Juvenile Myoclonic Epilepsy Refractory to Treatment in a Tertiary Referral Centre
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**Abstract**

**Introduction:** Juvenile Myoclonic Epilepsy (JME) is an epileptic syndrome often regarded as one in which seizures are relatively easy to control. Not infrequently, however, individuals with JME require lifelong therapy to remain seizure-free and a few have refractory epilepsy. We ascertained a population with JME and characterized a refractory subgroup.

**Material and Methods:** We audited and reviewed clinical records of individuals diagnosed with JME identified via a sample of 6,600 individuals in a clinical database at a specialized epilepsy clinic at a tertiary referral center.

**Results:** We identified 240 people with a diagnosis of JME (146 females), with mean age at seizure onset 14.2 years (SD 4.5) and mean age at diagnosis 15.6 years (SD 4.9). Clinical phenotypes seen were classic JME phenotype (88%), childhood absence epilepsy evolving into JME (6%), JME with adolescent absences (4%) and JME with astatic seizures (2%). More than a quarter (28%) had a family history of epilepsy. The most commonly used AED was sodium valproate, in 78% of individuals, followed by levetiracetam (64%) and lamotrigine (55%). In the previous year, 47.5% were seizure-free. Using the ILAE definitions and considering NICE recommended AEDs for this syndrome, 121 individuals (50.4%) were identified as having refractory epilepsy.

**Discussion:** JME is often regarded as a benign epileptic syndrome but in this setting half of the individuals with JME have refractory epilepsy with only about a quarter of those seizure-free in the previous year. Despite some advances in the understanding of this syndrome, there is still much to do before we can offer all the best outcomes.

**Highlights**

- JME is often said to be benign but not infrequently people have refractory seizures
- Classic phenotype is the most frequent in refractory cases
- More than a quarter have a family history of epilepsy
- During the previous year, seizure freedom was only seen in about half of the cohort
- JME has a variable prognosis without clear markers to predict a refractory course
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1. Introduction

The International League against Epilepsy (ILAE) [1] fully recognized juvenile myoclonic epilepsy (JME) in 1985, almost 120 years after the first clinical report [2] and 30 years after it was described [3]. JME is defined by the ILAE [4] as an epilepsy syndrome, a subgroup of Genetic Generalised Epilepsies (GGE), characterised by myoclonic jerks (MJ), which occur in a fully conscious state and predominate in the upper limbs, usually on awaking. Absence and generalized tonic–clonic seizures (GTCS) may occur in 50-80% of individuals. In 2013, an international experts panel proposed two sets of criteria for JME diagnosis [5], both relying on a clear history of myoclonic jerks predominantly after awakening and an EEG with generalized epileptiform discharges supporting a diagnosis of idiopathic generalized epilepsy (Box 1). Clinical phenotypes in JME were reported in the first descriptions [6-8], but only later [9] was a classification proposed with four subgroups: classic JME, childhood absence epilepsy (CAE) evolving to JME, JME with adolescent absence and JME with astatic seizures (see Box 1).

Seizures in JME are often regarded as relatively easy to control. Not infrequently, however, individuals require lifelong therapy to remain seizure-free. A few present with refractory epilepsy, defined by the ILAE as failure of adequate trials of two tolerated and appropriately chosen and used antiepileptic drugs (AED) schedules (whether as monotherapies or in combination) to attain sustained seizure freedom [10]. The UK National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines on the diagnosis and management of epilepsies [11] included recommendations for the pharmacological treatment of JME. Sodium valproate was recommended as first-line treatment and lamotrigine, levetiracetam or topiramate were considered first-line if sodium valproate was unsuitable or not tolerated. If first-line treatments were ineffective or not tolerated, lamotrigine, levetiracetam, sodium valproate or topiramate should be offered as adjunctive treatment. If adjunctive treatment is ineffective or not tolerated, clobazam, clonazepam or zonisamide should be considered. Lastly, the guidelines emphasize that the use of carbamazepine, gabapentin, oxcarbazepine, phenytoin, pregabalin, tiagabine and vigabatrin should be avoided as they may aggravate seizures.

We audited a large subsample of people with epilepsy at a tertiary epilepsy center to identify those with JME with a special focus on the treatment used, to assess adherence to the NICE guidelines.

2. Material and methods
We performed a registered clinical audit to identify individuals with JME and to assess adherence to NICE guidelines regarding their treatment. We identified 1078 people with GGE from a subsample of 6,600 individuals with epilepsy using an outpatient registry. We then reviewed individual records to identify those with JME according to the ILAE definition \(^4\). Those of had failed two appropriate AEDs for the syndrome on the grounds of efficacy were considered refractory. Clinical and demographic data collected included sex, age at seizure onset, age at diagnosis, coexisting seizure types, seizures facilitators, clinical phenotypes (according to the 2006 \(^9\) classification), past medical history and family history of epilepsy. Where available, EEG findings, brain imaging, neuropsychological and psychiatric evaluations were reviewed. Current and past treatments were reviewed along with seizure control over the previous years, allowing for identification of people with a refractory condition.

Data processing and statistical analysis was performed with Microsoft Excel 2013® and IBM SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) V22.0®. Demographic and clinical characteristics were compared between refractory and non-refractory groups using the 2-tailed, Wilcoxon rank-sum test for continuous variables with a non-normal distribution and the Fisher exact test for categorical variables. A \(p\) value of < 0.05 was considered as statistically significant. No correction for multiple comparisons was performed as these were not consider an in view of the small number of multiple comparisons.

3. Results

We identified 1078 people diagnosed with GGE of whom 240 met the criteria for JME and were included. Demographic and clinical characteristics are summarized in Table 1. Using the ILAE definition and NICE recommended AEDs for this syndrome, 121 individuals (50%) were identified as having refractory epilepsy. Table 2 characterises and compares the refractory group and the non-refractory group. The difference between the mean age at seizure onset and at diagnosis suggests a similar diagnostic delay of 1.4 years in both groups. Seizure types coexisting with myoclonus were convulsive seizures in 237 people (99%), absences in 98 (41%) and astatic seizures in 5 (2%).

Clinical phenotypes are described in Table 1 and 2, with the majority (88%) having classic JME, especially in the non-refractory group (96%). Other phenotypes were more prevalent in the refractory group. Sleep deprivation was described as a seizure precipitant by 102 people (43%), alcohol consumption by 44 (18%), photosensitivity by 33 (14%) and stress by 41 (17%). A family history of epilepsy was present in 67 people (28%), including in 38 first-degree relatives, of which 3 had JME.

Typical EEG findings were found in 192 people (80%), with photosensitivity present in 39 (20%) of these. Normal EEGs were recorded in 39 (16%) individuals, all of them on AED. EEG was not available in nine (done elsewhere). MRI brain imaging scans were performed in 216 people (90%)
and were normal in 179 (85%). The remaining showed non-specific white matter changes in 15 and incidental findings in the others, including: diffuse brain atrophy in 3, cerebellar atrophy in 3, arachnoid cyst in 2, developmental venous anomaly in 2 and pineal cyst in 1.

Neuropsychological evaluation was available in 75 individuals (31%), showing mild widespread dysfunction in 15 (20%), executive dysfunction in 12 (16%), verbal learning dysfunction in 11 (14.7%), verbal and non-verbal memory weakness in seven (9.3%), visual memory dysfunction in three (4%) and was normal in 27 (36%). We did not correlate cognitive performance and AEDs in use. Thirty people (12.5%) had psychiatric evaluation, which suggested anxiety in 14 (47%), depression in 12 (40%) and was normal in four (13%).

The most commonly used AED over the recorded course of the condition was sodium valproate (188 people; 78%), followed by levetiracetam (154; 64.2%), lamotrigine (133; 55%), clobazam (63; 26%), carbamazepine (62; 26%), zonisamide (59; 25%), topiramate (54; 23%), phenytoin (38; 16%), clonazepam (36; 15%), phenobarbital (21; 9%) and ethosuximide (15; 6%). Other AEDs used by 15 individuals in total included lacosamide, perampanel, gabapentin, primidone, acetazolamide, vigabatrin, pregabalin and sulthiame. Figure 1 shows past and current AEDs used. Two individuals had never taken AEDs. Seizure freedom with the first AED was seen in 41 (17%) individuals and in another 43 (18%) with the second AED. NICE non-recommended AEDs were used by 43 (18%) individuals, usually as adjunctive drugs. Forty-four of the 146 females were currently using sodium valproate (25 of childbearing age) and 60 had used this in the past. Amongst those on valproate, it was used as monotherapy in four and as part of a two AED regimen in eleven. The remaining were using valproate as part of a polytherapy regime mainly due to refractoriness.

In the previous year, 114 individuals (48%) were seizure-free, 30 (13%) had only MJ or absences and 84 (35%) also had convulsions. One died and 11 were lost to follow-up. On last follow-up, the majority (63%) of the non-refractory group was taking one AED, while 86% of the refractory group were taking two or more AEDs.

4. Discussion

JME is often regarded as a benign epileptic syndrome, with some reports even suggesting that some individuals are seizure-free without AEDs [12]. In our sample, however, about half of individuals have refractory epilepsy, suggesting a possible referral bias as the setting is a major tertiary referral centre, which is more likely to attract referral of more refractory cases.

Females were more prevalent in both groups. Age of onset was slightly higher in the easy-to-control group but diagnostic delay was similar, suggesting that the diagnosis in people with refractory disease is does not pose a more difficult diagnostic challenge. In our sample we found that, although
the classic clinical phenotype was the most prevalent in both groups, other phenotype subgroups were more prevalent in the refractory group. The phenotype difference between groups was statistically significant. It was reported previously\(^9\) that 72% of people presented with the classic subtype with over half of these seizure-free, a fifth had CAE evolving to JME with 7% seizure-free, 7% JME with adolescent absence with 56% seizure-free and 3% JME with astatic seizures with 62% seizure-free. Others also observed worse seizure control in those with previous CAE\(^{13, 14}\).

Only small non-significant differences were seen between groups regarding a family history of epilepsy. This was present in more than a quarter of individuals, but differences in the presence or absence of epilepsy in the family were not significant between the refractory and non-refractory group. This supports previously reported studies suggesting an underlying genetic predisposition to JME\(^{15-19}\).

EEGs finding were not different between groups. Abnormal MRI findings were interpreted as incidental and group differences were not significant. Overall, imaging studies in JME are normal, but advanced neuroimaging studies suggests functional and structural abnormalities in the frontal cortex and thalamus\(^{16, 20}\). This would be in accordance with some evidence of thalamo-frontocortical network dysfunction\(^{16, 21-24}\), as a putative pathophysiological mechanism for JME. There seems to be a subnetwork of hyperconnectivity, involving primary motor, supplementary motor, parietal and subcortical regions, which may contribute to myoclonic seizure generation\(^{25-27}\). The presence of altered motor system activation and functional connectivity in unaffected JME siblings demonstrates that this is not medication or seizure-related, but may constitute a genetically determined JME endophenotype\(^{16, 18}\).

In our cohort, neuropsychological evaluation profiles often shown mild widespread malfunctioning and executive dysfunction, in concordance with previous reports that people with JME have executive and attention issues characterized by deficits in mental flexibility, planning, concept formation, inhibitory control, attentional processes, memory, visuospatial function and verbal fluency\(^{28-31}\). In our sample, there were no group differences on neuropsychological evaluation. Neuropsychiatric evaluation, although infrequently performed, suggested that anxiety and depression are relatively common in these individuals, significantly more in the refractory group. As not all individuals were evaluated and the impact of polymedication was not assessed, conclusions about neuropsychological and neuropsychiatric evaluations are challenging.

Significantly, more people in the refractory group are on poly-therapy and this should not come as surprise. Nice recommended AEDs are among the most used in this cohort as over three-quarters using them. About a fifth were using AEDs outside the NICE recommendations. The SANAD study\(^{32}\) compared valproate, lamotrigine and topiramate in people with generalised seizures. The JME subgroup was not specifically addressed but it was concluded that sodium valproate should remain first line
treatment for most people with idiopathic generalised epilepsy or seizures that are difficult to classify, whereas lamotrigine and topiramate should generally be avoided due to the inferior efficacy of lamotrigine and the inferior tolerability of topiramate \( [32] \). Conversely, other studies support the use of topiramate \( [33] \) and lamotrigine \( [34] \) in people with JME. The most reasonable treatment path in these individuals is to follow NICE guidelines. For women, in view of its potential teratogenicity, valproate should only be a last resort option.

Despite the type and number of AEDs used in different combination, only a quarter of the refractory group were seizure-free in the previous year, compared with 71% of the non-refractory group. Overall, 48% of individuals were seizure-free in the previous year, considerably lower than reported in other studies \( [12, 35-38] \), which, as stated before, is probably due to the higher ratio of refractory epilepsy in our sample. Despite recent advances in the understanding of this syndrome, there is still much needed before we will be able to offer the best outcome to all as it has been shown that early seizure freedom improves social adjustment and occupational integration and is associated with a better quality of life \( [39] \).

A major limitation of the exercise is its retrospective nature and dependency on the accuracy and completeness of the existing medical records. Some people with JME amongst those diagnosed with GGE may have been missed. Seizure frequency data are often problematic in such retrospective exercises and this makes it a challenge to establish an exact correlation between AED changes and changes in seizure control but we have attempted deal with this in a pragmatic way. AED adherence was difficult to assess and, this could lead to some cases being “pseudo-refractory”. The sample was also drawn from a population in a tertiary referral centre, including incident and prevalent cases, which may have biased this exercise towards the more refractory end of the clinical spectrum of JME. The strengths of this exercise is the size of the cohort with a thorough comparison of refractory and non-refractory groups, which adds information to the clinical ascertainment of this entity.

5. **Conclusion**

JME is still a challenging condition, with variable prognosis and without clear markers to predict a refractoriness. The challenge of seizure freedom is even greater in this syndrome than in other epilepsy syndromes due to the psychological profile of these individuals may led to difficulties in treatment adherence. Prospective multicenter studies of an incident population with refractory JME will probably bring more information on this common condition.
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