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Abstract

Objective

Approximately one third of epileptic children are resistant to anticonvulsant drugs. This study evaluates the effectiveness, safety, and tolerability of pregabalin as adjunctive therapy in epileptic children relative to Zonisamide.

Materials & Methods

From April 2012 to November 2012, 121 children were referred to Mofid Children’s Hospital with intractable epilepsy and enrolled in the study. The patients were divided into two groups (A and B) randomly. Group A was treated with Zonisamide and group B was treated with Pregabalin in addition to prior medication. We assessed seizure frequency and severity during a 4-week interval from the beginning of the drug treatment and compared the efficacy of each in these two groups.

Results

Group A consists of 61 patients, 26 (42.6%) girls, and 35 (57.4%) boys with an age range from 1.5 months–14 years (mean, 73.9 ± 44.04 months). Group B consists of 60 patients, 31 (51.7%) girls, 29 (48.3%) boys with an age range from 6 months–16 years (mean, 71 ± 42.9 months). Age, gender, seizure onset, seizure frequency, seizure type, and previous antiepileptic medications showed that there was no significant difference between the groups (P > 0.05). Zonisamide and pregabalin reduced more than 50% of seizure intensity in 40.2%; 45.8% of patients also had a seizure frequency decline between 35.8–44.4%, respectively and there was no significant superiority between these two novel anticonvulsants (P > 0.05).

Conclusion

In this survey both pregabalin and Zonisamide were impressive for seizure control in children with intractable epilepsy and well sustained with mild complications that were completely reversible.
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Introduction

Every year about 40 out of 100,000 children under 16 years of age are affected by epilepsy as one of the most widespread neurologic disorders worldwide (1). Approximately one third of epileptic children do not achieve complete seizure improvement in spite of equal or more two antiepileptic therapies, i.e. refractory epilepsy (2-3). Election of the most suitable anticonvulsant for an epileptic patient
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Materials & Methods

From April 2012 to November 2012, 121 children were referred to Mofid Children’s Hospital with intractable epilepsy (failure of seizure recovery in spite of two or more antiepileptic drugs) and were enrolled in the study. Exclusion criterion was hypersensitivity to anticonvulsants and having a neurodegenerative disease. All parents endorsed a written informed consent. The initial assessment included history taking (seizure type, onset, etiology and frequency, period of the treatment, type of antiepileptic drug usage), general and neurologic physical examination, electroencephalography (EEG), and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) performance. Then, the patients were divided into two groups randomly (A and B). Group A was treated with Zonisamide while patients in group B received Pregabalin. We treated group A with capsules of ZNS (2–12 milligram per kilogram daily) as group B were treated with capsules of PGB (5–15 milligram per kilogram daily) divided in two or three doses in addition to prior medication. We assessed seizure frequency, severity, and duration during the 4 week interval from the beginning of treatment and compared the efficacy of each drug in the two groups. During follow-ups, seizure frequency or severity reduction equal and greater than 50% is termed as a response to the drug. A paired sample T-test, Z-test, and chi-square have been used in the statistical analysis. All of the ethical perspectives of this study have been confirmed by the Ethics Committee of Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences. This study was registered in the Iranian Registry of Clinical Trial (IRCT) as IRCT2012091210508N4.

Results

In this study, 137 patients were enrolled and 121 patients reached the final stage. Table 1 lists the details of patient specifications. Group A consists of 61 patients, 26 (42.6%) girls, 35 (57.4%) boys with an age range of 1.5 months–14 years (mean, 73.9± 44.04 months).
Group A toward 15(25%), 32(53.33%), and 13 (21.66%) patients of group B had no change, greater than 50% recovery, and reduction less than 50%, respectively (Figure1). Also, 25(41%), 19 (31.1%), 14(23.9%), and 3(4.9%) patients of group A compared to 18(30%), 23 (38.33%), 17(28.3%), and 2(3.3%) patients of group B were not changed, reduced greater than 50%, had reduction lower than 50%, and had worsened in the 6 months follow-up, respectively (Figure1). There was no significant difference between these two groups in view of seizure frequency, duration, and severity reduction after one (P=0.591) and six (P=0.607) months reviews. First month reviews showed that infantile spasms (85.7%), generalized tonic clonic (58.8%), and myoclonic (54.5%) seizures compared to partial (70.2%), tonic (60%), and generalized tonic clonic (40.9%) were the types of seizures with the highest response to ZNS and PGB respectively. The highest response to ZNS and PGB were in seizure types as follows: Myoclonic (54.5%), infantile spasms (47.1%), and generalized tonic clonic (42.9%) versus partial (53.2%), tonic (50%), and atonic (40%) during six-month review, respectively. There was no seizure response to mixed type and myoclonic seizures by ZNS and PGB, respectively, within the first or six months assay.

Discussion

This study showed that ZNS and PGB reduced greater than 50% of the seizure intensity in 40.2% and 44.4% of patients also had seizure frequency declines of 35.8% and 44.4%, respectively in which there was no significant superiority between these two novel anticonvulsants. Brodie et al, Sackellares et al, Faught et al, and Schmidt et al reported a response rate (greater than 50% seizure reduction) of 28–47% with ZNS as an add-on therapy for intractable epilepsy through four clinical studies (20). ZNS effectiveness in the current assay is in agreement with Coppola et al and Stephen who declared a frequency decline of greater than 50% between 48.7–39% of patients, respectively (21-22). No preference between these two drugs that we found is different from Claudia B et al and Yuen et al who estimated that with a ZNS retention rate of 31% compared to 24% for PGB after six months period (23-24). In our review, the efficacy of both drugs has been diminished after six months of...
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treatment towards one month of consumption. Loscher et al has observed that the efficacy of antiepileptic drugs decreased over time due to drug receptor sensitivity decreases that led to pharmacodynamic tolerance that can further lead to loss of drug function completely or could interfere with other anticonvulsant activity via cross tolerance (25). Similar to our results, Arroyo et al stated that 43.5% of patients with refractory epilepsy responded to PGB therapy. Furthermore, this study found a dose-dependent response to this drug at the higher dose equal to 600 mg per day was quite effective (15). Terence et al examined the effects of lamotrigine compared with pregabalin on refractory partial seizures in a 17-week treatment period and concluded that PGB reduced greater than 50% of seizure intensity in 35.5% of cases toward the lamotrigine efficacy in 21.4% of patients (26). Lee et al observed seizure declines in 46.2% of patients after 13 weeks of PGB treatment, which confirmed our result (27). Elger et al detected PGB antiepileptic efficacy more than our results who treated patients with a constant dose of PGB (600mg/day) and later 12 weeks found 49.3% seizure improvement (19). This discrepancy may be due to a wide spectrum of PGB dosage (5-15mg/kg/day), which takes a few weeks to achieve a fixed amount of the drug’s availability in patients. Pradeep found a significant PGB induced reduction in the frequency and severity of seizures of up to 56% among patients with various seizure types and those who had previously not responded to gabapentin had no response to PGB (28). Our study showed that three patients who had used gabapentin previously did not respond to PGB against Pradeep’s results. The highest response to ZNS in our case was obtained in seizure types of infantile spasms (66.4%), myoclonic (54.5%), and generalized tonic clonic (50.9%) with no effect on mixed type seizures. Partial seizures (61.7%), tonic (55%), and generalized tonic clonic (40.9%) were the seizure kinds with the highest response to PGB in our patients with no effect on myoclonic seizure. PGB and ZNS had complication rate of 18.33–16.4%, respectively. Decreased appetite, impaired speech, ataxia, sigh, visual disturbances, hallucinations, and dizziness versus increased appetite, increased urination, hallucinations, and headache have been the most prevalent side effects of ZNS and PGB, respectively. All of our patients’ complications occurred with ZNS and PGB dose greater than or equal to 200 vs 150 mg/day in patients over 6 vs 7 years of age, respectively. The incidence of ZNS complications in the current assay is insignificant compared to Tan et al (43.9%), Stephen (28.6%) and Claudia et al (58%) detections. Since, usually PGB has been used in the treatment of adults with epilepsy that requires at least 300 mg/day. Its complications incidence in n Lee et al (64.7%), Terence et al (50%), and Elger et al (32.8%) surveys were greater than our results. Weight gain was the most common side effect of PGB in our patients and was also Pradeep, Arroyo et al, and Terence et al reported 5–7% weight enhancement among 24–50% of those who took it.

In conclusion, in this survey both pregabalin and Zonisamide were impressive for seizure control in children with intractable epilepsy and well sustained with mild complications that were completely reversible. Acknowledgments
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### Table 1. Summary of Patient Characteristics

| Characteristic | Zonisamide. Group 2-12mg/kg/day (N = 61) | Pregabalin. Group 5-15mg/kg/day (N = 60) | Characteristic | Zonisamide. Group 2-12mg/kg/day (N = 61) | Pregabalin. Group 5-15mg/kg/day (N = 60) |
|----------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Gender         |                                          |                                           | Seizure frequency |                                           |                                           |
| Male           | 35 (57.4%)                               | 29 (48.3%)                               | Mean (SD)        | 5.43 ± 7.2                               | 4.65 ± 3.77                               |
| Female         | 26 (42.6%)                               | 31 (51.7%)                               | Range            | 0.3 - 50                                  | 0.1 - 20                                  |
| Age            |                                          |                                           | Seizure onset    |                                          |                                           |
| Mean (SD)      | 73.9±44m 1.5m to 14 y                    | 71±42.89 m 6 m to 16 y                   | Mean (SD)        | 27.1±28.1 m                               | 23.2±24.3 m                               |
| Range          |                                          |                                          | Range            | 3 D - 11 y                                | 15 D - 10 y                               |
| Seizure type   |                                          |                                           | MRI             |                                          |                                           |
| Tonic clonic   | 17 (27.9%)                               | 22 (36.7%)                               | Normal           | 19 (31.1%)                                | 20 (33.3%)                                |
| Simple partial  | 4 (6.6%)                                 | 3 (5%)                                   | Atrophy          | 17 (27.9%)                                | 16 (26.7%)                                |
| Complex partial | 12 (19.7%)                               | 13 (21.7%)                               | PVL              | 10 (19.4%)                                | 5 (8.3%)                                  |
| Total partial  | 16 (26.3%)                               | 16 (26.3%)                               | Tuberous sclerosis | 3 (4.9%)                                 | 2 (3.3%)                                  |
| Infantile spasm | 7 (11.5%)                               | 3 (5%)                                   | Migrational disorder | 4 (6.6%)                                | 3 (5%)                                    |
| Myoclonic      | 11 (18%)                                 | 3 (5%)                                   | M. temporal sclerosis | 2 (3.3%)                                | 6 (10%)                                   |
| Tonic          | 2 (3.3%)                                 | 5 (8.3%)                                 | Cortical dysplasia | 2 (3.3%)                                 | 2 (3.3%)                                  |
| Atonic         | 0 (0%)                                   | 2 (3.3%)                                 | Callosal dysgenesis | 2 (3.3%)                                | 0 (0%)                                    |
| Absence        | 0 (0%)                                   | 1 (1.7%)                                 | Encephalomalacia | 0 (0%)                                   | 1 (1.6%)                                  |
| mixed          | 8 (13.1%)                                | 8 (13.1%)                                | Basal ganglia    | 1 (1.6%)                                 | 1 (1.6%)                                  |
| EEG.quality    |                                          |                                           | Calcification    | 0 (0%)                                   | 2 (3.3%)                                  |
| Normal         | 4 (6.6%)                                 | 4 (6.57%)                                | Focal lesion     | 1 (1.6%)                                 | 3 (5%)                                    |
| Mild abnormal  | 18 (29.5%)                               | 17 (28.3%)                               | Spike            | 23 (37.7%)                                | 29 (48.33%)                               |
| Moderate abnor-| 24 (39.3%)                               | 25 (41.66%)                              | High voltage slow wave | 16 (26.22%) | 12 (20%)                                  |
| mal           |                                          |                                          | Hypsarrhythmia   | 9 (14.57%)                                | 5 (8.33%)                                 |
| Severe abnormal| 15 (24.6%)                               | 14 (23.33%)                              | Sharp wave       | 6 (9.83%)                                 | 8 (13.33%)                                |
| EEG.waves      |                                          |                                           | Burst suppression | 3 (4.9%)                                 | 2 (3.33%)                                 |
| First month    |                                          |                                           | Unchanged        | 25 (41%)                                 | 18 (30%)                                  |
| follow-up      |                                          |                                           | Improvement      |                                          |                                           |
| Unchanged      | 17 (27.9%)                               | 15 (25%)                                 | 75-99% reduction | 9 (14.8%)                                | 11 (18.3%)                                |
| Improvement    |                                          |                                           | 50-75% reduction | 8 (13.1%)                                | 6 (10%)                                   |
| 75-99% reduction | 8 (13.1%)                               | 13 (21.3%)                               | 25-50% reduction | 7 (11.5%)                                | 9 (15%)                                   |
| 50-75% reduction | 8 (13.1%)                               | 13 (21.3%)                               | <25% reduction   | 7 (11.5%)                                | 8 (13.3%)                                 |
| <25% reduction | 6 (9.1%)                                 | 3 (5%)                                   | worsening        | 3 (4.9%)                                 | 2 (3.3%)                                  |

M= month, y= years, MRI=Magnetic resonance imaging, PVL=Periventricular leukomalacia, HVSW= High voltage slow waves
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