

Reclassifying Neuroleptic Malignant Syndrome as a Designated Medical Event to enhance regulatory signal detection

Juan Roca-Pogo

jrocapogo@alumni.unav.es

University of Navarra <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7747-6563>

Research Article

Keywords: Drug Safety, Signal Detection, Patient Safety, Neuroleptic Malignant Syndrome

Posted Date: October 15th, 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-11353624/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Additional Declarations: The authors declare no competing interests.

Abstract

Background: The European Medicines Agency (EMA) Designated Medical Event (DME) framework enables immediate single-case prioritization in EudraVigilance for rare, inherently severe, drug-attributable adverse reactions. In contrast, the Important Medical Event (IME) list relies on routine aggregate quantitative monitoring, delaying signal detection for critical, low-incidence entities such as Neuroleptic Malignant Syndrome (NMS).

Objective: This study uses NMS as a case study to demonstrate the necessity of capturing rare, cross-specialty neuro-iatrogenic risks under high-priority safety surveillance, proposing its formal inclusion in the EMA Designated Medical Event list.

Methods: Standardized coding alignment was verified using MedDRA (version 29.1). A focused cross specialty pharmacological mapping evaluated the clinical spectrum of NMS triggers across medical specialties. Operational benchmarking was conducted against the four core EMA requirements for DME designation: inherent severity, drug attributability, baseline prevalence, and cross therapeutic footprint.

Results: NMS meets all EMA operational benchmarks for DME status: high severity with 5% to 11.6% mortality (rising to ~50% in acute renal failure), predominantly iatrogenic drug attribution, low baseline incidence (0.02% to 3% among exposed patients), and broad cross-therapeutic transversality.

Discussion and conclusion: NMS fully aligns with EMA Designated Medical Event (DME) criteria due to its high drug attributability, severe mortality, low baseline incidence, and cross-therapeutic footprint. Reclassifying NMS from routine Important Medical Event (IME) monitoring to the DME list via its existing MedDRA Preferred Term (PT 10029282) shifts surveillance from aggregate quantitative detection to proactive single-case prioritization, addressing diagnostic vulnerabilities outside psychiatric settings and safeguarding patient safety.

Introduction

The Designated Medical Event (DME) framework was established by the European Medicines Agency (EMA) as a dedicated safety net for signal management, functioning as a high-priority filter in EudraVigilance to enable proactive single-case prioritization for medical review of life-threatening adverse reactions, unlike the Important Medical Events (IME) framework, which relies on aggregated quantitative metrics (1–3). Both frameworks, IME and DME, are operationalized through standardized lists maintained by the EMA. By identifying MedDRA-coded conditions that are inherently serious, predominantly drug-attributable, and rare in the general population, the DME list allows signal detection assessors to prioritize high-concern individual reports independently of standard statistical disproportionality thresholds (4, 5). However, despite fulfilling all operational criteria for DME designation (high drug-attributability, severity, and baseline rarity), certain critical entities, particularly complex drug-induced neuropsychiatric syndromes such as Neuroleptic Malignant Syndrome (NMS), remain unexplainedly omitted from the list and relegated to routine IME monitoring.

NMS, a rare life-threatening condition triggered by dopamine-receptor antagonists or the abrupt withdrawal of dopaminergic agents, illustrates this regulatory gap (6). Depending on the clinical population, therapeutic agent, duration of treatment, and surveillance methodology, the estimated incidence of neuroleptic malignant syndrome ranges from 0.02% to 3% among exposed patients, with onset typically occurring within the first month of therapy (7, 8). Affecting all age groups and demographics equally, its global frequency directly reflects regional antipsychotic prescribing patterns (8). Central dopamine receptor blockade remains the core trigger of NMS, most frequently caused by high-potency first-generation antipsychotics, though atypical antipsychotics, low-potency neuroleptics, antiemetics, lithium, tricyclic antidepressants, and other pharmacologic agents are also implicated (6, 9). Its cardinal features comprise altered mental status, fever, muscular rigidity, and autonomic instability, requiring prompt recognition and interprofessional management (7, 8).

Transversal across psychiatry, gastroenterology, and neurology, and other clinical specialties, NMS is a rare condition carrying significant lethality and severe systemic complications, fully satisfying the requirements of high severity, baseline rarity, and strong drug attribution (8). Relegating NMS to routine quantitative monitoring limits early signal detection, making surveillance overly dependent on cumulative case numbers rather than proactive single-case evaluation. Therefore, this manuscript uses NMS as a case study to demonstrate the necessity of capturing rare, cross-specialty neuro-iatrogenic risks under high-priority safety surveillance, advocating for its formal inclusion in the EMA's DME list.

Methodology and Results

To verify that the well-described clinical entity aligned with regulatory coding standards, the term was queried in the official MedDRA Browser (version 29.1). NMS maps directly to the Preferred Term Neuroleptic malignant syndrome (PT: 10029282), nested under the High Level Term Muscle tone abnormal within the Nervous system disorders System Organ Class (10). Utilizing this standardized PT ensures exact alignment with the terminology employed by the EMA for automated signal detection in EudraVigilance.

A cross specialty pharmacological mapping was conducted to evaluate the full clinical spectrum of NMS beyond its traditional psychiatric paradigm (11). Triggers were systematically categorized by underlying mechanism, encompassing direct central D2 receptor blockade, acute dopaminergic depletion, and complex neuromodulatory interactions across diverse drug classes. This focused mechanistic synthesis is detailed in Table 1.

Table 1

Pharmacological spectrum, medical specialties, and underlying mechanisms of Neuroleptic malignant syndrome An evaluation of the regulatory gap was performed by systematically benchmarking the clinical and epidemiological characteristics of the PT Neuroleptic malignant syndrome against the four core operational requirements defined by the EMA for DME list inclusion. as summarized in Table 2.

Specialty and Clinical Setting	Pharmacological Class	Representative Agents	Pathophysiological Mechanism	References
Psychiatry and Anesthesiology	Typical and Atypical Antipsychotics	Haloperidol, Olanzapine, Risperidone, Clozapine	Direct central D2 receptor blockade	(9, 12, 13)
Gastroenterology and Internal Medicine	Gastroprokinetic Antiemetics	Metoclopramide, Domperidone, Promethazine	Central D2 receptor blockade across the blood brain barrier	(14, 15)
Neurology and Geriatrics	Dopaminergic Antiparkinsonians	Levodopa, Pramipexole, Amantadine	Abrupt withdrawal or rapid dose reduction of central dopaminergic tone	(16, 17)
Psychiatry and Neurology	Mood Stabilizers	Lithium, Sodium Valproate	Cyclic adenosine monophosphate depletion and GABAergic enhancement amplifying dopaminergic blockade	(18–20)
	Antidepressants	Sertraline, nortryptiline	Indirect serotonin mediated dopamine inhibition or acute withdrawal dopaminergic drop	(21–23)
	Psychostimulants	Methylphenidate	Dopamine uptake inhibition with secondary GABAergic deficiency	(24–26)
	Acetylcholinesterase Inhibitors	Donepezil, varenicline	Cholinergic surge inducing central dopaminergic and cholinergic imbalance	(27, 28)

Table 2

Operational evaluation of Neuroleptic malignant syndrome against EMA DME inclusion criteria.

EMA DME Operational Benchmark	Regulatory Requirement	Clinical Evaluation of PT Neuroleptic malignant syndrome
Inherently Severe / Life-Threatening	High mortality risk or high potential for permanent, disabling sequelae.	Neuroleptic malignant syndrome mortality currently ranges from 5% to 11.6%, rising to approximately 50% when complicated by acute renal failure (8).
High Drug Attributability	Event is almost exclusively iatrogenic, with negligible non-drug etiology.	Predominantly drug-related causal attribution, though rare non-pharmacological triggers such as metabolic disorders and surgical device adjustments can also precipitate hypodopaminergic crises (6, 8, 16).
Cross-Therapeutic Transversality	Spans multiple, unrelated medical specialties and drug classes.	Transversal across Psychiatry, Neurology, Gastroenterology, Internal Medicine, Geriatrics, Emergency Medicine, and Anesthesiology (6, 7, 9).
Low Baseline Frequency	Extremely low baseline incidence to prevent operational "signal fatigue".	Estimated neuroleptic malignant syndrome incidence ranges from 0.02% to 3% among exposed patients, varying by population, agent, treatment duration, and adverse event surveillance methodology (7).
Current Regulatory Status	Active priority single-case alert filtering in EudraVigilance.	Excluded from the priority list and relegated to standardized, aggregated quantitative surveillance within the official IME framework (1, 2).

Discussion

The precise alignment of the condition with a discrete Preferred Term demonstrates that integration into the Designated Medical Event framework requires no architectural modification to MedDRA or EudraVigilance databases, though evaluating technical database architecture falls outside the primary scope of this study.

The cross therapeutic footprint detailed in Table 1 highlights a critical diagnostic and reporting vulnerability across medical specialties. Because causative triggers extend beyond psychiatry into gastroenterology, neurology, geriatrics, and intensive care, reporters outside psychiatric settings including non psychiatric clinicians, hospital pharmacists, and marketing authorisation holders may fail to promptly attribute early systemic manifestations to an iatrogenic syndrome. This diagnostic ambiguity could lead to underreporting or misclassification in primary Individual Case Safety Reports. Relegating the condition to routine quantitative monitoring under the IME list compounds this delay, as disproportionality algorithms rely on aggregated case volumes that a rare, highly dispersed event cannot rapidly generate. Furthermore, evidence in signal management practices demonstrates that events prioritized on DME lists achieve higher rates of signal validation and regulatory confirmation compared to those relegated to routine IME surveillance (4).

Benchmarking the condition against the EMA operational benchmarks confirms complete alignment with all core inclusion requirements for Designated Medical Event status. The documented low background incidence ensures that automated single case alerts will not induce signal fatigue among regulatory assessors, while the high mortality and iatrogenic causality necessitate immediate prioritization. Formalizing DME status triggers immediate single case evaluation by regulatory assessors in EudraVigilance, eliminating the administrative detection lag inherent to periodic aggregate analysis under the IME framework.

This analysis draws upon EMA Good Pharmacovigilance Practices guidelines, demonstrating that the inclusion of Neuroleptic Malignant Syndrome via its existing MedDRA Preferred Term (PT 10029282) enables seamless technical integration into the DME list without database modifications. However, as a targeted mechanistic synthesis rather than a systematic review, specific clinical subgroup variations may be omitted. Additionally, while full operational alignment with EMA criteria is established, the real-world impact of DME designation on early signal detection performance can only be empirically confirmed once NMS is formally reclassified from routine IME monitoring to the DME list within EudraVigilance.

Conclusion

NMS fully meets all EMA Designated Medical Event criteria: high drug attributability, severe mortality, low baseline incidence, and a broad cross-therapeutic footprint. Reclassifying Preferred Term 10029282 from routine IME monitoring to the DME list transforms aggregate quantitative surveillance into proactive single-case prioritization, strengthening signal detection and safeguarding patient safety across all prescribing specialties.

References

1. European Medicines Agency (EMA) European Medicines Agency (EMA) [Internet]. [cited 2026 Sep 19]. EudraVigilance system overview - Important Medical Event list. Available from: https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/other/meddra-important-medical-event-terms-list-version-29-0_en.xlsx
2. European Medicines Agency (EMA) European Medicines Agency (EMA) [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2026 Sep 19]. Signal management - Designated Medical Event (DME) list. Available from: https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/other/designated-medical-event-dme-list_en.xlsx
3. European Medicines Agency (EMA) European Medicines Agency (EMA) [Internet]. [cited 2026 Sep 19]. Inclusion/exclusion criteria for the Important Medical Events list. Available from: https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/other/inclusion-exclusion-criteria-important-medical-events-ime-list_en.pdf
4. Sartori D, Aronson JK, Erlanson N, Norén GN, Onakpoya IJ (2024) A Comparison of Signals of Designated Medical Events and Non-designated Medical Events: Results from a Scoping Review. *Drug Saf* 47(5):475–485. 10.1007/s40264-024-01403-x

5. European Medicines Agency (EMA). European Medicines Agency (EMA) (2017) Guideline on good pharmacovigilance practices (GVP): Module IX Addendum I – Methodological aspects of signal detection from spontaneous reports of suspected adverse reactions
6. Simon LV, Hashmi MF, Callahan AL StatPearls [Internet] [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2026 Sep 19]. Neuroleptic Malignant Syndrome. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK482282/>
7. Wijdicks EFM, Ropper AH (2024) Neuroleptic Malignant Syndrome. N Engl J Med 391(12):1130–1138. 10.1056/NEJMra2404606
8. Benzer TI Medscape [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Oct 2]. Neuroleptic Malignant Syndrome. Available from: <https://emedicine.medscape.com/article/816018-overview>
9. Lam YWF (2025) Drug-associated neuroleptic malignant syndrome. Brown Univ Psychopharmacol Update 36(3):2–2. 10.1002/pu.31275
10. Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities (MedDRA) Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities (MedDRA) [Internet]. [cited 2026 Sep 19]. MedDRA browser. Available from: <https://tools.meddra.org/wbb/>
11. Zhang Y, Deng W, Wang M, Luo S, Li S (2024) A real-world pharmacovigilance study of neuroleptic malignant syndrome based on FDA adverse event reporting system. Front Pharmacol 15. 10.3389/fphar.2024.1438661
12. Trollor JN, Chen X, Chitty K, Sachdev PS (2012) Comparison of neuroleptic malignant syndrome induced by first- and second-generation antipsychotics. Br J Psychiatry 201(1):52–56. 10.1192/bjp.bp.111.105189
13. Sarkar S, Gupta N (2017) Drug information update. Atypical antipsychotics and neuroleptic malignant syndrome: Nuances and pragmatics of the association. BJPsych Bull 41(4):211–216. 10.1192/pb.bp.116.053736
14. Kocyigit SE, Soysal P, Isik AT (2017) Neuroleptic malignant syndrome associated with only one dose of metoclopramide in an older adult. Geriatr Gerontol Int 17(8):1232–1233. 10.1111/ggi.13044
15. Mendhekar DN, Andrade C, Australian (2005) New Z J Psychiatry 39(1–2):113–114. 10.1080/j.1440-1614.2005.01524.x
16. Paul G, Singhal S, Paul BS, Singh G, Goyal S (2022) Widening spectrum of neuroleptic malignant syndrome: Case series. J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol 38(2):309–314. 10.4103/joacp.JOACP_8_21
17. Lazarus A (1985) Neuroleptic malignant syndrome and amantadine withdrawal. Am J Psychiatry 142(1):142a–1142. 10.1176/ajp.142.1.142a
18. Ramadas S, Nitin Murali TN, Krishnan J, Andrade C (2023) Neuroleptic Malignant Syndrome with Low Dose Lithium, Without Concomitant Antipsychotics. Indian J Psychol Med 45(1):92–94. 10.1177/02537176221099307
19. Lindeman S, Kolari T, Tiihonen J (2020) Valproate and Neuroleptic Malignant Syndrome in an Elderly Patient With Schizoaffective Disorder. Prim Care Companion CNS Disord 22(3). 10.4088/PCC.19I02542

20. Patil V, Gupta R, Verma R, Singh Balhara YP (2016) Neuroleptic Malignant Syndrome Associated with Lithium Toxicity. *Oman Med J* 31(4):309–311. 10.5001/omj.2016.59
21. Konstantakopoulos G, Kouzoupis AV, Papageorgiou SG, Oulis P (2009) Putative Neuroleptic Malignant Syndrome Associated With Sertraline Withdrawal. *J Clin Psychopharmacol* 29(3):300–301. 10.1097/JCP.0b013e3181a39101
22. June R, Yunus M, Gossman W (1999) Neuroleptic malignant syndrome associated with nortriptyline. *Am J Emerg Med* 17(7):736–737. 10.1016/S0735-6757(99)90173-0
23. Ananth J, Aduri K, Parameswaran S, Gunatilake S (2004) Neuroleptic malignant syndrome: risk factors, pathophysiology, and treatment. *Acta Neuropsychiatr* 16(4):219–228. 10.1111/j.0924-2708.2004.00085.x
24. Basil B, Mathews M, Budur K (2006) Methylphenidate-induced neuroleptic malignant syndrome: a case report. *Prim Care Companion J Clin Psychiatry* 8(1):47. 10.4088/pcc.v08n0109a PubMed PMID: 16862256
25. Ehara H, Maegaki Y, Takeshita K (1998) Neuroleptic malignant syndrome and methylphenidate. *Pediatr Neurol* 19(4):299–301. 10.1016/S0887-8994(98)00045-9
26. Russell T, Riazi S, Kraeva N, Steel AC, Hawryluck LA (2012) Ecstasy-induced delayed rhabdomyolysis and neuroleptic malignant syndrome in a patient with a novel variant in the ryanodine receptor type 1 gene. *Anaesthesia* 67(9):1021–1024. 10.1111/j.1365-2044.2012.07226.x
27. Matsumoto T, Kawanishi C, Isojima D, Iseki E, Kishida I, Kosaka K (2004) Neuroleptic malignant syndrome induced by donepezil. *Int J Neuropsychopharmacol* 7(1):101–103. 10.1017/S1461145703003857
28. Frenier MAN, Lydiatt MF (2025) From Varenicline to Neuroleptic Malignant Syndrome. *Prim Care Companion CNS Disord* 27(6). 10.4088/PCC.25cr04004