.70 E	Smith 2015 [50]	100	13.00	0.07	0.73 [0.33, 1.14]
Wong 2017 [55] 196 13.00 -3.40 Wu 2006 [38] 35 13.00 7.40 Wu 2006 [38] 36 13.00 18.20 RE Model for SE 3-month FU (Q = 58.99, df = 20, p = 0.00; $P^2 = 63.0\%$) • 0.51 [0.34, 0.69] 6-month FU outcomes • 0.51 [0.17, 0.84] Casant 2015 [51] 35 26.00 5.69 Edinger 2005 [36] 24 26.00 4.00 Edinger 2005 [36] 13 26.00 7.00 Edinger 2005 [36] 13 26.00 7.00 Edinger 2009 [41] 66 26.00 -4.10 Espic 2007 [39] 201 26.00 1.07 Espic 2007 [39] 201 26.00 3.60 Kaldo 2015 [40] 148 26.00 3.60 Kaldo 2015 [41] 150 26.00 1.67 Kaldo 2015 [41] 161 26.00 3.61 Saward 2016 [48] 161 26.00 3.61 Saward 2016 [48] 162 26.00 0.31 Wong 2017 [55] 196 26.00 0.32	Swift 2012 [44]	151	13.00	8.18	0.66 [0.33, 0.99]
Wu 2006 [38] 35 13.00 7.40 0.39 [-0.28, 1.06] Wu 2006 [38] 36 13.00 18.20 1.29 [0.55, 2.01] RE Model for SE 3-month FU (Q = 58.99, df = 20, p = 0.00; 1 ² = 63.0%) 0.51 [0.17, 0.84] 0.51 [0.17, 0.84] Casaut 2015 [51] 35 26.00 5.90 0.67 [-0.01, 1.35] Edinger 2005 [36] 13 26.00 7.70 0.48 [-0.44, 1.37] Edinger 2005 [36] 13 26.00 7.70 0.48 [-0.44, 1.37] Edinger 2005 [36] 13 26.00 7.70 0.48 [-0.44, 1.37] Espic 2007 [39] 201 26.00 1.01 0.02 [-0.39, 0.57] Espic 2008 [40] 150 26.00 1.30 0.12 [-0.22, 0.46] Kaido 2015 [49] 148 26.00 3.60 3.61 Savard 2016 [48] 161 26.00 3.60 3.61 0.38 [0.07, 0.69] Savard 2016 [48] 161 26.00 0.31 0.34 [-0.10, 0.47] 0.38 [0.07, 0.69] Savard 2016 [48] 162 26.00 -0.32 1.64 0.38 [0.07, 0.69] Savard 2016 [48] 35 3.4.67 </td <td>Wong 2017 [55]</td> <td>196</td> <td>13.00</td> <td>-3.40</td> <td>-0.22 [-0.50, 0.06]</td>	Wong 2017 [55]	196	13.00	-3.40	-0.22 [-0.50, 0.06]
Wu 2006 [38] 36 13.00 18.20 1.29 [0.58, 2.01] RE Model for SE 3-month FU (Q = 58.99, df = 20, p = 0.00; 1 ² = 63.0%) 0.51 [0.34, 0.69] 6-month FU outcomes 0.51 [0.17, 0.84] Casant 2015 [51] 35 26.00 5.09 Edinger 2005 [36] 24 26.00 4.00 Edinger 2005 [36] 24 26.00 4.00 Edinger 2005 [36] 13 26.00 4.01 Egipe 2007 [39] 201 26.00 4.20 Espic 2007 [39] 201 26.00 4.20 Espic 2007 [39] 148 26.00 1.30 Savard 2016 [48] 161 26.00 3.21 Savard 2016 [48] 161 26.00 -0.32 Savard 2016 [48] 162 26.00 0.32 Wu 2006 [38] 35 34.67 5.60 Wu 2006 [38] 36 86.67 -1.00 H=H <td>Wu 2006 [38]</td> <td>35</td> <td>13.00</td> <td>7.40</td> <td>0.39 [-0.28, 1.06]</td>	Wu 2006 [38]	35	13.00	7.40	0.39 [-0.28, 1.06]
RE Model for SE 3-month FU (Q = 58.99, df = 20, p = 0.00, $l^2 = 63.0\%$) 6-month FU outcomes Alessi 2016 [52] 159 20.00 5.80 Casaul 2015 [51] 35 26.00 5.99 Edinger 2005 [36] 13 26.00 7.70 Edinger 2005 [36] 13 26.00 7.70 Edinger 2009 [41] 66 26.00 -4.10 Espic 2009 [41] 66 26.00 1.10 Espic 2009 [41] 66 26.00 1.30 Espic 2009 [41] 66 26.00 1.30 H=H 0.22 [-0.22, 0.46] Kaido 2015 [49] 148 26.00 3.60 J=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.69] Savard 2016 [48] 161 26.00 0.314 Savard 2016 [48] 161 26.00 0.314 Savard 2016 [48] 35 34.67 5.60 Wa 2006 [38] 35 34.67 5.60 H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.47] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.47] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.69] Kaido 2015 [49] 0.07, 0.72] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.69] Savard 2016 [48] 36 34.67 11.50 H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.69] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.69] Savard 2016 [48] 35 34.67 5.60 H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.69] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.69] Savard 2016 [48] 35 34.67 5.60 H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.69] H=H 0.38 [0.07, 0.71] H=H 0.48 [0.00, 0.71] H=H 0.49 [0.00, 0.97] H=H 0.49 [0.00, 0	Wu 2006 [38]	36	13.00	18.20	1.29 [0.58, 2.01]
6-month FU outcomes Alessi 2016 [52] 159 20.00 5.80 Casaul 2015 [51] 35 26.00 5.99 Edinger 2005 [36] 24 26.00 7.70 Edinger 2005 [36] 13 26.00 7.70 Edinger 2005 [36] 13 26.00 7.70 Edinger 2005 [41] 66 26.00 -4.10 Espic 2007 [39] 201 26.00 1.01 Espic 2007 [39] 201 26.00 1.30 Morin 2005 [37] 192 26.00 1.30 Morin 2005 [37] 192 26.00 1.67 Savard 2016 [48] 161 26.00 3.41 Savard 2016 [48] 161 26.00 0.03 Savard 2016 [48] 161 26.00 0.03 Wang 2017 [55] 100 26.00 0.03 Wang 2017 [51] 100 26.00 0.03 Wang 2017 [53] 100 26.00 0.03 Wang 2017 [53] 36 34.67 11.50 Nu 2006 [38] 35 34.67 5.60 <td>RE Model for SE 3-month FU (Q</td> <td>= 58.99, df = 20, j</td> <td>$p = 0.00; I^2 = 0$</td> <td>63.0%)</td> <td>• 0.51 [0.34, 0.69]</td>	RE Model for SE 3-month FU (Q	= 58.99, df = 20, j	$p = 0.00; I^2 = 0$	63.0%)	• 0.51 [0.34, 0.69]
Alessi 2016 [52] 159 20.00 5.80 Image: the set of t	6-month FU outcomes				
Casanti 2015 [51] 35 26.00 5.09 0.67 [-0.01, 1.35] Edinger 2005 [36] 24 26.00 4.00 0.48 [-0.41, 1.37] Edinger 2005 [36] 13 26.00 7.70 0.48 [-0.41, 1.37] Edinger 2005 [36] 13 26.00 -4.10 0.48 [-0.41, 1.37] Edinger 2005 [41] 66 26.00 -4.10 0.09 [-0.39, 0.57] Espic 2007 [39] 201 26.00 4.20 0.09 [-0.39, 0.57] Espic 2008 [40] 150 26.00 1.30 0.09 [-0.39, 0.57] Morin 2005 [37] 192 26.00 1.67 0.39 [0.07, 0.72] Morin 2005 [37] 192 26.00 1.67 0.39 [0.07, 0.72] Savard 2016 [48] 161 26.00 3.41 -0.18 [-0.10, 0.47] Savard 2016 [48] 162 26.00 -3.32 -0.71 0.35 [-0.05, 0.74] Wong 2017 [55] 196 26.00 -0.30 -0.02 [-0.30, 0.26] 0.87 [0.18, 1.55] RE Model for SE at 6-month FU (Q = 30.78, df = 15, p = 0.01; 1 ² = 51.6%) 0.32 [0.17, 0.47] 0.32 [0.17, 0.47] 12-month FU outcomes Alessi 2016	Alessi 2016 [52]	159	20.00	5.80	0.51 [0.17, 0.84]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Casault 2015 [51]	35	26.00	5.09	0.67 [-0.01, 1.35]
Edinger 2005 [36] 13 26.00 7.70 Image: 1.07 [-0.10, 2.23] Edinger 2005 [41] 66 26.00 -4.10 -0.32 [-0.81, 0.17] Espic 2007 [39] 201 26.00 4.20 Image: 1.07 [-0.10, 22, 0.54] Espic 2008 [40] 150 26.00 4.20 Image: 1.07 [-0.10, 22, 0.54] Kaido 2015 [49] 148 26.00 3.60 Image: 1.01 [-0.10, 0.27] Kaido 2015 [49] 148 26.00 3.60 Image: 1.01 [-0.10, 0.47] Savard 2016 [48] 161 26.00 3.34 Image: 1.01 [-0.10, 0.47] Savard 2016 [48] 162 26.00 0.03 Image: 1.00 [-0.30, 0.26] Wa 2006 [38] 35 3.4.67 11.50 0.34 [-0.33, 1.01] Wa 2006 [38] 35 3.4.67 11.50 0.32 [-0.33, 0.74] Va 2006 [38] 36 3.4.67 11.50 0.32 [0.05, 0.71] Va 2006 [38] 36 3.4.67 11.50 0.32 [0.05, 0.71] Va 2006 [38] 36 3.6.67 -1.00 Image: 1.0.38 [0.05, 0.71] Izerworth FU outcomes Izerworth FU outcomes Image: 1	Edinger 2005 [36]	24	26.00	4.00	0.48 [-0.41, 1.37]
Edinger 2009 [41] 66 26.00 -4.10 0.32 [-0.81, 0.17] Edinger 2009 [41] 66 26.00 1.01 0.32 [-0.81, 0.17] Espic 2007 [39] 201 26.00 4.20 0.32 [-0.32, 0.54] Espic 2008 [40] 150 26.00 1.30 1 0.02 [-0.22, 0.54] Kaldo 2015 [49] 148 26.00 3.60 1 0.12 [-0.22, 0.46] Savard 2016 [48] 161 26.00 1.67 +1 0.18 [-0.10, 0.47] Savard 2016 [48] 162 26.00 6.32 1 0.35 [-0.05, 0.74] Savard 2016 [48] 162 26.00 -0.30 +1 0.35 [-0.05, 0.74] Wong 2017 [55] 196 26.00 -0.30 +1 0.32 [0.07, 0.67] Wu 2006 [38] 35 3.4.67 5.60 0.32 [-0.30, 0.26] 0.87 [0.18, 1.55] RE Model for SE at 6-month FU (Q = 30.78, df = 15, p = 0.01; l ² = 51.6%) 0.03 [-0.26]	Edinger 2005 [36]	13	26.00	7.70	1.07 [-0.10, 2.23]
Edinger 2009 [41] 66 26 00 1.10 Image: 100 [-0.39, 0.57] Espic 2007 [39] 201 26 00 4.20 Image: 100 [-0.29, 0.57] Espic 2008 [40] 150 26 00 1.30 Image: 100 [-0.29, 0.57] Kaldo 2015 [49] 148 26 00 3.60 Image: 100 [-0.29, 0.57] Savard 2016 [48] 161 26 00 3.14 Image: 100 [-0.10, 0.47] Savard 2016 [48] 162 26 00 0.33 Image: 100 [-0.39, 0.60] Savard 2016 [48] 161 26 00 0.33 Image: 100 [-0.39, 0.60] Savard 2016 [48] 162 26 00 0.33 Image: 100 [-0.39, 0.60] Savard 2016 [48] 162 26 00 0.33 Image: 100 [-0.39, 0.60] Savard 2016 [48] 35 34.67 5.60 Image: 100 [-0.39, 0.26] Wu 2006 [38] 35 34.67 5.60 Image: 100 [-0.39, 0.26] Wu 2006 [38] 36 34.67 11.50 Image: 100 [-0.39, 0.26] Izemonth FU outcomes Image: 100 [20 [-1.7, 0.4] Image: 100 [-0.74, 0.64] Image: 100 [-0.74, 0.64] Irvin 2014 [46] 75 <td>Edinger 2009 [41]</td> <td>66</td> <td>26.00</td> <td>-4.10</td> <td>-0.32 [-0.81, 0.17]</td>	Edinger 2009 [41]	66	26.00	-4.10	-0.32 [-0.81, 0.17]
Espic 2007 [39] 201 26.00 4.20 Image: the second s	Edinger 2009 [41]	66	26.00	1.10	0.09 [-0.39, 0.57]
Espic 2008 [40] 150 26.00 1.30 Image: Constraint of the second s	Espic 2007 [39]	201	26.00	4.20	0.26 [-0.02, 0.54]
Kaldo 2015 [49] 148 26,00 3,60 $j = -1$ 0.39 [0.07, 0.72] Morin 2005 [37] 192 26,00 1.67 $i = -1$ 0.18 [-0.10, 0.47] Savard 2016 [48] 161 26,00 3.14 $i = -1$ 0.38 [0.07, 0.69] Savard 2016 [48] 162 26,00 0.03 $i = -1$ 0.35 [-0.05, 0.74] Wang 2017 [55] 196 26,00 -0.30 $i = -1$ -0.02 [-0.30, 0.26] Wa 2006 [38] 35 3.4,67 11.50 0.34 [-0.33, 1.01] 0.37 [0.18, 1.55] RE Model for SE at 6-month FU (Q = 30.78, df = 15, p = 0.01; 1 ² = 51.6%) \bullet 0.32 [0.17, 0.47] \bullet <i>12-month FU outcomes</i> \bullet 0.38 [0.05, 0.71] 0.38 [0.05, 0.71] 0.38 [0.05, 0.71] <i>12-month FU outcomes</i> \bullet 0.32 [0.17, 0.47] \bullet $-0.05 [-0.74, 0.64]$ Irwin 2014 [46] 75 52,00 6.40 $i = -1$ 0.38 [0.05, 0.71] Irwin 2014 [47] 148 52,00 1.50 $i = -1$ 0.47 [-0.11, 0.50] Lichstein 2001 [33] 47 52,00 5.33 $i = -1$ 0.47 [-0.11, 0.50]	Espie 2008 [40]	150	26.00	1.30	0.12 [-0.22, 0.46]
Morn 2005 [37] 192 26,00 1.67 F=1 0.18 [-0.10, 0.47] Savard 2016 [48] 161 26,00 3.14 F=1 0.38 [0.07, 0.69] Savard 2016 [48] 162 26,00 6.32 F=1 0.38 [0.07, 0.69] Smith 2015 [50] 100 26,00 -0.30 F=1 0.35 [-0.05, 0.74] Wong 2017 [55] 196 26,00 -0.30 F=1 0.34 [-0.33, 1.01] Wu 2006 [38] 35 3.4,67 5.60 0.87 [0.18, 1.55] RE Model for SE at 6-month FU (Q = 30.78, df = 15, p = 0.01; 1 ² = 51.6%) • 0.32 [0.17, 0.47] 12-month FU outcomes Alessi 2016 [52] 159 46,00 4.70 Alessi 2016 [52] 159 46,00 4.70 -••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	Kaldo 2015 [49]	148	26.00	3.60	1 0.39 [0.07, 0.72]
Savard 2016 [48] 161 26.00 3.14 Image: form of the start of the star	Morin 2005 [37]	192	26.00	1.67	Her 0.18 [-0.10, 0.47]
Savard 2016 [48] 162 26.00 6.32 Image: Constraint 2015 [30] 0.30 [0.48, 1.12] Smith 2015 [30] 100 26.00 -0.33 -0.35 -0.35 [-0.50, 0.74] Wa 2006 [38] 35 34.67 5.60 -0.34 [-0.33, 1.01] 0.34 [-0.33, 1.01] Wa 2006 [38] 35 34.67 11.50 0.87 [0.18, 1.55] 0.87 [0.18, 1.55] RE Model for SE at 6-month FU (Q = 30.78, df = 15, p = 0.01; 1 ² = 51.6%) • 0.32 [0.17, 0.47] 0.87 [0.05, 0.71] 12-month FU outcomes Alessi 2016 [52] 159 46.00 4.70	Savard 2016 [48]	161	26.00	3.14	0.38 [0.07, 0.69]
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Savard 2016 [48]	162	26.00	6.32	
wong 2017 [25] 196 26.00 -0.30 -0.02 [-0.30, 0.26] Wu 2006 [38] 35 34.67 5.60 -0.34 [-0.33, 1.01] Wu 2006 [38] 36 34.67 11.50 0.87 [-0.38, 1.55] RE Model for SE at 6-month FU (Q = 30.78, df = 15, p = 0.01; 1 ² = 51.6%) $0.32 [0.17, 0.47]$ 0.32 [0.17, 0.47] 12-month FU outcomes Alessi 2016 [52] 159 46.00 4.70 Irvin 2014 [46] 75 52.00 6.40 Irvin 2014 [46] 75 52.00 6.40 Lichstein 2001 [33] 47 52.00 3.33 Lichstein 2001 [33] 50 52.00 3.48 Saward 2016 [48] 161 52.00 4.57 Saward 2016 [48] 161 52.00 4.57 RE Model for SE at 12-month FU (Q = 5.70, df = 7, p = 0.57; 1 ² = 0.1%) ϕ 0.35 [0.21, 0.49]	Smith 2015 [50]	100	26.00	0.03	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Wong 2017 [55]	196	26.00	-0.30	
RE Model for SE at 6-month FU (Q = 30.78, df = 15, p = 0.01; $1^2 = 51.6\%$) 0.37 [0.13, 1.53] 12-month FU outcomes Alses: 2016 [52] 159 46.00 4.70 Interview Sector Alses: 2016 [52] 159 46.00 4.70 Interview Sector Alses: 2016 [52] 36 86.67 -1.00 Interview Sector Alse: 2016 [52] 0.38 [0.05, 0.71] Certical Sector -0.05 [-0.74, 0.64] Interview Sector -0.05 [-0.74, 0.64] -0.05 [-0.74, 0.64] -0.017 [-0.11, 1.05] Lickstein 2001 [33] -0.25 [-0.24, 0.84] -1.0.27 [-0.44, 0.58] Savar	Wu 2006 [38] Wu 2006 [38]	35	34.67	5.60	
12-month FU outcomes Alessi 2016 [52] 159 46.00 4.70 Alessi 2016 [52] 36 86.67 -1.00 Irvin 2014 [46] 75 52.00 6.40 Irvin 2014 [46] 75 52.00 6.40 Lichstein 2001 [33] 47 52.00 5.33 Lichstein 2001 [33] 50 52.00 3.48 Saward 2016 [48] 161 52.00 2.27 Savard 2016 [48] 162 52.00 4.57 RE Model for SE at 12-month FU (Q = 5.70, df = 7, p = 0.57; l ² = 0.1%) ϕ 0.35 [0.21, 0.49]	RE Model for SE at 6-month FU ((O = 30.78 df = 1)	$5 = 0.01 \cdot 1^2$	= 51.6%)	■ 0.32 [0.17, 0.47]
12-month FU outcomes Alessi 2016 [52] 159 46.00 4.70 Alessi 2016 [52] 36 86.67 -1.00 Irvin 2014 [46] 75 52.00 6.40 Irvin 2014 [46] 75 52.00 6.40 Lichstein 2001 [33] 148 52.00 1.640 Lichstein 2001 [33] 50 52.00 3.48 Saward 2016 [48] 161 52.00 2.27 Savard 2016 [48] 162 52.00 4.57 RE Model for SE at 12-month FU (Q = 5.70, df = 7, p = 0.57; l ² = 0.1%) ϕ 0.35 [0.21, 0.49]			, p, i		• •••••[•••••]
Alessi 2016 [52] 159 46.00 4.70 $\rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow$ 0.38 [0.05, 0.7] Creti 2005 [53] 36 86.67 -1.00 $\rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow$ -0.05 [-0.74, 0.64] Irvin 2014 [46] 75 52.00 6.40 -0.05 [-0.74, 0.64] 0.49 [0.00, 0.97] Kaido 2015 [49] 148 52.00 1.60 $\rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow$ 0.47 [-0.15, 0.50] Lichstein 2001 [33] 47 52.00 3.48 $\rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow$ 0.28 [-0.28, 0.84] Saward 2016 [48] 161 52.00 4.37 $\rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow$ 0.60 [0.29, 0.92] RE Model for SE at 12-month FU (Q = 5.70, df = 7, p = 0.57; l ² = 0.1%) $\rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow$ 0.35 [0.21, 0.49] 0.35 [0.21, 0.49]	12-month FU outcomes				
Creti 2005 [35] 36 86.67 -1.00 -0.05 -0.74 0.64 Irvin 2014 [46] 75 52.00 640 -0.49 0.49 0.00 0.97 Kaldo 2015 [49] 148 52.00 1.60 -0.49 0.49 0.00 0.97 Lichstein 2001 [33] 47 52.00 3.33 -0.28 0.84 Lichstein 2001 [33] 50 52.00 2.47 0.28 0.28 0.28 Savard 2016 [48] 161 52.00 2.27 -0.46 0.58 0.60 0.27 -0.44 0.58 Savard 2016 [48] 162 52.00 4.57 -0.69 0.55 0.69 0.25 0.29 0.25 0.29 0.25	Alessi 2016 [52]	159	46.00	4.70	0.38 [0.05, 0.71]
Irvm 2014 [40] 75 52.00 6.40 \bullet 0.49 [0.00, 0.97] Kaldo 2015 [49] 148 52.00 1.60 \bullet 0.17 [-0.15, 0.50] Lichstein 2001 [33] 47 52.00 5.33 \bullet 0.47 [-0.11, 1.05] Lichstein 2001 [33] 50 52.00 3.48 \bullet 0.28 [-0.28, 0.84] Savard 2016 [48] 161 52.00 2.27 \bullet 0.27 [-0.04, 0.58] Savard 2016 [48] 162 52.00 4.57 \bullet 0.60 [0.29, 0.92] RE Model for SE at 12-month FU (Q = 5.70, df = 7, p = 0.57; l ² = 0.1%) \bullet 0.35 [0.21, 0.49] 0.35 [0.21, 0.49]	Creti 2005 [35]	36	86.67	-1.00	-0.05 [-0.74, 0.64]
Katado 2015 [49] 148 52,00 1.60 H=1 0.17 [-0.15, 0.50] Lichstein 2001 [33] 47 52,00 5.33 H=1 0.47 [-0.11, 1.05] Lichstein 2001 [33] 50 52,00 3.48 0.28 [-0.28, 0.84] Saward 2016 [48] 161 52,00 2.27 H=1 0.27 [-0.46, 0.58] Saward 2016 [48] 162 52,00 4.57 H=1 0.60 [0.29, 0.92] RE Model for SE at 12-month FU (Q = 5.70, df = 7, p = 0.57; l ² = 0.1%) Image: Constraint of the state	Irwin 2014 [46]	75	52.00	6.40	0.49 [0.00, 0.97]
Lichstein 2001 [53] 47 52,00 5,33 $H = 1$ 0,47 [-0.11, 103] Lichstein 2001 [33] 50 52,00 3,48 $H = 1$ 0,28 [-0.28, 0.84] Savard 2016 [48] 161 52,00 2,27 $H = 1$ 0,27 [-0.46, 0.58] Savard 2016 [48] 162 52,00 4,57 $H = 1$ 0,60 [0.29, 0.92] RE Model for SE at 12-month FU (Q = 5.70, df = 7, p = 0.57; 1 ² = 0.1%)	Kaldo 2015 [49]	148	52.00	1.60	0.17[-0.15, 0.50]
Lickingen avoid [53] 50 52,00 5,48 0.28 [-0.28, 0.84] Savard 2016 [48] 161 52,00 2.27 0.27 [-0.40, 0.58] Savard 2016 [48] 162 52,00 4.57 0.60 [0.29, 0.92] RE Model for SE at 12-month FU (Q = 5.70, df = 7, p = 0.57; 1 ² = 0.1%) 0.35 [0.21, 0.49] 0.35 [0.21, 0.49]	Lichstein 2001 [33]	47	52,00	5.33	
Sarard 2010 [*6] 161 52.00 2.27 161 0.27 [=0.04, 0.58] Sarard 2016 [48] 162 52.00 4.57 161 0.60 [0.29, 0.92] RE Model for SE at 12-month FU (Q = 5.70, df = 7, p = 0.57; 1 ² = 0.1%) ϕ 0.35 [0.21, 0.49]	Elenstein 2001 [55]	50	52.00	3.48	0.28 [-0.28, 0.84]
RE Model for SE at 12-month FU (Q = 5.70, df = 7, p = 0.57; $I^2 = 0.1\%$) 0.00 [0.29, 0.92]	Savard 2016 [48]	161	52.00	1.27	
	RE Model for SE at 12-month FU	V(Q = 5.70, df = 7)	$p = 0.57; I^2 =$	= 0.1%)	● 0.35 [0.29, 0.92]

"although effects decline over time, CBT-I produces clinically significant effects that last up to a year after therapy"



Behavioral and psychological treatments for chronic insomnia disorder in adults: an American Academy of Sleep Medicine clinical practice guideline



Patients with insomnia and no comorbidities

Patients with insomnia and medical comorbidities

Patients with insomnia and

psychiatric comorbidities



- We recommend that clinicians use multicomponent cognitive behavioral therapy for insomnia for the treatment of chronic insomnia disorder in adults. (STRONG)
- 2. We suggest that clinicians use multicomponent brief therapies for insomnia for the treatment of chronic insomnia disorder in adults. (CONDITIONAL)

Brief therapies for insomnia (BTIs)

Multicomponent

BTIs include abbreviated versions of CBT-I (typically 1–4 sessions) emphasizing the behavioral components. BTIs typically consist of education about sleep regulation, factors that influence sleep, and behaviors that promote or interfere with sleep, along with a tailored behavioral prescription based on stimulus control and sleep restriction therapy and on information typically derived from a pretreatment sleep diary. Some therapies include brief relaxation or cognitive therapy elements.

Edinger et al., 2021 JCSM AASM Guideline



Theoretical

(or as decades)

Web OS

Web 4.0

2020-2030

...BACK to the future...



Semantic Web Web 3.0 2010-2020 . 🔴 Semantic Social Web Technologies Web 2.0 Real Web 2.5 2000-2010 Evolution 2010-20x World Wide Web Broadband Mobile Computing Web 1.0 G V 1990-200 3 Desktop Networking Cloud PC Era Computing 1980-1990 6 Web Tecnologies Socialization

Web Evolution

Semantics

...new perspective...



Baglioni et al., 2019 JSR Eur Guidelines CBTi

JAMA Psychiatry | Original Investigation

Effect of Digital Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for Insomnia on Health, Psychological Well-being, and Sleep-Related Quality of Life: A Randomized Clinical Trial

Colin A. Espie, PhD; Richard Emsley, PhD; Simon D. Kyle, PhD; Christopher Gordon, PhD; Christopher L. Drake, PhD; A. Niroshan Siriwardena, PhD; John Cape, PhD; Jason C. Ong, PhD; Bryony Sheaves, DClinPsy; Russell Foster, PhD; Daniel Freeman, PhD; Joan Costa-Font, PhD; Antonia Marsden, PhD; Annemarie I. Luik, PhD

Table 2. Effects of Digital Cognitive Behavioral Therapy vs Sleep Hygiene Education on Primary Outcomes: Physical Health, Psychological Well-being, Sleep-Related Quality of Life, and Insomnia

	Unadjusted, Mean (SD)				
Assessment ^a	SHE + TAU	dCBT + TAU	Adjusted Difference (95% CI)	Cohen d	P Value
PROMIS-10					
Week 4	32.52 (6.05)	33.84 (6.49)	0.90 (0.40 to 1.40)	0.16	<.001
Week 8	32.92 (6.18)	35.08 (6.65)	1.76 (1.24 to 2.28)	0.31	<.001
Week 24	33.10 (6.10)	35.24 (6.88)	1.76 (1.22 to 2.30)	0.31	<.001
WEMWBS					
Week 4	44.72 (8.21)	46.03 (8.55)	1.04 (0.28 to 1.80)	0.13	.007
Week 8	45.16 (8.77)	48.12 (8.82)	2.68 (1.89 to 3.47)	0.35	<.001
Week 24	45.31 (8.89)	48.62 (9.02)	2.95 (2.13 to 3.76)	0.38	<.001
GSII ^b					
Week 4	69.80 (23.64)	60.69 (26.20)	-8.76 (-11.83 to -5.69)	-0.69	<.001
Week 8	65.68 (25.86)	46.78 (29.90)	-17.60 (-20.81 to -14.39)	-1.38	<.001
Week 24	63.33 (27.26)	43.78 (31.25)	-18.72 (-22.04 to -15.41)	-1.46	<.001







6 sessions typically lasting 20 minutes each, and participants had access to the intervention for up to 12 weeks

«dCBT is **effective** in improving **functional health**, **psychological well-being**, and **sleep-related QoL** in people reporting insomnia symptoms.

A reduction in insomnia symptoms mediates these improvements»

Skep Medicine Reviews 61 (2022) 101567 Contents lists available at ScienceDirect Sleep Medicine Reviews		When face to face is unavailable, comparing with usual care (no active intervention)			A deep sight on Start
CLINICAL REVIEW Comparative efficacy of digital cognitive behavioral therapy for insomnia: A systematic review and network meta-analysis Faizul Hasan ^a , Yu-Kang Tu ^{b, c} , Chien-Ming Yang ^{d, e} , Christopher James Gordon ^{f, g} , Dean Wu ^{h, i, j} , Hsin-Chien Lee ^{j, k} , Lia Taurussia Yuliana ^a , Lucky Herawati ¹ , Ting-Jhen Chen ^a , Hsiao-Yean Chiu ^{a, j, *}		TST,	SOL, SE, WASO, ins	somnia symptoms	
WebCBTi with therapist	TST, SOL; WASO; SEInsomnia Symptoms		Group- delivered	TST, SOL; WASO; SEInsomnia Symptom	IS
WebCBTi	TST, SOL; WASO; SEInsomnia Symptoms		Simplified CBT (1 component)	 NS vs usual care 	
Telephone based	SOL; WASO; SEInsomnia Symptoms		Self-help book CBTi	 TST, SOL; WASO; SE Insomnia Symptom 	S
Mobile app	• TST, WASO; SE		Sleep Hygiene	 NS vs usual care 	

Expert Opinions and Consensus Recommendations for the Evaluation and Management of Insomnia in **Clinical Practice: Joint Statements of Five Italian Scientific Societies**







If not improved or not available

Laura Palagini^{1*}, Raffaele Manni², Eugenio Aguglia³, Mario Amore^{4,5}, Roberto Brugnoli⁶,

Psychoeducation about sleep

• Z-drugs or short acting BDZ or sedating antidepressant short term (<4 weeks)

· Melatonin prolonged release 2 mg (might be the preferred choice in patiens >55 years, up to 13 weeks)

June 2020 | Volume 11 | Article 558



frontiers

in Psychiatry



Sleep hygiene education as a treatment of insomnia: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Family Practice, 2017, 1–11

Ka-Fai Chung^{a,*}, Chit-Tat Lee^b, Wing-Fai Yeung^c, Man-Sum Chan^d, Emily Wing-Yue Chung^e and Wai-Ling Lin^f

Outcome Study name Statistics for each study Difference Standard Lower Upper limit Z-Value p-Value in means error Variance limit Falloon (2015) PSQ 1.750 0.792 0.627 0.198 3.302 2.210 0.027 PSQ 1.200 0.397 -0.035 1.904 0.057 Bjorvatn (2011) 0.630 2.435 1,700 2,708 0.007 Black (2015) PSQ 0.628 0.394 0.469 2.931 Edinger (2009) PI PSQ 1.600 2.087 4.356 -2.4915.691 0.767 0.443 Edinger (2009) CM PSQ 1.000 2.038 4.154 -2.9954.995 0.491 0.624 Martinez (2014) PSQ 2.040 1,198 1.436 -0.308 4.388 1,703 0.089 PSQ 4,660 0.964 0.930 2.770 6.550 4.833 0.000 Sun (2013) PSQ 4,000 0.895 2.246 5.754 4.470 0.000 Alessi (2016) 0.801 0.628 0.729 0.002 Wang (2016) PSQ 1.960 0.394 3.191 3.122 2.255 5.536 0.407 0.166 1.456 3.053 0.000

Sleep hygiene is effective in insomnia

Less effective than CBT-I







Pharmacological Management of insomnia: CBT-I ... «Pigliate 'na pastiglia siente a me»







Journal of Psychopharmacology 2019, Vol. 33(8) 923–947



Most used drugs

Trazodone	Triazolam
Zolpidem	
Amitriptilina	Alprazolam
Mirtazapina	Lorazepam
Temazepam	Olanzapina
Quetiapine	
Zaleplon	riurazeparri
Clonazepam	Doxepin



Farmaci per il trattamento dell'insonnia





HYPNOTICS: BDZ

the duration of action of BDZ is correlated

• - T_{1/2}

- - to a lesser extent
 - to the permanence on the receptor
 - to the distribution volume (beware to Lipophilicity)





WHAT'S NEW ABOUT "OLD" HYPNOTICS?

Emivita breve/brevissima	Emivita breve/intermedia	Emivita lunga	
Brotizolam	Alprazolam	Clonazepam	
Etizolam	Bromazepam	Clordiazepossido	
Midazolam	Flunitrazepam*	Diazepam	
Triazolam	Lorazepam	Flurazepam	
Oxazepam	Lormetazepam	Prazepam	
Eszopiclone for insomnia (Rev	iew) EUROPEAN MEDICINES	AGENCY Search	
Rösner S, Englbrecht C, Wehrle R, Hajak G,	2018 Soyka M Lunivia: Withdrawal	of the marketing authorisation application	

«Eszopiclone appears to be an efficient drug with moderate effects on sleep onset and maintenance. There was no or little evidence of harm if taken as recommended.»

OverviewKey facts

All documents

Table of contents

Overview

On 13 May 2009, Sepracor Ltd. officially notified the Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use (CHMP) that it wishes to withdraw its application for a marketing authorisation for Lunivia, for the treatment of insomnia.

Z DRUGS Warning 2007 FDA

DoA

- Sleep walking
- Sleep-violence
- Sleep eating



Writing emails as part of sleepwalking after increase in Zolpidem

Fouzia Siddiqui ^{a,b,*}, Edgar Osuna ^a, Sudhansu Chokroverty ^a

Slaan Madicina 10 (2000) 262 264



Subj: I DON'T GETIT Date: 12/7/2004 11:50:07 PM Eastern Standard Time From: DUCKANDJOE To: Suetheshoe13 WHAT THE?





"I Did What?" Zolpidem and the Courts

Christopher Daley, MD, Dale E. McNiel, PhD and Renée L. Binder, MD

"...A young adult with **no prior history of psychiatric** illness used zolpidem once a week to fall asleep. One night, she took **a shower after her dose of zolpidem** and went to sleep later than her usual time. She woke up **with a garden axe** on her nightstand with no memory of how it got there. Later she scrolled through her text messages from the night before and **discovered a conversation that she had had with her partner after her shower. She had no memory of writing the text messages**. In them, she described to her partner **hearing voices from her kitchen and seeing moving images out of the corner of her eye**. Concerned for her safety, she **had gotten the axe** from the tool shed and placed it on her nightstand..."

Sedative hypnotics in older people with insomnia: meta-analysis Chronici Nor risks and benefits

Jennifer Glass, Krista L Lanctôt, Nathan Herrmann, Beth A Sproule, Usoa E Busto

Study Treatment (all) Placebo Effect size (SE) Effect size (95% CI) Weight Effect size (95% CI) All treatments (effect size) Bayer et al¹⁹ 40 40 1.07 (6.83) 0.00 1.07 (-12.32 to 14.46) Klimm et al²⁶ 72 72 0.57 (4.91) 0.01 0.57 (-9.06 to 10.19) 1.16 (4.50) Murphy et al³² 16 1 0.01 1.16 (-7.66 to 9.98) 221 1.17 (3.30) 0.02 1.17 (-5.30 to 7.64) Roger et al³⁶ 221 Dehiln et al²² 26 40 0.50 (0.60) 0.62 0.50 (-0.68 to 1.68) Elle et al²³ 29 15 0.23 (0.58) 0.66 0.23 (-0.91 to 1.38) Vlukal et al³⁷ 0.37 (0.20) 32 32 5.43 0.37 (-0.03 to 0.77) Hodnor of al25 268 136 0.13 (0.05) 93.24 0.13 (0.03 to 0.22) 701 557 100.00 0.14 (0.05 to 0.23) Subtotal (95% CI) Test for heterogeneity: x2=1.91, df=7, P=0.96, /2=0% Test for overall effect: z=2.99, P=0.003 Benzodiazepines only (effect size) Bayer et al¹⁹ 40 40 1.07 (6.83) 0.07 1.07 (-12.32 to 14.46) Klimm et al²⁶ 72 72 0.57 (4.91) 0.14 0.57 (-9.06 to 10.19) Murphy et al³² 16 1 1.16 (4.50) 0.16 1.16 (-7.66 to 9.98) Roger et al³⁶ 221 221 1.17 (3.30) 0.30 1.17 (-5.30 to 7.64) Dehiln et al²² 26 40 0.50 (0.60) 9.20 0.50 (-0.68 to 1.68) Elle et al²³ 20 15 0.23 (0.58) 9 75 0.23 (-0.91 to 1.38) Vlukal et al³⁷ 32 32 0.37 (0.20) 80.38 0.37 (-0.03 to 0.77) Subtotal (95% CI) 436 431 100.00 0.37 (0.01 to 0.73) Test for heterogeneity: x2=0.20, df=6, P=1.00, /2=0% -5 10 5 Test for overall effect: z=2.04, P=0.04 Favours Favours control treatment

Efficacy

Fig 2 Mean effect size (95% confidence intervals) for subjective improvements in sleep quality with any sedative treatment and benzodiazepines only compared with placebo for at least five nights in people aged 60 or older with insomnia

Safety

What is already known on this topic Benzodiazepines and newer benzodiazepine receptor agonists are thought to be efficacious for sleep disturbances in elderly people They are associated with risks that are particularly detrimental in elderly people, such as ataxia, cognitive effects, and falls

Little is known about how the risks and benefits compare for non-prescription sedative hypnotics

What this study adds

In people over 60, the benefits associated with sedative use are marginal and are outweighed by the risks, particularly if patients are at high risk for falls or cognitive impairment

BMJ 2005

International Journal of Neuropsychopharmacology (2022) 25(4): 261-268

REGULAR RESEARCH ARTICLE

Benzodiazepine and Z-Drug Use and the Risk of Developing Dementia

Francisco Torres-Bondia, Farida Dakterzada, Leonardo Galván, Miquel Buti, Gaston Besanson, Eric Grill, Roman Buil, Jordi de Batlle, Gerard Piñol-Ripoll•



BDZ users

•Unadjusted HR 1.22 (95% CI = 1.15 to 1.31)

•Adjusted for confounding factors HR = 1.01 (95% CI = 0.94 to 1.08) NOT SIGNIFICANT

SHORT-TO-INTERMEDIATE HALF LIFE

•BZD (HR = 1.11; 95% CI = 1.04 to 1.20) vs intermediate-to-long half-life BZDs (HR = 1.01; 95% CI = 0.94 to 1.08).

•Z-drugs (HR = 1.20; 95% CI = 1.07 to 1.33)

Higher doses

• HR = 1.38; (95% CI = 1.27 to 1.50) vs (HR = 1.23; 95% CI = 1.07 to 1.41

WOMEN

•(HR = 1.28; 95% CI = 1.14 to 1.44) than in men (HR = 1.09; 95% CI = 1.08 to 1.10) ALSO ADJUSTED FOR doses and treatment -→ survival bias?

«We observed that BZDs users did not present an increased risk of dementia as a whole group. However, we observed an increased risk of dementia related with **short-to-intermediate half-life BZD** and **BZDRs**. This risk was **higher in women** and it increased with **higher doses** of BZD. **These results address the importance of avoiding long-term use of these medications**»





...BACK to the future...







Flip-flop switch model





Sistema orexinergico

~ solo 70.000 neuroni situati nell'ipotalamo laterale

I neuroni che producono orexina stimolano neuroni della «veglia» (corteccia, tronco encefalo, proencefalo basale)

Hanno un ruolo importante nell'eccitare regioni del tronco encefalo che sopprimono il sonnoREM





INSIGHTS

PERSPECTIVES

Losing sleep with age

Hypocretin neuron hyperexcitability underlies disrupted sleep quality associated with age

By Laura H. Jacobson^{1,2,3} and Daniel Hoyer^{1,2,4}



Sleep quality declines with aging. In mice, wake-promoting hypocretin neurons, normally silent during sleep, become hyperexcitable with age, resulting in intrusions of wakefulness into sleep. This discovery may lead to new therapies to improve sleep in aging and related disorders.

Table 2. Unadjusted and adjusted survival ratio



«sleep complaints in older people are associated with increased risks of impaired physical and mental health and with mortality»

Jacobson & Hoyer, 2022 (27/2/22)

		Unadjusted hazard ratio (95% CI)	р	Adjusted hazard ratio (95% CI)	р
ADL	А	1.0			
	В	3.25 (1.49-7.13)	0.003		
	С	7.48 (3.39–17.00)	< 0.0001		
Sleep disturbance	Nighttime insomnia				
and with the loss 💳 of the state of the sta	Absent	1.0			
	Present	1.84 (1.23-2.75)	0.003	1.59 (1.05-2.40)	0.028
	Daytime sleepiness	HARMONDARY IN DECIDENCE DOLLARS SHOULD BE AND A SHOULD BE		The contraction of the state of	
	Absent	1.0			
	Present	1.69(1.13 - 2.52)	0.011	1.48 (0.98-2.23)	0.057
	Early awakening				
	Absent	1.0			
	Present	0.84(0.53 - 1.35)	0.476	0.91 (0.57-1.45)	0.689
	Sleep-onset delay				
	Absent	1.0			
	Present	2.22 (1.49-3.32)	< 0.0001	1.83 (1.22–2.75)	0.004

Manabe, 2000 Gerontology

RESEARCH ARTICLE

NEUROSCIENCE

Hyperexcitable arousal circuits drive sleep instability during aging

25/02/2022

Shi-Bin Li^{1,2}⁺, Valentina Martinez Damonte^{1,2}⁺, Chong Chen^{3,4}, Gordon X. Wang¹, Justus M. Kebschull⁵[±], Hiroshi Yamaguchi^{1,2}[§], Wen-Jie Bian^{1,2}, Carolin Purmann^{1,6}, Reenal Pattni^{1,6}, Alexander Eckehart Urban^{1,6}, Philippe Mourrain^{1,7}, Julie A. Kauer^{1,2}, Grégory Scherrer^{3,4}, Luis de Lecea^{1,2}*

- age-dependent decreased hypocretin neuron density
- calcium peaks in hypocretin neurons associated with wakefulness
- During the inactive phase («*sleep*»), calcium transients were more frequent and lower in amplitude in old versus young associated with increased wakefulness



NEUROSCIENCE

Hyperexcitable arousal circuits drive sleep instability during aging

Shi-Bin Li†, Valentina Martinez Damonte†, Chong Chen, Gordon X. Wang, Justus M. Kebschull, Hiroshi Yamaguchi, Wen-Jie Bian, Carolin Purmann, Reenal Pattni, Alexander Eckehart Urban, Philippe Mourrain, Julie A. Kauer, Grégory Scherrer, Luis de Lecea*



lower threshold to arousal in aged hypocretin neurons

Increased wakefulness by optogenetic stimulation of orx neurons



RESEARCH ARTICLE SUMMARY

NEUROSCIENCE

Hyperexcitable arousal circuits drive sleep instability during aging

Shi-Bin Li†, Valentina Martinez Damonte†, Chong Chen, Gordon X. Wang, Justus M. Kebschull, Hiroshi Yamaguchi, Wen-Jie Bian, Carolin Purmann, Reenal Pattni, Alexander Eckehart Urban, Philippe Mourrain, Julie A. Kauer, Grégory Scherrer, Luis de Lecea*





RESEARCH ARTICLE SUMMARY

NEUROSCIENCE

Hyperexcitable arousal circuits drive sleep instability during aging







Daridorexant is approved for the treatment of insomnia in the USA, EU and the UK





Approved by the US FDA in January 2022: Indicated for the treatment of adult patients with insomnia characterized by **difficulties with sleep onset and/or sleep maintenance**¹





Approved by the EMA in April 2022 and UK MHRA in September 2022:

Indicated for the treatment of adult patients with insomnia characterised by **symptoms present for at least 3 months and considerable impact on daytime functioning**^{2,3}



EMA, European Medicines Agency; FDA, Food and Drug Administration; MHRA, Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency.

1. Idorsia. Highlights of prescribing information. Daridorexant. US FDA, 2022. Available from: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2022/214985s000lbl.pdf (accessed September 2022); 2. Idorsia. Summary of product characteristics, Daridorexant. EMA, 2022. Available from: https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/product-information/quviviq-epar-product-information_en.pdf (accessed September 2022); 3. Idorsia. Summary of product characteristics. Daridorexant. UK MHRA, 2022. Available from: https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/product-information/quviviq-epar-product-information_en.pdf (accessed September 2022); 4. Lebold TP, et al. *Bioorg Med Chem Lett* 2013;23:4761–9; 5. Coleman PJ, et al. *ChemMedChem* 2012;7:415–24.

Daridorexant's PK profile is adapted to the patient's needs



Rapid absorption for fast sleep onset¹

• C_{max} reached 1–2 h after administration

Rapid decline in plasma concentrations² enabling sleep maintenance without next-morning residual effects

Terminal half-life ≈8 h²⁻⁴ explaining absence of accumulation after repeated daily dosing

- Measured during final elimination of the drug when concentrations have already markedly decreased
- Time to eliminate half the *remaining concentration*

C_{max} at 1–2 h Daridorexant plasma concentration (ng/ml) 1400 1200 1000 800 600 Terminal half-life ≈8 h 400 200 Λ 12 24 36 48 60 72 Time (hours) 25 mg 5 mg 50 mg Adapted from Muehlan, et al. 2018.²

 C_{max} , maximum serum concentration; PK, pharmacokinetic.

3. Muehlan C, et al. Eur Neuropsychopharmacol 2019;29:847-57; 4. Muehlan C, et al. J Psychopharmacol 2020;34:326-35

Daridorexant PK profile

^{1.} Muehlan C, et al. J Clin Psychopharmacol 2020;40:157-66; 2. Muehlan C, et al. Clin Pharmacol Ther 2018;104:1022-9;

Daridorexant has been investigated in two multicentre, randomised, double-blind phase 3 trials



Mignot E, Mayleben D, Fietze I, Leger D, Zammit G, Bassetti CLA, Pain S, Kinter DS, Roth T; investigators. Safety and efficacy of daridorexant in patients with insomnia disorder: results from two multicentre, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trials. Lancet Neurology 2022;21(2):125–139

- Two multicentre, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trials
- 156 sites
- 17 countries
- Interactive response technology (1:1:1)
- Daridorexant 50 mg, 25 mg, or placebo (study 1)
- Daridorexant 25 mg, 10 mg, or placebo (study 2)
- Medication intake every evening for 3 months
- Extension study²

1,854 patients
with insomnia disorder
for ~11 years
~5.5 hours sleep/night
aged ≥18 years

Placebo, n=618 Daridorexant 10 mg, n=307 Daridorexant 25 mg, n=619 Daridorexant 50 mg, n=310

IDSIQ, Insomnia Daytime Symptoms and Impacts Questionnaire; LPS, latency to persistent sleep; PBO, placebo; PSG, polysomnography; sTST, subjective total sleep time; WASO, wake after sleep onset. 1. Mignot E, et al. *Lancet Neurol* 2022;21:125–39; 2. Kunz D, et al. *Sleep Med* 2022;100(Suppl 1):S130.

Daridorexant has been investigated in two multicentre, randomised, double-blind phase 3 trials



hronic₁\som

IDSIQ, Insomnia Daytime Symptoms and Impacts Questionnaire; LPS, latency to persistent sleep; PBO, placebo; PSG, polysomnography; sTST, subjective total sleep time; WASO, wake after sleep onset. 1. Mignot E, et al. *Lancet Neurol* 2022;21:125–39; 2. Kunz D, et al. *Sleep Med* 2022;100(Suppl 1):S130.

Daridorexant has been investigated in two multicentre, randomised, double-blind phase 3 trials





IDSIQ, Insomnia Daytime Symptoms and Impacts Questionnaire; LPS, latency to persistent sleep; PBO, placebo; PSG, polysomnography; sTST, subjective total sleep time; WASO, wake after sleep onset.

1. Mignot E, et al. Lancet Neurol 2022;21:125-39; 2. Kunz D, et al. Sleep Med 2022;100(Suppl 1):S130.

Daridorexant effects on sleep in insomniacs Chronic iNsomn Latency to persistent sleep Change from baseline to months 1 and 3 80 Month 3 Mean of observed values (min) [± SEM] **Reduction** in minutes 60 40 **-23.1** (-26.5 to -19.8) p<0.0001* p<0.0001* 20 **-34.8** (-38.1 to -31.5) 0. Month 1 Month 3 Baseline Daridorexant Placebo

*Statistically significant vs placebo after multiplicity adjustment. Numbers in brackets indicate 95% confidence interval. CBT-I, cognitive behavioural therapy for insomnia; DORA, dual orexin receptor antagonist; SEM, standard error of the mean; sTST, subjective total sleep time. Mignot E, et al. *Lancet Neurol* 2022;21:125–39.

Daridorexant effects on sleep in insomniacs





Chronic iNsom

*Statistically significant vs placebo after multiplicity adjustment. Numbers in brackets indicate 95% confidence interval. CBT-I, cognitive behavioural therapy for insomnia; DORA, dual orexin receptor antagonist; SEM, standard error of the mean; sTST, subjective total sleep time. Mignot E, et al. *Lancet Neurol* 2022;21:125–39.



*Statistically significant vs placebo after multiplicity adjustment. Numbers in brackets indicate 95% confidence interval. CBT-I, cognitive behavioural therapy for insomnia; DORA, dual orexin receptor antagonist; SEM, standard error of the mean; sTST, subjective total sleep time. Mignot E, et al. *Lancet Neurol* 2022;21:125–39. Insomnia Daytime Symptoms and Impacts Questionnaire (IDSIQ[©]*[†]) is used to assess multiple facets of daytime functioning in insomnia according to FDA guidelines



*© 2020, University of Pittsburgh. All rights reserved. IDSIQ-14 derivative created 2020 by Idorsia Pharmaceuticals Ltd under license and distributed by Idorsia Pharmaceuticals Ltd under license. †Developed by Buysse DJ, Thompson W, Scott J, Franzen PI, Germain A, Hall M, Moul DE, Nofzinger EA and Kuper DJ of the University of Pittsburgh and as amended by Idorsia Pharmaceuticals Ltd. FDA, US Food and Drug Administration; IDSIQ, Insomnia Daytime Symptoms and Impacts Questionnaire.

Hudgens S, et al. Patient 2021;14:249–68; Phillips-Beyer A, et al. Sleep 2022;45(Suppl 1):A201–2 [Abstract 0455].

Daridorexant improves IDSIQ[©]*[†] scores over time



IDSIQ[©] sleepiness domain at week 4 and week 12



*© 2020, University of Pittsburgh. All rights reserved. IDSIQ-14 derivative created 2020 by Idorsia Pharmaceuticals Ltd under license and distributed by Idorsia Pharmaceuticals Ltd under license. †Developed by Buysse DJ, Thompson W, Scott J, Franzen PI, Germain A, Hall M, Moul DE, Nofzinger EA and Kuper DJ of the University of Pittsburgh and as amended by Idorsia Pharmaceuticals Ltd. P-value vs placebo. Error bars represent standard error of the mean. IDSIQ, Insomnia Daytime Symptoms and Impacts Questionnaire. Mignot E, et al. *Lancet Neurol* 2022;21:125–39; Data on File.

Daridorexant improves IDSIQ[©]*[†] scores over time



Exploratory endpoints at week 4 (month 1) and week 12 (month 3):

IDSIQ total score

Score Change From Baseline

-2

-4

-6

-8

0

1

2

3

Δ

5

6

Week

- IDSIQ mood domain score
- IDSIQ alert/cognition domain score

IDSIQ[©] mood domain

10 11

8

Q



Clinically meaningful improvements with daridorexant can be achieved over time

Sleep outcomes with daridorexant are also significant in elderly patients with insomnia disorder





*© 2020, University of Pittsburgh. All rights reserved. IDSIQ-14 derivative created 2020 by Idorsia Pharmaceuticals Ltd under license and distributed by Idorsia Pharmaceuticals Ltd under license. †Developed by Buysse DJ, Thompson W, Scott J, Franzen PI, Germain A, Hall M, Moul DE, Nofzinger EA and Kuper DJ of the University of Pittsburgh and as amended by Idorsia Pharmaceuticals Ltd. P-value vs placebo, IDSIQ total score, not adjusted for multiplicity. Error bars represent standard error of the mean. CI, confidence interval; IDSIQ, Insomnia Daytime Symptoms and Impacts Questionnaire; sTST, subjective total sleep time. Fietze I, et al. *Drugs Aging* 2022; doi: 10.1007/s40266-022-00977-4.

	Tole Full populat	rabi	lity Adults ≥65	5 years ²	A deep sight on galaxy
Summary of adverse events	Daridorexant 50 mg (n=308)	Placebo (n=309)	Daridorexant 50 mg (n=119)	Placebo (n=122)	
Participants with ≥1 adverse event, n (%)	116 (38)	105 (34)	42 (35)	38 (31)	—
Adverse event leading to treatment discontinuation, n (%)	3 (1)	10 (3)	1 (1)	6 (5)	AE rate for daridorexant
Participants with ≥1 serious adverse event, n (%)	3 (1)	7 (2)	0	3 (3)	50 mg was low and
Participants with a given adverse event (≥2% in	n any group), n (%)				
Nasopharyngitis	20 (6)	20 (6)	7 (5.9)	4 (3.3)	
Headache	19 (6)	12 (4)	6 (5.0)	5 (4.1)	
Accidental overdose	8 (3)	5 (2)	3 (2.5)	0	
Fatigue	7 (2)	2 (1)	3 (2.5)	1 (0.8)	
Dizziness	7 (2)	2 (1)	1 (0.8)	1 (0.8)	
Nausea	7 (2)	3 (1)	4 (3.4)	1 (0.8)	
Somnolence	5 (2)	6 (2)	1 (0.8)	1 (0.8)	
Fall	1 (<1)	8 (3)	1 (0.8)	4 (3.3)	
Upper respiratory tract infection	1 (<1)	3 (1)	0	0	
Adverse events of special interest, n (%)					
Excessive daytime sleepiness	1 (<1)	1 (<1)	0	0	
Sleep paralysis	1 (<1)	0	1 (1)	0	No <u>adverse events</u> of
Hallucinations	0	0	0	0	<u>narcolepsy or cataplexy</u>
Suicidal ideation/self-injury	0	0	0	0	were observed

NR, not reported. 1. Mignot E, et al. Lancet Neurol 2022;21:125–39; 2. Fietze I, et al. Drugs Aging 2022; doi: 10.1007/s40266-022-00977-4.

Tolerability



No evidence of rebound insomnia compared with placebo based on WASO, LPS, and sTST measures during the placebo run-out period^a

272

No withdrawal symptoms during the placebo run-out period in Benzodiazepine Withdrawal Symptom Questionnaire

No evidence of TEAEs suggestive of drug abuse potential



Well tolerated and safe in patients with insomnia disorder

^aComparison between first night of run-out and baseline for WASO and LPS; comparison between the mean value of the 7-day run-out and baseline for sTST. LPS, latency to persistent sleep; sTST, subjective total sleep time; TEAE, treatment-emergent adverse event; WASO, wake after sleep onset. Mignot E, et al. *Lancet Neurol* 2022;21:125–39; Data on file.

Long term safety extension study (40 weeks)

hronic i Som



No new safety signals observed in the extension study

EODBT, end of double-blind treatment; EOS, end of study; EOT, end of treatment; PBO, placebo; V, site visit. Kunz D, et al. *Sleep Med* 2022;100(Suppl 1):S130.

Daridorexant treatment improvements were maintained over 1 year

Subjective Total Sleep Time exploratory endpoint at weeks 12, 24 and 36: 12-week core and 40-week extension study



hronic iNsomr

Grey shading indicates run-out period with both arms receiving placebo only.

NS, not significant; RO, run-out.

Mignot E, et al. Lancet Neurol 2022;21:125-39; Kunz D, et al. Sleep Med 2022;100(Suppl 1):S130.

Improvement in IDSIQ^{©a⁺} continued up to 1 year

Extension Extension Mean Change From Baseline Score Mean Change From Baseline Score **IDSIQ Mood Domain** -3 **IDSIQ** Total Score -6 -2 -9 -3 -12 -15 -5 -18 -6 -21 -7 -24 -8 -27 -9 -30 -10 40_{RO} 12_{RO} 40 RC 01 12_{R0} 4 01 4 8 4 8 12 16 20 24 28 32 36 4 8 8 12 16 20 24 28 32 36 Week No. of subjects Week No. of subjects Daridorexant 137 136 136 134 115 113 107 101 97 97 93 89 87 73 Daridorexant 107 101 137 136 136 134 115 113 97 97 93 89 87 73 Placebo 57 57 57 53 51 48 48 39 41 39 36 35 35 26 57 57 57 53 51 48 48 39 41 Placebo 39 36 35 35 26 Extension Extension Mean Change From Baseline Score -1 Mean Change From Baseline Score IDSIQ Sleepiness Domain IDSIQ Alert/Cognition Domain -2 -2 -3 -3 -4 -5 -6 -5 -7 -6 -8 -7 -9 Exploratory endpoints at -10 -8 -11 weeks 12, 24 and 36 -9 -12 -10 -13 12_{R0} 20 40_{RO} 12_{R0} 4 20 24 40_{RO} 01 4 12 24 28 32 01 4 8 12 28 8 4 8 16 36 8 16 32 36 Placebo (n=57) Week Week No. of subjects No. of subjects Daridorexant 50 mg (n=137) Daridorexant 137 136 136 134 115 113 107 101 97 97 93 89 87 73 Daridorexant 137 136 136 134 115 113 107 101 97 97 93 89 87 73 53 51 48 48 39 41 39 36 35 57 53 51 48 48 39 41 39 36 Placebo 57 57 57 35 26 Placebo 57 57 35 35 26 Clinically meaningful change ____

hronic iNsomni

^a© 2020, University of Pittsburgh. All rights reserved. IDSIQ-14 derivative created 2020 by Idorsia Pharmaceuticals Ltd under license and distributed by Idorsia Pharmaceuticals Ltd under license. †Developed by Buysse DJ, Thompson W, Scott J, Franzen PI, Germain A, Hall M, Moul DE, Nofzinger EA and Kuper DJ of the University of Pittsburgh and as amended by Idorsia Pharmaceuticals Ltd. Grey shading indicates run-out period with both arms receiving placebo only. FDA, US Food and Drug Administration; IDSIQ, Insomnia Daytime Symptoms and Impacts Questionnaire; RO, run-out. Mignot E, et al. *Lancet Neurol* 2022;21:125–39; Kunz D, et al. *Sleep Med* 2022;100(Suppl 1):S130.

Why treat insomnia...or simply how to treat?





Perlis et al., 2021 Journal of Primary Care & Community Health



America has been suffering from an insomnia crisis where hundreds of thousands of cases are terminal...

What if sleep were a commodity?

And what if sleep may be bought or sold?

Patiens are called «orexins»

an infant donor — a miracle child really — who possesses the soundest sleep in the country







Giuseppe Vitrani Simone Cappellano Marco Caccamo Federica Testa

Sleep Medicine Center





JR NEU I.R.C.C.S. ISTITUTO NEUROLOGICO MEDITERRANEO

Grazie!