

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

Risk of seizures induced by intracranial research stimulation: analysis of 770 stimulation sessions

To cite this article before publication: Hannah E Goldstein *et al* 2019 *J. Neural Eng.* in press <https://doi.org/10.1088/1741-2552/ab4365>

Manuscript version: Accepted Manuscript

Accepted Manuscript is “the version of the article accepted for publication including all changes made as a result of the peer review process, and which may also include the addition to the article by IOP Publishing of a header, an article ID, a cover sheet and/or an ‘Accepted Manuscript’ watermark, but excluding any other editing, typesetting or other changes made by IOP Publishing and/or its licensors”

This Accepted Manuscript is © 2019 IOP Publishing Ltd.

During the embargo period (the 12 month period from the publication of the Version of Record of this article), the Accepted Manuscript is fully protected by copyright and cannot be reused or reposted elsewhere.

As the Version of Record of this article is going to be / has been published on a subscription basis, this Accepted Manuscript is available for reuse under a CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 licence after the 12 month embargo period.

After the embargo period, everyone is permitted to use copy and redistribute this article for non-commercial purposes only, provided that they adhere to all the terms of the licence <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0>

Although reasonable endeavours have been taken to obtain all necessary permissions from third parties to include their copyrighted content within this article, their full citation and copyright line may not be present in this Accepted Manuscript version. Before using any content from this article, please refer to the Version of Record on IOPscience once published for full citation and copyright details, as permissions will likely be required. All third party content is fully copyright protected, unless specifically stated otherwise in the figure caption in the Version of Record.

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

Risk of Seizures Induced by Intracranial Research Stimulation: Analysis of 770 Stimulation Sessions

Hannah E. Goldstein,¹ Elliot H. Smith,^{2,3} Robert E. Gross,⁴ Barbara C. Jobst,⁵ Bradley C. Lega,⁶ Michael R. Sperling,⁷ Gregory A. Worrell,⁸ Kareem A. Zaghoul,⁹ Paul A. Wanda,¹⁰ Michael J. Kahana,¹⁰ Daniel S. Rizzuto,¹⁰ Catherine A. Schevon,² Guy M. McKhann II,¹ Sameer A. Sheth¹¹

1. Department of Neurological Surgery, Columbia University, New York, NY
2. Department of Neurology, Columbia University, New York, NY
3. Department of Neurosurgery, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT
4. Department of Neurosurgery, Emory University Hospital, Atlanta, GA
5. Department of Neurology, Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, Lebanon, NH
6. Department of Neurosurgery, University of Texas, Southwestern, Dallas, TX
7. Department of Neurology, Thomas Jefferson University Hospital, Philadelphia, PA
8. Department of Neurology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN
9. Surgical Neurology Branch, NINDS, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD
10. Department of Psychology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA
11. Department of Neurosurgery, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX

Corresponding author:
Sameer A. Sheth, MD, PhD
Vice-Chair of Clinical Research
Department of Neurosurgery
Baylor College of Medicine
7200 Cambridge, 9th Floor
Houston, TX 77030
713.798.4696 tel
sasheth@bcm.edu

Running Title: **Seizures During Electrical Stimulation**

Abstract

Objective Patients with medically refractory epilepsy often undergo intracranial electroencephalography (iEEG) monitoring to identify a seizure focus and determine their candidacy for surgical intervention. This clinically necessary monitoring period provides an increasingly utilized research opportunity to study human neurophysiology, however ethical concerns demand a thorough appreciation of the associated risks.

We measured the incidence of research stimulation-associated seizures in a large multi-institutional dataset in order to determine whether brain stimulation was statistically associated with seizure incidence and identify potential risk factors for stimulation-associated seizures.

Approach 188 subjects undergoing iEEG monitoring across 10 institutions participated in 770 research stimulation sessions over 3.5 years. Seizures within 30 minutes of a stimulation session were included in our retrospective analysis. We analyzed stimulation parameters, seizure incidence, and typical seizure patterns, to assess the likelihood that recorded seizures were stimulation-induced, rather than events that occurred by chance in epilepsy patients prone to seizing.

Main Results In total, 14 seizures were included in our analysis. All events were single seizures, and no adverse events occurred. The mean amplitude of seizure-associated stimulation did not differ significantly from the mean amplitude delivered in sessions without seizures.

In order to determine the likelihood that seizures were stimulation induced, we used three sets of analyses: Visual iEEG analysis, statistical frequency, and power analyses. We determined that three of the 14 seizures were likely stimulation-induced, five were possibly stimulation-induced, and six were unlikely stimulation-induced. Overall, we estimate a rate of stimulation-induced seizures between 0.39% and 1.82% of sessions.

1
2
3 **Significance** The rarity of stimulation-associated seizures and the fact that none added
4 morbidity or affected the clinical course of any patient are important findings for understanding
5
6 the feasibility and safety of intracranial stimulation for research purposes.
7
8
9
10

11 **Keywords**

12
13
14
15 Research stimulation; seizures; intracranial stimulation; neuroethics
16
17
18
19

20 **Abbreviations**

21
22 AED: anti-epileptic drug
23

24 AD: after-discharge
25

26 EMU: epilepsy monitoring unit
27

28 iEEG: intracranial electroencephalography
29

30 sEEG: stereo-EEG
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

Patients with medically refractory epilepsy, who comprise approximately one-third of epilepsy patients, often undergo an extensive workup attempting to identify the seizure onset zone and therefore determine their candidacy for surgical intervention. In cases where non-invasive elements of the workup do not adequately localize the seizure focus, invasive monitoring with intracranial electroencephalography (iEEG) may be clinically indicated. Examples of iEEG include subdural surface grids or strips, or intraparenchymal depth electrodes (stereo-EEG, or sEEG). After placement of iEEG electrodes in the operating room, seizure patients are monitored in an epilepsy-monitoring unit (EMU) as they are weaned off of their antiepileptic medications, in order to identify seizure foci. These patients, who are undergoing intracranial recordings for clinical purposes, provide an increasingly utilized opportunity to study human neurophysiology and understand the neurocircuitry underlying neurological and psychiatric disorders(1, 2). Intracranial stimulation in these patients for research purposes can provide unique and valuable information about both normal function and disease states. However, ethical concerns surrounding human-subjects research demand a thorough appreciation of the risks associated with such stimulation. One of the known risks of brain stimulation is the induction of seizures;(3-5) a risk that is increased in the epilepsy population, especially as patients are weaned off of their anti-epileptic medications in a controlled setting.

As human subjects research with brain stimulation becomes more common, a more thorough understanding of the safety profile and research-related risk of intracranial stimulation is paramount to our ability to safely and ethically conduct this research. It is important to determine safety parameters and potential thresholds for seizure induction in order to minimize associated risk. Furthermore, it is essential to determine the likelihood that seizures occurring

1
2
3 during research sessions are stimulation-induced, or simply represent coincidental occurrences,
4
5 when determining additional risk incurred by research participation.
6
7

8 In this study, we sought to characterize the nature and frequency of stimulation-
9 associated seizures, looking at stimulation parameters, stimulation location, and baseline seizure
10 patterns. We sought to assess potential stimulation safety thresholds, and better understand the
11 overall risk associated with intracranial stimulation. We further sought to determine which
12 seizures were more likely to be actually stimulation-induced, as opposed to coincidental
13 occurrences in epilepsy patients prone to seizures. As stimulation-associated seizures are rare
14 events overall, we aggregated data across a large multi-institutional cohort in order to achieve
15 sufficient statistical power and generalizability.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Materials and Methods**

29 **Patient Selection and Stimulation Paradigm**

30
31 The subjects for this study were patients with medically refractory epilepsy undergoing
32 intracranial recording for seizure localization. All subjects had been enrolled in a multi-
33 institutional research study (RAM, Restoring Active Memory), sponsored by the Defense
34 Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), whose goal was to enhance memory using
35 intracranial stimulation. Subjects agreed to participate in research-related memory tasks with and
36 without intracranial stimulation during their stay in the EMU. The continuous iEEG recording
37 was monitored by an epileptologist during stimulation sessions in order to detect stimulation-
38 associated after-discharge activity. The study was approved by each individual institution's IRB
39 and by the Department of Defense IRB.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The surgical procedure consisted of placement of either subdural grid/strip electrodes or
4 sEEG electrodes, according to each center's practice. High-resolution preoperative MRI and
5
6 postoperative CT scans were obtained in all cases, using acquisition parameters standardized
7
8 across all 10 centers. These imaging data allowed for accurate localization of electrode contacts
9
10 within segmented MRIs to identify the exact position of each contact. Also part of the
11
12 prospective design were instructions to each clinical site to document certain features of each
13
14 stimulation-associated seizure: type of seizure (focal onset, aware/impaired aware, focal to
15
16 bilateral tonic-clonic), whether its semiology was similar to the patient's typical seizures, seizure
17
18 severity, whether it required any additional measures such as respiratory support, and whether its
19
20 occurrence increased overall length of stay in the EMU.
21
22
23
24
25

26 It was left to the discretion of each institution's team to determine when during the EMU
27
28 monitoring period to conduct research stimulation sessions – whether during the period of AED
29
30 wean or only when on full AEDs, and whether before or after all seizures had been obtained for
31
32 clinical purposes. Additionally, the exact location of research stimulation was determined by a
33
34 combination of the central research team and each local clinical team. At the beginning of each
35
36 research session, the team carried out a procedure to determine safe amplitudes for stimulation.
37
38 This amplitude determination procedure consisted of two or three 1 s pulse trains ranging from
39
40 0.5mA up to the stimulation amplitude that would be used for the task. By protocol, stimulation
41
42 was not to be carried out within 30 minutes of a preceding clinical seizure, and research sessions
43
44 were terminated after the occurrence of a seizure, though not after the occurrence of after-
45
46 discharges, as long as the iEEG recording returned to baseline.
47
48
49
50

51 Clinical factors such as type/manufacturer of electrode used, surgical technique, overall
52
53 length of EMU stay, pattern of AED medication wean, etc. were also subject to each site's
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 discretion. The stimulation paradigm evolved over the course of the project, but overall
4
5 parameters fell within the following range: anodic first balanced biphasic stimulation pulses of
6
7 300 μ s per phase with amplitudes ranging between 0.1 and 3.5 mA, frequencies ranging between
8
9 10 and 200 Hz with stimulation durations between 0.25 and 4.6 seconds.

12 **Data Analysis**

13
14 At the outset of the DARPA RAM project, a “stimulation-associated seizure” was
15
16 defined as any electrographic seizure occurring during or within 30 minutes of research
17
18 stimulation. This was therefore an organic yet conservative threshold for inclusion in our
19
20 retrospective analysis of seizure incidence. Seizure data recorded for any seizure occurring
21
22 within 30 minutes of research stimulation included the type, duration, and severity of the seizure,
23
24 the patient’s medication status, stimulation parameters used for that session, and baseline seizure
25
26 information for the patient, when available. The prospective design of the study and the data
27
28 coordination center ensured consistent data collection and annotation.
29
30
31

32
33 We first identified and collected data for all “stimulation-associated seizures.” The
34
35 conservative operational definition of stimulation-associated seizures likely overestimated the
36
37 actual rate of seizures caused by stimulation (“stimulation-induced seizures,”) because some of
38
39 the seizures may have occurred spontaneously, as a consequence of the non-zero baseline seizure
40
41 rate in this study population. In most clinical contexts, a seizure occurring more than five
42
43 minutes, or sometimes even more than 30 seconds to 1 minute after delivered stimulation is not
44
45 considered “stimulation-associated.” However, as the goal of this stimulation was not to trigger
46
47 seizures, and as such, the occurrence of a seizure would be considered an adverse event, we
48
49 decided to look at all seizures within the initially laid out 30 minute time window. We employed
50
51 three further analyses to distinguish between coincidental seizures (spontaneous seizures around
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the time of stimulation) and those seizures likely to be induced by stimulation. The null
4 hypothesis for these analyses was that all observed seizures were in fact stimulation-induced.
5
6

7
8 The first analysis was an electrographic analysis of the iEEG data to determine the
9 temporal relationship between the time of stimulation and electrographic onset time of the
10 seizure. A qualitative determination was then made as to whether the seizure could have been
11 triggered by the delivered stimulation. Based on this analysis, seizures were determined to either
12 be “concordant,” meaning the seizure clearly followed delivered stimulation in a temporal
13 fashion, within a time window of 600 seconds, and therefore could have been triggered by
14 stimulation; or “delayed,” meaning the seizure occurred greater than 600 seconds after
15 stimulation delivery, but within the 30-minute time window parameter established at the start of
16 the study. Given that any chosen time interval is necessarily arbitrary, 600 seconds was chosen
17 as a reasonable and conservative one as it was felt that when assessing risk of research
18 stimulation, it was better to err on the conservative end, rather than dismiss potential adverse
19 events as unrelated.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 We also determined the spatial relationship between stimulation delivery and seizure
36 onset based on the contacts through which stimulation was delivered, and the contacts that
37 showed earliest seizure onset. This information was not used to distinguish coincidental vs.
38 stimulation-induced seizures, but rather to observe whether stimulation may induce, by our
39 criteria, seizures at a distance from the stimulation site.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 The second analysis was a statistical comparison of seizure frequency. We modeled each
48 patient’s seizure rate with a Poisson distribution, which puts no upper limit on the total number
49 of events, but assumes that they are relatively rare occurrences.(6) The parameters used to fit
50 each patient’s individualized distribution were obtained from the number of seizures that
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 occurred over his/her total EMU stay (poisson.test function in R). For each stimulation-
4 associated seizure, we calculated the likelihood that it would have occurred by chance within the
5 research session using the Poisson distribution. This analysis produced a p-value corresponding
6 to the likelihood that the seizure that occurred during the stimulation session was not a chance
7 occurrence. A significant p-value meant that the likelihood of seizure occurrence was outside the
8 chance distribution, suggesting it was induced by stimulation. This hypothesis was tested for
9 each of the 14 stimulation-associated seizures. The two-tailed threshold for statistical
10 significance was set at $p < 0.05$, with trend-level association defined as $p < 0.1$. This analysis did
11 assume that the frequency distribution of naturally occurring seizures remained constant
12 throughout the EMU period. This assumption was imperfect, as AED doses and other factors
13 were changing, but represents a reasonable initial estimate.

14
15 The final analysis for each seizure was designed to verify the statistical test for seizure
16 frequency using a power analysis. We calculated a post-hoc power value for each of the
17 aforementioned poisson tests. For example, if the previous analysis yielded a non-significant p-
18 value (meaning the seizure fell within the expected background distribution) and had a high
19 degree of statistical power (meaning there was enough data to have seen a significant difference
20 had there been one), then the seizure was determined less likely to be stimulation-induced.
21 Achieved power for each statistical test was calculated from effect size, type I error probability
22 ($\alpha = 0.05$), and the total sample size using R. Sufficient power was defined as > 0.8 .

23
24 Using the above analyses, seizures were assigned to one of three categories based on the
25 likelihood that the stimulation-associated seizure was in fact stimulation-induced as opposed to a
26 coincidental occurrence. Categories were defined as follows: (1) likely stimulation-induced, (2)
27 possibly stimulation-induced, and (3) unlikely stimulation-induced. The first category, likely
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 stimulation-induced seizures, included any seizure with concordant iEEG data, and at least trend-
4 level significance ($p < 0.1$) on rate analysis, regardless of the power analysis; or an insignificant
5 p-value ($p \geq 0.1$) on rate analysis, but with low power. The second category, possibly
6 stimulation-induced, included seizures with concordant iEEG data but with insignificant p-values
7 ($p \geq 0.1$) on their rate analysis, with high power; or seizures for which the iEEG data was not
8 available for full analysis. This was intentionally a conservative approach, meant to capture any
9 event that could possibly be stimulation-induced, in order to determine an upper limit of actual
10 stimulation-induced seizure rates.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 The third category, unlikely stimulation-induced seizures, included seizures with delayed
23 seizure onset on iEEG analysis, regardless of statistical significance. Again, the cut-off of 600
24 seconds between “concordant” and “delayed” on the iEEG analysis is somewhat arbitrary, as is
25 the upper limit of 30 minutes established at the outset of the study. Arguably, both are
26 conservative time frames, as in clinical electrical stimulation mapping, a seizure starting more
27 than 10-30 seconds after stimulation delivery is generally thought to be incidental; however, in
28 this study looking at the safety of stimulation for purely research purposes, these conservative
29 estimations are purposefully meant to capture any seizure event that could possibly be related to
30 stimulation (**Table 1**).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Results

46
47 A total of 188 patients participated in 770 stimulation sessions over 3.5 years across 10
48 institutions. Defining a stimulation-associated seizure as any seizure occurring during research
49 stimulation or within a subsequent 30-minute window, 14 seizures occurred in 12 different
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 patients. The rate of seizures included in our study, which represents an upper limit of the true
4 rate, was thus 1.82% of stimulation sessions.
5
6

7
8 Six of the 14 seizures (43%) were similar to the patient's typical seizures in terms of
9 semiology, onset, and spread. None of the seizures occurred in a cluster, with the majority (64%)
10 being focal aware seizures. An additional 29% were focal impaired aware seizures; only one was
11 a focal to bilateral tonic-clonic seizure. None of these stimulation-associated seizures required
12 respiratory support beyond standard protocol-based placement of a nasal cannula. Per the
13 assessment of the clinical team at each center, none of the stimulation-associated seizures were
14 more severe than the patient's typical seizure. The average clinical duration of the seizures was
15 79 seconds, with a range of 7-237 seconds. No adverse events occurred, and in the estimation of
16 the clinical team at each site, these events did not affect overall length of stay in the EMU (**Table**
17 **2**).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 In the majority of cases (64%) there was no overlap in the area of stimulation with either
32 the known seizure onset zone or known areas of inter-ictal discharges. Of note, 11 of the 14
33 seizures (79%) occurred when patients were not on their full AED dose. In terms of stimulation
34 parameters, there was no statistically significant difference in stimulation amplitude between
35 the sessions in which seizures occurred (mean 1.125 mA, range 0.25-2 mA) and the sessions
36 without seizures (mean 1.06 mA, range 0.1-3.5 mA; $p = 0.32$). Current frequency and duration
37 also did not differ between sessions without seizures and sessions with seizures.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 In addition to the 14 seizures, there were 52 after-discharge (AD) events during the 770
48 stimulation sessions (6.8% of sessions), occurring in 36 different patients. Five of the patients
49 who experienced AD events during stimulation sessions had seizures that were included in the
50 current analysis. One of these seizures was preceded by three AD events that occurred in the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 same research stimulation session. Three other patients experienced ADs following stimulation
4 with the same amplitude and frequency delivered at the same location in a previous stimulation
5 session. Importantly, none of the stimulation-associated ADs evolved directly into seizures,
6 meaning that on iEEG analysis, activity returned to normal after ADs, including in the sessions
7 in which a seizure occurred.
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 We performed electrographic and statistical analyses in order to distinguish between
15 coincidental seizures and those that were likely induced by stimulation. These 14 seizures are
16 listed in **Tables 3 & 4** in the order that they occurred during the 3.5-year study. Looking first at
17 the iEEG analysis, five seizures were found to be concordant, meaning that the seizure event
18 occurred within 600 seconds following stimulation. Of these five “concordant” seizures, three
19 were found to have trend-level significance on rate analysis, meaning there was a reasonable
20 probability that they would not have occurred by chance, categorizing them as “likely”
21 stimulation-induced. The remaining two of the concordant seizures had insignificant p-values on
22 rate analysis, with high power, meaning based on the patients’ baseline seizure rates they were
23 likely chance occurrences, pushing them into the “possibly” stimulation-induced category. Three
24 additional seizures fell into the “possibly” stimulation-induced category, as their iEEG data were
25 not available for review.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 The remaining six seizures occurred in a delayed fashion (after 600 seconds but within 30
43 minutes of stimulation) on iEEG analysis, so regardless of their rate analysis, they were
44 categorized as “unlikely” stimulation-induced. Three of these seizures actually occurred after the
45 completion of the stimulation session, though within the 30-minute time window, and so the
46 seizures themselves were not captured on study-protocol iEEG, and were accordingly
47 categorized as “delayed.” One seizure began electrographically before the stimulation was
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 delivered during the session, but after the test stimulation for safety determination at the
4 beginning of each trial. In this case, the seizure occurred more than 600 seconds after this test
5 stimulation, placing it in the “delayed” iEEG analysis category, and ultimately in the “unlikely”
6 stimulation-induced group.
7
8
9

10
11
12 The following section presents examples of each category of stimulation-associated
13 seizure. These seizures come from three different patients and are numbered in the order in
14 which they occurred temporally during the 3.5 year study. A stimulation electrode and seizure
15 onset electrode for each example are shown in Fig. 1A.
16
17
18
19

20
21
22 *Seizure #7: likely stimulation-induced*
23

24 Seizure #7 was determined to be likely stimulation-induced. On iEEG analysis, a train of
25 bipolar stimulation artifact can be seen in channels 65 and 66, which corresponds to the medial-
26 most posterior hippocampal electrode contacts. Looking at channels 57 and 58, which
27 correspond to the medial-most anterior hippocampal electrode contacts, there is clearly
28 concordant seizure activity, as it begins while stimulation is still being delivered, followed by
29 spread to the stimulation channels and other surrounding electrodes (**Figure 1**). The likelihood of
30 causality based on seizure rate gave a p-value of 0.097, or trend level significance, with a power
31 of 1. Based on iEEG analysis and rate analysis, this seizure was categorized as likely
32 stimulation-induced.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 *Seizure #3: possibly stimulation-induced*
46

47 Seizure #3 is an example of a seizure that was determined to be possibly stimulation-
48 induced. Looking at only the iEEG strip, stimulation delivered to the entorhinal cortex is
49 followed by clear seizure activity, most prominent in the neighboring electrodes (**Figure 2**). This
50 seizure was clinically and electrographically similar to the other seizures the patient had while in
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the EMU. While based only on the iEEG analysis it is possible that the seizure was stimulation-
4 induced, the rate analysis gave an insignificant p-value of 0.140, with a high power of 0.97,
5 suggesting that this seizure could have been a chance occurrence. We therefore categorized this
6 seizure as possibly stimulation-induced.
7
8
9
10
11

12 *Seizure #4: unlikely stimulation-induced*

13
14
15 Seizure #4 is an example of an unlikely stimulation-induced seizure. On iEEG, the
16 seizure electrographically starts at approximately 520 seconds, just prior to stimulation delivery
17 at 542 seconds in the posterior hippocampus (**Figure 3**). In addition, the likelihood based on rate
18 analysis was insignificant, with a p-value of 0.245 and a power of 0.94. The temporal order of
19 seizure and stimulation on iEEG would make it seem impossible that stimulation could have
20 produced this seizure. However, more than 600 seconds before this seizure, the researchers
21 performed an amplitude determination test (see Methods for explanation of amplitude
22 determination testing) consisting of two or three pulse trains at 0.5 mA. Because this short train
23 of test stimulation preceded the seizure, we cannot definitively rule out a causal connection, even
24 though the interval was >600 seconds. We therefore categorized this seizure as unlikely
25 stimulation-induced to allow for this slim possibility.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Putting the iEEG analysis, rate analysis, and power analysis together, three of the 14
41 seizures fell into the likely stimulation-induced category, resulting in an overall rate of 0.39% of
42 all stimulation sessions. Five seizures fell into the possibly stimulation-induced category, and the
43 remaining six seizures fell into the unlikely stimulation-induced category (**Table 4**).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **Discussion**

53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Based on our categorization method, three of the 14 seizures were determined to be likely
4 stimulation-induced, five were determined to be possibly stimulation-induced, and the remaining
5 six were determined to be unlikely stimulation-induced. These results suggest that “likely”
6 stimulation-induced seizures occurred in only 0.39% of sessions. Inclusion of “possibly”
7 stimulation-induced seizures results in a rate of 1.04% of sessions. A maximum rate of seizure
8 occurrence of 1.82% of sessions results if the unlikely stimulation-induced seizures are included
9 as well.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 As the current study was conducted in patients with epilepsy, the majority of whom were
20 not on their full dose AED medications during stimulation, one can infer that the seizure rate in
21 this population is higher than in the general public. Therefore, as one extrapolates this data to
22 future studies using intracranial stimulation or neuroprostheses in patients without epilepsy, one
23 would expect to see an even lower incidence of stimulation-associated seizures. Adverse events
24 associated with implanted neuroprostheses that have been reported include infection and device
25 migration, without mention of seizures(7, 8).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Previous studies have reported seizures in 1.1 to 7.6% of patients during intra-operative
36 stimulation, depending on the technique of stimulation utilized,(4, 9-21) and in up to 33-35% of
37 patients during extra-operative cortical mapping.(3, 5) Importantly, both of these last studies
38 reporting extra-operative stimulation-associated seizures employed higher stimulation
39 amplitudes. Bank et al. report an initial current of 1-5 mA, which was increased by 1-2 mA per
40 stimulation until the target maximum of 8-15 mA, while Aungaroon et al. report an initial current
41 of 1-2mA, which was increased by 1-2 mA to a maximum current of 10 mA. Furthermore, while
42 Aungaroon et al. report stimulation-associated seizures and stimulation-associated ADs
43 separately, Bank et al. define a stimulation-evoked seizure “as after-discharges that evolved and
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 were associated with clinical symptoms.” Neither study accounted for the possibility of
4 coincidentally occurring seizures. Regardless, these numbers are still higher than the rate of
5 seizures or after-discharges seen in stimulation sessions in the current study and may reflect the
6
7
8
9
10 higher amplitudes used.

11
12 Kovac et al. investigated amplitude thresholds for inducing after-discharges, and report a
13 mean stimulation intensity needed to elicit a clinical event of 3.3 ± 0.1 mA when using bipolar
14 stimulation, and 3.9 ± 0.2 mA when using monopolar stimulation.(22) Similarly, Karakis et al.
15 report that an increase in stimulus intensity of 1 mA increases the likelihood of triggering intra-
16 stimulation discharges, which are themselves associated with a 5-fold increase in odds of
17 triggering after-discharges.(23) In our study, the mean amplitude used during stimulation
18 sessions where a seizure occurred was 1.125 mA, and the maximum amplitude applied overall
19 was 3.5 mA.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 While we did not find a significant difference in maximum stimulation amplitudes
32 between the sessions in which seizures occurred and the sessions without seizures, given the
33 previous reports with higher rates of stimulation-associated seizures using higher stimulation
34 amplitude, it appears that increased current amplitude is likely to trigger more seizures. Perhaps
35 intuitively, the lowest possible stimulation parameters should be used in order to minimize risk
36 of seizures during intracranial stimulation.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Four seizures occurred following stimulation parameters and locations known to trigger
46 after-discharges. In order to reduce seizure risk further, one could avoid delivering stimulation if
47 it has previously triggered an after-discharge at that location, regardless of whether the iEEG
48 returned to baseline following the AD, or whether the AD occurred in a prior research session.
49
50
51
52
53
54 Similarly, as 79% of patients were not on their full-dose home AED regimen when the seizure
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 occurred, conducting research on epilepsy patients only when they are on full home-dose
4 medications should intuitively reduce seizure frequency further. In our study, the location of
5 stimulation did not appear to directly correlate with seizure occurrence. However, given that only
6 14 seizures occurred in our current study, it is possible that the sample size was too small to see a
7 location effect.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 While the size and multi-institutional nature of this study improves its generalizability,
16 certain limitations to this study should be noted. For one, though criteria for what constituted a
17 “stimulation-associated” seizure were clearly defined at the outset of the study, the reliance on
18 individual reporting is subject to potential bias. One important element that was not closely
19 controlled for was the effect of anti-epileptic medication wean on seizure frequency. We had
20 access to rough measures of the stage of the medication wean at the time of each seizure, but not
21 the exact doses relative to their pre-operative baseline, or medication status during stimulation
22 sessions that were not associated with seizures. Overall, stimulation sessions were more likely to
23 occur later during the patients’ EMU stays, and many centers waited until patients were back on
24 their home dose of medication before carrying out stimulation sessions. Another important
25 limitation to this study is the variability in type of electrode used. While we could control for
26 current amplitude and frequency, we would not control for electrode used or subtle variability in
27 operative technique between centers.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **Conclusion**

48
49 In conclusion, while we know that seizures are a potential risk of research involving
50 intracranial stimulation, the rate of stimulation-induced seizures identified in this large multi-
51 institutional cohort was small. Importantly, none of the stimulation-associated seizures added
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 morbidity or affected the clinical course of any of the patients. As intracranial stimulation is
4 increasingly utilized to study normal and pathologic brain function, these results will be
5 important for understanding the feasibility and safety of intracranial stimulation for
6 research purposes.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figures

Figure 1. Seizure #7 (A) Localization of electrode channels in a 3D brain model; The open circles correspond to seizure #7, the asterisks to seizure #3, and the triangles to seizure #4. (B) iEEG recording from channel 66, the medial-most posterior hippocampal electrode contact, showing a train of stimulation current being delivered. This is followed by clear seizure activity. (C) Seizure activity can be seen most prominently in channel 57, which corresponds to the medial-most anterior hippocampal electrode contacts. (D) Expanded view of the recording from 1500 to 1520 seconds from panel C.

Figure 2. Seizure #3 (A) Stimulation delivered to entorhinal cortex, shown in gray bars along the top of the plot, followed by clear seizure activity in a neighboring channel (asterisks in Fig. 1A). (B) and (C) are expanded views of the seizure activity, which was both clinically and electrographically similar to the patient's typical seizures.

Figure 3. Seizure #4 (A, B) iEEG tracings from the stimulation channels in the posterior hippocampus (triangles in Fig. 1A) show seizure activity clearly starting prior to the onset of stimulation, which is delivered initially at approximately 542 seconds into the recording (indicated with gray bars along the top of the plot). (C) Overview, and (D) expanded view, captures of seizure activity, electrographically beginning just after 520 seconds, clearly before the onset of stimulation.

Funding

DARPA: Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency

Competing Interests

Dr. Gross serves as a consultant to Medtronic, which is a subcontractor on the MEMES project, and receives compensation for these services. The terms of this arrangement have been reviewed and approved by Emory University in accordance with its conflict of interest policies.

References

1. Chiong W, Leonard MK, Chang EF. Neurosurgical Patients as Human Research Subjects: Ethical Considerations in Intracranial Electrophysiology Research. *Neurosurgery*. 2017.
2. Parvizi J, Kastner S. Promises and limitations of human intracranial electroencephalography. *Nat Neurosci*. 2018;21(4):474-83.
3. Bank AM, Schevon CA, Hamberger MJ. Characteristics and clinical impact of stimulation-evoked seizures during extraoperative cortical mapping. *Epilepsy Behav*. 2014;34:6-8.
4. Szelenyi A, Joksimovic B, Seifert V. Intraoperative risk of seizures associated with transient direct cortical stimulation in patients with symptomatic epilepsy. *Journal of clinical neurophysiology : official publication of the American Electroencephalographic Society*. 2007;24(1):39-43.
5. Aungaroon G, Zea Vera A, Horn PS, Byars AW, Greiner HM, Tenney JR, et al. After-discharges and seizures during pediatric extra-operative electrical cortical stimulation functional brain mapping: Incidence, thresholds, and determinants. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2017;128(10):2078-86.
6. Hollander M, Wolfe DA. *Nonparametric Statistical Methods*. New York: John Wiley & Sons; 1973. p. 15-22.
7. Ajiboye AB, Willett FR, Young DR, Memberg WD, Murphy BA, Miller JP, et al. Restoration of reaching and grasping movements through brain-controlled muscle stimulation in a person with tetraplegia: a proof-of-concept demonstration. *Lancet*. 2017;389(10081):1821-30.
8. Kilgore KL, Peckham P, Keith MW. Twenty year experience with implanted neuroprostheses. *Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc*. 2009;2009:7212-5.
9. Berger MS, Kincaid J, Ojemann GA, Lettich E. Brain mapping techniques to maximize resection, safety, and seizure control in children with brain tumors. *Neurosurgery*. 1989;25(5):786-92.
10. Cedzich C, Taniguchi M, Schafer S, Schramm J. Somatosensory evoked potential phase reversal and direct motor cortex stimulation during surgery in and around the central region. *Neurosurgery*. 1996;38(5):962-70.
11. Duffau H, Capelle L, Sichez J, Faillot T, Abdennour L, Law Koune JD, et al. Intraoperative direct electrical stimulations of the central nervous system: the Salpetriere experience with 60 patients. *Acta neurochirurgica*. 1999;141(11):1157-67.
12. Ebeling U, Schmid UD, Reulen HJ. Tumour-surgery within the central motor strip: surgical results with the aid of electrical motor cortex stimulation. *Acta neurochirurgica*. 1989;101(3-4):100-7.
13. King RB, Schell GR. Cortical localization and monitoring during cerebral operations. *J Neurosurg*. 1987;67(2):210-9.
14. Kombos T, Suess O, Ciklatekerlio O, Brock M. Monitoring of intraoperative motor evoked potentials to increase the safety of surgery in and around the motor cortex. *J Neurosurg*. 2001;95(4):608-14.

15. Neuloh G, Pechstein U, Cedzich C, Schramm J. Motor evoked potential monitoring with supratentorial surgery. *Neurosurgery*. 2004;54(5):1061-70; discussion 70-2.
16. Romstock J, Fahlbusch R, Ganslandt O, Nimsky C, Strauss C. Localisation of the sensorimotor cortex during surgery for brain tumours: feasibility and waveform patterns of somatosensory evoked potentials. *Journal of neurology, neurosurgery, and psychiatry*. 2002;72(2):221-9.
17. Sala F, Lanteri P. Brain surgery in motor areas: the invaluable assistance of intraoperative neurophysiological monitoring. *Journal of neurosurgical sciences*. 2003;47(2):79-88.
18. Sartorius CJ, Wright G. Intraoperative brain mapping in a community setting--technical considerations. *Surg Neurol*. 1997;47(4):380-8.
19. Taniguchi M, Cedzich C, Schramm J. Modification of cortical stimulation for motor evoked potentials under general anesthesia: technical description. *Neurosurgery*. 1993;32(2):219-26.
20. Yingling CD, Ojemann S, Dodson B, Harrington MJ, Berger MS. Identification of motor pathways during tumor surgery facilitated by multichannel electromyographic recording. *J Neurosurg*. 1999;91(6):922-7.
21. Tate MC, Guo L, McEvoy J, Chang EF. Safety and efficacy of motor mapping utilizing short pulse train direct cortical stimulation. *Stereotact Funct Neurosurg*. 2013;91(6):379-85.
22. Kovac S, Scott CA, Maglajlija V, Toms N, Rodionov R, Miserocchi A, et al. Comparison of bipolar versus monopolar extraoperative electrical cortical stimulation mapping in patients with focal epilepsy. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2014;125(4):667-74.
23. Karakis I, Leeman-Markowski BA, Leveroni CL, Kilbride RD, Cash SS, Eskandar EN, et al. Intra-stimulation discharges: an overlooked cortical electrographic entity triggered by direct electrical stimulation. *Clin Neurophysiol*. 2015;126(5):882-8.

Table 1: Stimulation-Relation Categories

Category	Definition
1. Likely stimulation-related	Concordant* iEEG <i>AND</i> p-value < 0.1 (regardless of power) <i>OR</i> p-value > 0.1 but with low power
2. Possibly stimulation-related	Concordant iEEG <i>AND</i> p-value > 0.1 with high power
3. Unlikely stimulation-related	Delayed iEEG Regardless of p-value

*Concordant refers to a seizure that occurred within 600 seconds following stimulation

Table 2: Stimulation-Associated Seizure Characteristics

Seizure Characteristic	Number (%) (total seizures = 14)
Type of seizure	
Focal onset aware	9 (64%)
Focal onset impaired aware	4 (29%)
Focal to bilateral tonic-clonic	1 (7%)
Length of seizure	Mean: 79 seconds Range: 7-237 seconds
More severe than patient's typical seizure?	0
Required intubation or respiratory support beyond NC?	0
Extended the amount of time the patient needed to be kept in the EMU?	0
Timing of seizure in relation to recording of all clinical seizures	
Before	9(64%)
After	5(36%)
Patient on full home dose AEDs?	
Yes	2(14%)
No	11(79%)
Unknown (not recorded)	1(7%)
Location of stim	
CA1	4(29%)
EC	3 (21%)
Other	7 (50%)
Location of stimulation relative to SOZ	
Overlap in location of stim and SOZ	2(14%)
Overlap in location of stim and area of interictal spiking	3(21%)
No direct overlap	9 (64%)

Table 3: Stimulation-Associated Seizures – Clinical Details


Seizure	Location of Stim	MRI Abnormalities	Overlap with known SOZ or known areas of interictal discharges	Amplitude of Stim (mA)	Frequency of Stim (Hz)	Patient on full home dose AEDs	Type of Seizure	Duration of Seizure (seconds)
1	R CA1	None	No	1.5	50	No	Focal onset aware	17
2	R EC	None	Yes	1	50	No	Focal onset aware	99
3	R EC	None	Yes	1.5	50	No	Focal onset aware	90
4	L PHC	None	No	0.5	50	No	Focal onset impaired aware	102
5	L EC	None	No	1.5	50	Yes	Focal to bilateral tonic-clonic	124
6	L CA1	None	No	1	100-200	No	Focal onset aware	11
7	R CA1	None	Yes	0.5	10-200	No	Focal onset aware	93
8	R CA1	None	Yes	0.25	25	No	Focal onset aware	78
9	R subiculum	None	No	1	10-200	No	Focal onset impaired aware	146
10	R superior frontal	R lateral frontal cortical dysplasia	Yes	2	10-200	No	Focal onset aware	24
11	R rostral middle frontal	R lateral frontal cortical dysplasia	No	2	50	No	Focal onset aware	23
12	R rostral anterior cingulate	None	No	1	10-200	Not recorded	Focal onset impaired aware	7
13	L MTG	None	No	1	10-200	No	Focal onset impaired aware	237
14	L6-7	None	No	1	200	Yes	Focal onset aware	57

(Stim = Stimulation; R = right; L = left; EC = entorhinal cortex; PHC = parahippocampal cortex; MTG = middle temporal gyrus)

Table 4: Stimulation-associated Seizures – Analysis

Seizure	iEEG Analysis	Rate analysis (p-value)	Power analysis	“Stimulation-associated” Category
1	Concordant	0.052*	0.96	1 – Likely
2	Concordant	0.140	0.98	2 – Possibly
3	Concordant	0.140	0.97	2 – Possibly
4	Delayed	0.245	0.94	3 – Unlikely
5	Unavailable	0.122	0.98	2 – Possibly
6	Unavailable	0.120	1	2 – Possibly
7	Concordant	0.097*	1	1 – Likely
8	Delayed	0.241	1	3 – Unlikely
9	Unavailable	0.130	1	2 – Possibly
10	Delayed	0.507	0.75	3 – Unlikely
11	Delayed	0.507	0.75	3 – Unlikely
12	Delayed	0.767	0.87	3 – Unlikely
13	Delayed	0.090*	1	3 – Unlikely
14	Concordant	0.052*	0.99	1 – Likely

*Denotes trend-level significance



Accepted Manuscript

