Systematic Review on Anti-Epileptic Drugs

Dr. Sangeeta Kamthan

Associate Professor

Department of Chemistry ,

Bareilly College , Bareilly (UP)

drdk62@yahoo.com

Abstract

The number of commercially accessible antiepileptic medicines (AEDs) has significantly expanded in recent years. This may make management decisions more difficult, but it also presents some welcome new alternatives for efficiently individualizing care. Opportunities to customize medication therapy to the unique patient's features have never been stronger due to the fact that each of the current AEDs differs from others in many clinically significant qualities. Spectrum of efficacy in various seizure types, adverse effects profile, pharmacokinetic properties, susceptibility to cause or be a target of clinically important drug-drug interactions, ease of use, and cost are all factors that should be taken into consideration when choosing a drug for patients with epilepsy. Other elements that must be taken into account when choosing a medication include the accessibility of user-friendly paediatric formulations, and possibly positive impacts on human health.

Among the most often administered centrally active medications are antiepileptic medicines (AEDs). AED use was discovered to be present in 5,426 people in a recent study of 471,873 people in Denmark, which represents a prevalence of 1.1%. [1]

INTRODUCTION

A chronic neurological disorder called epilepsy is described as having recurring, unprovoked seizures. [2] In the United States, it is one of the most prevalent major neurological illnesses and frequently need long-term therapy. In the United States, 150000 persons are freshly diagnosed with epilepsy, having 3% or close to it is the lifetime cumulative incidence. [3][4] The best antiepilectic medicine prevents seizures without impairing the central nervous system's functionality or causing side effects that lower the patient's quality of life. This objective is too challenging to achieve because seizure activity is a delicate functional perturbation of the normal physiologic action of the nervous system. However, Merrit and Putnam's 1938 discovery of phenytoin as the first non-sedating anticonvulsant showed that the objective is reachable. [5] Not much research has been done on the "natural history" of newly diagnosed epilepsy and how it responds to therapy. According to long-term outcome studies and randomized comparative trials (2–5), 50% of patients experience seizure-free days after taking their first antiepileptic medication. Drug (AED). Failure brought on by a lack of effectiveness is related has a negative consequence of Newly discovered epilepsy's "natural history". It is not clearly known how patients responded to therapy. [6] Effectiveness includes tolerance and effectiveness. [7] Although randomized trials, particularly those for regulatory purposes, that are not intended to address the drug's actual everyday use frequently do a poor job of evaluating the latter's significance. [8] It is uncertain at

what dosage an AED should be regarded ineffective in treating individuals with recurrent seizures and when alternate treatment, such as with a second AED, should be used. Medication or an AED cocktail should be taken into consideration. The standard suggestion is to increase the dosage to near-toxic concentrations in individuals with ongoing seizures. [9] Although randomized controlled studies are necessary to determine whether a novel AED is effective, it has been questioned whether these findings may be extended to clinical practice. [10] The application of trial findings to real-world situations may be aided by observational research . We looked at how newly diagnosed epilepsy patients followed up at a single facility responded to the initial AED in terms of efficacy, tolerability, and overall effectiveness.

EPILECTIC DRUGS MODE OF ACTION

Anticonvulsant medications in clinical usage may be categorized into three classes based on how they work: those that promote -aminobutryic acid (GABA)ergic neurotransmission; those that block neuronal ion channels; and those whose exact mechanism of action is still unknown. The substances influencing GABAergic .The systems that modify transmission through chloride channels, for example, can be further classified into two categories. the benzodiazepines and barbiturates; those substances, particularly vigabatrin, which slow down the deterioration via inhibiting GABA transaminase; and those that prevent GABA from being taken up again by the precursor terminal. The other class of substances with a recognised mode of action is those that block neuronal ion channels. Lamotrigine, phenytoin, or carbamazepine diminishes electrical activity, which likely results in a subsequent decrease in glutamate release. These drugs also block voltage-operated sodium channels. On the other hand, ethosuximide inhibits voltage-operated calcium channels, particularly those that mediate calcium currents in thalamic neurons. Sodium valproate is the best example of a medication whose mode of action is unclear. And It's also possible that antagonistic activity at the glutamate receptor's N-methyl-D-aspartate (NMDA) subtype has a role. Possibilities, which could apply to some of the more recent medicines that are now being evaluated. [11]

AEDs are often not categorized according to their various mechanisms of action, unlike other therapeutic classes, for a variety of reasons. First, present information suggests that most AEDs have several mechanisms of action , each of which may contribute to therapeutic success to varying degrees depending on the illness being treated. Their molecular effects are also not fully understood. [12] [13] Second, the approach to treating epilepsy and, in fact, the majority of other disorders in which AEDs are used, is not mechanism based, probably as a result of our insufficient understanding of how medications affect the path physiology of the disease. In other words, understanding the various AEDs' mechanisms of action is only marginally useful for forecasting the beneficial and harmful effects of these medications in clinical settings.[14] Last but not least, drug promotion in an increasingly cutthroat market does little to offer balanced information on mechanisms of action, and every agent introduced into clinical use is invariably claimed to have additional or innovative properties not shared by preexisting drugs, frequently on the basis of dubious evidence . Despite these drawbacks, some crucial pathways have been uncovered, and a consistent pattern connecting particular activities to particular clinical activity profiles is beginning to emerge. [15] Phenytoin (PHT), carbamazepine (CBZ), oxcarbazepine (OXC), lamotrigine (LTG), topiramate (TPM), zonisamide (ZNS), and felbamate all work primarily by blocking voltage-dependent sodium channels (FBM). [16] The fact that this block is voltage- and use-dependent suggests that it selectively prevents high-frequency repeated neuronal firing, preventing the spread of seizure activity without interfering with normal neurotransmission. Sodium channel blockers decrease action-potential firing without directly influencing synaptic responses at therapeutic dosages, but blocking neuronal firing eventually stops the nerve terminal from depolarizing and the subsequent release of neurotransmitters, mainly glutamate. Drugs with this feature are beneficial against partial and secondary generalised tonic-clonic seizures, and perhaps even against primary generalised tonic-clonic seizures, according to experimental and clinical data.[18] Absence and myoclonic seizures are not

thought to benefit from sodium channel inhibition, and AEDs whose sole primary activity is sodium channel blocking may even make these seizure types worse.[19] It should be emphasized that the kinetics of how various AEDs interact with sodium channels may differ significantly.

It is not unexpected that many AEDs decrease epileptic discharge by potentiating GABAergic inhibition since -aminobutyric acid (GABA) is the primary inhibitory transmitter in the human brain (5). By blocking GABA transaminase, the drug vigabatrin (VGB) increases the amount of GABA that may be released from presynaptic nerve terminals and has the desired effect. In contrast, tiagabine (TGB) boosts GABAergic transmission by preventing synaptically produced GABA from being reabsorbed. GABAergic drugs' ability to aggravate paradoxical seizures in some syndromes, particularly those belonging to the group of generalised epilepsies, may be explained by the possibility that GABA in certain brain regions has a proepileptic effect (partially by suppressing activity of inhibitory pathways). Specifically, VGB and TGB may cause absence and myoclonic seizures even if they are effective against partial and secondary generalised tonic-clonic seizures. [20] AEDs that augment specifically GABAA-mediated responses do not appear to cause absence seizures, which may be due to the possibility that GABAergic medicines' ability to exacerbate absences is at least partially mediated by activation of GABAB receptors in thalamic neurons. These medications include benzodiazepines (BZDs), as well as TPM and FBM, which have a modulatory effect on the GABAA receptor-chloride channel complex's non-BZD recognition sites. [21] The antiabsence effects of ethosuximide (ESM) and ZNS are primarily caused by the blockade of T-type calcium channels in thalamic neurons. However there is conflicting information about whether this action also contributes to the effectiveness of VPA and LTG in absence epilepsy. Despite less thorough research, impacts at other voltage-gated calcium channels may be significant. Pregabalin (PGB) and gabapentin (GBP) appear to be effective in treating epilepsy, neuropathic pain, and possibly other indications because they modulate excitatory transmission release by blocking N-type and P/Q-type calcium channels, whereas blockade of L-type calcium channels, for example, may contribute to CBZ's ability to worsen absence seizures . Numerous additional AEDs work on different voltage-gated calcium subtypes.[22]

EFFICACY OF ANTI EPILECTIC MEDICATION

Not much research has been done on the "natural history" of newly diagnosed epilepsy and how it responds to therapy. A long-term result says and randomised comparative studies (2–5) reveal that the initial antiepileptic treatment causes around 50% of patients to become seizure-free (AED). Failure brought on by ineffectiveness is linked to unfavourable consequences. [23] Effectiveness encompasses both efficacy and tolerability. [24] Nonetheless, the latter's significance is frequently misjudged in randomised trials, particularly regulatory ones that are not intended to address the everyday, practical usage of the drug. [25] It is uncertain at what dosage an AED can be declared ineffective and when alternate treatment, such as with a second AED, should be used in individuals with recurrent seizures medication or a mix of two AEDs should be taken into account. The typical advice is to increase the dosage to near-toxic concentrations in individuals with ongoing seizures. [26] assumes an appropriate dose–response relationship. Although randomized controlled trials are essential to establish the efficacy of a new AED, whether these results can be extrapolated to clinical practice has been questioned. [27] Observational studies may help in the application of trial results to real-world situations (10–12). Patients with newly diagnosed epilepsy followed up at a single centre responded to the initial AED in terms of efficacy, tolerability, and overall effectiveness.

PATIENTS

The Epi-lepsy Unit at the Western Infirmary in Glasgow, Scotland, between 1 January 1984 and 31 December 1997, identified epilepsy in unselected patients, and began treating them. Only individuals who had never

previously had AED treatment were examined. A standardized questionnaire was utilized to gather information from the patients and any witnesses to the seizure during the initial clinic appointment. [28] When clinically necessary, investigations like surface electro-encephalography and brain imaging were carried out. According to worldwide standards, information from the history, physical examination, and investigations was utilized to categorize epileptic seizures and syndromes. [29][30] The final decision taken at the time of analysis was represented by the categorization of each patient.

TREATMENT

At the epilepsy clinic, AED therapy was started for all patients, taking into account the different seizure types, epilepsy syndromes, and other clinical characteristics.[31][32] Before beginning therapy, the majority of patients experienced two or more epileptic seizures. Twenty (4%) individuals decided to begin therapy following a single episode. AEDs were rolled out in accordance with suggested dose regimens. [33][34] Be modified throughout follow-up as necessary, paying close attention to effectiveness and tolerability. At each dos-age increment, enough time was given to determine if the patient continued to be seizure-free. In patients who were still having seizures, doses were increased until they were no longer tolerable. Participants in randomised, double-blind, flexible-dose, comparative monotherapy studies included some patients. Their results were comparable to those of the other cohort members, indicating there was no bias in the patient selection for these investigations. Patients were checked in at the epilepsy clinic after starting therapy every 4-6 weeks for the first 6 months and at least every 4 months after that. A dedicated phone line was established up so that patients and their primary care doctors could contact the epilepsy unit if issues arose in between visits to the clinic. At the clinic, the clinic's compliance with the aid. Patients who consistently failed to follow their treatment plan were not included in the research. [35]

CONCLUSION

The number of AEDs that are now on the market has gradually expanded in recent years. This may make management decisions more difficult, but it also presents some welcome new alternatives for efficiently individualizing care. It has never been easier to customize pharmacological therapy to the unique characteristics of each patient because each AED is different from the others in terms of pharmacologic qualities, effectiveness range, side-effect profile, interaction potential, and cost. Although first-generation medications continue to be the best option in the majority of cases, mounting data suggests that newer medications may be completely justified for first therapy in many illnesses. For instance, due to its good tolerability profile in this age range, LTG may be an effective first-line treatment for the elderly.[36] and it may also be preferable over VPA in women with generalized epilepsy who are of reproductive age since VPA may be viewed as undesirable due to concerns for the unborn child. [37] When a patient with acute intermittent porphyria experiences partial-onset seizures, GBP may be the most sensible treatment option.[38] particularly for infantile spasms brought on by tuberous sclerosis, VGB is frequently the treatment of choice.[39] The efficacy of various AEDs in treating comorbid diseases also affects treatment decisions. We may anticipate a more judicious use of these drugs in the years to come thanks to the continual advancement in our knowledge of the mechanisms of action, effectiveness spectrum, and side-effect profiles of AEDs in various patient groups and indications .[40]

References

1. 1 Rochat P, Hallas J, Gaist D, *et al.* Antiepileptic drug utilization: a Danish prescription database analysis. Acta Neurol Scand 2001;104: 6–11.DOI: 10.1034/j.1600-0404.2001.00197.x

2. Blume WT, Luder HO, Mizrahi E, et al. Glossary of descriptive terminology for ictal semiology: report of the ILAE task force on classification and terminology. Epilepsia. 2001;42:1212-1218
3. Hauser WA, Annegers JF, Kurland KT, et al. The prevalence of epilepsy in Rochester, Minnesota, 1940- 1980. Epilepsia. 1991;32:429-445.
4. Begley CE, Annegers JF, Lairson DR, et al. Cost of epilepsy in the United States: a model based on incidence and prognosis. Epilepsia. 1994;35:1230-1243
5. Rogawski, M., Löscher, W. The neurobiology of antiepileptic drugs. Nat Rev Neurosci 5, 553–564 (2004). https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn1430
6. Kwan P, Brodie MJ. Early identification of refractory epilepsy. N Engl J Med 2000;342:314–9
7. ILAE Commission on Antiepileptic Drugs. Considerations on designing clinical trials to evaluate the place of new antiepileptic drugs in the treatment of newly diagnosed and chronic patients with epilepsy. Epilepsia 1998;39:799–803
8. Chadwick D. Monotherapy clinical trials of new antiepileptic drugs: design, indications, and controversies. Epilepsia 1997;38 (suppl 9):S16–20
9. Perucca E. Principles of drug treatment. In: Shorvon S, Dreifuss F, Fish D, et al., eds. The treatment of epilepsy. Oxford: Blackwell Science, 1996:152–68
10. Walker MC, Sander JWAS. Difficulties in extrapolating from clinical trial data to clinical practice: the case of antiepileptic drugs. Neurology 1997;49:333–7
11. Richens A, Davidson DLW, Cartlidge NEF, et al. A multicentre comparative trial of sodium valproate and carbamazepine in adult onset epilepsy. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 1994;57:682–7.
12. Meldrum BS. Update on the mechanism of action of antiepileptic drugs. Epilepsia 1996;37(suppl 6):S4–11.
13. Meldrum BS. Antiepileptic drugs potentiating GABA. Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol Suppl 1999;50: 450–7.
14. Beghi E, Perucca E. The management of epilepsy in the 1990s: acquisitions, uncertainties, and perspectives for future research. Drugs 1995;49: 680–94.
15. Perucca E. The new generation of antiepileptic drugs: advantages and disadvantages. Br J Pharmacol 1996;42: 531–3.
16. Meldrum BS. Update on the mechanism of action of antiepileptic drugs. Epilepsia 1996;37(suppl 6):S4–11.
17. Perucca E. The clinical pharmacology and therapeutic use of the new antiepileptic drugs. Fund Clin Pharmacol 2001;15: 405–7.DOI: 10.1046/j.1472-8206.2001.00055.x
18. Perucca E. The clinical pharmacology and therapeutic use of the new antiepileptic drugs. Fund Clin Pharmacol 2001;15: 405–7.DOI: 10.1046/j.1472-8206.2001.00055.x
19. Kuo CC, Chen RS, Lu L, et al. Carbamazepine inhibition of neuronal Na+ currents: quantitative distinction from phenytoin and possible therapeutic implications. Mol Pharmacol 1997;51: 1077–83.
20. Perucca E, Gram L, Avanzini G, et al. Antiepileptic drugs as a cause of worsening seizures. Epilepsia 1998;39: 5–17.
21. Marescaux C, Vergnese M, Bernasconi R. GABA-B receptor antagonists: potential new anti-absence drugs. J Neural Transm Suppl 1992;35: 179–88.
22. Fink K, Meder W, Dooley DJ, et al. Inhibition of neuronal Ca(2+) influx by gabapentin and subsequent reduction of neurotransmitter release from rat neocortical slices. Br J Pharmacol 2000;130: 900–6.DOI: 10.1038/sj.bjp.0703380
23. Kwan P, Brodie MJ. Early identification of refractory epilepsy. N Engl J Med 2000;342:314–9. 2.

24. ILAE Commission on Antiepileptic Drugs. Considerations on designing clinical trials to evaluate the place of new antiepileptic drugs in the treatment of newly diagnosed and chronic patients with epilepsy. Epilepsia 1998;39:799–803.
25. Chadwick D. Monotherapy clinical trials of new antiepileptic drugs: design, indications, and controversies. Epilepsia 1997;38 (suppl 9):S16–20. 8.
26. Perucca E. Principles of drug treatment. In: Shorvon S, Dreifuss F, Fish D, et al., eds. The treatment of epilepsy. Oxford: Blackwell Science, 1996:152–68
27. Walker MC, Sander JWAS. Difficulties in extrapolating from clinical trial data to clinical practice: the case of antiepileptic drugs. Neurology 1997;49:333–7.
28. Tobias E, Brodie AF, Brodie MJ. An outcome audit at the epilepsyclinic: results from 1000 consecutive referrals.Seizure1994;3:37–43.
29. Commission on Classification and Terminology of the Interna-tional League Against Epilepsy. Proposal for revised classificationof epilepsies and epileptic syndromes.Epilepsia1989;30:389–99.15.
30. Commission on Epidemiology and Prognosis. Guidelines for epi-demiological studies on epilepsy.Epilepsia1993;34:592–6.
31. Brodie MJ, Kwan P. The star systems: overview and use in deter-mining antiepileptic drug choice. CNS Drugs2001;18:1–12.17.
32. Brodie MJ, French JA. Management of epilepsy in adolescents andadults.Lancet2000;356:323–9.18.
33. Brodie MJ, Dichter MA. Antiepileptic drugs.NEnglJMed1996;334:168–75.19.
34. Dichter MA, Brodie MJ. New antiepileptic drugs.NEnglJMed1996;334:1583–90
35. McKee PJW, Larkin JG, Brodie AF, et al. Five years of anticon-vulsant monitoring on site at the epilepsy clinic.Ther Drug Monit1993;15:83–90
36. Pisani F, Oteri G, Russo MF, et al. The efficacy of valproate–lamotrigine comedication in refractory complex partial seizures: evidence for a pharmacodynamic interaction. Epilepsia 1999;40: 1141–6.
37. Brodie MJ, Overstall PW, Giorgi L, and the UK Lamotrigine Elderly Study Group. Multicentre, double-blind, randomised comparison between lamotrigine and carbamazepine in elderly patients with newly diagnosed epilepsy. Epilepsy Res 1999;37: 81–7.
38. Perucca E. The clinical pharmacology and therapeutic use of the new antiepileptic drugs. Fund Clin Pharmacol 2001;15: 405–7.DOI: 10.1046/j.1472-8206.2001.00055.x
39. Chiron C, Dumas C, Jambaqué I, et al. Randomized trial comparing vigabatrin and hydrocortisone in infantile spasms due to tuberous sclerosis. Epilepsy Res 1997;26: 389–95.
40. Perucca E. Current trends in antiepileptic drug therapy. Epilepsia 2003;44(suppl 4):41–7.