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Practice guideline summary: Sudden unexpected death in epilepsy incidence rates and risk factors


ABSTRACT

Objective: To determine the incidence rates of sudden unexpected death in epilepsy (SUDEP) in different epilepsy populations and address the question of whether risk factors for SUDEP have been identified.

Methods: Systematic review of evidence; modified Grading Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation process for developing conclusions; recommendations developed by consensus.

Results: Findings for incidence rates based on 12 Class I studies include the following: SUDEP risk in children with epilepsy (aged 0–17 years) is 0.22/1,000 patient-years (95% confidence interval [CI] 0.16–0.31) (moderate confidence in evidence). SUDEP risk increases in adults to 1.2–2.32/1,000 patient-years (95% CI 0.64–2.32) (low confidence in evidence). The major risk factor for SUDEP is the occurrence of generalized tonic-clonic seizures (GTCS); the SUDEP risk increases in association with increasing frequency of GTCS occurrence (high confidence in evidence).

Recommendations: Level B: Clinicians caring for young children with epilepsy should inform parents/guardians that in 1 year, SUDEP typically affects 1 in 4,500 children; therefore, 4,499 of 4,500 children will not be affected. Clinicians should inform adult patients with epilepsy that SUDEP typically affects 1 in 1,000 adults with epilepsy per year; therefore, annually 999 of 1,000 adults will not be affected. For persons with epilepsy who continue to experience GTCS, clinicians should continue to actively manage epilepsy therapies to reduce seizures and SUDEP risk while incorporating patient preferences and weighing the risks and benefits of any new approach. Clinicians should inform persons with epilepsy that seizure freedom, particularly freedom from GTCS, is strongly associated with decreased SUDEP risk. Neurology® 2017;88:1674-1680

GLOSSARY

AAN = American Academy of Neurology; AED = antiepileptic drug; CI = confidence interval; GTCS = generalized tonic-clonic seizures; SUDEP = sudden unexpected death in epilepsy.

This document summarizes information provided in the complete guideline, available at Neurology.org. Appendix e-6, cited in the full guideline (data supplement), is available at Neurology.org.

Sudden unexpected death in epilepsy (SUDEP) is a poorly understood and catastrophic risk of epilepsy. The sensitive nature of discussions of this infrequent but important risk with patients and families has prompted the need for evidence-based information about SUDEP. The goal of this practice guideline is to examine evidence for the SUDEP incidence rate in epilepsy populations and for prognostic factors.
for SUDEP occurrence. This in turn will inform an honest and balanced discussion when clinicians counsel people about SUDEP, and provide insight into areas where more clinical research is needed.

Two questions were asked:

1. What is the incidence rate of SUDEP in different epilepsy populations?
2. Are there specific risk factors for SUDEP?

DESCRIPTION OF THE ANALYTIC PROCESS This practice guideline broadly follows the process delineated in the 2004 American Academy of Neurology (AAN) guideline development process manual, with the exception of the processes for formulating conclusions and recommendations, which follow the processes explained in the 2011 AAN guideline development process manual.

In 2010, the AAN Guideline Development, Dissemination, and Implementation Subcommittee and the Guidelines Committee of the American Epilepsy Society convened a panel of experts to develop this practice guideline. The guideline panel engaged an independent medical librarian to search the MEDLINE and Embase databases from earliest available article to November 2010. The panel then performed an identical search in April 2015 to include articles published since November 2010. The keywords for both searches were SUDEP or (sudden and [unexplained or unexpected] and death) combined with the traditional medical subheadings (MeSH) for epilepsy (eplepsy/abnormalities or epilepsy/classification or epilepsy/complications or epilepsy/drug effects or epilepsy/drug therapy or epilepsy/epidemiology or epilepsy/ethnology or epilepsy/etiolog or epilepsy/genetics or epilepsy/mortality or epilepsy/physiopathology or epilepsy/prevention and control or epilepsy/therapy) with limits of humans, plus all child: 0–18 years or all adult: 19+ years. Literature types were limited to clinical trial; randomized controlled trial; comparative study; controlled clinical trial; evaluation studies; journal article; multicenter study; research support; NIH, extramural, research support; NIH, intramural, research support; non-US gov’t, research support; US gov’t, non PHS, research support; or US gov’t, PHS, validation studies. Finally, the guideline panel specifically searched causes implicated in SUDEP (i.e., cardiac arrhythmias and preictal autonomic dysfunction), where the hypotheses were tested.

This search yielded 1,068 abstracts, all of which were reviewed for relevance by at least 2 panel members working independently of each other: 744 abstracts were not relevant to provide answers to the questions. Of the remaining 324 abstracts, 2 panel members then obtained the full articles and reviewed them independently for inclusion. Reviewed articles were entered into a database application through an online questionnaire. Seventy articles had data for inclusion, and 254 were excluded because they failed to address the questions, employ an adequate SUDEP definition, or use an appropriate epilepsy comparison group in the prognostic studies. The available literature consisted of multiple Class I articles for incidence, and therefore articles rated Class II or lower were excluded because the Class II publications did not address populations not otherwise encompassed by the Class I articles. Several Class I and multiple Class II articles were available for prognostic questions.

Included articles were required to state that the SUDEP definition provided by Nashef, Annegers, and Leestma et al. was used or to describe criteria in accordance with these definitions. These definitions share the following criteria, and the guideline panel included any article that incorporated these criteria in its SUDEP definition: (1) the patient had epilepsy by reasonable criteria without reference to the criteria used for epilepsy; (2) deaths by drowning, trauma, or status epilepticus were excluded; (3) death could have occurred after a witnessed seizure; (4) other competing causes of death were excluded.

The guideline panel used 2 of the AAN’s evidence-based schemes to rate articles: the screening criteria for the incidence question and the prognostic criteria for the risk factor question.

**Question 1: What is the incidence of SUDEP in different epilepsy populations?** Twelve Class I studies provided incidence rate data. Imprecision in study findings resulted in moderate confidence in the evidence for SUDEP rates in childhood and low confidence in the evidence for SUDEP rates in adulthood and overall (table 1). Because of imprecision in the incidence study results with a lack of overlap of 95% confidence interval (CIs) between several comparable study populations, the guideline panel performed a random-effects meta-analysis to provide summary measures of the absolute or relative risk of SUDEP. In addition, to explore reasons for heterogeneity in the absolute risk of SUDEP reported, the panel conducted a meta-analysis of subgroups of studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>SUDEP/1,000 patient-years (confidence interval)</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>0.58 (0.31–1.08)</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood</td>
<td>0.22 (0.16–0.31)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adulthood</td>
<td>1.2 (0.64–2.32)</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
including different groups of patients with epilepsy (e.g., children vs adults). These meta-analyses have significant unexplained heterogeneity, which may suggest the presence of other unknown or unexplored risk factors.

**Rationale for recommendations 1 and 2.** Our systematic review found that the SUDEP risk in children with epilepsy is 0.22/1,000 patient-years (95% CI 0.16–0.31). The SUDEP risk increases in adults to 1.2/1,000 patient-years (95% CI 0.64–2.32). There is considerable uncertainty regarding the estimates of the adult risk.

People with epilepsy and their families prefer to be informed of the individual’s risk for a catastrophic event such as SUDEP, even when the probability of the event is low.14 This preference is subject to cultural influences. After being informed of an adverse event, people commonly overestimate the risk of that adverse event happening to them.15 Such overestimation unduly increases anxiety related to an adverse event. Overestimation can be lessened by presenting the risk as the probability of both having and not having the event,16 and by using numbers in addition to words17 and frequencies rather than percentages to convey the risk.18

**Incidence recommendation 1: SUDEP incidence in children.** Clinicians caring for children with epilepsy should inform the children’s parents or guardians that (Level B for the following):

1. There is a rare risk of SUDEP.
2. In 1 year, SUDEP typically affects 1 in 4,500 children with epilepsy; in other words, annually, 4,499 of 4,500 children will not be affected by SUDEP.

**Incidence recommendation 2: SUDEP incidence in adults.** Clinicians should inform adult persons with epilepsy that (Level B for the following):

1. There is a small risk of SUDEP.
2. In 1 year, SUDEP typically affects 1 in 1,000 adults with epilepsy; in other words, annually, 999 of 1,000 adults will not be affected by SUDEP.

**Question 2: Are there any risk factors for SUDEP?** Six Class I14,22–26 and 16 Class II articles6,7,17,23,27–38 provided evidence for this question. Table 2 summarizes the results.

**Rationale for recommendation 3.** Our systematic review found that a major risk factor for SUDEP is the presence and frequency of generalized tonic-clonic seizures (GTCS). For example, people with 3 or more GTCS per year have a 15-fold increased risk of SUDEP. This relative risk increase translates to an absolute risk of up to 18 deaths per 1,000 patient-years for people with frequent GTCS.

The large SUDEP risk increase from GTCS, coupled with epilepsy monitoring unit evidence29 demonstrating that a GTCS was always the precipitating event of SUDEP, strongly suggests that GTCS are not just associated with SUDEP but, rather, are in the causal path to SUDEP. From this, it seems reasonable to infer that improved control of an individual’s GTCS will result in a reduced risk of SUDEP. Thus, a reduction in SUDEP risk is an additional benefit to the many benefits resulting from improved seizure control.

As with all benefits associated with improved seizure control, the potential benefit of SUDEP risk reduction needs to be balanced with the risks and burdens associated with antiseizure therapies.

**Recommendation 3.** For persons with epilepsy who continue to experience GTCS, clinicians should continue to actively manage epilepsy therapies to reduce seizure occurrences and the risk of SUDEP while incorporating patient preferences and weighing the risks and benefits of any new approach (Level B).

**Rationale for recommendation 4.** GTCS are clear risk factors for SUDEP, and nocturnal seizures may also increase risk. These findings, in conjunction with the observation that postictal respiratory depression is a major mechanism in SUDEP,30 suggest that un-witnessed nocturnal seizures and postictal respiratory depression can cause SUDEP.

Moreover, the presence in the bedroom of another individual at least 10 years of age and of normal intelligence is associated with a decreased SUDEP risk. These results imply that a bedroom observer could detect seizures, check on the patient, and provide sufficient stimulation to prevent respiratory arrest. This association does not indicate that these interventions directly mitigate the mechanism that causes SUDEP.

If it were in accordance with patient and family circumstances and values, nocturnal supervision

### Table 2: Conclusions for sudden unexpected death in epilepsy (SUDEP) risk factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>OR (CI)</th>
<th>Confidence level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presence of GTCS vs lack of GTCS</td>
<td>10 (1.7–14)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of GTCS</td>
<td>OR 5.07 (2.94–8.76) for 1–2 GTCS per year and OR 15.46 (9.92–24.18) for ≥3 GTCS per year</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not being seizure-free for 1–5 y</td>
<td>4.7 (1.4–16)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not adding an AED when patients are medically refractory</td>
<td>6 (2–20)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nocturnal supervision (risk reduction)</td>
<td>0.4 (0.2–0.8)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of nocturnal listening device (risk reduction)</td>
<td>0.1 (0.0–0.3)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: AED = antiepileptic drug; CI = confidence interval; GTCS = generalized tonic-clonic seizure; OR = odds ratio.
could reduce SUDEP risk; however, providing nighttime observation might be overly burdensome and intrusive.

**Recommendation 4.** For persons with frequent GTCS and nocturnal seizures, clinicians may advise selected patients and families, if permitted by their individualized epilepsy and psychosocial circumstances, to use nocturnal supervision or other nocturnal precautions, such as the use of a remote listening device, to reduce SUDEP risk (Level C).

**Rationale for recommendation 5.** One of the most consistent findings of this review is that many factors that are indicators of uncontrolled epilepsy, including having GTCS, having frequent GTCS, and the absence of seizure freedom, are strongly associated with SUDEP.

Usually, people with epilepsy and their families prefer to be informed of factors that are associated with an increased risk of a catastrophic event such as SUDEP. Patients are especially interested in factors that might reduce their risk even when a causal link between the factor and a reduction in risk has not been established. Knowledge of these risk factors might suggest behaviors that could modify the risk factors (e.g., improved therapy adherence⁴⁰), increase the person’s sense of control, and reduce the anxiety that comes from awareness of the risk. Less severe seizure types, such as focal seizures or myoclonic seizures, are not proven to be associated with increased SUDEP risk, but individuals who have them often remain at risk for GTCS in the setting of therapy nonadherence. Therefore, therapy adherence to maintain freedom from GTCS is important even when an individual is not experiencing this severe seizure type.

**Recommendation 5.** Clinicians should inform patients with epilepsy that seizure freedom, particularly freedom from GTCS (which is more likely to occur with medication adherence), is strongly associated with a decreased risk of SUDEP (Level B).

**Additional conclusions (no recommendations made).** The evidence is low that the following factors are associated with altering SUDEP risk:

1. Nocturnal seizures (associated with increased risk)
2. Any specific antiepileptic drug (AED) (none associated specifically with increased risk)
3. Lamotrigine use in women (associated with increased risk)
4. Never having been treated with an AED (associated with increased risk)
5. Number of AEDs used overall (associated with increased risk)
6. Heart rate variability (not associated with increased risk)
7. Extratemporal epilepsy (associated with increased risk)
8. Intellectual disability (associated with increased risk)
9. Male sex (associated with increased risk)
10. Anxiolytic drug use (associated with increased risk)

The evidence is very low or conflicting that the following factors are associated with altering SUDEP risk:

1. Overall seizure frequency when evaluated by using all seizure types
2. Medically refractory epilepsy vs not having well-controlled seizures defined as no seizures in the last year
3. Monotherapy vs polytherapy
4. Carbamazepine, phenytoin, or sodium valproate levels that are above, below, or within the reference range
5. Psychotropic drug use
6. Mental health disorders, lung disorders, or alcohol use
7. Lamotrigine use in people with highly refractory epilepsy
8. Frequent changes in AEDs
9. Therapeutic drug monitoring
10. Undergoing a resective epilepsy surgical procedure (although current research does not rule out the possibility of a beneficial effect or, further, the potential effect of epilepsy surgery on reducing GTCS frequency and epilepsy severity on reducing SUDEP risk)
11. Engel outcome of epilepsy surgery (although current research does not rule out the possibility of a beneficial effect and, further, the potential effect of epilepsy surgery on reducing SUDEP risk)
12. Vagus nerve stimulator use for more than 2 years (however, current research does not rule out the possibility of a beneficial effect and, further, the potential effect of epilepsy surgery on reducing SUDEP risk)
13. Epilepsy etiology, whether idiopathic or localization-related
14. Structural lesion on MRI
15. Duration of epilepsy
16. Age at epilepsy onset
17. Postictal EEG suppression

**SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

1. Systematic methods should be developed to identify and report the incidence of SUDEP in
different epilepsy populations in order to obtain a better understanding of the incidence and causes of this devastating condition.

2. Educational efforts are needed to improve the forensic knowledge of SUDEP among professionals such as medical examiners, coroners, and pathologists in order to help determine, and document on death certificates, the etiology in individuals, and in order to improve overall knowledge of this condition.

3. Research to identify preventable risk factors should be supported and encouraged so that future clinical trials will be conducted to reduce SUDEP occurrence. Of particular importance is to better understand (1) the relationship between the nature, severity, and duration of epilepsy and the occurrence of SUDEP and (2) whether current treatments affect the risk of developing SUDEP.

4. Because of (1) risks identified with frequent GTCS, (2) the fact that one study shows more SUDEP events occur in people in placebo arms of trials, and (3) increased SUDEP risk, serious consideration should be given to avoid assigning people with frequent GTCS to placebo for long periods.
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