



Ezogabine: A New Angle On Potassium Gates

Edward Faught, M. D.

Professor of Neurology, Emory University, Atlanta, GA

Address correspondence to Edward Faught, M.D.,

Emory Epilepsy Program, Department of Neurology A3100,

1365 Clifton Road NE, Atlanta, GA 30322

E-mail: rfaught@emory.edu

Ezogabine is a new drug for adjunctive therapy of partial-onset seizures with a novel mechanism of action. As a potassium-channel facilitator, it promotes membrane repolarization and thus opposes rapid repetitive discharges. Side effects are typical for antiepileptic drugs and the safety profile is good. Occasional instances of urinary difficulty may require surveillance.

Ezogabine (EZG) is the nonproprietary name adopted in the U.S. for retigabine, the international nonproprietary name for (*N*- [2-amino-4-(4-fluorobenzyl amino) -phenyl] carbamic acid ethyl ester. In January 2011 approval for marketing in Europe under the brand name Trobalt[®] was recommended by the Committee of Medicinal Products for Human Use of the European Medicines Agency, with an indication for adjunctive treatment of partial-onset seizures, with or without generalization, for patients 18 years of age and older (1). It has been submitted for approval in the United States. The original developer in Dresden, Germany, found it as one of a family of aminopyrroles with anticonvulsant activity. Since initial reports in the mid-1990s (2), EZG has followed a long and winding course toward regulatory approval (3). This was less because of issues intrinsic to the drug and more because of shifts in corporate licensing. EZG is of particular interest because of its unique mechanism of action as a potassium-channel facilitator.

Animal Data

EZG was effective in a wide variety of animal models when tested in the NIH antiepileptic drug development (ADD) program and by the original manufacturer (4). It is active against seizures in rodents induced by maximal electroshock, pentylenetetrazole, picrotoxin, NMDA (2), and amygdalar kindling (5). Based on rotorod testing, it had a better protective index in these models than valproate or phenytoin (5). Thus it appeared to be a broad-spectrum drug when it emerged from preclinical testing. Subsequently, it has been found to be effective in the amygdala-kindled lamotrigine-resistant rat model of drug-resistant epilepsy (6), a model which is also resistant to phenytoin and carbamazepine.

Mechanism of Action

Ezogabine is often referred to as a “potassium channel opener”, but this is a simplified description. EZG does not directly open a potassium channel. The channels at which it acts are voltage-gated, not ligand-gated. This is demonstrated by its efficacy in the low-magnesium seizure model, which does not depend upon synaptic transmission (7). The principal mechanism by which membrane repolarization occurs after an action potential is an outward potassium current, termed the M-current (muscarinically-modulated). This current flows at subthreshold voltages and is enhanced as depolarization further opens the $K_v7.2$ and $K_v7.3$ species of voltage-gated potassium channels, allowing potassium to flow outward driven by its concentration gradient (8). EZG facilitates the action of the neuronal $K_v7.2$ and $K_v7.3$ channels (encoded by genes *KCNQ2* and *KCNQ3*) by shifting the channels’ activation potentials 20-30mV toward hyperpolarization (9). This has the following physiological consequences: 1) a lesser degree of depolarization is needed to open the channel; 2) the channel, which usually opens rather slowly, opens faster, and 3) the channel stays open longer- perhaps as much as two to four times longer(10). This presumably has the effect of slowing repetitive firing, and thus underlies the compounds’ antiseizure effect.

At the stereochemical level, EZG seems to act as a sort of prop or doorstop, binding into a hydrophobic pocket within the “gate” region of the $K_v7.2$ and 3 channels which is the site of a molecular “hinge”(11). To extend the analogy, once EZG has lodged within this pocket, it bends the hinge slightly open, decreasing the angle through which the gate must swing to open fully. Therefore less energy is required to open the channel and to keep it open. It should be noted that the gate must be slightly open for EZG to act, suggesting that its most important effect is to stabilize the channel in the open state- in a sense, propping it open at a more favorable angle (12). EZG does not affect cardiac potassium channels, possibly because those channels (e.g. $K_v7.1$; coded by gene *KCNQ1*) are missing a glycine component which is essential for EZG to fit within its target (11).



There were early reports that EZG increases GABA action and decreases glutamate release (13), but it now seems likely that these are epiphenomena.

Pharmacokinetics

EZG is rapidly absorbed, with a T_{max} of 1.5 hours, and absorption is delayed but not reduced by food (14). Serum concentrations are linear through 1200 mg/day. The elimination half-life is 8 hours, so in clinical trials it was given three times per day. EZG is mostly glucuronidated rather than being metabolized by cytochrome P450 enzymes; therefore no significant age or sex effects on metabolism are expected. No clinically significant drug interactions have been identified. Phenytoin and carbamazepine increase the metabolic rate of EZG modestly but phenobarbital does not (15). Both the parent drug and metabolites are renally cleared.

Efficacy

Results of two multinational, randomized, controlled trials of EZG in patients with refractory partial-onset seizures have been published (16,17). A third trial, enrolling mostly in the US, was recently reported (18). All three multicenter trials had a classical add-on design. The three most common concomitant drugs were carbamazepine (about half of patients), lamotrigine and valproic acid (about one-quarter each). Over 70% of patients were on polytherapy when EZG was added, so no conclusions were possible concerning the best combinations.

To sum up the efficacy results from these trials, there was a reduction in seizures in the tested dose range 600 to 1200 mg/day.

All data that follow are presented as the result for each dosage cohort with the result for the parallel placebo cohort subtracted. The key primary endpoint aimed at FDA approval was the responder rate for the intent-to-treat population (50% seizure reduction from baseline) calculated from baseline, including the titration period. For the 600 mg/day dose, this reduction exceeded the placebo reduction by 7% (16) and 12% (17), for 900 mg/day by 16% (16) and 28% (17), and for 1200 mg/day, 17% (16) and 27% (18). The key primary endpoint aimed at European Medicines Agency approval was the responder rate in the intent-to-treat (ITT) population during the maintenance (stable dose) period. This was, for the 600 mg/day dose with the placebo rate subtracted, 1% (16) and 2% (17), for the 900 mg/day dose 9% (16) and 14.5% (17), and for the 1200 mg/day dose 15.2% (16) and 33% (18). In the first study, these figures were lowered by the unusually high placebo responder rate of 26% during the maintenance period (16).

The secondary endpoint in these studies was the median percent seizure reduction over baseline. The median percent reductions over placebo for the FDA ITT population were: 600 mg/day 10% (16) and 12% (17); 900 mg/day 16 (16) and 24% (17), and 1200 mg/day 22% (17) and 27% (18). In pairwise comparisons, the 600 mg dose was not statistically better than placebo but the 900 mg (16,17) and 1200 mg (16,18) doses were ($p < .001$).

The results of maintenance-phase data for patients reaching their target dose were superior, as expected, to the ITT populations: the median percent reduction in seizure number

over the baseline number for the 600 mg/day dose was 20% (16); for the 900 mg/day dose the reduction was 26% better than placebo (17), and for the 1200 mg/day dose 37% (18). Seizure-free rates counted from the time of randomization were low, as expected in a refractory population: 3.2% at 600 mg/day and 4.7% at 900 mg/day, not statistically different from the 1.2% placebo rate (17).

The best results were from the third trial, which enrolled 306 patients, mostly from the US, randomized to only one dose of EZG, 1200 mg/day, or to placebo as adjunctive therapy (18).

Tolerability

Effectiveness is a balance between efficacy and tolerability. A good measure of tolerability is the total dropout rate, which is more objective than the dropout rate attributed to adverse effects by the investigators. Most dropouts were during the titration period. During the first randomized clinical trial, dropouts during dose titration were 25% for the 600 mg/day arm, 38% for the 900 mg/day arm, and 50% for the 1200 mg/day arm (16). Because of the high dropout rate in the 1200 mg/day cohort, doses were limited to 900 mg/day for a later study: dropouts during titration were placebo 9%, 600 mg/day 13%, and 900 mg/day 16% (17). However, when the 1200 mg dose was tried again in the third trial, the dropout rate was only 27% compared to 9% for placebo (18). When data from clinical trials with this design are published, the statement is often made that the titration was forced, with the implication that slower titrations would increase tolerability. However, this does not completely explain the differences in dropout rates between the three EZG studies. The first trial permitted a rather leisurely 8-week titration to the target dose (16), but recorded more dropouts than the second trial, which provided for only a 4-week titration (17). The forced titration period for the third trial was 6 weeks, but it had the fewest dropouts (18).

The most common reasons for dropouts attributed to adverse effects were somnolence, dizziness, and fatigue or asthenia (16,17,18). Adverse effects with a definite dose-relationship were dizziness and somnolence (17). The dizziness was not usually associated with ataxia. There were also some instances of blurred vision, confusion, dysarthria, and -unusually for an antiepileptic drug- urinary tract infection (18).

Bladder epithelium contains voltage-gated potassium channel isoforms $K_v7.2$ and 3, and EZG causes urodynamic effects in rats (19). Accordingly, most participants in clinical trials had systematic measurements of post-voiding residual volumes and were administered a standard urological questionnaire designed to detect symptoms of prostatic hypertrophy (20). Among 1365 patients from 7 clinical trials, symptoms related to voiding difficulty or urinary retention occurred in 8.6%, slight increases in post-voiding residual volumes were recorded in 3.0%, and 5 of these 1365 patients required urinary catheterization (21). Symptoms resolved when EZG was discontinued. EZG can cause a reddish or orange discoloration of the urine, which is harmless and unrelated to bladder function.

Safety

So far, EZG therapy appears relatively safe. Concerns about possible cardiac effects of potassium-channel actions have



been allayed by the normal results of ECGs in human trials, including a 24-hour Holter monitor in the first trial (16). In contrast to some other antiepileptic drugs, EZG-treated subjects were virtually rash-free (16,17,18), had no visual field effects with formal testing (16), and had no clinically significant changes in hepatic enzymes or hematological parameters (16,17,18). In clinical trials, there were single reported cases of suicidal ideation and of psychosis (16). Sudden death rates did not exceed reported rates for individuals with refractory epilepsy (16,17,18).

Comparative Efficacy

For a new antiepileptic drug to keep marching toward commercialization, there seems to be a magic number for median percent seizure reduction in add-on trials of at least 30%, or at least 20% above the placebo rate. This standard, though nowhere publically endorsed and with no particular scientific merit, has remained remarkably constant for the past 20 years. This is despite protests that it may be getting harder and harder to obtain this result because of the availability of more and more drugs. Fortunately for EZG's development program, it cleared the bar. It is debatable whether results from adjunctive trials in such populations ought to be used in meta-analyses of comparative drug effectiveness. Results from EZG trials are not dissimilar to those from trials of other new drugs for refractory epilepsy (22). Also unknown is how these numbers will translate into clinical usefulness; apparent potency in trials does not necessarily predict wide clinical use. Is EZG a more efficacious drug than others? We cannot say until direct comparative trials are done.

Practical Use

Regulatory labeling is incomplete. Clinical trials enrolled men and women between the ages of 16 and 75 (16,17,18). In Europe, EZG labeling will likely reflect approval for patients 18 years and older (1). The best target dose for most patients in terms of balancing efficacy and tolerability appears to be about 900 mg/day, though 1200 mg/day is tolerated by many patients. The current formulation will require three daily divided doses.

Patients should be told of the common CNS side effects of somnolence, dizziness, and fatigue. If peak-dose dizziness occurs, taking EZG with food may help. Patients certainly should be informed that urinary discoloration may occur. Although this effect appears to be harmless, if a patient reports this it may be useful to do a urinalysis to be sure the discoloration is not caused by something unrelated to EZG therapy, such as blood.

Urinary hesitation may occur, and patients should be told this as well. A relative contraindication to EZG use may be prostatism or other pre-existing voiding difficulty. Formal screening and followup with the American Urological Association questionnaire (20) (AUA-SI) may be worthwhile in that circumstance, but is probably unnecessary in most patients. In the absence of evidence of cardiac effects, and with a good biological explanation of why EZG should not affect cardiac function (9), electrocardiographic surveillance should not be required.

Place in therapy

It is to be expected that EZG will be tried for patients with refractory partial-onset seizures who have failed other drugs. Most of the interest in this drug derives from its unique mechanism of action. It is tempting to say that we ought to try it in patients who have failed drugs with other mechanisms, but that hardly narrows the field of potential candidates. Will EZG be a path toward rational polytherapy of epilepsy? Theoretically, it should be complementary to both sodium-channel blocking drugs or GABA-facilitating drugs. A critical question is whether EZG displays synergism with other drugs, or merely an additive effect. Clues from animal isobolographic work suggest synergism with some drugs (23) but human evidence of antiepileptic synergy has not been easy to obtain even for older drug combinations. It is reasonable to consider possible additive side effects, such as dizziness or somnolence, when selecting drug combinations.

Besides rational polytherapy, another holy grail of epileptology is the idea of matching drugs to correct specific pathologies. A genetic abnormality coding for $K_v7.2$ channels is now known to be the cause of benign familial neonatal convulsions—"third day seizures" (24). Other K_v7 channelopathies may lead to other generalized epilepsies (25,26,27). There is insufficient experience to know whether EZG has a place in the therapy of these specific syndromes. Having a silver bullet is appealing, but practically what we need more is another "broad-spectrum" antiepileptic drug. EZG holds some promise for having a broad spectrum of activity based on animal data, but it has not been tested for generalized-onset seizures. EZG may also prove useful for conditions other than epilepsy, because its target channels are ubiquitous in the nervous system.

Conclusion

Ezogabine is the first antiepileptic drug with a very specific effect on central nervous system potassium channels. It changes the angle of a critical hinge in two isoforms of voltage-gated potassium channels, facilitating the open state of the channels. Thus it opens a new avenue for therapy of refractory epilepsies. It is also a tool to sort out which syndromes are modifiable by this mechanism. It has advantages of minimal drug interactions and mostly renal excretion. There are few safety concerns and most side effects are those typically seen with antiepileptic agents. The exception is urinary retention, which may rule out its use in populations susceptible to this problem.

References

1. Press release dated 21 Jan 2011 downloaded 14 Feb 2011 from www.gsk.com/media/pressreleases/2011/2011_pressrelease_10017.htm
2. Rostock, A., C. Tober, et al. (1996). D-23129: a new anticonvulsant with a broad spectrum activity in animal models of epileptic seizures. *Epilepsy Res* 23(3): 211–223.
3. Ben-Menachem, E. (2007). Retigabine: has the orphan found a home? *Epilepsy Curr* 7(6): 153–154.
4. Rostock, A., Tober C, Rundfeldt C, Bartsch R, Unverferth K, Engel J, Wolf HH, White HS (1997). AWD 140-190: a new anticonvulsant with a very good margin of safety. *Epilepsy Res* 28(1): 17–28.
5. Tober, C., A. Rostock, et al. (1996). D-23129: a potent anticonvulsant



- in the amygdala kindling model of complex partial seizures. *Eur J Pharmacol* 303(3): 163–169.
6. Srivastava, A., White HS (2005). Retigabine decreases behavioral and electrographic seizures in the lamotrigine-resistant amygdala kindled rat model of pharmacoresistant epilepsy. *Epilepsia* 46(Suppl 8): 217.
 7. Dost, R. and C. Rundfeldt (2000). The anticonvulsant retigabine potently suppresses epileptiform discharges in the low Ca⁺⁺ and low Mg⁺⁺ model in the hippocampal slice preparation. *Epilepsy Res* 38(1): 53–66.
 8. Brown, D. A. and G. M. Passmore (2009). Neural KCNQ (K_v7) channels. *Br J Pharmacol* 156(8): 1185–1195.
 9. Lagrange, A. (2005). Retigabine: bending potassium channels to our will. *Epilepsy Curr* 5(5): 166–168.
 10. Gao, Z., T. Zhang, et al. (2010). Isoform-specific prolongation of K_v7 (KCNQ) potassium channel opening mediated by new molecular determinants for drug-channel interactions. *J Biol Chem* 285(36): 28322–28332.
 11. Wuttke, T. V., G. Seebohm, et al. (2005). The new anticonvulsant retigabine favors voltage-dependent opening of the K_v7.2 (KCNQ2) channel by binding to its activation gate. *Mol Pharmacol* 67(4): 1009–1017.
 12. Lange, W., J. Geissendorfer, et al. (2009). Refinement of the binding site and mode of action of the anticonvulsant Retigabine on KCNQ K⁺ channels. *Mol Pharmacol* 75(2): 272–280.
 13. Kapetanovic, I. M., Yonekawa, W.D., Kupferberg, H.J. (1995). The effects of D 123129, a new experimental anticonvulsant drug, on neurotransmitter amino acids in the rat hippocampus in vivo. *Epilepsy Res* 22: 167–173.
 14. Ferron, G. M., J. Paul, et al. (2002). Multiple-dose, linear, dose-proportional pharmacokinetics of retigabine in healthy volunteers. *J Clin Pharmacol* 42(2): 175–182.
 15. Ferron, G. M., A. Patat, et al. (2003). Lack of pharmacokinetic interaction between retigabine and phenobarbitone at steady-state in healthy subjects. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 56(1): 39–45.
 16. Porter R.J., Partiot, A., (2007) Randomized, multicenter, dose-ranging trial of retigabine for partial-onset seizures. *Neurology* 68(15): 1197–1204.
 17. Brodie, M. J., H. Lerche, et al. (2010). Efficacy and safety of adjunctive ezogabine (retigabine) in refractory partial epilepsy. *Neurology* 75(20): 1817–1824.
 18. French, J.A., Abou-Khalil, B.W., Leroy, R.F. et al. (2011) Randomized, placebo-controlled trial ezogabine (retigabine) in partial epilepsy. *Neurology* E pub ahead of print 30 March 2011, downloaded 4 April 2011.
 19. Streng, T., T. Christoph, et al. (2004). Urodynamic effects of the K⁺ channel (KCNQ) opener retigabine in freely moving, conscious rats. *J Urol* 172(5 Pt 1): 2054–2058.
 20. Barry, M. J., Fowler, F.J., O'Leary, M.P., et al. Measurement Committee of the American Urological Association (1992). The American Urological Association symptom index for benign prostatic hyperplasia. *Mea. J Urol* 148: 1549–1557.
 21. Brickel, N., Hammond, J., DeRossett, S. Pharmacological effects of retigabine on bladder function: results from phase 2/3 studies. (2010) American Epilepsy Society Annual Meeting abstract 1.272. Downloaded from www.aesnet.org 14 Feb 2011.
 22. Beyenberg, S., Stavert, S., Schmidt, D. (2010). Placebo-corrected efficacy of modern antiepileptic drugs for refractory epilepsy: systematic review and metaanalysis. *Epilepsia* 51: 7–26.
 23. Luszczki, J. J., J. Z. Wu, et al. (2009). Isobolographic characterization of interactions of retigabine with carbamazepine, lamotrigine, and valproate in the mouse maximal electroshock-induced seizure model. *Naunyn Schmiedebergs Arch Pharmacol* 379(2): 163–179.
 24. Neubauer, B. A., Waldegger, S., Heinzinger, J., et al. (2008). KCNQ2 and KCNQ3 channels: neonatal epilepsy and progressive deafness. *Neurology* 71: 177–183.
 25. Lerche, H., Y. G. Weber, et al. (2005). Ion channel defects in idiopathic epilepsies. *Curr Pharm Des* 11(21): 2737–2752.
 26. Maljevic, S., T. V. Wuttke, et al. (2008). Nervous system K_v7 disorders: breakdown of a subthreshold brake. *J Physiol* 586(7): 1791–1801.
 27. Benarroch, E.E. (2009). Potassium channels. Brief overview and implications in epilepsy. *Neurology* 72(7): 664–669.



American Epilepsy Society

Epilepsy Currents Journal

Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest

Instructions

The purpose of this form is to provide readers of your manuscript with information about your other interests that could influence how they receive and understand your work. Each author should submit a separate form and is responsible for the accuracy and completeness of the submitted information. The form is in four parts.

1. Identifying information.

Enter your full name. If you are NOT the main contributing author, please check the box “no” and enter the name of the main contributing author in the space that appears. Provide the requested manuscript information.

2. The work under consideration for publication.

This section asks for information about the work that you have submitted for publication. The time frame for this reporting is that of the work itself, from the initial conception and planning to the present. The requested information is about resources that you received, either directly or indirectly (via your institution), to enable you to complete the work. Checking “No” means that you did the work without receiving any financial support from any third party – that is, the work was supported by funds from the same institution that pays your salary and that institution did not receive third-party funds with which to pay you. If you or your institution received funds from a third party to support the work, such as a government granting agency, charitable foundation or commercial sponsor, check “Yes”. Then complete the appropriate boxes to indicate the type of support and whether the payment went to you, or to your institution, or both.

3. Relevant financial activities outside the submitted work.

This section asks about your financial relationships with entities in the bio-medical arena that could be perceived to influence, or that give the appearance of potentially influencing, what you wrote in the submitted work. For example, if your article is about testing an epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) antagonist in lung cancer, you should report all associations with entities pursuing diagnostic or therapeutic strategies in cancer in general, not just in the area of EGFR or lung cancer.

Report all sources of revenue paid (or promised to be paid) directly to you or your institution on your behalf over the 36 months prior to submission of the work. This should include all monies from sources with relevance to the submitted work, not just monies from the entity that sponsored the research. Please note that your interactions with the work’s sponsor that are outside the submitted work should also be listed here. If there is any question, it is usually better to disclose a relationship than not to do so.

For grants you have received for work outside the submitted work, you should disclose support ONLY from entities that could be perceived to be affected financially by the published work, such as drug companies, or foundations supported by entities that could be perceived to have a financial stake in the outcome. Public funding sources, such as government agencies, charitable foundations or academic institutions, need not be disclosed. For example, if a government agency sponsored a study in which you have been involved and drugs were provided by a pharmaceutical company, you need only list the pharmaceutical company.

4. Other relationships

Use this section to report other relationships or activities that readers could perceive to have influenced, or that give the appearance of potentially influencing, what you wrote in the submitted work.



American Epilepsy Society

Epilepsy Currents Journal

Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest

Section #1 Identifying Information

1. Today's Date: 6/17/2011
2. First Name Edward Last Name Faught Degree M.D.
3. Are you the Main Assigned Author? Yes No

If no, enter your name as co-author:

4. Manuscript/Article Title: Ezogabine

5. Journal Issue you are submitting for:

Section #2 The Work Under Consideration for Publication

Did you or your institution at any time receive payment or services from a third party for any aspect of the submitted work (including but not limited to grants, data monitoring board, study design, manuscript preparation, statistical analysis, etc.)?

Complete each row by checking "No" or providing the requested information. If you have more than one relationship just add rows to this table.

Type	No	Money Paid to You	Money to Your Institution*	Name of Entity	Comments**
1. Grant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
2. Consulting fee or honorarium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
3. Support for travel to meetings for the study or other purposes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
4. Fees for participating in review activities such as data monitoring boards, statistical analysis, end point committees, and the like	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
5. Payment for writing or reviewing the manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
6. Provision of writing assistance, medicines, equipment, or administrative support.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
7. Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

* This means money that your institution received for your efforts on this study.

** Use this section to provide any needed explanation.

Section #3 Relevant financial activities outside the submitted work.

Place a check in the appropriate boxes in the table to indicate whether you have financial relationships (regardless of amount of compensation) with entities as described in the instructions. Use one line for each entity; add as many lines as you need by clicking the “Add” box. You should report relationships that were present during the 36 months prior to submission.

Complete each row by checking “No” or providing the requested information. If you have more than one relationship just add rows to this table.

Type of relationship (in alphabetical order)	No	Money Paid to You	Money to Your Institution*	Name of Entity	Comments**
1. Board membership	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
2. Consultancy	<input type="checkbox"/>	x		Eisai, Lundbeck, Sunovion, Supernus, UCB Pharma	
3. Employment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
4. Expert testimony	<input type="checkbox"/>	x		Abbott Laboratories	
5. Grants/grants pending	<input type="checkbox"/>		x	Cyberonics, GlaxoSmithKline, The Analysis Group, Centers for Disease Control	
6. Payment for lectures including service on speakers bureaus	<input type="checkbox"/>	x		Southern Epilepsy and EEG Society	
7. Payment for manuscript preparation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
8. Patents (planned, pending or issued)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
9. Royalties	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
10. Payment for development of educational presentations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
11. Stock/stock options	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
12. Travel/accommodations/meeting expenses unrelated to activities listed.**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
13. Other (err on the side of full disclosure)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

* This means money that your institution received for your efforts.

** For example, if you report a consultancy above there is no need to report travel related to that consultancy on this line.

Section #4 Other relationships

Are there other relationships or activities that readers could perceive to have influenced, or that give the appearance of potentially influencing, what you wrote in the submitted work?

No other relationships/conditions/circumstances that present a potential conflict of interest.

Yes, the following relationships/conditions/circumstances are present:

Thank you for your assistance.
Epilepsy Currents Editorial Board