# Next-Morning Safety Profiles: Evaluating Somnolence and Motor Coordination Impairment of Dual Orexin Receptor Antagonists vs. Traditional Hypnotics

Charles Ahlfeld

## Abstract

For decades, the pharmacological solutions to insomnia have been limited to general central nervous system depression used by $GABA_A$ agonists, which have been known to negatively affect next-morning safety and motor function. Because of this, patients face a difficult trade-off between enduring sleep disruption or accepting daytime impairment. However, in recent years, there has been an emerging therapeutic class, a new type of hypnotic that is known as Dual Orexin Receptor Antagonists. This paper analyzes the differences, in both the chemical world and real world, by evaluating clinical trial data and comparative network meta-analyses comparing DORAs with traditional sleeping drugs, specifically, using objective safety measurements such as Standard Deviation of Lateral Position. The sources that were analyzed for this paper revealed that precise antagonism of the $OX_1$ and $OX_2$ receptors provides both effective sleep induction and maintenance while preserving motor coordination and driving safety, unlike traditional sedative-hypnotics. This is a huge breakthrough in the clinical world, as DORAs offer both doctors and patients a dependable option that eliminates broad brain sedation and lowers next day safety concerns.

## Introduction

Chronic insomnia is a pervasive sleep disorder that severely impacts quality of life and daily functional capability. Far from a minor convenience, it is a debilitating condition that brings about reduced productivity, emotional and cognitive dysregulation, and long-term risks.

There have been attempts to create a permanent treatment for those with chronic insomnia. For years, people have been prescribed sleep medication to help with chronic insomnia, with the most popular drugs being zolpidem, Eszopiclone, and Zaleplon. These traditional sleep medications, known as $GABA_A$ receptor agonists, work by a depression of the broad central nervous system which, while they do make a person drowsy, have many prominent negative side effects. The traditional hypnotics are shown to consistently leave patients with next-morning somnolence, motor incoordination, and objective general deficits compared to normal.[1] These side effects leave patients at risk of accidents caused by the sleep medicine induced drowsiness and clumsiness. This is backed up because network meta-analyses show that these traditional drugs cause statistically significant increases in standard deviation of lateral position (SDLP), which indicates an impairment in next-morning driving.[2] These profiles have generated general reluctance toward traditional hypnotic medicine, and a lack of help for those who greatly suffer from chronic insomnia.

To address these issues, there has been a new class of drugs emerging recently. These are known as Dual Orexin Receptor Antagonists (DORAs), and work completely different from traditional $GABA_A$ drugs. Instead of targeting the general central nervous system as a whole, DORAs selectively block off both the $OX_1$ and $OX_2$ receptors to slow down brain activity. Rather than creating a depression of the whole nervous system, DORAs bind to both G-protein-coupled receptors, which block wake-promoting peptides (Orexin-A and Orexin-B) from reaching their active sites.[1] This physiological approach to sleep promotion results in, according to clinical trials, patients not experiencing the morning balance or memory issues caused by traditional sleeping pills.[3] Although traditional $GABA_A$ receptor agonists promote sleep in insomniacs, Dual

Orexin Receptor Antagonists provide a statistically superior alternative by preserving balance, posture, and driving performance without causing next-day somnolence.[4]

## Methods

To complete research for this topic, a detailed literature search was conducted using the PubMed database to find clinical data that compares the safety of traditional $GABA_A$ receptor agonists and DORAs. The main search combined vocabulary and keywords using Boolean operators, specifically “Dual Orexin Receptor Antagonists,” “DORAs,” “lemborexant,” “$GABA_A$ agonists,” and “zolpidem” and with terms targeting objective safety measurements, like “residual somnolence,” “postural stability,” “SDLP,” and “driving performance.” This search was refined by applying filters for real, human clinical trials, reviews, analyses, and English-language publications.

Several studies were found and screened based upon certain criteria on the Pubmed database. This criteria required direct comparative data between DORAs and traditional sedative drugs, specifically evaluating objective safety measurements (such as SDLP for driving, body sway for postural balance, or morning somnolence scores). The criteria for data collection did have some exclusion, such as animal models, studies lacking next day safety measurements, and non-comparative cases. This screening process yielded four primary sources, comprising a landmark Phase 3 randomized controlled trial, systemic safety reviews, and network meta-analyses which help to create the analytical foundation of this paper.[1-4]

## Biological Mechanisms

These traditional sleeping drugs can be better understood by analyzing their cellular and molecular mechanisms. Classic non-benzodiazepine drugs (such as zolpidem) bind themselves to the $\alpha_1$ subunit of the $GABA_A$ receptor complex. This binding is a type of a positive allosteric

modulator. It binds to the benzodiazepine site, increasing the amount that the channel is open. This allows an influx of chloride ions into the postsynaptic neuron, causing a hyperpolarization of the membrane, which moves the membrane potential further from the action potential threshold, broadly suppressing neuronal firing. Since the $GABA_A$ receptors mediate non-selective, generalized inhibition, drug concentrations often linger over to the next morning.[2] This manifests as slower processing speed, postural instability, and increased Standard Deviation of Lateral Position during driving.

The DORA sleeping drugs take a different approach, however. The orexin system, which is what the DORAs are involved with, consists of a discrete cluster of neurons located within the perifornical area and lateral hypothalamus. These neurons synthesize two neuropeptides, Orexin-A and Orexin-B. These project throughout the brain to activate different types of nuclei that constitute the Ascending Reticular Activating System (ARAS). DORAs function as reversible, competitive antagonists at both receptors (which are G-protein-coupled receptors). Rather than inducing neuronal inhibition, DORAs physically occupy the binding areas of these receptors, preventing a cascade that normally would stimulate wake-active neurons.[1]

$GABA_A$ agonists force an artificial state of central nervous system depression by hyperpolarizing the entire brain. Though, DORAs do not force sedation, but rather selectively block signals responsible for driving wakefulness, which allows for natural sleep architecture. Agents such as lemborexant exhibit this by having a rapid initial distribution half-life and fast-off binding abilities. By the end of an 8-hour sleeping period, concentrations of the DORA that may be circulating around drop significantly, since DORAs dissociate so rapidly. Therefore, this leads to a lack of broad central nervous system depression or residual effects.[1-3]

## Results

Control groups that were analyzed across the widespread literature establish a baseline yofor comparison. Placebo groups consisted of patients receiving inert placebos. It was recorded that placebo groups consistently exhibited normal fatigue, as a result of the insomnia, and without measurable impairments in postural equilibrium or motor coordination observed in active drug groups. This is a significantly different situation from those who were given zolpidem (a standard $GABA_A$ agonist). It was recorded that this group exhibited significant increases in postural sway, which was measured in millimeters of body displacement, during middle-of-the-night awakenings and upon morning awakening. However, it was recorded in the same study that those who took lemborexant (a DORA) at a dosage of both 5 mg and 10 mg doses demonstrated minimal postural instability. These subjects maintained balance sway parameters nearly identical to those of the control group during nighttime awakenings and next-morning evaluations.[1]

The gold standard for an objective metric used in clinical psychopharmacology is Standard Deviation of Lateral Position (SDLP). This measurement, measured in centimeters, is used in clinical trials to assess vehicle weaving and lane maintenance during standardized on-road driving tests. In these evaluations, an increase in SDLP of 2.4 cm relative to the placebo represents a meaningful driving impairment, a threshold established as the clinical equivalent of driving under an impairment. In the study conducted, zolpidem recipients demonstrated high increases in SDLP, reflecting motor incoordination equivalent to a Blood Alcohol Concentration of 0.05%. Notably, this metric excludes even those whose driving tests were prematurely ended due to severe safety concerns. On the other hand, the DORA outcomes (specifically those taking lemborexant) showed no statistically significant increase in SDLP relative to placebo, with zero safety-related test cancellations across the trials.[3,4]

Overall, these findings demonstrate that DORAs maintain a very high safety margin overall, however, higher doses (10 mg vs. 5 mg) occasionally produce small increases in morning somnolence or minor balance adjustments. This demonstrates a predictable dose-dependent profile, and highlights a consideration within DORA therapy. Even with this issue from DORAs, $GABA_A$ agonists have the hidden issue of severe long-term complications. This includes rapid receptor downregulation, physical dependence, a tolerance requiring rising doses, and severe rebound insomnia upon abrupt discontinuation. These long-term effects further diminish the utility of traditional hypnotics. These symptoms fail to appear in subjects who take DORAs, as they maintain consistent efficacy without any evidence of withdrawal symptoms, dependence, or rebound insomnia.[2]

## Discussion

Across all of these trials, it is evident, with a multitude of different measurements of data, that DORA hypnotics are far superior to $GABA_A$ receptor agonists. The data demonstrates that those who take DORAs will have reduced body sway, lower driving risks, and fewer long-term health risks, compared to those who take $GABA_A$ receptor agonists. DORAs fulfill the primary goal of sleep pharmacotherapy, which is to promote sleep continuity to insomniacs while preserving next-day coordination, safety, and sharpness. $GABA_A$ agonists severely fail at the latter, limiting their ongoing clinical utility.[1-4]

Precision-targeted inhibition of the $OX_1$ and $OX_2$ receptors has allowed patients to get effective sleep without worrying about middle-of-the-night falls, morning postural instability, or next day safety issues regarding driving as a result of motor impairment. These DORAs provide a very dependable, safe alternative to physicians who may have been previously hesitant to prescribe hypnotics due to the potential risks, dependence, or clinical concern.[2,3]

While the conclusions that have been drawn were made from real, current data, these originate from ideal, controlled clinical trial environments rather than real-world practice. These studies do not account for real-world variables such as combining hypnotics with alcohol or other medications, which could potentially alter DORA safety. Also, while these trials lasted multiple months and confirmed sustained efficacy, there is a lack of multi-year data across decades. Finally, while the data supports DORAs in almost every aspect, they are not the most practical option financially, as these drugs are branded medications with significantly higher out-of-pocket costs and insurance limits compared to the widely available $GABA_A$ agonists (such as zolpidem).[1,2]

## Conclusion

Instead of facing clinical reluctance and limited utilization, modern insomnia drugs can now achieve effective sleep for insomniacs without being subjugated to hazardous next-day and future impairments. This is due to an evolution in psychopharmacology, which is moving away from broad total central nervous system sedation ($GABA_A$ receptor agonists) towards targeted, site-specific orexin receptor blockade ($OX_1$ and $OX_2$ antagonism). This new mechanism successfully delivers consistent sleep while also preserving morning posture, eliminating vehicle weaving, and maintaining next-day cognitive sharpness.[1-4]

While current data demonstrates the advantages of taking DORAs, there is still a need for future research with the purpose of identifying biological markers or genetic profiles to predict how individual patients may respond to DORA therapy. The short-term focus of pharmacokinetic optimization is to address the immediate drug experience, by helping patients sleep quicker and wake up more alert. It is important that future DORA formulations should focus on absorption rates and elimination half-lives, in order to shorten sleep latency without leaving residual drug

concentrations in the morning. Beyond these short-term refinements, it is essential to evaluate long-term effects on the brain, monitor for adverse events, confirm the cost-effectiveness, and validate generalizability across a wide range of diverse demographics. In total, together with the identification of biological markers, these advancements will solidify Dual Orexin Receptor Antagonists as the standard for modern insomnia treatment.[2]

## References

1. Rosenberg R, Murphy P, Zammit G, et al. Comparison of lemborexant with placebo and zolpidem tartrate extended-release for the treatment of older adults with insomnia disorder: a phase 3 randomized clinical trial (SUNRISE-1). *JAMA Netw Open*. 2019;2(12):e1918254. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.18254
2. Fornaro M, Carvalho AF, De Prisco B, et al. Comparative safety and tolerability of central nervous system depressants on driving performance: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *CNS Drugs*. 2024;38(3):185-201. doi:10.1007/s40263-024-01072-4
3. Moline M, Zammit G, Yardley J, et al. Safety of lemborexant in persistent insomnia disorder: results from a 12-month phase 3 study (SUNRISE-2). *Sleep Med*. 2020;75:512-520. doi:10.1016/j.sleep.2020.09.017
4. McElroy H, Robieson W, Baker J, et al. Impact of insomnia pharmacotherapies on next-morning driving performance measured by standard deviation of lateral position: a systematic literature review and meta-analysis. *J Clin Sleep Med*. 2021;17(9):1891-1903. doi:10.5664/jcsm.9334