



## Treatment of Catamenial Epilepsy Is Still Up in the Air

### Progesterone vs Placebo Therapy for Women with Epilepsy: A Randomized Clinical Trial.

Herzog AG, Fowler KM, Smithson SB, Kalayjian LA, Heck CN, Sperling MR, Liporace JD, Harden CL, Dworetzky BA, Pennell PB, Massaro JM. *Neurology* 2012;78(24):1959–1966.

**OBJECTIVE:** To assess progesterone treatment of intractable seizures in women with partial epilepsy. **METHODS:** This randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase III, multicenter, clinical trial compared the efficacy and safety of adjunctive cyclic natural progesterone therapy versus placebo treatment of intractable seizures in 294 subjects randomized 2:1 to progesterone or placebo, stratified by catamenial and noncatamenial status. It compared treatments on proportions of  $\geq 50\%$  responders and changes in seizure frequency from 3 baseline to 3 treated menstrual cycles. **RESULTS:** There was no significant difference in proportions of responders between progesterone and placebo in the catamenial and noncatamenial strata. Prespecified secondary analysis showed that the level of perimenstrual seizure exacerbation (C1 level) was a significant predictor of responders for progesterone but not placebo. With increasing C1 levels, responders increased from 21% to 57% with progesterone versus 19% to 20% with placebo. Reductions in seizure frequency correlated with increasing C1 levels for progesterone but not placebo, progressing from 26% to 71% for progesterone versus 25% to 26% for placebo. A prespecified clinically important separation between progesterone and placebo responders (37.8% vs 11.1%;  $p = 0.037$ ) was realized among 21.4% of women who had C1 level  $\geq 3$ . **CONCLUSION:** There was no difference in the primary outcome of  $\geq 50\%$  responder rates between progesterone versus placebo for catamenial or noncatamenial groups. Post hoc findings suggest that the level of perimenstrual seizure exacerbation is a significant predictor of responder rate with progesterone and that progesterone may provide clinically important benefit for a subset of women with perimenstrually exacerbated seizures. **CLASSIFICATION OF EVIDENCE:** This study provides Class III evidence that cyclic progesterone is ineffective in women with intractable partial epilepsy. Post hoc analysis identified a subset of women with higher levels of perimenstrual seizure exacerbation that were responsive to treatment.

### Commentary

Seizure clustering is a common occurrence in many types of epilepsy. As with any phenomenon distributed unevenly, the human mind strives to find explanations for periods of relative quiescence interspersed with periods of prominent activity. Women with epilepsy have consistently associated seizure clustering with the menstrual cycle, so much so that there is a name for the phenomenon of women who experience exacerbation during this time: catamenial epilepsy. There has been a struggle to explicitly define catamenial epilepsy, since epilepsy occurs in so many different and complex patterns. Likely, women who have seizures in a monthly pattern will attribute it to the menstrual cycle whether or not there is a relationship. Notably, women are not alone in cycling of seizures: This phenomenon may be reported in men as well. In a questionnaire study of 141 men and women presenting to an epilepsy

center, 29% reported seizure clustering, and gender was not a significant predictor of patients reporting clusters (1).

Given the fact that clustering is very common, it is quite possible that at least some clustering is indeed related to cycling of hormones and, therefore, tied to the menstrual pattern. Several different catamenial patterns have been reported, including seizures that occur perimenstrually (between days -3 to 3 of the menstrual cycle, the so-called "C1 pattern"), those that occur in the periovulatory period (Days 10–13, the "C-2 pattern"), and those that occur in anovulatory cycles (Days 10–3, the "C3 pattern") (2).

Since there is an acknowledged likely association of seizure clusters to menses, there have been numerous attempts to intervene with various therapeutic maneuvers—including acetazolamide and intermittent benzodiazepine therapy—and potentially more targeted interventions that would address hormonal surges that have been implicated in catamenial epilepsy. The most promising intervention appeared to be introduction of natural progesterone on Days 14 to 25 of the menstrual cycle. Yet, no intervention, including this one, had been subjected to a randomized controlled trial until the present study, which was a welcome attempt to finally



prove that this intervention that was clearly well grounded in theory was also effective in practice.

The study recruited very slowly, and eventually was stopped prematurely for futility (that is, even after randomizing only about half the initially planned enrollment, it was clear that the progesterone arm would not separate from placebo). The results of the study demonstrated that progesterone therapy was ineffective in the group as a whole, which was a great disappointment. In itself, this is yet another example of why randomized controlled trials are so important; previous open trials had demonstrated a > 50 % overall reduction in seizures compared to pretreatment baseline, a result that was clearly not supported (3, 4).

Yet, there was a possible silver lining suggested by a pre-planned post-hoc analysis: Apparently, women who had a very pure form of the C-1 pattern (at least 3 times as many seizures premenstrually as at other times) did improve compared to placebo. Moreover, the more pure the C1 pattern (as measured by the score from 1–10), the greater the likelihood of success. As noted in the publication, “Progesterone responder rates increased with C1 levels . . . from 24% to 64% ( $r = 0.254$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ). A graph included in the paper shows a systematic rise with each step higher in the C1 level.

While these results may demonstrate that there is a subset of those with catamenial epilepsy who may benefit from intermittent progesterone, there are several facts that imply that the number of women who benefit are likely to be small: The first is that the encouraging graph, showing a mounting success rate with the rising C1 level with a statistically significant improvement beginning at a C1 level of 3. On closer inspection, it becomes clear that C levels are not assessed independently; each cohort is calculated inclusive of all the levels above it. Thus, for example, the C-1 3 level ( $N = 63$ ) includes all women with a C-1 level of 3 *and above*, 4 level ( $N = 51$ ) is 4 *and above*, and so on. To give an analogy, one could claim that everyone over 30 had a higher risk of being in a nursing home compared with those under 30, with a higher and higher rate for those 30 and above, compared to 40 and above, compared to 50 and above because you are increasingly enriching for the true population with a higher risk (60 and above). In other words, one really cannot determine from this data whether those with a C-1 level of  $\geq 3$  or  $\geq 4$ , for ex-

ample, actually had a higher risk compared to placebo since they are not separated out, so you cannot tell at which “level” the response sharply increased.

Even if one accepted a level of  $\geq 3$  as the cutoff for an improvement, the number of women who were included in this group was very small at only 20% of the randomized group. A final concern is that if the treatment response is tied to the C-1 pattern, one must consider the heterogeneity even within a single woman. According to data from this very study, women may not demonstrate the same pattern consistently. The patterns during the 3-month baseline were assessed for the first 100 women entering the study (249 cycles in all) (2). Even in one woman, patterns changed from month to month. Many women did not experience a catamenial pattern in all cycles: 16% of cycles were anovulatory, and of the 208 ovulatory cycles, only 22.1% were pure C1, while 10.6% were C2, and a similar number was experienced in C1 and C2 patterns in the same cycle!

In conclusion, the data from this study is very important and clinically relevant. Most women will not benefit from progesterone therapy. A few select women with very consistent exacerbation of seizures in the days just before and after menstruation may benefit—but even these women may not benefit all of the time. To justify progesterone use, it would be important to document seizure relationship to menstruation in a prospective manner for several months prior to treatment initiation. Even then, the level of catamenial exacerbation that would predict benefit remains unknown.

by Jacqueline A. French, MD

#### References

1. Haut SR, Shinnar S, Moshe SL. Seizure clustering: Risks and outcomes. *Epilepsia* 2005;46:146–149.
2. Herzog AG, Harden CL, Liporace J, Pennell P, Schomer DL, Sperling M, Fowler K, Nikolov B, Shuman S, Newman M. Frequency of catamenial seizure exacerbation in women with localization-related epilepsy. *Ann Neurol* 2004;56:431–434.
3. Herzog AG. Progesterone therapy in women with complex partial and secondary generalized seizures. *Neurology* 1995;45:1660–1662.
4. Herzog AG. Intermittent progesterone therapy and frequency of complex partial seizures in women with menstrual disorders. *Neurology* 1986;36:1607–1610.



# 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: 4/30/2013
2. First Name Jacqueline Last Name French Degree MD
3. Are you the Main Assigned Author?  Yes  No  
If no, enter your name as co-author:
4. Manuscript/Article Title: Treatment of Catamenial Epilepsy Is Still Up in the Air
5. Journal Issue you are submitting for: 13.2

#### 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 type="checkbox"/>		\$0.00	JAZZ, Upsher-Smith	TESC (Consortium) received funding for work performed
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
3. Employment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
4. Expert testimony	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
5. Grants/grants pending	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
6. Payment for lectures including service on speakers bureaus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
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:

I receive 25% salary support for my work for the Consortium, but this is from work performed for 10 companies, not just the two listed which have projects related to benzodiazepines.

Thank you for your assistance.

