Extended-release Antiepilepsy Drugs— Review of the Effects of Once-daily Dosing on Tolerability, Effectiveness, Adherence, Quality of Life, and Patient Preference

Basim M Uthman, MD, FACIP, FAAN

Professor and Vice Chair, Department of Neurology, Weill Cornell Medical College in Qatar, Qatar Foundation and Hamad Medical Corporation, Doha, Qatar

Abstract

Long-term adherence to antiepilepsy drug (AED) regimens is frequently suboptimal. Poor adherence to therapy is associated with a number of negative consequences, including an increase in patient seizures and mortality. Nonadherence is related to a variety of factors, such as treatment-related adverse events, convenience of treatment, efficacy, and quality of life. There is therefore a need for treatment strategies in epilepsy that improve long-term adherence. One such strategy is the use of extended-release (ER) AED formulations. Advantages of ER AEDs over other AED formulations include the potential for once-daily dosing, a more stable mean drug concentration over time, improved tolerability profiles, maximal use of the therapeutic window, and the possibility to achieve better seizure control. Improvements in overall treatment effectiveness may therefore increase patient adherence. This review presents evidence related to patient adherence and preference patterns for ER AEDs and highlights the beneficial properties of ER AEDs.

Keywords

Epilepsy, antiepilepsy drugs, medication nonadherence, quality of life

Disclosure: Basim M Uthman, MD, FACIP, FAAN, participates in research funded by the Qatar National Research Fund. He received no honorarium or other form of financial support related to the development of this article.

Acknowledgments: The author thanks Alan Saltzman, PhD, of Fishawack Communications for editorial and medical writing support, which was funded by Supernus Pharmaceuticals. Received: February 20, 2014 Accepted: March 10, 2014 Citation: US Neurology, 2014;10(1):30–7 DOI: 10.17925/USN.2014.10.01.30

Correspondence: Basim M Uthman, MD, FACIP, FAAN, Weill Cornell Medical College in Qatar, Education City, PO Box 24144, Doha, Qatar. E: bmu2001@qatar-med.cornell.edu

Support: The publication of this article was supported by Supernus Pharmaceuticals. The views and opinions expressed are those of the author and not necessarily those of Supernus Pharmaceuticals.

Epilepsy is a chronic neurologic disorder characterized by recurrent episodes that may vastly affect health, daily functioning, and quality of life (QoL). Although many antiepilepsy drugs (AEDs) are available (see *Table 1*),¹⁻¹⁴ a substantial proportion of patients with epilepsy experience seizures that are inadequately controlled because of the ineffectiveness of or nonadherence to their current regimen.

Nonadherence is a significant problem in patients with epilepsy.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ A retrospective analysis of claims data from a large US adult managed care population noted an overall nonadherence rate of 39 % in patients with epilepsy following AED initiation (based on a medication possession ratio of <0.8).¹⁶ According to a patient survey by Cramer et al., 71 % of patients reported missing at least one dose of medication, with a mean of two missed doses per month.¹⁷

Poor adherence is associated with negative patient outcomes.^{15–18} In a patient survey by Cramer et al., 45 % of respondents who had missed

a dose of AED at least once monthly reported that they experienced a seizure thereafter.¹⁷ Based on healthcare insurance claims, individuals with epilepsy who are nonadherent to treatment are significantly more likely to experience seizures,15 have increased morbidity,18 require emergency department care and hospitalization,¹⁶ and incur higher inpatient costs compared with adherent patients.¹⁶ Analysis of a large insurance claims database revealed nonadherent adult patients with epilepsy were 21 % more likely to experience a seizure than were adherent patients (hazard ratio [HR] = 1.205, 95 % confidence interval [CI] 1.092-1.330; p=0.0002).15 In an open cohort analysis of Medicaid claims from adults with epilepsy, mortality was approximately three times greater among patients nonadherent to their prescribed AED regimen compared with adherent patients (HR=3.32, 95 % CI 3.11-3.54).18 Nonadherence to AEDs was also linked to a 50 % higher incidence of emergency room visits (incident rate ratio [IRR] = 1.50, 95 % CI 1.49-1.52) and an 86 % higher frequency of hospitalizations (IRR=1.86, 95 % CI 1.84-1.88).18

Table 1: Summary of Extended-release Antiepilepsy Drugs Approved by the US Food and DrugAdministration or European Countries

Generic Name	Trade Name	Epilepsy Indications [†]	Dosage Strengths (Maximum Recommended Dose)	Dosage Form and Frequency	Technology ¹³	Pharmacokinetics (Half-life)	Most Common Adverse Events†
Carbamazepine*	Carbatrol ^{®1}	Partial seizures with complex symptomatology; generalized tonic–clonic seizures; mixed seizure patterns	•	Capsule, BID	Fixed ratio of three bead types: 25 % IR, 35 % enteric coated, 40 % Microtrol ^{®14}	Variable	Dizziness, drowsiness, unsteadiness, nausea, vomiting
Carbamazepine*	Tegretol® XR ²	Partial seizures with complex symptomatology; generalized tonic–clonic seizures; mixed seizure patterns	100, 200, 400 mg (1,000 mg/ day patients 6–15 years; 1,200 mg/day patients >15 years; 1,600 mg/day adults, in rare circumstances)	Tablet, BID	Osmotic release delivery system	Variable	Dizziness, drowsiness, unsteadiness, nausea, vomiting
Divalproex*	Depakote ER ³	Monotherapy or adjunctive treatment of complex partial seizures and simple and complex absence seizures; adjunctive therapy in patients with multiple seizures including absence seizures	250 and 500 mg (60 mg/kg/day)	Tablet, QD	Hydrophobic matrix	9–16 hours	Headache, asthenia, nausea, vomiting, abdominal pain, drowsiness, dizziness, tremor
Lamotrigine*	Lamictal® XR™4	Adjunctive therapy for primary generalized tonic– clonic seizures and partial onset seizures, conversion	25, 50, 100, 200, 250, 300 mg (250–300 mg/day to 400–600 mg/day day dependent on additional medications taken)	Tablet, QD	DiffCORE™ modified-release eroding matrix, clear enteric coat with a drilled aperture through both faces of the tablet	25–70 hours depending if taken with AED	Dizziness, drowsiness headache, rash nausea, nystagmus
Levetiracetam*	Keppra XR®5	Adjunctive therapy for partial onset seizures	500, 750 mg (3,000 mg/day)	Tablet, QD	Film-coated tablets	6–8 hours	Drowsiness, irritability
Oxcarbazepine	Oxtellar XR®6	Adjunctive therapy in treatment of partial seizures in patients ≥6 years	150, 300, 600 mg (900–1,800 mg/day [dependent on weight] patients 6–17 years; 1,200–2,400 mg/day adults)	Tablet, QD	Solutrol ^{®14}	7–12 hours	Dizziness, drowsiness, headache, balance disorder, tremor, vomiting, diplopia, asthenia
Phenytoin*	Dilantin® Kapseals®7	Generalized tonic–clonic and complex partial seizures and seizures occurring during neurosurgery	30 mg	Capsule, QD, TID, or QID	Various	7–42 hours	CNS most common including nystagmus, ataxia, slurred speech, decreased coordination, mental confusion
Phenytoin*	Phenytek®8	Generalized tonic–clonic and complex partial seizures and seizures occurring during neurosurge	200, 300 mg ry	Capsule, QD, TID, or QID	Various	7–42 hours	CNS most common including nystagmus, ataxia, slurred speech, decreased coordination, mental confusion
Topiramate	Trokendi XR™?	Monotherapy in partial onset seizures or primary generalized tonic–clonic seizures in patien ≥10 years or adjunctively in patients ≥6 years; adjunctive therapy in Lennox-Gastaut Syndrome in patients ≥6 yea	I IS	Capsule, QD	Microtrol ^{®14}	Approximately 31 hours	Paresthesia, drowsiness, anorexia, weight decrease, dizziness, difficulty with memory
Topiramate	Qudexy™ XR ¹⁰	Monotherapy in partial onset seizures or primary tonic–clon seizures in patients ≥10 year or adjunctively in patients ≥2 years; adjunctive therapy Lennox-Gastaut Syndrome in patients ≥2 years	25, 50, 100, 150, 200 mg ic s in	Capsule, QD	Unknown	Approximately 56 hours	Paresthesia, anorexia, weight decrease, dizziness, drowsiness, difficulty with memory

Table 1: Summary of Extended-release Antiepilepsy Drugs Approved by the US Food and DrugAdministration or European Countries (continued)

Generic Name	Trade Name	Epilepsy Indications ⁺	Dosage Strengths (Maximum Recommended Dose)	Dosage Form and Frequency	Technology ¹³	Pharmacokinetic (Half-life)	s Most Common Adverse Events [†]
Valproate/ sodium valproate*	Epilim® Chrono,1 Depakine® Chrono12	¹¹ Epilepsy seizures	200, 300, 500 mg	Tablet, BID	Enteric coated	8–20 hours	Nausea, tremor

*Generics available. †See each product package insert for full indications and complete adverse event information.

AED = antiepilespy drug; BID = twice daily; CNS = central nervous system; ER, XR = extended-release; IR = immediate release; QD = once daily; QID = four times a day; TID = three times a day.

Despite the harmful consequences of missing doses, full adherence to epilepsy pharmacotherapy remains an elusive treatment goal and an unmet medical need. Patient- and drug-related factors that may contribute to nonadherence include younger age, adverse events (AEs), inconvenience, and social stigma.¹⁹⁻²³ In a study by Buck et al., 6 % of patients \geq 60 years of age (n=180) missed a dose at least once a month, while 16 % of teenagers (n=25) did.¹⁹ In the same study, AEs were noted as a factor in nonadherence in 16 % of patients (n=326).¹⁹ Among persistent AEs that have been reported by patients taking AEDs that could potentially contribute to nonadherence were dizziness, somnolence, nausea, weight gain, irritability, diplopia, and cognitive impairment.²⁴ These AEs can be associated with peak AED blood levels for some AEDs.25 Another aspect related to nonadherence is the complexity or inconvenience of the drug regimen. In general, more frequent doses are associated with lower adherence^{19,21} as it increases the need to have sufficient medication onhand at work, school, or when performing daily activities. Furthermore, when taking AEDs in public settings, some patients may be embarrassed and experience a feeling of stigmatization.22,23 Patients subsequently may avoid taking AEDs in public, make excuses for using AEDs, or stop taking medication to avoid this perceived social stigma.²²

One approach that has aided in improving adherence has been the reformulation of several immediate-release (IR) and delayed-release (DR) AEDs that are dosed as twice daily or more frequently to extendedrelease (ER) preparations that are dosed as once daily.^{13,26} ER formulations (also denoted as XR) have the advantages of minimizing peak to trough variations seen with IR formulations, thereby reducing AEs associated with peak concentrations while allowing for more consistent plasma levels and reducing the number of daily doses. Furthermore, ER or XR formulations maximize the use of the therapeutic window by allowing necessary modest increases in the total daily dose for better efficacy while keeping maximum concentration (C_{max}) below the upper limit of the therapeutic range, thus avoiding peak-related AEs. These improvements in the pharmacokinetic properties of an individual particular AED by reformulation to an ER (or XR) preparation can vary and are dependent on the characteristics of the original molecule, such as bioavailability, solubility, and permeability properties, and the particular ER technology used. In the preparation of ER formulations, crystalline matrix, modified-release eroding matrix, film-coated tablet, osmotic release delivery system, and enteric coating technologies have been used. ER AEDs are dosed less frequently than IR formulations, either once or twice daily (see Table 1).1-14

This review will compare patient adherence patterns for ER AEDs with those observed with their IR counterparts (or equivalents), as well as assess

patient preferences for these formulations. Furthermore, factors associated with patient adherence, such as AEs, tolerability, effectiveness, efficacy, and QoL will be discussed for the ER and other formulations of AEDs.

Adherence Patterns and Patient Preference for Extended-release Antiepilepsy Drugs Compared with Immediate-release Antiepilepsy Drugs

Various studies have shown increased adherence when patients were switched from an IR AED to an ER AED formulation (see Table 2).21,27-34 In one prospective, observational study involving 2,031 patients, adherence improved from 40 % to 71 % (p<0.001) upon switching from an IR to an ER AED formulation of valproate.²¹ Improved adherence was also seen in patients (n=358) switching from carbamazepine IR to carbamazepine ER (Carbatrol®, Shire, Wayne, PA) with 59 % of patients on the ER formulation stating that they 'strongly agreed' they rarely skipped or missed a dose of their medication compared with 39 % on the IR formulation.²⁷ Furthermore, in a recent pharmacokinetic switch study of adult patients with epilepsy (n=61) who were surveyed after switching from IR twice-daily topiramate (Topamax®, Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Titusville, NJ) to a once-daily XR formulation (SPN-538; Supernus Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Rockville, MD), 92 % expressed preference for the once-daily dosing and believed it facilitated treatment adherence after switching to the XR formulation.29

Similar concordance of patient preference with improved adherence with ER formulations of two other AEDs was also reported. In a study of 41 adult patients with epilepsy who switched from divalproex DR to divalproex ER, 71 % of patients preferred the ER formulation.³³ In a small pharmacokinetic study of lamotrigine ER involving 44 patients, 69 % of patients preferred the once-daily regimen while 17 % reported no preference.³⁴

Properties of Extended-release Antiepilepsy Drugs Associated With Adherence Reduced Adverse Events and Increased Tolerability

A tolerability advantage of long-acting AED formulations has been observed in various published reports for a number of different AEDs (see *Table 3*).^{21,30,32-47} Several investigators have proposed that improved tolerability is likely due to lower C_{max} values and reduced peak-to-trough differences in plasma drug concentration over the post-dose period, resulting in less fluctuation of drug plasma levels.^{13,36,40}

In a double-blind, crossover study of IR versus ER carbamazepine conducted in 48 patients, significantly fewer patients experienced AEs with carbamazepine ER treatment compared with carbamazepine IR (6

Table 2: Summary of Studies Examining Extended-release Medication Adherence, Quality of Life, and Patient Preference

Author/Year/Citation	Study Design	Treatment Arms	Patients (n)	Outcomes
Adherence				
Boggs et al. 2007 ²⁸	Randomized, IR versus ER	Divalproex ER	20	Better compliance observed with Divalproex ER
	compliance comparison trial	Valproate IR		
Doughty et al. 2003 ²¹	Prospective, 3-month,	Valproate ER	2,031	Never missed dose: Valproate ER: 71 %
	open-label IR-ER switch	Valproate IR		Valproate IR: 40 % (p<0.001)
Moore et al. 2005 ²⁷	Prospective, open-label,	Carbamazepine ER	358	Compliance ('strongly agree that they rarely/neve
	3-month, IR-ER switch	Carbamazepine IR		missed dose'): Carbamazepine ER: 59 %
				Carbamazepine IR: 39 %
Stocks et al. 2011 ²⁹	Open-label, 4-week,	Topiramate ER	61	Improved adherence reported by 92 %
	IR-ER switch	Topiramate IR		of patients switched to Topiramate XR
QoL				
Ficker et al. 2005 ³⁰	Prospective, 3-month,	Carbamazepine ER	453	QOLIE 31 score:
	open-label, IR versus ER switch	Carbamazepine IR		Carbamazepine IR: 62.8
				Carbamazepine ER: 68.3 (p<0.001)
Steinhoff et al. 2009 ³¹	Questionnaire following IR	Oxcarbazepine ER	27	Significant improvement in QOLIE-10
	to ER switch	Oxcarbazepine IR		score in 23 of 27 patients (p<0.001)
Yu et al. 2011 ³²	Prospective, multicenter,	Valproate ER	958	Improved seizure worry, social functioning,
	6-month, open-label			overall QoL (all p<0.01) based on QOLIE-31
Patient Preference				
Doughty et al. 2003 ²¹	Prospective, open-label,	Valproate ER	2,031	Satisfaction: Valproate ER: 91 %
	3-month IR-ER switch	Valproate IR		Valproate IR: 40 %
Pierre-Louis et al. 2009 ³³	Prospective, open-label,	Divalproex ER	41	Patient preference: Divalproex ER: 71 %
	6-month IR-ER switch	Divalproex DR		Divalproex DR: 14 %. No preference: 14 %
Stocks et al. 2011 ²⁹	Open-label,	Topiramate ER: (SPN-53)	61	Prefer Topiramate XR: 93 %
	4-week IR-ER switch	Topiramate IR		
Tompson et al. 2008 ³⁴	Prospective, open-label, 2-period	Lamotrigine XR	44	Patient preference: Lamotrigine ER: 69 %
	crossover IR-ER switch	Lamotrigine IR		No preference: 17 %

DR = delayed-release; ER, XR = extended-release; IR = immediate-release; QoL = quality of life; QOLIE = Quality of Life in Epilepsy.

versus 26; p<0.001).⁴⁰ Additionally, a global evaluation of tolerability was significantly better with carbamazepine ER, with 31 patients giving a 'very good' ranking compared with 6 for the IR formulation (p<0.001).

In one of the largest open-label IR to ER switch studies reported, Ficker et al. compared AEs following a switch from carbamazepine IR to carbamazepine ER among 453 patients older than 12 years with partial epilepsy.³⁰ In adults, investigators reported significant reductions from baseline in AE profile total scores, as well as in central nervous system (CNS) side-effect scores measured by the AE profile (p<0.0001 for both). In adolescents, they also reported significant reductions at study conclusion in both the Hague Side Effect total score and sedation and confusion subscales compared with baseline (p<0.01 for each).

Similarly, in a 2-year retrospective chart review of patients (n=61) switched from carbamazepine IR to carbamazepine ER, Miller et al. reported a significant decrease in CNS AEs.³⁶ When receiving carbamazepine IR, 49 % of patients experienced sedation, diplopia, ataxia, confusion, or dizziness, while only 20 % of patients while receiving carbamazepine ER experienced such AEs (p=0.001). Of the patients who experienced CNS AEs with carbamazepine IR, 80 % reported complete resolution after switching to carbamazepine ER.

Treatment-emergent AEs (TEAEs) were compared for levetiracetam ER and levetiracetam IR in an analysis of pooled individual patient data

derived from three similarly designed, randomized, double-blind, placebocontrolled clinical trials (n=555).³⁸ A significantly lower risk for TEAEs was observed for levetiracetam ER versus levetiracetam IR for CNS disorders (risk difference [RD] = -18 %; p=0.03), but not for psychiatric disorders (RD = -11 %; p=0.08), or metabolism and nutrition disorders (RD = -3 %; p=0.08).

ER formulations were also shown to decrease AEs associated with valproate in an open-label trial in which 41 patients taking multiple daily doses of valproate DR were switched to a once- or twice-daily regimen of valproate.37 During 3 months of follow-up after switching to valproate ER, complaints of tremor, weight gain, and nausea/vomiting were decreased while other AEs, such as hair loss, remained unchanged. In an earlier study involving 2,031 patients, Doughty et al. reported a significant reduction in the mean side-effect score 3 months after patients switched from valproate IR to valproate ER (32.8 versus 28.5; p<0.001).21 Smith et al. conducted a meta-analysis of pooled individual patient data from nine short-term, open-label studies of divalproex ER versus divalproex DR, which included 213 patients with epilepsy and 108 patients with psychiatric disorders.³⁵ Among patients with either epilepsy or a psychiatric disorder, fewer patients reported TEAEs with divalproex ER. Compared with divalproex IR, divalproex ER had a lower incidence of tremor, weight gain, and gastrointestinal complaints (p<0.001 for each comparison).

In a phase III study evaluating the safety and efficacy of oxcarbazepine XR in 366 patients with epilepsy, 30 % discontinued treatment at the highest dose

Table 3: Summary of Studies Examining Extended-release Antiepilepsy Drug Adverse Events,Tolerability, and Efficacy

12-week trial Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group, 19-week trial Lamotrigine XR 143 TEAEs ≥5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache, vomiting, nausea, pyrexia Decreased primary generalit clonic seizure frequency/we cp<0.0001 versus placebo). Since patients (maintenance): (p<0.0001 versus placebo) Biton et al. Pooled analysis of three Lamotrigine XR 662 AEs with Lamotrigine R similar to that reported for Lamotrigine R with the most common TEAEs being dizziness (10 %) and headache (6 %) NR Free net al. Randomized, double-blind study with pseudo-placebo historical control, pseudo-placebo Lamotrigine XR 226 Headache and dizziness most limit with historical common AE associated with based on nonoverlag of 95 % (limit with historical control, pseudo-placebo Decreased parial seizure frequency/we common FEAEs being dizziness, diarrhea, drowsiness most limit with historical control, pseudo-placebo Lamotrigine XR 239 TEAEs ≥5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache, becreased parial seizure frequency week: 46 % (p=0.0004 versus placebo). Seizure frequency week: 46 % (p=0.0004 versus placebo) Naritoku Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel- group, 19-week trial Lamotrigine XR 244 Headache most frequent TEAE: Number of seizure frequency week: 46 % (p=0.0004 versus placebo). Seizure-free patients (maint with historical control i 9% (p=0.0004 versus placebo) Seizure-free patients (maint with historical control i 9% (p=0.0004 versus placebo). Seizure-free patients (maint with historical control i 9% (p=0.0004 versus placebo) S	cts: Carbamazepine CR: 6Carbamazepine CR: 6.3±9izepine IR: 26 (p<0.001)Carbamazepine IR: 9.3±15improvement in nervousNRKE (p<0.0001); AE profile total crease from 37.2 to 31.7NR1); Hague side-effect score in ents improvement from 26.7 to 0.01)Seizures/month: Carbama ER: 3.0. Carbamazepine IR eresepine ER: 20 %cts (% of patients): azepine IR: 49 % (p=0.001)Seizures/month: Carbama ER: 3.0. Carbamazepine IR eresepine IR: 49 % (p=0.001)quency similar (weight, tremor, switch to ER improved ased on questionnaire but not des spiral drawing testMedian seizures/month: D ER: 0.7. Divalproex IR: 32 % (p=0.0)	side effects: Carbama Carbamazepine IR: 24 AE profile improveme system AE (p<0.0001 score decrease from (p<0.0001); Hague sid adolescents improve 22.6 (p<0.01) CNS effects (% of pat Carbamazepine ER: 2 Carbamazepine IR: 44 TEAE frequency simil nystagmus, gastrointe fatigue, alopecia); in p baseline tremor, switc	453	Carbamazepine IR Carbamazepine ER Carbamazepine IR	2-period crossover Prospective, 3-month, open-label, IR versus ER switch	1990 ⁴⁰ Ficker et al.	
Cardiomacepine IR: 9 (a):0.01) Cardiomacepine IR: 9 (a):0.01 Cardiomacepine IR: 9 (a):0.01 Cardiomacepine IR: 9 (a):0.01 2005 ¹¹ open-table), IR versus Cardiomacepine IR: 9 (a):0.01 Scient decrease (more main figure	azepine IR: 26 (p<0.001)	Carbamazepine IR: 24 AE profile improveme system AE (p<0.0001 score decrease from (p<0.0001); Hague sid adolescents improve 22.6 (p<0.01) CNS effects (% of pat Carbamazepine ER: 2 Carbamazepine IR: 4 TEAE frequency simil nystagmus, gastrointe fatigue, alopecia); in p baseline tremor, switc		Carbamazepine ER Carbamazepine IR	Prospective, 3-month, open-label, IR versus ER switch	Ficker et al.	
Ficker Li ProSpective 3, amonth, 2005 ⁹⁰ Carbamazepine IR switch 433 AE profile improvement, in revueus, system AT (PoulD01), Hagus add-effect score in addesares from 37.2 to 31.7 (p-0.0001), Hagus add-effect score in addesares from 27.2 to 31.7 NR Miller et al. 2-year retrospective chart review, IR-ER switch Carbamazepine IR 3 year Carbamazepine IR 2 year Corbamazepine IR 2 year Corbamazepine IR 2 year Seizures/month: Carbamaze ER 30, Carbamazepine IR 2 year ER 30, Carbamazepine IR 2 year ER 30, Carbamazepine IR 2 year Carbamazepine IR 2 year Seizures/month: Carbamaze 2 year Prospective, 2 with tet al. 2009 ¹⁰ Prospective, 3 with 2 year Prospective, 3 with 2 year TEAE frequency similar weight, month R-ER switch Divalprock IR 2 with 2 year Hage frequency similar weight, month R-ER switch Divalprock R 2 with 2 year of crossover, 14 cay trait Divalprock R 2 with 2 year of crossover, 14 cay trait Divalprock R 2 year of crossover, 2 year carbover, 19 weight R 2 year of crossover, 14 cay trait Divalprock R 2 year of crossover, 14 cay trait Divalprock R 2 year of crossover, 2 year o	e improvement in nervous NR KE (p<0.0001); AE profile total crease from 37.2 to 31.7 1); Hague side-effect score in ents improvement from 26.7 to 0.01) Cts (% of patients): Seizures/month: Carbama azepine ER: 20 % ER: 3.0. Carbamazepine IR izepine IR: 49 % (p=0.001) (p=0.29). Patients with 50 % from baseline: 46 %. Seizur quency similar (weight, us, gastrointestinal discomforts, lopecia); in patients with Seizure-free: Divalproex IR: 0.85 Seizure-free: Divalproex IR: 0.85 Seizure-free: Divalproex IR: 0.85 Seizure-free: Divalproex IR: 32 % (p=0.06 ased on questionnaire but not des spiral drawing test	AE profile improveme system AE (p<0.0001) score decrease from (p<0.0001); Hague sid adolescents improve 22.6 (p<0.01) CNS effects (% of pat Carbamazepine ER: 2 Carbamazepine IR: 4 TEAE frequency simil nystagmus, gastrointe fatigue, alopecia); in p baseline tremor, switc		Carbamazepine IR Carbamazepine ER	open-label, IR versus ER switch		
Ficker of al. 2005 ⁹ Prospective, zmenth, ER switch Carbamazepine IR carbamazepine IR 2007 ⁹ Gatamazepine IR 2000 ⁹ Gatamazepine IR 2000 ⁹ Septem AC (Poul 0001), Program (Poul fortal score decrease from 27.2 to 31.7 (p-0.0001), Prague side-affect score in addressers improvement for 27.0 to 31.7 (p-0.0001), Prague side-affect score in addressers improvement for 27.0 to 31.7 (p-0.0001), Prague side-affect score in addressers improvement for 27.0 to 31.7 (p-0.0001), Prague side-affect score in addressers improvement for 27.0 to 31.7 (p-0.0001), Prague similar for 28.7 (p-0.0001) Seizures/month: Carbamaze ER 30.0 Carbamazepine IR 20.0 Addressers improvement for 27.0 to 31.7 (p-0.0001) Seizures/month: Carbamaze ER 30.0 Carbamazepine IR 20.0 Addressers improvement for 28.7 (p-0.0001) Seizures/month: Carbamaze ER 30.0 Carbamazepine IR 20.0 Addressers improvement in revous. NR 2004 ¹⁰ Prospective, open label, 20.0 Addressers in 12.0 Millores IR 20.0 Addressers in 12.0 Millores in 12.0 Mill	e improvement in nervous NR KE (p<0.0001); AE profile total crease from 37.2 to 31.7 1); Hague side-effect score in ents improvement from 26.7 to 0.01) Cts (% of patients): Seizures/month: Carbama azepine ER: 20 % ER: 3.0. Carbamazepine IR izepine IR: 49 % (p=0.001) (p=0.29). Patients with 50 % from baseline: 46 %. Seizur quency similar (weight, us, gastrointestinal discomforts, lopecia); in patients with Seizure-free: Divalproex IR: 0.85 Seizure-free: Divalproex IR: 0.85 Seizure-free: Divalproex IR: 0.85 Seizure-free: Divalproex IR: 32 % (p=0.06 ased on questionnaire but not des spiral drawing test	AE profile improveme system AE (p<0.0001) score decrease from (p<0.0001); Hague sid adolescents improve 22.6 (p<0.01) CNS effects (% of pat Carbamazepine ER: 2 Carbamazepine IR: 4 TEAE frequency simil nystagmus, gastrointe fatigue, alopecia); in p baseline tremor, switc		Carbamazepine IR Carbamazepine ER	open-label, IR versus ER switch		
Books oppn-label, IR versus Carbamazepine IR scructerizes from 327 to 317 (pc0.0001); Hague alde-effect score in adolescents improvement from 26.7 to 317 (pc0.0001); Hague alde-effect score in adolescents improvement from 26.7 to 317 (pc0.0001); Hague alde-effect score in adolescents improvement from 26.7 to 317 (pc0.0001); Hague alde-effect score in adolescents improvement from 26.7 to 317 (pc0.0001); Hague alde-effect score in adolescents improvement from 26.7 to 317 (pc0.0001); Hague alde-effect score in adolescents improvement from 26.7 to 317 (pc0.0001); Hague alde-effect score in adolescents improvement from 26.7 to 317 (pc0.0001); Hague alde-effect score in adolescents improvement from 26.7 to 10-029, Peterts svtth 50.95 from baseline 45.8 sclutter store in advectore in advectore in advectore in advec	AE (p<0.0001); AE profile total crease from 37.2 to 31.7	system AE (p<0.0001 score decrease from (p<0.0001); Hague sic adolescents improve 22.6 (p<0.01) CNS effects (% of pat Carbamazepine ER: 2 Carbamazepine IR: 4 TEAE frequency simil nystagmus, gastrointe fatigue, alopecia); in p baseline tremor, switc		Carbamazepine IR Carbamazepine ER	open-label, IR versus ER switch		
ER switch sore decrease from 3/2 to 31.7 (sc0.0001); Hague side effect score in addecseurs improvement from 26.7 to 27.7 22.2 (p-0.01) Miller et al. 2, year retrospective chart review, IR-ER switch Carbamazepine ER 21 year Corbamazepine IR: 20.9 % Carbamazepine IR: 20.9	Crease from 37.2 to 31.71); Hague side-effect score in ents improvement from 26.7 to 0.01)cts (% of patients): azepine ER: 20 %ER: 3.0. Carbamazepine IR (p=0.29). Patients with 50 % from baseline: 46 %. Seizur guency similar (weight, Js, gastrointestinal discomforts, lopecia); in patients with tremor, switch to ER improved ased on questionnaire but not des spiral drawing test	score decrease from (p<0.0001); Hague sid adolescents improve 22.6 (p<0.01) CNS effects (% of pat Carbamazepine ER: 2 Carbamazepine IR: 4 TEAE frequency simil nystagmus, gastrointe fatigue, alopecia); in p baseline tremor, switc	61	Carbamazepine ER	ER switch	2000	
Miler et al. 2-year retrospective chart Carbamazepine R 6.1 O.NS effects (% of patients): Seizures/month: Carbamazepine R: 20 % Miler et al. 2-year retrospective open-label, Ovalproze RR 4.1 O.NS effects (% of patients): Seizures/month: Carbamazepine R: 20 % Prere-touis Prospective, open-label, Ovalproze RR 4.1 Prospective, open-label, Ovalproze RR 4.1 Prospective, open-label, Ovalproze RR 24 Novalproze RR	1); Hague side-effect score in ents improvement from 26.7 to 0.01) cts (% of patients): szepine ER: 20 % guency similar (weight, Jas gastrointestinal discomforts, lopecia); in patients with seizure-free: Divalproex IR: 32 % (p=0.00) bised on questionnaire but not	(p<0.0001); Hague sic adolescents improve 22.6 (p<0.01) CNS effects (% of pat Carbamazepine ER: 2 Carbamazepine IR: 4 TEAE frequency simil nystagmus, gastrointe fatigue, alopecia); in p baseline tremor, switc	61				
Miller of al. 2 year retrospective chart. review, IR EF switch Carbamazepine IR at year Carbamazepine IR at year 41 Charbamazepine IR Carbamazepine IR at year Carbamazepine IR Carbamazepine IR Carbamazepine IR Carbamazepine IR Carbamazepine IR Carbamazepine IR Carbamazepine IR At year Carbamazepine IR Carbamazepine IR Carbamazepin IR Carbamazepine IR Carbamazepin IR Carbamazepine IR C	nts improvement from 26.7 to 0.01) Cts (% of patients): Seizures/month: Carbama ER: 3.0. Carbamazepine IR azepine ER: 20 % (p=0.29). Patients with 50 % from baseline: 46 %. Seizur quency similar (weight, s, gastrointestinal discomforts, lopecia); in patients with tremor, switch to ER improved ased on questionnaire but not des spiral drawing test	adolescents improve 22.6 (p<0.01) CNS effects (% of pat Carbamazepine ER: 2 Carbamazepine IR: 4' TEAE frequency simil nystagmus, gastrointe fatigue, alopecia); in p baseline tremor, switc	61		Our and the second time shout		
Willer et al. 2-year retrospective chart Carbamazepine R 61 CDS effects (% of paients); Carbamazepine R: 20% Seizures/month:: Carbamaze (monthing); Seizures/month:: Carbamazepine R: 20% Seizures/month:: Carbamazepi	0.01) Seizures/month: Carbama azepine ER: 20 % ER: 3.0. Carbamazepine IR azepine IR: 49 % (p=0.001) (p=0.29). Patients with 50 ° guency similar (weight, s, gastrointestinal discomforts, lopecia); in patients with Median seizures/month: D Iopecia); in patients with Seizure-free: Divalproex IR: 0.85 seed on questionnaire but not des spiral drawing test Divalproex IR: 32 % (p=0.0)	22.6 (p<0.01) CNS effects (% of pat Carbamazepine ER: 2 Carbamazepine IR: 4 TEAE frequency simil nystagmus, gastrointe fatigue, alopecia); in p baseline tremor, switc	61				
2004** review, IF-ER switch 21 year Carbamazepine ER: 20 % ER: 30. Carbamazepine IR: 49 % (p=0.001) ER: 30. Carbamazepine IR: 49 % (p=0.027) Pierre-Louis Prospective, open-label, Divalproex FR 14 TEAE frequency similar (weight, inspans, gastroinestical discontions, feligue, alpecta; in patients witch to ER improved tremor based on questionnaire but not Archimedes spiral drawing test Media assizureszmenth: Divalproex IR: 32 % (p=0.02) Red et al. Randomized, open-label, Divalproex FR 24 Noronthils Fei Ruise, alpecta; in patients with patients with powlproce VR: 32 % (p=0.02) Seizure frequency Smilar ac three regimens Seizure frequency Smilar ac three regimens 2004** Andomized, open-label, Divalproex FR 24 Noronthils Fish SW28 % Seizure frequency Smilar ac three regimens 2004** Bread of accessioner, 14-day trib Divalproex FR 24 Noronthree To patients with psychiatric Seizure frequency Molaroe Divalproex DR: 32 % (p=0.02) 2004** Parodic crossover, 14-day trib Divalproex FR 43 TEAEs similar between formulations Seizure frequency With psychiatric 2010** Parodic crossover, 14-day trib Divalproex FR 43 TEAEs similar between formulations Nereigneen similar treported for Lamotrigine XR<	azepine ER: 20 % ER: 3.0. Carbamazepine IR azepine IR: 49 % (p=0.001) (p=0.29). Patients with 50 ° from baseline: 46 %. Seizur quency similar (weight, s, gastrointestinal discomforts, lopecia); in patients with Median seizures/month: D Seizure-free: Divalproex IR: 0.85 Seizure-free: Divalproex EF tremor, switch to ER improved ased on questionnaire but not Divalproex IR: 32 % (p=0.0)	Carbamazepine ER: 2 Carbamazepine IR: 49 TEAE frequency simil nystagmus, gastrointe fatigue, alopecia); in p baseline tremor, switc	61		O construction and the selected		
Carbamazepine IR Carbamazepine IR 21 year Carbamazepine IR 49 % (p=0.001) (p=0.29) Patients with 50 % from baseline, 46 % second the patients 46 % second the patient	azepine IR: 49 % (p=0.001)(p=0.29). Patients with 50 % from baseline: 46 %. Seizur quency similar (weight, us, gastrointestinal discomforts, lopecia); in patients with tremor, switch to ER improved ased on questionnaire but not des spiral drawing test(p=0.29). Patients with 50 % from baseline: 46 %. Seizur ER: 0.7. Divalproex IR: 0.85 Seizure-free: Divalproex ER Divalproex IR: 32 % (p=0.04)	Carbamazepine IR: 4 TEAE frequency simil nystagmus, gastrointe fatigue, alopecia); in p baseline tremor, switc		A	2-year retrospective chart	Miller et al.	
Pierre Louis Prospective, open label, e-month IR-ER switch Divelgroex ER 41 TEAE frequency similar (weight, mystagmus, gastrontestinal discontions, fatigue, alopeca); in patients with baseline trends, witch to ER improved tremor based on questionnare but not Archimedes spiral drawing test Median soizures/month. Divelgroex IR 0.5 Si Seizure frequency Similar ac trend regimens Reed et al. Randomized, open-label, 3-period crossover, 14-day trial Divelgroex ER Divelgroex ER 24 No conclusions were made due to termor based on questionnare but not Archimedes spiral drawing test Seizure frequency Similar ac three regimens Reed et al. Randomized, open-label, Divelgroex ER Divelgroex ER 322, n=213 Divelgroex DR Seizure frequency Similar ac tors number of patients Smith et al. Meta-analysis, open-label, Divelgroex ER Divelgroex ER 322, n=213 Divelgroex SR Divelgroex DR Seizure frequency Divelgroe Divelgroex DR Seizure frequency Similar ac three regimens Biton et al. Randomized, open-label, parallel-group, 19-week trial Divelgroex RR 143 TEAEs similar between formulations Seizure frequency Divelgroe tors of the parallel-group, 19-week trial Biton et al. Pooled analysis of three randomized, double-blind, bitstorical control, parallel-group, 19-week trial Lamotrigine XR 226 AEs with Lamotrigine XR is anotrigi	from baseline: 46 %. Seizur quency similar (weight, us, gastrointestinal discomforts, lopecia); in patients with tremor, switch to ER improved ased on questionnaire but not des spiral drawing test	TEAE frequency simil nystagmus, gastrointe fatigue, alopecia); in p baseline tremor, switc		≥1 year	review, IR-ER switch	2004 ³⁶	
Preme-Louis b month IR ER switch Divalproex RR Divalproex R 41 TEAE frequency similar (weight, nystagrus, gastraintestinal discontrs, fague, aloced); in patients with baseline termor, switch to ER Improved termor based on questionnaire but not Archimedes spiral drawing test Median seizure-serve Received tail. 82006 ⁴⁷ 3-period crossover, 14-day trial Divalproex RR Divalproex RR 24 No conclusions were made due to Archimedes spiral drawing test Seizure free planers. 82004 ⁴⁷ 3-period crossover, 14-day trial Divalproex RR Divalproex RR 322, n=213 Divalproex RR Seizure frequency similar at three regimens 82004 ⁴⁷ 3-period crossover, 14-day trial Divalproex RR Divalproex RR 322, n=213 Divalproex RR Seizure frequency similar to number of patients with patients with patient	quency similar (weight, us, gastrointestinal discomforts, lopecia); in patients withMedian seizures/month: D ER: 0.7. Divalproex IR: 0.85 Seizure-free: Divalproex ER Divalproex IR: 32 % (p=0.0) ased on questionnaire but notdes spiral drawing testMedian seizures/month: D ER: 0.7. Divalproex IR: 0.85 Seizure-free: Divalproex IR: 0.85 Divalproex IR: 32 % (p=0.0) ased on questionnaire but not	nystagmus, gastrointe fatigue, alopecia); in pa baseline tremor, switc		Carbamazepine IR			
et al. 2009 ²⁷ 6inorth IR-ER switch Divalproex IR Divalproex IR 2.8 (p. 2004) Reed et al. Randomized, open-label, Divalproex ER 2.4 No conclusions were made due to the remore based on questionmate but not Archimedes spit drawing test d	us, gastrointestinal discomforts, lopecia); in patients with tremor, switch to ER improved ased on questionnaire but not des spiral drawing testER: 0.7. Divalproex IR: 0.85 Seizure-free: Divalproex ER Divalproex IR: 32 % (p=0.0) ased on questionnaire but not	nystagmus, gastrointe fatigue, alopecia); in pa baseline tremor, switc		≥1 year			
Reed et al. Randomized, open-label, 3-period crossover, 14-day trial Divajproex Re Divajproex Re 24 No conclusions were made due to Archimedes spraid frawing test: Seizure frequency similar act three regiments 2004" 3-period crossover, 14-day trial Divajproex RP, 2004" Divajproex RP, 3-period crossover, 14-day trial Divajproex RP, 2004" Divajproex RP, 2004" 24 No conclusions were made due to three regiments Seizure frequency similar act three regiments 2004" Divajproex RP, Divajproex RP, Divajproex DR 22, n=213 Divajproex RP, Divajproex DR, 22, period crossover, 12, week trial Divajproex RP, Divajproex DR Seizure frequency: Divajproe patients with patients with pat	lopecia); in patients withSeizure-free: Divalproex Eftremor, switch to ER improvedDivalproex IR: 32 % (p=0.0)ased on questionnaire but notdes spiral drawing test	fatigue, alopecia); in pa baseline tremor, switc	41	Divalproex ER	Prospective, open-label,	Pierre-Louis	
Reed et al. Randomized, open-label, 3-period crossover, 14-day trial Divajproex Re Divajproex Re 24 No conclusions were made due to Archimedes spraid frawing test: Seizure frequency similar act three regiments 2004" 3-period crossover, 14-day trial Divajproex RP, 2004" Divajproex RP, 3-period crossover, 14-day trial Divajproex RP, 2004" Divajproex RP, 2004" 24 No conclusions were made due to three regiments Seizure frequency similar act three regiments 2004" Divajproex RP, Divajproex RP, Divajproex DR 22, n=213 Divajproex RP, Divajproex DR, 22, period crossover, 12, week trial Divajproex RP, Divajproex DR Seizure frequency: Divajproe patients with patients with pat	lopecia); in patients withSeizure-free: Divalproex Eftremor, switch to ER improvedDivalproex IR: 32 % (p=0.0)ased on questionnaire but notdes spiral drawing test	fatigue, alopecia); in pa baseline tremor, switc		Divalproex IR	6-month IR-ER switch	et al. 2009 ³³	
Red et al. Randomized, open-label, 2006" Divajproex RR 24 No conclusions were made due to itremor based on questionnait dawing test Seizure frequency similar ac three regimens 2006" 3-period crossover, 14-day trial Divajproex RR Divajproex RR 322, n=213 Divajproex RR Divajproex RR 322, n=213 2004" Divajproex RR Divajproex RR 322, n=213 Divajproex RR Divajproex RR Divajproex RR 322, n=213 2004" Divajproex RR Divajproex RR 322, n=213 Divajproex RR Divajproex RR 322, n=213 2004" Divajproex RR Divajproex RR 322, n=213 Divajproex RR Seizure frequency. Divajproe patients with patients with patieabo nonoverlap of \$%, (patients w	tremor, switch to ER improved Divalproex IR: 32 % (p=0.0) ased on questionnaire but not des spiral drawing test	baseline tremor, switc					
Reed et al. Randomized, open-label, Divalproex RR 24 No conclusions were made due to Seizure frequency similar actions were made due to Smith et al. Dete-analysis, open-label, Divalproex RR 24 No conclusions were made due to Seizure frequency: Divalproex RD Smith et al. Dete-analysis, open-label, Divalproex RR 22, n=133 Divalproex RR/Divalproex RR Seizure frequency: Divalproex DR Special dromized, open-label, Divalproex DR patients with patipatients with patipatipatients with patients with patients with p	ased on questionnaire but not des spiral drawing test						
Red et al. Radomized, open-label, 3-period crossover, 12/week trial Divalproex R 24 No conclusions were made due to 10w number of patients Seizure frequency similar at three regimens 2004" 3-period crossover, 12/week trial Divalproex RR 322, n=213 Divalproex RR/Divalproex DR Seizure frequency: Divalproex patients with patients with patis with patis with patis with patients with patis with patients wi	des spiral drawing test						
Reed et al. Randomized, open-label, 3-period crossover, 14-day trial Divalgroex ER 24 No conclusions were made due to low number of patients Seizure frequency similar ac three regimens 2004 ^{an} Divalgroex IR 322, n=213 Divalgroex ER Divalgroex ER Divalgroex DR Seizure frequency. Divalgroe three regimens 2004 ^{an} Divalgroex IR Divalgroex DR Seizure frequency. Divalgroex DR Seizure control rate: Divalgroe Divalgroex IR: 95 % (p=0.55 Control rate: Divalgroex DR Biton et al. Randomized, double-blind, parallel: group, 19-week trial Lamotrigine XR 143 TEAEs set & Lamotrigine XR. headache, vomiting, nausea, pyrexia Clonic seizure frequency/w (p<0.0001 versus placebo)							
2006 ^w 3-period crossover, 14-day trial Divalproce IR Iow number of patients three regimens Smith et al. Meta-analysis, open-label, Divalproce XR 322, n=213 Divalproce KR/Divalproce XR Seizure frequency: Divalproce XR Seizure frequency: Divalproce XR Divalproce KR/Divalproce XR Seizure frequency: Divalproce XR Seizure frequency: Divalproce XR Divalproce XR Seizure frequency: Divalproce XR Divalproce XR Seizure forquency: Divalproce XR Divalproce XR Seizure control rate: Divalproce XR			24	Divaloroex FR	Randomized open-label	Reed et al	
Smith et al. Meta-analysis, open-label, Divalproex ER 322, n=213 Divalproex ER/Divalproex DR Seizure frequency: Divalproe 2004** DR-ER switch Divalproex RR Divalproex RR Divalproex ER/Divalproex DR Seizure frequency: Divalproex DR Divalproex DR: 32 % (p=0.02 Thibault Randomized, open-label, Divalproex RR A3 TEAEs similar between formulations Seizure control rate: Divalproex DR: 32 % (p=0.02 Thibault Randomized, open-label, Divalproex RR A3 TEAEs similar between formulations Seizure control rate: Divalproex DR: 32 % (p=0.02 Ta-week trial Divalproex RR Divalproex RR A3 TEAEs similar between formulations Seizure control rate: Divalproex DR: 32 % (p=0.02 2010 ⁴⁴ placebo-controlled, parallel-group, 19-week trial Lamotrigine XR 143 TEAEs s> % Lamotrigine XR: headache, vomiting, nausea, pyrexia Clonic seizure frequency/we (p<0.0001 versus placebo). Seizure frequency/we (p<0.0001 versus placebo)							
2004** DR-ER switch Divalproex DR patients with splepsy, n=109 Termors: 30 %/39 % Divalproex DR: 32 % (p=0.02 2004** Randomized, open-label, 2-period crossover, 12-week trial Divalproex RR 43 TEAEs similar between formulations Seizure control rate: Divalproex DR: 2010* Biton et al. Randomized, open-label, 2-period crossover, 12-week trial Divalproex RR 43 TEAEs similar between formulations Divalproex RR: 95 % (p=0.02 Divalproex RR: 95 % (p=0.02 Divalproex RR: 95 % (p=0.02 Divalproex RR: 95 % (p=0.056) Biton et al. Randomized, double-blind, clinical trials Lamotrigine XR randomized, double-blind, clinical trials Lamotrigine XR Lamotrigine RR 662 AEs with Lamotrigine RR similar to that reported for Lamotrigine RR similar to that randomized, double-blind, clinical trials NR Study with pseudo-placebo historical control, 22-23-week trial Lamotrigine RR Historical pseudo-placebo 226 Headache and dizziness most common TEAEs being dizziness (10 %) and headache (a %) Lamotrigine XR was deemed to based on nonverlap of 95 % (p=0.0004 versus placebo Naritoku et al. 2007** Randomized, double-blind, clinical trials Lamotrigine XR Historical control, 22-23-week trial Lamotrigine XR Placebo 239 TEAEs >5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache, dizziness, dlarnhea, drowsiness nusea, asthenia, tremor Decreased parial seizure M week: 46 % (p=0.00004 versus seizure free patientis (mainte 19		Divalproex ER/Divalp	322, n=213				
epilepsy.n=109 Weight gain: 15 %/28 % gastrointestinal factors: 3 %/11 % gastrointestinal factors: 3 %/11 % psychiatric disorder 2-period crossover, 2 Divalproex ER 43 2-period crossover, 2 Divalproex DR 2-week trial Divalproex DR Biton et al. Randomized, double-blind, parallel-group, 19-week trial Lamotrigine XR 2010 ⁴⁴ Pooled analysis of three randomized, double-blind, clinical trials Lamotrigine XR 2013 ⁴⁴ Pooled analysis of three randomized, double-blind, clinical trials Lamotrigine XR 2013 ⁴⁴ Pooled analysis of three randomized, double-blind, clinical trials Lamotrigine XR 226 French et al. Randomized, double-blind, clinical trials Lamotrigine XR 226 French et al. Randomized, double-blind, clinical trials Lamotrigine XR 226 French et al. Randomized, double-blind, clinical trials Lamotrigine XR 226 French et al. Randomized, double-blind, paedo-placebo historical control, pseudo-placebo historical control, gaudo-placebo historical control, gaudo-placebo historical control, gaudo-placebo isoung requesting req				•			
patients with psychiatric (all p<0.001)Gastrointestinal factors: 3 %/11 % (all p<0.001)Seizue control rate: Divalproe Divalproex IR: 95 % (p=0.66)Thibault et al. 2002"Randomized, open-label, 2-period crossover, 12-week trialDivalproex DR43TEAEs similar between formulations Divalproex IR: 95 % (p=0.66)Biton et al. 2010"Randomized, double-blind, parallel-group, 19-week trialLamotrigine XR PlaceboTEAEs >5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache, vomiting, nausea, pyrexia common TEAEs being dizziness (10 %) and headache (%)Decreased primary generalit concoron TEAEs being dizziness (10 %) and headache (%)Biton et al. 2013"Pooled analysis of three randomized, double-blind bistorical control, pseudo-placeboLamotrigine XR Historical pseudo-placebo662 Headache and dizziness nost torigine XRAmotrigine XR teadache (%)French et al. 2014"Randomized, double-blind historical control, pseudo-placeboLamotrigine XR Historical pseudo-placebo22-23-week trial234 Headache and dizziness nost torigine XR teadache (%)Lamotrigine XR teadache (%)Lamotrigine XR teadache (%)Lamotrigine XR teadache (%)Lamotrigine XR teadache torigine XR239 teadache and dizziness, diarriba, drowsiness teadache (%)Decreased parial seizure fre dizziness nost teadache (%)Lamotrigine XR teadache (%)Lamotrigine XR teadache (%)Lamotrigine XR teadache (%)Lamotrigine XR teadache (%)Headache (%)Lamotrigine XR teadache (%)Lamotrigine XR teadache (%)Lamotrigine XR teadache (%)Lamotrigine XR teadache (%)							
psychiatric disorders(all p<0.001) disordersSeizure control rate: Dvalproe Divalproex RR Dvalproex DRSeizure control rate: Dvalproe Divalproex RR Bione et al. 2002"Seizure control rate: Dvalproe Divalproex RR Dvalproex RRSeizure control rate: Dvalproe Divalproex RR Bione et al. 2002"Decreased primary generali control network individual patient data fromBiton et al. 2013"Pooled analysis of three randomized, double-blind parallel-group, 19-week trialLamotrigine XR Lamotrigine RSeizure frequency/we (p<0.0001 versus placebo. (p<0.0001 versus placebo.) (p<0.0001 versus placebo.) (p<		0 0					
Thibault Randomized, open-label, open-label, open-label, and omized, open-label, open-label							
Thibault Randomized, open-label, Divalproex ER 43 TEAEs similar between formulations Seizure control rate: Divalproex DR 2:veroid crossover, Divalproex DR Divalproex IR: 95 % (p=0.563 12:week trial Placebo Placebo Divalproex IR: 95 % (p=0.563 parallel-group, 19-week trial Placebo Placebo Conic seizure frequency/we parallel-group, 19-week trial Placebo Placebo NR Conic seizure frequency/we Biton et al. Pooled analysis of three Lamotrigine XR 662 AEs with Lamotrigine R similar to that NR clinical trials randomized, double-blind Lamotrigine XR 226 Headache and tizziness most Lamotrigine XR was deemed to seace or trial seizure frequency/we common AE associated with based on nonoverlap of 95 % of historical control, pseudo-placebo Historical control, pseudo-placebo Lamotrigine XR 239 TEAEs ±5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache, dowith bistorical control, escape criteria for seizure frequency/we vertical a 2007 ⁴⁸ Randomized, double-blind, Lamotrigine XR 239 TEAEs ±5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache, be controlled, pseudo-placebo Decreased primary generation seizure frequent PS % of polocito seizure freq patients (maint reported for Lamotrigine XR) Decreased primary generation seizure fre		(un p<0.001)					
et al. 2002 ³⁹ 2-period crossover, 12-week trial Divalproex DR Divalproex IR: 95 % (p=0.563 Biton et al. Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group, 19-week trial Lamotrigine XR Placebo 143 TEAEs ≥5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache, vomiting, nausea, pyrexia preside Decreased primary generalic clonic seizure frequency/week (p<0.0001 versus placebo). S free patients (maintenance): (p<0.0001 versus placebo). S free patients (maintenance): (p<0.0004 versus placebo. Control, pseudo-placebo placebo. Control, pseudo-placebo placebo. Control, pseudo-placebo placebo. Control, pseudo-placebo prospective, open-label, 2-period Lamotrigine XR. 239 TEAEs ≥ 5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache, dizziness, diarrhea, drowsiness prospective, open-label, 2-period Lamotrigine RR. 44 Headache most frequent TEAE: (22 %), headache (20 %), criteria of seizure freq patients (maintenance): (22 %), headache (20 %), criteria of seizure frequency. study with historical Levetiracetam XR versus Levetiracetam XR<	milar between formulations Seizure control rate: Divalpro	TEAEs similar betwee		Divalproex ER	Randomized, open-label,	Thibault	
12-week trialBiton et al.Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group, 19-week trialLamotrigine XR Placebo143TEAEs ≥5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache, vomiting, nausea, pyrexia clonic seizure frequency/we (p<0.0001 versus placebo). Gree patients (maintenance): (p<0.0001 versus placebo)				•		et al. 2002 ³⁹	
2010 ⁴⁴ placebo-controlled, parallel-group, 19-week trial Placebo							
parallel-group, 19-week trial (p<0.0001 versus placebo). S	5 % Lamotrigine XR: Decreased primary genera	TEAEs ≥5 % Lamotrig	143	Lamotrigine XR	Randomized, double-blind,	Biton et al.	
Biton et al. Pooled analysis of three randomized, double-blind clinical trials Lamotrigine XR Lamotrigine IR 662 AEs with Lamotrigine XR similar to that reported for Lamotrigine IR with the most common TEAEs being dizziness (10 %) and headache (6 %) NR French et al. Randomized, double-blind clinical trials Lamotrigine XR 226 Headache and dizziness most common TEAEs being dizziness most Lamotrigine XR was deemed of based on nonoverlap of 95 % of historical control, pseudo-placebo 2012 ⁴⁵ study with pseudo-placebo historical control, pz-2-23-week trial Lamotrigine XR 226 Headache and dizziness most Lamotrigine XR Lamotrigine XR was deemed of based on nonoverlap of 95 % of historical control, pseudo-placebo Naritoku Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel- group, 19-week trial Lamotrigine XR 239 TEAEs ≥5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache, dizziness, diarrhea, drowsiness nausea, asthenia, tremor Decreased partial seizure firm escape criteria for seizure w nausea, asthenia, tremor Tompson Prospective, open-label, 2-period Lamotrigine XR 44 Headache most frequent TEAE: Lamotrigine RR: 16 %. Lamotrigine IR: 7 % XR: 1.4. Lamotrigine IR: 1.5 Chung et al. 2012 ⁴⁴ Randomized, double-blind et al. 2012 ⁴⁵ Levetiracetam XR 228 Most common TEAEs: drowsiness control, 10-week trial Levetiracetam XR 228 Tompson et al. 2012 ⁴⁴ <td>e, vomiting, nausea, pyrexia clonic seizure frequency/v</td> <td>headache, vomiting,</td> <td></td> <td>Placebo</td> <td>placebo-controlled,</td> <td>201044</td>	e, vomiting, nausea, pyrexia clonic seizure frequency/v	headache, vomiting,		Placebo	placebo-controlled,	201044	
Biton et al. 2013 ⁴¹ Pooled analysis of three randomized, double-blind clinical trials Lamotrigine XR Lamotrigine IR 662 AEs with Lamotrigine XR similar to that reported for Lamotrigine IR with the most common TEAEs being dizziness (10 %) and headache (6 %) NR French et al. 2012 ⁴⁵ Randomized, double-blind thistorical control, 22-23-week trial Lamotrigine XR 226 Headache and dizziness most common AE associated with based on nonoverlap of 95 % Lamotrigine XR Lamotrigine XR was deemed to scape criteria for seizure we dizziness, diarrhea, drowsiness Lamotrigine XR was deemed based on nonoverlap of 95 % to speudo-placebo Naritoku et al. 2007 ⁴³ Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel- group, 19-week trial Lamotrigine XR Placebo 239 TEAEs ≥5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache, dizziness, diarrhea, drowsiness nausea, asthenia, tremor Decreased partial seizure fre veek: 46 % (p=0.0004 versu nausea, asthenia, tremor Tompson Prospective, open-label, 2-period et al. 2008 ⁴⁴ Lamotrigine XR 44 Headache most frequent TEAE: Number of seizures/week: Li Lamotrigine IR: 15 Chung et al. 2008 ⁴⁴ Randomized, double-blind et al. 2008 ⁴⁴ Levetiracetam XR 228 Most common TEAEs idrowsiness nausea, asthenia, tremor Levetiracetam XR cumulativ criteria of seizure Chung et al. 2012 ⁴⁵ Ktudy with historical Historical control 228 Most common TEAEs: drowsiness conrulsion (15 %)	(p<0.0001 versus placebo).				parallel-group, 19-week trial		
Biton et al. Pooled analysis of three Lamotrigine XR 662 AEs with Lamotrigine XR similar to that NR 2013 ⁴¹ randomized, double-blind Lamotrigine IR Common TEAEs being dizziness (10 %) and headache (6 %) NR French et al. Randomized, double-blind Lamotrigine XR 226 Headache and dizziness most Lamotrigine XR was deemed of common AE associated with based on nonoverlap of 95 % of based on nonoverlap of 95 % of common AE associated with 2012 ⁴⁵ study with pseudo-placebo Historical Common AE associated with based on nonoverlap of 95 % of common AE associated with based on nonoverlap of 95 % of common AE associated with Varitoku Randomized, double-blind, 22-23-week trial Lamotrigine XR 239 TEAEs ≥5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache, placebo-controlled, parallel- group, 19-week trial Decreased partial seizure fro dizziness, diarrhea, drowsiness week: 46 % (p=0.0004 versus nausea, asthenia, tremor Seizure-free patients (maint 19 % (p=0.0016 versus place Tompson Prospective, open-label, 2-period Lamotrigine XR 44 Headache most frequent TEAE: Number of seizures/week: La Lamotrigine IR: 1,5 Chung Randomized, double-blind Levetiracetam XR 228 Most common TEAEs: drowsiness Levetiracetam XR cumulativ (22 %), headache (20 %), coriteria of seizure frequency t	free patients (maintenance						
2013 ⁴¹ randomized, double-blind Lamotrigine IR reported for Lamotrigine IR with the most 2013 ⁴¹ clinical trials reported for Lamotrigine IR with the most 2013 ⁴¹ Randomized, double-blind Lamotrigine XR 226 Headache and dizziness most Lamotrigine XR was deemed of some common TEAEs being dizziness most Lamotrigine XR was deemed of some common AE associated with 2012 ⁴⁵ study with pseudo-placebo Historical common AE associated with based on nonoverlap of 95 % of limit with historical control feescape criteria for seizure w 22-23-week trial pseudo-placebo Lamotrigine XR 239 TEAEs ≥5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache, dowenses Decreased partial seizure fre versus placebo-controlled, parallel- group, 19-week trial Lamotrigine XR 44 Headache most frequent TEAE: Number of seizures/week: Li Tompson Prospective, open-label, 2-period Lamotrigine IR 44 Headache most frequent TEAE: Number of seizures/week: Li Chung Randomized, double-blind Levetiracetam XR 228 Most common TEAEs: drowsiness Levetiracetam XR cumulativ et al. 2012 ⁴⁶ study with historical Historical control 228 Most common TEAEs: drowsiness Levetiracetam XR cumulativ	(p<0.0001 versus placebo)						
clinical trialscommon TEAEs being dizziness (10 %) and headache (6 %)French et al.Randomized, double-blind study with pseudo-placebo historical control, 22–23-week trialLamotrigine XR pseudo-placebo226Headache and dizziness most common AE associated with Lamotrigine XRLamotrigine XR was deemed of based on nonoverlap of 95 % of Lamotrigine XRNaritoku et al. 200743Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel- group, 19-week trialLamotrigine XR Placebo239TEAEs ≥5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache, dizziness, diarrhea, drowsiness nausea, asthenia, tremorDecreased partial seizure fre seizure-free patients (maint 19 % (p=0.0016 versus place Seizure-free patients (maint 19 % (p=0.0016 versus place trialsTompson et al. 200844Prospective, open-label, 2-period Lamotrigine IRLamotrigine XR Lamotrigine IR44Headache most frequent TEAE: Lamotrigine XR: 16 %. Lamotrigine IR: 7 % XR: 1.4. Lamotrigine IR: 1.5Chung et al. 2012445Randomized, double-blind study with historical control, 10-week trialLevetiracetam XR Historical control228Most common TEAEs: drowsiness (22 %), headache (20 %), convulsion (15 %)Levetiracetam XR significantly lower than histori significantly lower than histori significantly lower than histori convulsion (15 %)NR	Lamotrigine XR similar to that NR	AEs with Lamotrigine	662	Lamotrigine XR	Pooled analysis of three	Biton et al.	
and headache (6 %)French et al.Randomized, double-blindLamotrigine XR226Headache and dizziness mostLamotrigine XR was deemed of social control, pseudo-placebo201245study with pseudo-placeboHistoricalcommon AE associated withbased on nonoverlap of 95 % of common AE associated withbased on nonoverlap of 95 % of common AE associated with22-23-week trialpseudo-placeboLamotrigine XR239TEAEs ≥5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache, placebo-controlled, parallel-Decreased partial seizure fre dizziness, diarrhea, drowsinessvert al. 200743placebo-controlled, parallel- group, 19-week trialPlaceboPlacebodizziness, diarrhea, drowsinessweek: 46 % (p=0.0004 versu) nausea, asthenia, tremorSeizure-free patients (maint 19 % (p=0.0016 versus place)Tompson et al. 200844Prospective, open-label, 2-periodLamotrigine XR44Headache most frequent TEAE: Lamotrigine XR: 16 %. Lamotrigine IR: 7 %XR: 1.4. Lamotrigine IR: 1.5Chung et al. 201246Randomized, double-blind study with historical control, 10-week trialLevetiracetam XR Levetiracetam XR228Most common TEAEs: drowsiness convulsion (15 %)Levetiracetam XR significantly lower than histori significantly lower than historiRichy et al.Meta-analysis of pooled individual patient data fromLevetiracetam XR Levetiracetam IRS55Risk difference for Levetiracetam XR versus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders:NR	for Lamotrigine IR with the most	reported for Lamotrigi		Lamotrigine IR	randomized, double-blind	201341	
and headache (6 %)French et al.Randomized, double-blindLamotrigine XR226Headache and dizziness mostLamotrigine XR was deemed of social common AE associated withbased on nonoverlap of 95 % of common AE a	TEAEs being dizziness (10 %)	common TEAEs bein		Ū	clinical trials		
French et al.Randomized, double-blindLamotrigine XR226Headache and dizziness mostLamotrigine XR was deemed to based on nonoverlap of 95 % on limit with pseudo-placebo2012 ⁴⁵ study with pseudo-placeboHistoricalpseudo-placeboLamotrigine XRbased on nonoverlap of 95 % on limit with historical control for seizure week trialNaritokuRandomized, double-blind,Lamotrigine XR239TEAEs ≥5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache,Decreased partial seizure frodizziness, diarrhea, drowsinessplacebo-controlled, parallel-Placebo239TEAEs ≥5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache,Decreased partial seizure frodizziness, diarrhea, drowsinessveek: 46 % (p=0.0004 versunausea, asthenia, tremorSeizure-free patients (maint19 % (p=0.0016 versus placeboLamotrigine IR44Headache most frequent TEAE:Number of seizures/week: LaChungRandomized, double-blindLevetiracetam XR228Most common TEAEs: drowsinessLevetiracetam XR cumulativet al. 2012 ⁴⁶ study with historicalHistorical control228Most common TEAEs: drowsinessLevetiracetam XR cumulativet al. 2012 ⁴⁶ study with historicalHistorical control228Most common TEAEs: drowsinessLevetiracetam XR cumulativet al. 2012 ⁴⁶ fudy with historicalLevetiracetam XR555Risk difference for Levetiracetam XRNR2009 ³⁸ individual patient data fromLevetiracetam IR555Risk difference for Levetiracetam XRNR							
201245study with pseudo-placebo historical control, 22-23-week trialHistorical pseudo-placebocommon AE associated with Lamotrigine XRbased on nonoverlap of 95 % of limit with historical control f escape criteria for seizure with andomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel- group, 19-week trialHistorical pseudo-placeboCommon AE associated with Lamotrigine XRbased on nonoverlap of 95 % of limit with historical control f escape criteria for seizure with dizziness, diarrhea, drowsiness nausea, asthenia, tremorbased on nonoverlap of 95 % of limit with historical control f escape criteria for seizure with Neek: 46 % (p=0.0004 versu Seizure-free patients (maint 19 % (p=0.0016 versus place)TompsonProspective, open-label, 2-period consover IR-ER switchLamotrigine XR44Headache most frequent TEAE: Lamotrigine XR: 16 % Lamotrigine IR: 7 %Number of seizures/week: La Lamotrigine IR: 1.5ChungRandomized, double-blind et al. 201246Levetiracetam XR228Most common TEAEs: drowsiness (22 %), headache (20 %), control, 10-week trialLevetiracetam XR228Richy et al.Meta-analysis of pooled individual patient data fromLevetiracetam XR555Risk difference for Levetiracetam XR versus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders:NR			226	Lamotrigine XR	Randomized double-blind	French et al	
historical control, 22–23-week trialpseudo-placeboLamotrigine XRlimit with historical control f escape criteria for seizure w escape criteria for seizure wNaritoku et al. 200743Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel- group, 19-week trialLamotrigine XR239TEAEs ≥5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache, dizziness, diarrhea, drowsiness nausea, asthenia, tremorDecreased partial seizure fre week: 46 % (p=0.0004 versu Seizure-free patients (maint 19 % (p=0.0016 versus place)TompsonProspective, open-label, 2-period crossover IR-ER switchLamotrigine XR44Headache most frequent TEAE: Lamotrigine XR: 16 %. Lamotrigine IR: 7 % XR: 1.4. Lamotrigine IR: 1.5Number of seizures/week: La Chung study with historical control, 10-week trialLevetiracetam XR Historical control (22 %), headache (20 %), convulsion (15 %)Levetiracetam XR significantly lower than historical significantly lower than historical Levetiracetam IRNRRichy et al.Meta-analysis of pooled individual patient data fromLevetiracetam XR Levetiracetam IRS55Risk difference for Levetiracetam XR versus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders:NR	0		220	-			
22–23-week trialescape criteria for seizure wNaritokuRandomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel- group, 19-week trialLamotrigine XR Placebo239TEAEs ≥5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache, dizziness, diarrhea, drowsiness nausea, asthenia, tremorDecreased partial seizure fre week: 46 % (p=0.0004 versu Seizure-free patients (maint 19 % (p=0.0016 versus place becauses/week: Le tamotrigine IRTompsonProspective, open-label, 2-period et al. 2008 ³⁴ Lamotrigine XR Lamotrigine IR44Headache most frequent TEAE: Lamotrigine XR: 16 %. Lamotrigine IR: 7 % XR: 1.4. Lamotrigine IR: 1.5Number of seizures/week: Le tamotrigine IR: 1.5Chung et al. 2012 ⁴⁶ Randomized, double-blind study with historical control, 10-week trialLevetiracetam XR Historical control228Most common TEAEs: drowsiness (22 %), headache (20 %), convulsion (15 %)Levetiracetam XR significantly lower than historic significantly lower than historicRichy et al.Meta-analysis of pooled individual patient data fromLevetiracetam XR Levetiracetam IR555Risk difference for Levetiracetam XR versus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders:NR					, , , ,	2012	
Naritoku et al. 200743Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel- group, 19-week trialLamotrigine XR Placebo239TEAEs ≥5 % Lamotrigine XR: headache, dizziness, diarrhea, drowsiness nausea, asthenia, tremorDecreased partial seizure fre week: 46 % (p=0.0004 versu Seizure-free patients (maint 19 % (p=0.0016 versus placeTompson et al. 200834Prospective, open-label, 2-period crossover IR-ER switchLamotrigine XR Lamotrigine IR44Headache most frequent TEAE: Lamotrigine XR: 16 %. Lamotrigine IR: 7 % XR: 1.4. Lamotrigine IR: 1.5Number of seizures/week: La XR: 1.4. Lamotrigine IR: 1.5Chung et al. 201246Randomized, double-blind study with historical control, 10-week trialLevetiracetam XR Historical control228Most common TEAEs: (22 %), headache (20 %), convulsion (15 %)Levetiracetam XR significantly lower than historical significantly lower than historical Levetiracetam IRNRRichy et al. 200938Meta-analysis of pooled individual patient data fromLevetiracetam IRS55Risk difference for Levetiracetam XR versus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders:NR		Editiotingine Xiv		pseudo pideebo			
et al. 2007 ⁴³ placebo-controlled, parallel- group, 19-week trial Placebo Placebo Placebo dizziness, diarrhea, drowsiness week: 46 % (p=0.0004 versus nausea, asthenia, tremor Seizure-free patients (maint 19 % (p=0.0016 versus place 19 % (p=0.0016 versus		TEAEs >5 % Lamotric	239	Lamotrigine VP		Naritoku	
group, 19-week trialnausea, asthenia, tremorSeizure-free patients (maint 19 % (p=0.0016 versus placeTompsonProspective, open-label, 2-periodLamotrigine XR44Headache most frequent TEAE:Number of seizures/week: La Most common TEAEs: drowsinesSNumber of seizures/week: La Most common TEAEs: drowsinesSVertiracetam XR228Most common TEAEs: drowsinesSLevetiracetam XR cumulativ convulsion (15 %)Levetiracetam XR228Most common TEAEs: drowsinesSLevetiracetam XR cumulativ significantly lower than historiRichy et al.Meta-analysis of pooledLevetiracetam XR555Risk difference for Levetiracetam XR versus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders:NR2009 ³⁸ individual patient data fromLevetiracetam IR555Risk difference for Levetiracetam XR versus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders:NR	-	-	237	-			
19 % (p=0.0016 versus place Tompson Prospective, open-label, 2-period Lamotrigine XR 44 Headache most frequent TEAE: Number of seizures/week: La et al. 2008 ³⁴ crossover IR-ER switch Lamotrigine IR Lamotrigine XR: 16 %. Lamotrigine IR: 7 % XR: 1.4. Lamotrigine IR: 1.5 Chung Randomized, double-blind Levetiracetam XR 228 Most common TEAEs: drowsiness Levetiracetam XR cumulativ et al. 2012 ⁴⁶ study with historical Historical control (22 %), headache (20 %), criteria of seizure frequency convulsion (15 %) significantly lower than histori Richy et al. Meta-analysis of pooled Levetiracetam XR 555 Risk difference for Levetiracetam XR NR 2009 ³⁸ individual patient data from Levetiracetam IR versus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders: Versus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders:				PIACEDO		et al. 2007**	
TompsonProspective, open-label, 2-periodLamotrigine XR44Headache most frequent TEAE:Number of seizures/week: La XR: 1.4. Lamotrigine IR: 1.5et al. 200834crossover IR-ER switchLamotrigine IRLamotrigine IRLamotrigine XR: 16 %. Lamotrigine IR: 7 %XR: 1.4. Lamotrigine IR: 1.5ChungRandomized, double-blindLevetiracetam XR228Most common TEAEs: drowsinessLevetiracetam XR cumulativ (22 %), headache (20 %), control, 10-week trialHistorical control(22 %), headache (20 %), significantly lower than histori significantly lower than historiRichy et al.Meta-analysis of pooledLevetiracetam XR555Risk difference for Levetiracetam XR versus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders:NR200938individual patient data fromLevetiracetam IRversus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders:NR		nausea, astrienia, tre			group, 19-week triai		
et al. 2008 ³⁴ crossover IR-ER switchLamotrigine IRLamotrigine IRLamotrigine IR: 7 %XR: 1.4. Lamotrigine IR: 1.5ChungRandomized, double-blindLevetiracetam XR228Most common TEAEs: drowsinessLevetiracetam XR cumulativet al. 2012 ⁴⁶ study with historicalHistorical control(22 %), headache (20 %), convulsion (15 %)criteria of seizure frequencyRichy et al.Meta-analysis of pooledLevetiracetam XR555Risk difference for Levetiracetam XRNR2009 ³⁸ individual patient data fromLevetiracetam IRversus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders:Versus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders:		Haadacha moot from	11	Lamotriging VP	Prospective open label 2 paried	Tompson	
Chung Randomized, double-blind Levetiracetam XR 228 Most common TEAEs: drowsiness Levetiracetam XR cumulative et al. 2012 ⁴⁶ study with historical Historical control (22 %), headache (20 %), criteria of seizure frequency control, 10-week trial Levetiracetam XR 555 Risk difference for Levetiracetam XR NR Richy et al. Meta-analysis of pooled Levetiracetam IR versus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders: NR			44	-			
et al. 2012 ⁴⁶ study with historical control Historical control (22 %), headache (20 %), criteria of seizure frequency significantly lower than historia Richy et al. Meta-analysis of pooled Levetiracetam XR 555 Risk difference for Levetiracetam XR NR 2009 ³⁸ individual patient data from Levetiracetam IR versus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders: Versus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders:		-	220	-			
control,10-week trialconvulsion (15 %)significantly lower than historiRichy et al.Meta-analysis of pooledLevetiracetam XR555Risk difference for Levetiracetam XRNR2009 ³⁸ individual patient data fromLevetiracetam IRversus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders:			220			-	
Richy et al.Meta-analysis of pooledLevetiracetam XR555Risk difference for Levetiracetam XRNR200938individual patient data fromLevetiracetam IRversus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders:				HISTORICAI CONTROL		et al. 201246	
2009 ³⁸ individual patient data from Levetiracetam IR versus Levetiracetam IR. CNS disorders:							
			555			-	
three randomized double-blind (risk difference _18 %) (n=0.03). Psychiatric						200938	
	erence –18 %) (p=0.03). Psychiatric	(risk difference –18 %			three randomized double-blind,		
placebo-controlled trials; disorders: –11 % (p=0.08). Metabolism	s: –11 % (p=0.08). Metabolism				placebo-controlled trials:		
including placebo arms and nutrition disorders: –3 % (p=0.08)	tion disorders: –3 % (p=0.08)	disorders: –11 % (p=0					

Author, Year	Study Design	Treatment Arms	Patients (n)	Adverse Events/Tolerability	Efficacy
French	Randomized, double-blind,	Oxcarbazepine XR	366	Most common AEs: headache,	Median percent seizure frequency
et al. 201342	placebo-controlled,	Placebo		dizziness, drowsiness nausea,	change: Oxcarbazepine XR
	parallel-group, 16-week trial			vomiting, diplopia	(1,200 mg): –38 % (p=0.08 versus
					placebo). Oxcarbazepine XR
					(2,400 mg): -43 % (p=0.003 versus
					placebo). Placebo: –29 %
Doughty	Prospective, open-label,	Valproate ER	2,031	Mean side-effect score: Valproate ER:	Seizures-free: Valproate ER: 69 %
et al. 2003 ²¹	3-month IR-ER switch	Valproate IR		28.5. Valproate IR: 32.8 (p<0.001). Most	Valproate IR: 46 % (p<0.001)
				significant changes in side-effect profile	!
				in tiredness, nervousness, agitation,	
				headache, concentration, and memory	
McCabe	Prospective, open-label,	Valproate ER	41	Decreased TEAEs with Valproate ER	Seizures/28 days: Valproate ER: 3.29
et al. 2006 ³⁷	5-month, IR-ER switch	Valproate DR		(tremor, weight gain, nausea/vomiting)	Valproate DR: 3.35
Yu et al.	Prospective, multicenter,	Valproate ER	958	6.7 % of patients had increased AEs	Seizures/month: Endpoint: 1.0
2011 ³²	6-month, open-label			(weight gain, hair loss, hand tremor,	Baseline: 8.56
				drowsiness) after 6 months	

Table 3: Summary of Studies Examining Extended-release Antiepilepsy Drug Adverse Events,Tolerability, and Efficacy (continued)

AE = adverse event; CNS = central nervous system; CR = controlled-release; DR = delayed-release; ER, XR = extended-release; IR = immediate-release; NR = not reported; TEAEs = treatment-emergent adverse event.

due to AEs,⁴² while in another study, 67 % of patients (n=694) discontinued treatment at the highest dose of oxcarbazepine IR due to AEs.⁴⁸

However, not all AEDs clearly show an improvement in the tolerability profile with the ER formulation. Mixed results were seen in studies comparing divalproex ER versus divalproex DR (or equivalent).^{33,35} In a trial of 41 adult patients with epilepsy who switched from divalproex DR to divalproex ER, no change was found in the AE profile after 6 months, including gastrointestinal disorders and weight gain.³³ The effect of tremors on daily activities and the Archimedes spiral score were also not significantly changed with divalproex ER (p=0.07 and p=0.79, respectively). One should not be too surprised to see no significant difference in the AE profile of two formulations of an AED that are designed to reduce AEs associated with the IR formulation of that drug. Though the DR valproate formulation is not 'extended' release to the extent the ER formulation is, nonetheless, it is more 'extended' than the IR formulation, thus reducing the difference in the impact of the slower-absorption formulations (DR and ER) on AEs.

Of interest, the ER formulation of lamotrigine does not appear to have an improved AE and tolerability profile compared with the IR formulation. In a pooled analysis of three clinical trials evaluating the long-term safety and tolerability of lamotrigine ER (n=662), 69 % of patients reported one or more AEs, which led to premature withdrawal in 7 % of patients, similar to previous reports with lamotrigine IR.⁴¹

Simplicity of Regimen and Convenience of Dosing

Studies that have evaluated the relationship between dosing frequency and adherence in patients with epilepsy suggest that increased dosing frequency usually contributes to decreased medication adherence.^{17,49} Based on the results of a questionnaire answered by 661 patients, there was a 27 % increase in the odds of missing a dose of AED for each increase in the number of times per day the AED was taken (p=0.09).¹⁷ In a separate study, the effect of dosing frequency of AEDs on adherence over a period of 3,428 days was evaluated using a medication event monitoring system.⁴⁹ Adherence rates increased as the number of daily doses decreased from four times a day to once daily (39 %, 77 %, 81 %, and 87 %, respectively). However, in a recent study of 108 patients by Bautista et al., better adherence (higher mean medication possession ratio) was observed with thrice- and twice-daily dosing compared with once-daily dosing (1.02 and 0.93, respectively, versus 0.86; p<0.001).⁵⁰

Increase in Effectiveness and Efficacy

While effectiveness may refer to the totality of effects produced when considering all factors of a product following its administration to patients, including efficacy, safety, tolerability, pharmacokinetics, and ease of use, efficacy refers to the ability of a product to produce a desired effect. Therapeutic plasma drug concentrations of ER-AEDs are more stable, which may lead to enhanced effectiveness through improved seizure control (see *Table 3*).^{21,30,32-47}

In a double-blind crossover study by Canger and colleagues, a significant decrease in seizure frequency from 9.3 to 6.3 (p=0.013) was seen with carbamazepine ER compared with carbamazepine IR in 48 patients after 1 month of optimal therapy.⁴⁰ Similarly, in a retrospective chart review of 61 patients with up to 1 year of follow-up after switching from carbamazepine IR to carbamazepine ER, 46 % of patients had a \geq 50 % decrease in seizure frequency after switching and 27 % became seizure-free.³⁶ However, seizure frequency per month was comparable with that prior to the switch.

In a trial where 2,031 patients with epilepsy were switched from an IR to ER valproate formulation, improved adherence was observed that was accompanied by a 23 % increase in the proportion of patients who were seizure-free. Importantly, this improvement was also accompanied by a statistically significant decrease (19 %; p<0.001) in the proportion of patients experiencing one or more seizures per month.²¹ Furthermore, in a comparison of two open-label trials (n=63) comparing outcomes following a divalproex DR to divalproex ER medication switch, a significantly smaller proportion of patients experienced seizures during treatment with divalproex ER (19 % versus 32 %; p=0.02).³⁵

Figure 1: Potential Factors Associated with Increased Patient Adherence and Preference of Extended-release Antiepileptic Drug Formulations



AE = adverse event; AED = antiepileptic drug; PK = pharmacokinetics; QoL = quality of life.

However, in some studies with divalproex, comparable or only slightly improved efficacy was seen for a given ER formulation compared with other formulations of divalproex. A small head-to-head comparative trial of divalproex DR versus divalproex ER was conducted in 43 adolescent and adult patients with generalized seizures that were well controlled on a stable dose of divalproex or valproate.³⁹ These patients had a lengthy history of treatment success prior to the switch, with 91 % seizure-free in the previous year. During the 12 weeks of treatment after switching to divalproex ER, no statistical difference in seizure control was seen with divalproex ER (93 %) compared with divalproex DR (95 %; p=0.564). These results may be associated with the slow release of the DR formulation, as described above. In a 6-month, open-label prospective study in adult patients with epilepsy, patients reported a nonstatistically significant decrease in monthly seizure frequency (0.7 versus 0.85; p=0.14) with divalproex ER treatment versus divalproex IR.33 At study end, a higher percentage of patients taking divalproex ER were seizure-free (42 %) compared with baseline divalproex IR treatment (32 %), although these improvements did not reach statistical significance (p=0.06).

Because of the enhanced tolerability of ER AEDs, clinicians may potentially safely prescribe higher therapeutic doses in patients who require them clinically (e.g., those experiencing breakthrough seizures). Breakthrough seizures may be reduced by maintaining higher minimum plasma drug concentrations, thereby decreasing the potential for concentrations to fall into the subtherapeutic range.^{13,51} Some support for this concept has been described in an investigation of five patients experiencing breakthrough seizures who were able to tolerate higher doses of valproate after being switched to the ER formulation, with no increase in AEs.³⁷ Four of the five patients had not been able to tolerate seizure-free and three patients had decreased seizure frequency.

Improved Quality of Life

As with any drug regimen that must be maintained over a long period of time, the tolerability, complexity, and convenience of AED therapy can have a profound impact on patient QoL. Such QoL concerns include limitations on the ability of the patient to drive, socialize, and work as well as effects on their physical and mental state. Relatively few investigations have examined QoL in patients with epilepsy (see *Table 2*),^{21,27-34} particularly

comparing ER and IR formulations. In one such study, the QoL of patients before and after switching from IR to ER oxcarbazepine were compared. A significant improvement in QoL (as measured by Quality of Life in Epilepsy [QOLIE]-10) was observed (p<0.001), with 23 of 27 patients reporting improvements.³¹ In the results from a separate prospective open-label investigation whereby patients were switched from IR to ER carbamazepine (n=453), a significant improvement in QOLIE-31 scores, from 62.8 to 68.3, was found (p<0.001).³⁰

Conclusion

In general, patients preferred and were more adherent to the ER (XR) formulations, probably because of decreased AEs, increased tolerability, dosing convenience, increased efficacy, and improved QoL (see *Figure 1*). This increased patient preference for and adherence to ER formulations, however, may differ depending on the given AED, which may reflect differences in the AEDs. For example, while AEs have generally been reported to be reduced with the ER formulation of carbamazepine,^{30,36,40} no difference was seen between the ER and IR formulations of lamotrigine.⁴¹

There are times when physicians may prefer the IR formulation. Concerns exist that the 'forgiveness' period, or time period one can delay taking the prescribed dose, is shorter with ER versus IR formulations.²⁵ On the contrary, we believe that if patients forget to take their once-daily AED in the morning, they have the whole day to take it before going to bed. Likewise, if they forget to take their once-daily bedtime dose, they can take it upon awakening. We strongly recommend the use of a pill-box (with a schedule) for all patients to readily discover whether a particular dose was forgotten. Also, some physicians believe that the ER formulation does not provide complete therapeutic coverage throughout the dosing interval.25 It is in this situation that we recommend full use of the therapeutic range by making the necessary modest increases in the dose since the lesser peak-trough fluctuations in plasma concentrations make such adjustments with ER formulations more permissible. While it is easy to assume that XR formulations provide low $\mathrm{C}_{_{\mathrm{max}}}$ (hence less side effects) and higher minimum concentration (C_{min}) (hence less breakthrough seizures theoretically) compared with IR formulations, some XR formulations showed a slightly lower C_{min} (i.e., lamotrigine, levetiracetam, and divalproex) than IR counterparts. This could be partly due to the fact that not all XR formulations are bioequivalent to IR formulations milligram for milligram. One should refer to the manufacturer's instructions for dosage conversions when switching patients from IR to XR formulations of the same AED. This may not be a factor when a healthcare provider starts a patient on an XR formulation de novo.

Overall, it is extremely important that the patient is educated on his/her treatment options. When discussing AED regimens with patients, it is important for physicians to give patients options and encourage them to communicate their concerns, problems, and preferences regarding their medication regimen. In doing so, the individual treatment strategy may be tailored for each patient and may thereby result in better long-term adherence. Epilepsy therapy is not 'one size fits all,' and many patients require individualized medication regimens.

Extended-release AEDs offer several potential advantages over IR counterparts. In addition to benefits in tolerability and the potential for improved efficacy, they may also include improved QoL, and, ultimately, better patient satisfaction. Consequently, these improved attributes can lead to better patient adherence. ■

- Carbatrol [package insert]. Wayne, PA: Shire US Inc., 2013.
 Tegretol [package insert]. East Hanover, NJ: Novartis
- Pharmaceutical Corporation, 2013.
- Depakote ER [package insert]. North Chicago, IL: AbbVie Inc., 2013.
 Lamictal XR [package insert]. Research Triangle Park, NC: GlaxoSmithKline, 2011.
- Keppra XR [package insert]. Smyrna, GA: UCB Inc., 2011.
 Oxtellar XR [package insert]. Rockville, MD: Supernus Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 2012.
- Dilantin Kapseals [package insert]. New York, NY: Pfizer Inc., 2009
 Phenytek [package insert]. Morgantown, WV: Mylan
- Pharmaceuticals Inc., 2013.
 9. Trokendi XR [package insert]. Rockville, MD: Supernus Pharmaceuticals Inc., 2013.
- Qudexy XR [package inset]. Maple Grove, MN: Upsher-Smith Laboratories, Inc., 2014.
 Epilim Chrono [package insert]. Surrey, UK: Sanofi, 2012.
- Epilim Chrono [package insert]. Surrey, UK: Sanofi, 2012.
 Depakine Chrono [package insert]. Paris, France: Sanofi-Synthelabo, 2005.
- Leppik IE, Hovinga CA, Extended-release antiepileptic drugs: a comparison of pharmacokinetic parameters relative to original immediate-release formulations, *Epilepsia*, 2013;54:28–35.
- A. Supernus Pharmaceuticals, Supernus pharmaceuticals: novel extended-release technology concepts advancing patient therapy in epilepsy. Poster presented at: 67th Annual American Epilepsy Society Meeting; December 6–10, 2013; Washington DC.
- Manjunath R, Davis KL, Candrilli SD, Ettinger AB, Association of antiepileptic drug nonadherence with risk of seizures in adults with epilepsy. *Epilepsy Behav*, 2009;14:372–8.
 Davis KL, Candrilli SD, Edin HM, Prevalence and cost of
- Davis KL, Candrilli SD, Edin HM, Prevalence and cost of nonadherence with antiepileptic drugs in an adult managed care population. Epilepsia. 2008;49:446–54
- population, *Epilepsia*, 2008;49:446–54.
 17. Cramer JA, Glassman M, Rienzi V, The relationship between poor medication compliance and seizures, *Epilepsy Behav*, 2002;3:338–42.
- Faught E, Duh MS, Weiner JR, et al., Nonadherence to antiepileptic drugs and increased mortality: findings from the RANSOM Study, *Neurology*, 2008;71:1572–8.
- Buck D, Jacoby A, Baker GA, Chadwick DW, Factors influencing compliance with antiepileptic drug regimes, Seizure, 1997;6:87–93.
 Estable L Baker CA. Magazing antient adhermone and ruleitu of
- Eatock J, Baker GA, Managing patient adherence and quality of life in epilepsy, *Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat*, 2007;3:117–31.
 Doughty J, Baker GA, Jacoby A, Lavaud V, Compliance and
- satisfaction with switching from an immediate-release to sustained-release formulation of valproate in people with epilepsy, *Epilepsy Behav*, 2003;4:710–6.
- Conrad P, The meaning of medications: another look at compliance, Soc Sci Med, 1985;20:29–37.
- 23. Buchanan N, Social aspects of epilepsy in childhood and

- adolescence, Aust Paediatr J, 1988;24:220–1. 24. Ghaffarpour M, Pakdaman H, Harirchian MH, et al.
- Pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic properties of the new AEDs: A review article, *Iran J Neurol*, 2013;12:157–65. 25. Bialer M, Extended-release formulations for the treatment of
- epilepsy, CNS Drugs, 2007;21:765–74.
 Reed RC, Dutta S, Liu W, Once-daily dosing is appropriate for extended-release divalproex over a wide dose range, but not for enteric-coated, delayed-release divalproex: evidence via computer simulations and implications for epilepsy therapy, *Epilepsy Res*, 2009;87:260–7.
- Moore JL, Transitioning from immediate-release to extended-release carbamazepine capsules: medication preference and increased compliance [abstract 2.367], *Epilepsia*, 2005;46(Suppl. 8):214.
- Boggs J, DeToledo J, Compliance with once-daily divalproex extended-release tablets (Depakote-ER) versus multiple-daily dose valproic acid capsules (Depakene) in epilepsy [abstract 3.251], Epilepsia, 2007;48(Suppl. 6):340–1.
- Stocks J, Johnson J, Baroldi P, Patient preference for once-daily treatment with extended-release topiramate (SPN-538) [abstract 2.250], *Epilepsy Curr*, 2012;12(Suppl. 1):225.
- Ficker DM, Privitera M, Krauss G, et al., Improved tolerability and efficacy in epilepsy patients with extended-release carbamazepine, *Neurology*, 2005;65:593–5.
- Steinhoff BJ, Wendling AS, Short-term impact of the switch from immediate-release to extended-release oxcarbazepine in epilepsy patients on high dosages, *Epilepsy Res*, 2009;87(2-3):256–9.
- patients on high dosages, *Epilepsy Res*, 2009;87(2-3):256–9.
 Yu PM, Zhu GX, Wu XY, et al., A 6-month prospective study on efficacy safety and QOL profiles of extended-release formulation of valproate in patients with epilepsy. *Seizure*, 2011;20:23–6.
 Pierre-Louis SJ, Brannegan RT, Evans AT, Seizure control and
- Pierre-Louis SJ, Brannegan RT, Evans AT, Seizure control and side-effect profile after switching adult epileptic patients from standard to extended-release divalproex sodium, *Clin Neurol Neurosurg*, 2009;111:437–41.
- Tompson DJ, Ali I, Oliver-Willwong R, et al., Steady-state pharmacokinetics of lamotrigine when converting from a twice-daily immediate-release to a once-daily extended-release formulation in subjects with epilepsy (The COMPASS Study), *Epilepsia*, 2008;49:410–7.
- Smith MC, Centorrino F, Welge JA, Collins MA, Clinical comparison of extended-release divalproex versus delayedrelease divalproex: pooled data analyses from nine trials, *Epilepsy Behav*, 2004;5:746–51.
- Miller AD, Krauss GL, Hamzeh FM, Improved CNS tolerability following conversion from immediate- to extended-release carbamazepine, *Acta Neurol Scand*, 2004;109:374–7.
- McCabe PH, Michel NC, McNew CD, Lehman EB, Conversion from delayed-release sodium valproate to extended-release sodium valproate: initial results and long-term follow-up, *Epilepsy Behav*,

2006;8:601-5

- Richy FF, Banerjee S, Brabant Y, Helmers S, Levetiracetam extended release and levetiracetam immediate release as adjunctive treatment for partial-onset seizures: an indirect comparison of treatment-emergent adverse events using metaanalytic techniques, *Epilepsy Behav*, 2009;16:240–5.
- Thibault M, Blume WT, Saint-Hilaire JM, Zakhari R, Sommerville KW, Divalproex extended-release versus the original divalproex tablet: results of a randomized, crossover study of well-controlled epileptic patients with primary generalized seizures, *Epilepsy Res*, 2002;50:243–9.
- Canger R, Altamura AC, Belvedere O, et al., Conventional vs controlled-release carbamazepine: a multicentre, double-blind, cross-over study, Acta Neurol Scand, 1990;82:9–13.
- Biton V, Shneker BF, Naritoku D, et al., Long-term tolerability and safety of lamotrigine extended-release: pooled analysis of three clinical trials, *Clin Drug Investig*, 2013;33:359–64.
- 42. French JA, Baroldi P, Brittain ST, Johnson JK, Efficacy and safety of extended-release oxcarbazepine (Oxtellar XR) as adjunctive therapy in patients with refractory partial-onset seizures: a randomized controlled trial, Acta Neurol Scand, 2014;129:143–53.
- Naritoku DK, Warnock CR, Messenheimer JA, et al., Lamotrigine extended-release as adjunctive therapy for partial seizures, *Neurology*, 2007;69:1610–8.
- A. Biton, V. Di Memmo J. Shukla R, et al., Adjunctive lamotrigine XR for primary generalized tonic-clonic seizures in a randomized, placebo-controlled study, *Epilepsy Behav*, 2010;19:352–8.
 French JA, Temkin NR, Shneker BF, et al., Lamotrigine XR
- French JA, Temkin NR, Shneker BF, et al., Lamotrigine XR conversion to monotherapy: first study using a historical control group, *Neurotherapeutics*, 2012;9:176–84.
 Chung S, Ceia H, Gawlowicz J, et al., Levetiracetam extended release
- Chung S, Ceja H, Gawlowicz J, et al., Levetiracetam extended release conversion to monotherapy for the treatment of patients with partial-onset seizures: a double-blind, randomised, multicentre, historical control study, *Epilepsy Res*, 2012;101:92–102.
- Reed RC, Dutta S, Cavanaugh JH, et al., Every-12-hour administration of extended-release divalproex in patients with epilepsy: impact on plasma valproic acid concentrations, *Epilepsy Behav*, 2006;8:391–6.
- Barcs G, Walker EB, Elger CE, et al., Oxcarbazepine placebocontrolled, dose-ranging trial in refractory partial epilepsy, *Epilepsia*, 2000;41:1597–607.
- Cramer JA, Mattson RH, Prevey ML, et al., How often is medication taken as prescribed? A novel assessment technique, JAMA, 1989;261:3273–7.
- Bautista E, Rundle-Gonzalez V, Effects of antiepileptic drug characteristics on medication adherence, *Epilepsy Behav*, 2012;23:437–41.
- 51. Sommerville KW. Bioequivalence in development of antiepileptic drugs, *Epilepsy Res*, 2006;68:82–5.