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ABSTRACT: Purpose: To evaluate the prevalence of nonlesional focal epilepsy in an adult epilepsy clinic and its refractoriness to antiepileptic drug therapy. Background: Focal epilepsy is frequently, but not always, associated with structural epileptogenic lesions identifiable on magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). Methods: We analyzed the data from all patients evaluated at an adult epilepsy clinic from January 2002 to December 2011. Clinical and paraclinical findings were used to diagnose focal epilepsy. Magnetic resonance imaging were reviewed and classified as normal, with an epileptogenic lesion, or with a lesion of unclear epileptogenicity. Epileptogenic lesions were further categorized as tumours, vascular malformations, gliosis (including hippocampal atrophy/sclerosis), and malformations of cortical development. Our study group included patients with no lesions on MRI. Pharmacoresistance of patients with nonlesional focal epilepsy was assessed using the ILAE and Perucca's criteria. Results: Out of 1521 patients evaluated (mean age 44 years; range 14-93 years), 843 had focal epilepsy. Magnetic resonance imaging data, available for 806 (96%) subjects, showed epileptogenic lesions in 65%, no obvious epileptogenic lesions in 31% and lesions of unclear epileptogenicity in 4%. Magnetic resonance imaging-identified lesions included gliosis due to an acquired insult (52% including 17% of hippocampal atrophy/sclerosis), tumours (29%), vascular malformations (16%) and malformations of cortical development (10%). Fifty-two percent of nonlesional focal epileptic patients were drug-refractory. Conclusion: In a tertiary epilepsy clinic, close to a third of patients with focal epilepsy were found to be nonlesional, half of which were drug-resistant.

Epilepsy is a chronic condition characterized by recurrent seizures resulting from abnormal and excessive neuronal discharges1. It is the most common neurological disorder after stroke with a prevalence of 5-6 per 1,000 in Canada2. Each year an average of 15,500 Canadians learn that they have epilepsy. The major form of treatment is long-term drug therapy to which approximately 30% of patients are unfortunately refractory3. For these patients, other treatment alternatives include epilepsy surgery or neuromodulation.

Seizures can be focal (activation of only part of one cerebral hemisphere) or generalized (more than minimal involvement of both cerebral hemispheres4). Partial or focal epilepsy is the most common form of epilepsy in adults and is frequently associated with an epileptogenic lesion5. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is very useful in detecting structural abnormalities related to seizures such as tumours, gliosis/hippocampal sclerosis, malformations of cortical development or vascular...
malformations. It is not uncommon, however, that brain MRI fails to uncover such epileptogenic lesions.

The prevalence of nonlesional epilepsy has been evaluated in some surgical series or during the presurgical evaluation phase but the prevalence of nonlesional focal epilepsy in the setting of an epilepsy clinic is unclear. In this study, we sought to determine the proportion of patients with nonlesional focal epilepsy in our adult epilepsy clinic. A secondary objective was to determine the degree of pharmacoresistance in patients with nonlesional focal epilepsy.

**Patients and Methods**

**Patients**

Charts from all patients evaluated by a single epileptologist at an adult tertiary epilepsy clinic between January 2002 and December 2011 were reviewed. The diagnosis of partial epilepsy was established based on review of all available clinical and paraclinical findings at the time of the study (clinical notes, electroencephalogram (EEG) and neuroimaging findings). The presence of focal spikes on standard EEG for the diagnosis of focal epilepsy as clinical evaluation (ictal semiology, neurological examination, age of onset etc.) and neuroimaging (type of lesion, location of lesion etc.) provided enough evidence to establish the diagnosis of focal epilepsy. Videoelectroencephalography was performed only in some subjects if clinically indicated (diagnostic dilemma or presurgical evaluation). Patients with an unclear epilepsy diagnosis, a single seizure with normal EEG and neuroimaging, acute symptomatic seizures and idiopathic generalized epilepsy were excluded. Epileptic encephalopathies, a heterogenous group of epilepsy syndromes associated with severe cognitive, behavioral and epileptic disturbances in infancy or early childhood (e.g. Lennox-Gastaut syndrome), were excluded as well, even they could present focal seizures. These patients were generally investigated and diagnosed in a pediatric setting before being transferred to our adult epilepsy clinic for continued care. Magnetic resonance imaging was not generally performed or repeated due to lack of cooperation or clinical necessity.

**Magnetic Resonance Imaging**

Magnetic resonance imaging reports from all patients with focal epilepsy were reviewed. The MRIs were obtained using a 1.5T Avanto scanner (Siemens, Germany) or an Achieva Dual 3T system (Philips Medical Systems, Netherlands). All studies included (a) a 3-D T1-weighted gradient-echo acquisition of the whole brain; (b) an axial T2-weighted and fluid-attenuated inversion recovery (FLAIR) acquisitions of the whole brain; (c) coronal T2-weighted and FLAIR acquisitions perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the hippocampus. Intravenous contrast agents were given only if a mass lesion was demonstrated. In our institution, all brain MRIs are reviewed by a group of four neuroradiologists experienced in interpreting epilepsy studies. Some clinical information was available on the MRI request form. Upon review of MRI interpretation, reported potentially epileptogenic lesions were classified into five categories: tumours (e.g. gliomas, gangliogliomas, dyssembryoplastic neuroectodermal tumors), vascular malformations (e.g. cavernomas, arteriovenous malformations), gliosis from an acquired insult (including hippocampal atrophy and sclerosis), malformations of cortical development (e.g. cortical dysplasia, heterotopias, polymicrogyria) and others. Patients were considered to have nonlesional focal epilepsy if the MRI failed to disclose an epileptogenic lesion. Patients with MRI lesions not expected to give epilepsy (Chiari type 1, pineal cyst, septum pellucidum etc.) were included in this group. Diffuse cerebral or cerebellar atrophy, non-specific white matter changes, leukoaraiosis and arachnoid cysts were classified as lesions of unclear relationship to the patient’s epileptic condition.

**Pharmacoresistance**

Response to medical treatment was assessed for all patients with nonlesional focal epilepsy. Patients were considered to be drug-resistant if they continued to have seizures despite two adequate antiepileptic drug (AED) trials whether used in monotherapy or in combination\(^6\). We also graded the degree of drug-resistance using the classification proposed by Perucca\(^7\).

This study was approved by our institutional ethics committee.

**Results**

**MRI of Focal Epilepsy Patients**

Out of 1521 patients (mean age 44 years; range 14-93) evaluated at the epilepsy clinic between January 2002 and December 2011, 1051 (69%) had epilepsy. Among these patients, 843 (80%) were diagnosed with focal epilepsy, 130 (12%) with idiopathic generalized epilepsy, 61 (6%) with an epileptic encephalopathy and 17 (2%) with an unclear epileptic syndrome. While 37 subjects did not or could not undergo an MRI study, the majority of patients with focal epilepsy (806/843; 96%) did. In these 806 remaining patients with focal epilepsy, MRI disclosed a clear epileptogenic lesion in 520 (65%), no obvious epileptogenic lesion in 251 (31%), and lesions of unclear epileptogenicity in 35 (4%) (Figure).

Among the 520 patients with an epileptogenic lesion, 153 (29%) had a tumour, 82 (16%) had a vascular malformation, 54 (10%) had a malformation of cortical development and 219 (42%) had gliosis due to an acquired insult. Included in this latter group were 86 (17%) patients with hippocampal atrophy/sclerosis.

**Pharmacoresistance**

Out of 251 patients with nonlesional epilepsy, 131 (52%) were medically intractable according to the International League Against Epilepsy (ILAE) classification. Using Perucca’s classification, 176 were drug-resistant: 45 (26%) patients were refractory to one AED (grade I), 30 (17%) to two (grade II) and 101 (57%) to 3 or more (grade III).

**Discussion**

Our study showed that, in nearly one third of patients with focal epilepsy in an adult epilepsy clinic, no clear epileptogenic lesions on MRI are seen. Many patients have some difficulty grasping the notion that focal epilepsy can occur without a structural lesion identifiable on MRI. One possible explanation for the lack of an apparent epileptogenic lesion is that an...
underlying lesion is present but is so subtle that it is undetected by standard MRI. This is supported by histopathological studies of resected epileptogenic tissue in patients with normal standard MRIs which have revealed subtle cortical dysplasias or gliosis or hippocampal sclerosis\textsuperscript{8-18}. Another potential explanation is that focal seizures are related to a genetic defect. This is supported by recent findings indicating that some partial epilepsies have a significant genetic component\textsuperscript{19-24}.

The prevalence of nonlesional focal epilepsy found in our epilepsy clinic is relatively in line with prior studies found in the literature. Prior series, using mostly standard field MRIs, have mainly been dealt with three other slightly different subsets of populations: a) patients with refractory focal epilepsy being investigated for epilepsy surgery (presurgical investigation series); b) patients with refractory epilepsy who were operated (surgical series); and c) patients with refractory focal epilepsy who underwent an intracranial EEG study (invasive EEG series). In presurgical investigation series, the rate of nonlesional cases was lower (range from 15-23%) which is to be expected as not all focal epilepsy patients are drug-refractory and require further investigation for epilepsy surgery. For example, Scott et al (1999) reported that 40/222 (18%) of drug-resistant patients undergoing video-EEG for epilepsy surgery investigation had a normal MRI\textsuperscript{25}. In another study by Berg et al (2003), 130/565 (23%) candidates for epilepsy surgery had normal MRI findings\textsuperscript{26}. In Bien et al (2009), 190/1192 (16%) patients undergoing comprehensive presurgical assessment for intractable epilepsy had a negative MRI\textsuperscript{14}. These nonlesional rates in presurgical investigation series are close to those reported in surgical series. Hence, in temporal lobe epilepsy surgery series, Berkovic et al (1995) reported that 24/135 (18%) patients undergoing an anterior temporal lobectomy had a normal MRI\textsuperscript{27}. In a controlled randomized trial of surgery for temporal lobe epilepsy, Wiebe et al (2001) had 13/80 (16%) patients with normal MRI\textsuperscript{28}. In Bell et al (2009), 44/272 (16%) patients with medically refractory temporal lobe epilepsy who had undergone an anterior temporal lobectomy were nonlesional\textsuperscript{11}. Finally, in a study by Alarcon et al (2006), 21/136 (15%) operated patients had nonlesional epilepsy\textsuperscript{29}. As for extratemporal lobe epilepsy series, an outcome meta-analysis of adult patients operated for nonlesional extratemporal lobe epilepsy found that 25/61 (19%) MRIs were normal\textsuperscript{16}. These relatively comparable rates are, however, contrasted by the data collected by Berg et al (2003) in a multicenter study of epilepsy surgery in which 58/396 (45%) patients undergoing resective surgery had normal MRI findings\textsuperscript{26}. Possible explanations include its prospective design, the academic setting (epilepsy surgery centers of reference) and earlier study years (1996-2001). Finally, when looking at invasive EEG series, one can observe with no surprise a very high rate of nonlesional focal epilepsy as implantation of intracranial electrodes are more often required in nonlesional than in lesional epilepsies. For example, Cukiert et al (2001) reported that 10/16 (62.5%) patients with refractory extratemporal epilepsy investigated with subdural
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\caption{MRI findings in patients with focal epilepsy.}
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electrodes had normal MRI. In a larger series of 100 patients undergoing stereoelectroencephalography, 43 (43%) also had a normal MRI.

A normal MRI is not synonymous with self-limited or pharmaco-sensitive epilepsy. In our series, 52% of patients were drug-resistant according to the recent ILAE criteria, including 57% refractory to three or more antiepileptic drugs.

The limitations of our study are inherent to any retrospective design. Because MRI scans were not standardized in terms of magnet strength, one could argue that our rate of nonlesional focal epilepsy would have been lower had all patients benefited from a 3T MRI since high-field MR scanners provide an improved signal-to-noise ratio which can theoretically allow the detection of subtle lesions missed on standard 1.5T MRIs. In a previous study however, we showed that re-imaging at 3T patients with refractory epilepsy and negative 1.5T MRIs only allowed the detection of 5.6% more lesions. Of course, we also have to take into account the issue of radiologist intra and inter-rater variability. Recent development of quantitative MRI postprocessing methods applied to digital data image may improve the detection of occult lesions not readily recognizable by visual analysis alone, in addition to reducing intra and interrater variability. Finally, selecting patients from a specialized epilepsy clinic in a tertiary academic center may have biased the study into finding a higher rate of surgically challenging cases of nonlesional focal epilepsy cases or of lesions associated with intractable epilepsy. Hence, our numbers cannot necessarily be generalized outside the adult epilepsy clinic setting that typically deals with more complex and difficult to treat epilepsies than in general Neurology practices. Despite limitations mentioned above, our data helps to give a certain idea of the number of nonlesional cases encountered in the epilepsy clinic, not only for neurology and radiology colleagues or residents but, more importantly, for the patients themselves.

Knowing that approximately a third of patients in the clinic are in the same situation is somewhat reassuring for them. In the near future, it may be interesting to test patients identified in this series for all mutations known to be associated with epilepsy and use advanced quantitative MRI postprocessing techniques to assess how many occult lesions might have been missed.

CONCLUSIONS

In an adult epilepsy clinic setting, close to a third of patients with focal epilepsy have no obvious epileptogenic lesion on MRI, and more than half of these are drug-resistant.
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