

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews

The role of high-frequency oscillations in epilepsy surgery planning (Review)

Gloss D, Nevitt SJ, Staba R

Gloss D, Nevitt SJ, Staba R. The role of high-frequency oscillations in epilepsy surgery planning. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2017, Issue 10. Art. No.: CD010235. DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD010235.pub3.](https://doi.org/10.1002%2F14651858.CD010235.pub3)

www.cochranelibrary.com

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[Intervention Review]

The role of high-frequency oscillations in epilepsy surgery planning

David Gloss¹, Sarah J Nevitt², Richard Staba³

1CAMC Neurology, Charleston Area Medical Center, Charleston, USA. 2Department of Biostatistics, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK. 3Department of Neurology, University of California, Los Angeles, California, USA

Contact address: David Gloss, CAMC Neurology, Charleston Area Medical Center, 415 Morris St, Suite 300, Charleston, WV 25301, USA. [davy.gloss@gmail.com.](mailto:davy.gloss@gmail.com)

Editorial group: Cochrane Epilepsy Group. **Publication status and date:** New search for studies and content updated (no change to conclusions), published in Issue 10, 2017.

Citation: Gloss D, Nevitt SJ, Staba R. The role of high-frequency oscillations in epilepsy surgery planning. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2017, Issue 10. Art. No.: CD010235. DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD010235.pub3.](https://doi.org/10.1002%2F14651858.CD010235.pub3)

Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

A B S T R A C T

Background

Epilepsy is a serious brain disorder characterized by recurrent unprovoked seizures. Approximately two-thirds of seizures can be controlled with antiepileptic medications (Kwan 2000). For some of the others, surgery can completely eliminate or significantly reduce the occurrence of disabling seizures. Localization of epileptogenic areas for resective surgery is far from perfect, and new tools are being investigated to more accurately localize the epileptogenic zone (the zone of the brain where the seizures begin) and improve the likelihood of freedom from postsurgical seizures. Recordings of pathological high-frequency oscillations (HFOs) may be one such tool.

Objectives

To assess the ability of HFOs to improve the outcomes of epilepsy surgery by helping to identify more accurately the epileptogenic areas of the brain.

Search methods

For the latest update, we searched the Cochrane Epilepsy Group Specialized Register (25 July 2016), the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) via the Cochrane Register of StudiesOnline (CRSO, 25 July 2016), MEDLINE (Ovid, 1946 to 25 July 2016), CINAHL Plus (EBSCOhost, 25 July 2016), Web of Science (Thomson Reuters, 25 July 2016), [ClinicalTrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov/) (25 July 2016), and the World [Health](http://apps.who.int/trialsearch/) Organization [International](http://apps.who.int/trialsearch/) Clinical Trials Registry Platform ICTRP (25 July 2016).

Selection criteria

We included studies that provided information on the outcomes of epilepsy surgery for at least six months and which used high-frequency oscillations in making decisions about epilepsy surgery.

Data collection and analysis

The primary outcome of the review was the Engel Class Outcome System (class I = no disabling seizures, II = rare disabling seizures, III = worthwhile improvement, IV = no worthwhile improvement). Secondary outcomes were responder rate, International League Against Epilepsy (ILAE) epilepsy surgery outcome, frequency of adverse events from any source and quality of life outcomes. We intended to analyse outcomes via an aggregated data fixed-effect model meta-analysis.

Main results

Two studies representing 11 participants met the inclusion criteria. Both studies were small non-randomised trials, with no control group and no blinding. The quality of evidence for all outcomes was very low. The combination of these two studies resulted in 11 participants who prospectively used ictal HFOs for epilepsy surgery decision making. Results of the postsurgical seizure freedom Engel class I to IV outcome were determined over a period of 12 to 38 months (average 23.4 months) and indicated that six participants had an Engel class

I outcome (seizure freedom), two had class II (rare disabling seizures), three had class III (worthwhile improvement). No adverse effects were reported. Neither study compared surgical results guided by HFOs versus surgical results guided without HFOs.

Authors' conclusions

No reliable conclusions can be drawn regarding the efficacy of using HFOs in epilepsy surgery decision making at present.

P L A I N L A N G U A G E S U M M A R Y

The role of high-frequency oscillations in epilepsy surgery planning

Background

Epilepsy is characterized by recurrent seizures. Seizures are typically short events with changes in awareness, changes in feelings or sensations, and strange body movements. More than half of the people with epilepsy have seizures which can be controlled with medication. For those with epileptic seizures that do not respond to medication, surgery can treat the seizures in many, but not all, individuals. New tools are being investigated to more accurately find the area in the brain which produces the seizures, to help remove the area of the brain causing the seizures. Recordings of high-frequency oscillations (HFOs) (these are signals in the brain that oscillate faster than the typical signals that are recorded) may be one such tool.

Results

Our literature searches carried out on 25 July 2016 found that so far 11 participants have been enrolled in two small prospective studies that used recordings of abnormal HFOs to help delineate the epileptogenic zone and guide resective surgery.

Conclusions

No reliable conclusions can be drawn from the limited evidence that exists at present.

S U M M A R Y O F F I N D I N G S

Summary of findings for the main comparison. High frequency oscillations for epilepsy surgery in medically refractory epilepsy

High frequency oscillations for epilepsy surgery in medically refractory epilepsy

Patient or population: patients undergoing epilepsy surgery with medically refractory epilepsy **Settings:** hospital setting

Intervention: high frequency oscillations

*The basis for the **assumed risk** (e.g. the median control group risk across studies) is provided in footnotes. The **corresponding risk** (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the **relative effect** of the intervention (and its 95% CI). **CI:** Confidence interval, **ILAE:** International League Against Epilepsy, **NA**: Not applicable

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

High quality: Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.

Moderate quality: Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate. **Low quality:** Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.

evidence.

decisions. health.

Very low quality: We are very uncertain about the estimate.

1 Responder rate, ILAE Epilepsy Surgery outcome and Quality of life were not reported in either of the included studies.

² We could not calculate assumed or corresponding risk as neither study included in the review had a control group. Therefore we also could not calculate relative effect. Outcome data is described narratively in 'Comments.'

³ Both studies were non-randomised studies, without blinding of either the participants or the practitioners. There is a risk of bias in Engel class II versus III outcome due to the fact that the treating provider determined outcome, and, in one case, we determined outcome post-hoc from the data provided in the study. One study did not pre specify Engel Class Outcome as an outcome. Both studies were at high risk of spectrum bias, due to the small number of enrolled participants.

4 The number of included participants in the studies were 5 and 6. Due to the very wide confidence intervals that this would include, it makes any data that these papers would generate imprecise.

4

B A C K G R O U N D

Description of the condition

Epilepsy is a common disorder of the human brain, accounting for approximately 1% of the global burden of disease ([Murray](#page-15-0) 1994). It has an incidence of 33 to 57 per 100,000 person-years ([Annegers](#page-14-0) [1999](#page-14-0); [Hirtz 2007](#page-15-1); [MacDonald 2000;](#page-15-2) [Olafsson](#page-15-3) 2005) and a lifetime risk (risk of a person developing epilepsy in their lifetime) of 1300 to 4000 per 100,000 [\(Hauser 1993](#page-15-4); [Juul-Jenson 1983\)](#page-15-5). One study estimates that the lifetime prevalence of epilepsy is almost 70 million people world-wide ([Ngugi 2010](#page-15-6)).

More than one-third of individuals with epilepsy will be drugresistant ([Kwan](#page-15-7) 2000; [Mohanraj](#page-15-8) 2006). "Drug resistant epilepsy may be defined as failure of adequate trials of two tolerated and appropriately chosen and used AED (antiepilepsy drug). schedules (whether as monotherapies or in combination) to achieve sustained seizure freedom" [\(Kwan](#page-15-9) 2010). In individuals with drug-resistant epilepsy, the probability of further drug trials using other proven medications to stop all seizures is extremely low [\(Kwan](#page-15-7) 2000; [Mohanraj](#page-15-8) 2006); in these cases, epilepsy surgery is often considered [\(Engel](#page-15-10) 2003). Unfortunately, referral of individuals who are candidates for epilepsy surgery can take many years. One study had a range of referral for surgery that was from zero to 46 years (Berg [2003](#page-14-1)). This large range was in part owing to the fact that some individuals who have been seizure free for some time, for unknown reasons develop seizures while stable on antiepileptic drug medication. The range of referral for surgery is one of the many factors that determines the likelihood of postsurgical seizure freedom in individuals with drug-resistant seizures (Berg [2003;](#page-14-1) [Berg](#page-14-2) [2006](#page-14-2)).

Another important factor contributing to postsurgical seizure freedom is determination of the epileptogenic zone, which is the area necessary and sufficient for the generation of spontaneous seizures. Identification of the epileptogenic zone can be difficult because it cannot be measured directly and has to be derived from the following diagnostic tests:

- 1. clinical history including seizure semiology (the attempt to localize the epileptogenic zone from the behavioural manifestation of the seizure);
- 2. electroencephalogram (EEG) recordings of both ictal (during a seizure) and interictal (baseline state, when the individual is not having a seizure) activity;
- 3. magnetic resonance imaging (MRI).

Other modalities are also used that depend on the individual; the specialists who are available (from local, regional, and national practice); and sometimes cost and availability, which can vary across centres. These include:

- 1. neuropsychological testing;
- 2. magnetoencephalography (mapping brain activity using the tiny magnetic fields induced from the electrical activity of the brain);
- 3. invasive EEG recordings (in which an EEG recording is done either on the surface of the brain or where wires are inserted into the brain to perform the recording, which requires surgery to be done to accomplish the recordings);
- 4. intracarotid amobarbital testing (this is a test of language and memory, where half of the brain is put in a sleep state for a couple of minutes to see if the other side can maintain language and memory);
- 5. other imaging modalities using a specialized computed tomography (CT) scanner such as positron emission tomography (PET), single photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) (this test shows blood flow in the brain during or immediately after a seizure), or special MRI studies like the use of a surface coil or looking at fibre tracts.

Concordance of the localization of the seizure focus from multiple tests is thought to significantly improve the prognosis of postsurgical seizure freedom because the epileptogenic zone is more clearly ascertained, and thus can be more clearly removed in surgery. When there is discordance, and it is less clear how to measure the epileptogenic zone, it makes the surgical decision more prone to error. There is some controversy about the reasons for failures of epilepsy surgery but the most common reason is that there is incomplete resection of the epileptogenic zone ([Bautista](#page-14-3) [1999;](#page-14-3) [Hennessy 2001;](#page-15-11) [Jehi 2009](#page-15-12); [Mathern 2007\)](#page-15-13).

EEG recordings to identify sites of ictal onset are most commonly used to localize the epileptogenic zone, although such recordings may not be accurate. Intracranial depth evaluation can better distinguish between neocortical and subcortical ictal onsets. Recordings of interictal EEG spikes are often used to help determine the epileptogenic zone. There is evidence that some interictal EEG spikes correspond to the epileptogenic zone, while others do not [\(Engel](#page-15-14) 2009). High sampling (a minimum of 800 Hz) of scalp and depth electrodes can show interictal local field potentials called high-frequency oscillations (HFOs). In the normal mammalian brain, HFOs occur spontaneously during slow wave sleep and can be evoked during sensory information processing. In the epileptic brain, interictal pathological HFOs are associated with brain areas capable of generating spontaneous seizures and can occur either independently or coincident with some EEG spikes. Based on these latter findings, some have proposed that pathological HFOs may identify interictal EEG spikes that reliably reflect the epileptogenic zone [\(Engel](#page-15-14) 2009). Furthermore, pathological HFOs can occur before or during the onset of some epileptic seizures. Capturing pathological HFOs, therefore, could provide important information to identify the epileptogenic zone and help plan surgical resection that may ultimately improve the prognosis of seizure freedom.

Description of the intervention

The intervention we proposed studying was the use of interictal (activity between seizures) or ictal (immediately before or during seizures) HFOs recorded from the scalp, intracranial recordings, or intraoperative electrocorticography (when brain signals recorded from the surface of the brain during surgery are used to help determine the limits of resection) in individuals with drug-resistant epilepsy who undergo epilepsy surgery.

How the intervention might work

Interictal pathological HFOs are believed to reflect the spiking activity of small groups or clusters of neurons that are responsible for epileptogenicity [\(Bragin](#page-14-4) 2010; [Engel](#page-15-14) 2009; [Ogren](#page-15-15) 2009). There is evidence that HFOs occur immediately before or during the onset of some seizures, which suggests that HFOs could be involved in the generation of seizures ([Jirsch](#page-15-16) 2006; [Khosravani](#page-15-17) 2009; [Worrell](#page-16-1)

[2004](#page-16-1)) even though the mechanisms for their potential role in ictogenesis are not known. Nevertheless, pathological HFOs could be an electrophysiologic biomarker of brain areas that are capable of generating spontaneous seizures ([Staba](#page-16-2) 2011).

Why it is important to do this review

Current methods used to map and measure the epileptogenic area of the brain are not always accurate or reliable. There is a clear need for new diagnostic tools and techniques in order to improve surgical outcomes ([Wiebe 2001](#page-16-3)). An example of a new tool that is not in common use is interictal pathological HFOs, which may be an independent predictor of the epileptogenic zone ([Bragin](#page-14-5) 2000; [Jacobs](#page-15-18) 2008; [Staba](#page-16-4) 2004; [Worrell](#page-16-5) 2008; [Wu 2010](#page-16-6)). Mostimportantly, there is a retrospective (meaning this study was conducted after surgery was already complete) study that examined HFOs in 20 participants who underwent epilepsy surgery ([Jacobs](#page-15-19) 2010). The study found that a good epilepsy surgery outcome was significantly correlated with resection of the majority of areas generating high rates of HFOs. The small number of participants and the retrospective nature of this evidence makes it at high risk of bias, therefore a larger-scale review of all available evidence should provide more reliable results.

O B J E C T I V E S

To assess the ability of HFOs to improve the outcomes of epilepsy surgery by helping to identify more accurately the epileptogenic areas of the brain.

M E T H O D S

Criteria for considering studies for this review

Types of studies

This review included both randomised trials and non-randomised trials that included information about both HFOs and the outcomes of epilepsy surgery. All participants in these studies had to have surgery. The treatment groups we considered were those that either used HFOs to make surgical decisions or used HFOs as part of electrocorticography and used that information in making surgical decisions. The control groups did not use HFOs in the decision making.

Of the non-randomised studies, we included prospective cohort studies. We excluded case-control studies and retrospective cohort studies since they do not prove causation, and retrospective studies where participants were ascertained after surgery (for example, case reports and case series). We considered other trial designs on a case-by-case basis.

Types of participants

Eligible participants were males and females (both adults and children of all ages) with any diagnosis of epilepsy, as long as they were drug-resistant. We did not exclude participants with a comorbidity.

Types of interventions

The participants needed to have had epilepsy surgery and electrophysiologic recordings containing evidence for HFOs that were reviewed before or during surgery and used as part of surgical decision making.

Types of outcome measures

Primary outcomes

The primary outcome was the Engel Class Outcome System ([Engel](#page-14-6) [1993\)](#page-14-6), which is defined as follows:

- Class I is free of disabling seizures;
- Class II is rare disabling seizures;
- Class III is worthwhile improvement;
- Class IV is no worthwhile improvement.

We measured the classes as an ordinal outcome (meaning that the different classes follow an order). An intention-to-treat (ITT) approach was taken with this outcome.

We accepted all data provided on the outcomes of epilepsy surgery. We converted outcomes, whenever possible, to the Engel Class Outcome System ([Engel](#page-14-6) 1993) in order to compare results across studies from different epilepsy centres. The data for individual papers were presented in the rawest possible form where they used other forms of grading of outcome.

Secondary outcomes

- Responder rate (the proportion of participants who experience a 50% or greater reduction in seizure frequency from baseline to maintenance period).We included any maintenance period of at least six months.
- We included any dichotomous (data that can be divided into two categories) measure in cases where we were unable to analyse the data as ordinal data: 'good' Engel Class Outcome (classes I and II) versus 'bad' Engel Class Outcome (classes III and IV).
- International League Against Epilepsy (ILAE) epilepsy surgery outcome ([Wiser 2001](#page-16-7)).
- Proportion of participants that experienced at least one adverse event from any source.
- Proportion of participants that experienced each separate adverse event from any source.
- Quality of life outcomes measured with validated scales.

An ITT approach was taken with all outcomes.

Search methods for identification of studies

Electronic searches

We ran searches for the original review in October/November 2012 and subsequent searches in April 2013 and April 2015. Forthe latest update, we searched the following databases with no language restrictions.

- 1. The Cochrane Epilepsy Group Specialized Register (25 July 2016), using the search strategy outlined in [Appendix 1.](#page-27-1)
- 2. The Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) via the Cochrane Register of Studies Online (CRSO, 25 July 2016) using the search strategy outlined in [Appendix 2](#page-27-2).
- 3. MEDLINE (Ovid, 1946 to 25 July 2016) using the search strategy outlined in [Appendix 3](#page-27-3).
- 4. CINAHL Plus (EBSCOhost, 25 July 2016) using the search strategy outlined in [Appendix 4](#page-28-0).
- 5. Web of Science (Thomson Reuters, 25 July 2016) using the search strategy outlined in [Appendix 5.](#page-28-1)

- 6. [ClinicalTrials.gov](https://clinicaltrials.gov/) (25 July 2016) using the search strategy outlined in [Appendix 6](#page-28-2).
- 7. World Health Organization [International](http://apps.who.int/trialsearch/) Clinical Trials Registry [Platform](http://apps.who.int/trialsearch/) ICTRP (25 July 2016) using the search terms outlined in [Appendix 7.](#page-28-3)

Searching other resources

We contacted experts in the field for information about any unpublished or ongoing studies.

We reviewed the reference lists of retrieved studies to search for additional reports of relevant studies.

Data collection and analysis

When authors disagreed, we used the consensus-oriented decision making model to create consensus. We used a decision rule of unanimous agreement.

Selection of studies

Two review authors (DG and RS) independently read the titles and abstracts of all the studies identified by the search strategy. When we had retrieved all potentially relevant papers, each review author independently evaluated the full text of each paper for inclusion. We recorded the excluded studies and the reasons for exclusion. Any disagreements were resolved by mutual agreement.

Data extraction and management

Two review authors (DG and RS) extracted data onto a data extraction form; any disagreements were resolved by mutual agreement.

The data form included:

- study design, including information about randomisation and clusters, blinding, allocation concealment, sequence generation, a priori protocol, a priori analysis plan, type of study;
- study size, including number participants, type of epilepsy, information about participants;
- type of intervention with HFOs;
- outcomes, including number of dropouts and time points collected, follow-up, adverse effects, addressing incomplete outcome data, selective reporting;
- identification of and method used to control for confounders;
- ORBIT classification of the primary outcome [\(Kirkham 2010\)](#page-15-20).

We recorded the raw form of the data, when possible.

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

For randomised trials, we assessed the risk of bias in the included studies using Cochrane's tool for assessing risk of bias as outlined in the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* [\(Higgins 2011](#page-15-21)) and contained in RevMan 5.2 ([RevMan](#page-16-8) 2011) (see [Appendix 8](#page-28-4)).

For non-randomised trials, we assessed the risk of bias using the tools developed by B Reeves and G Wells, which address confounding, study design features, and a specific non-randomised risk of bias table. Their non-randomised risk of bias tool was further edited by Jen Pulman (see [Appendix 9\)](#page-30-0).

It is important to understand that both randomised and nonrandomised trials were assessed using the same criteria, although the tables may look somewhat different. Both were subjected to the GRADE profiler for applicability, and both were subjected to an assessment of confounding (see [Appendix 10\)](#page-33-0).

We assessed the impact of outcome reporting bias via the ORBIT tool [\(Kirkham 2010\)](#page-15-20).

Measures of treatment effect

We measured the primary outcome as an ordinal outcome; frequency and percentage of individuals classified as classes I to IV of the Engel Class Outcome System [\(Engel](#page-14-6) 1993).

We measured the secondary outcomes as follows:

- responder rate measured as the frequency and the proportion of participants who experienced a 50% or greater reduction in seizure frequency from baseline to maintenance period, measured as a dichotomous measure and expressed as a risk ratio (RR) with 95% confidence interval;
- 'good' Engel Class Outcome (classes 1 and 2) versus 'bad' Engel Class Outcome (classes 3 and 4) was measured as a dichotomous outcome and expressed as risk ratio (RR) with 95% confidence interval (CI);
- adverse events were measured as the frequency and proportion of participants who experienced each single adverse event, measured as a continuous measure and expressed as a risk ratio (RR) with 95% confidence interval;
- quality of life outcomes measured with validated scales, depending on how such outcomes were reported in the individual trials. This cannot be pre-specified further, as we wished to include any available quality of life data.

We used an ITT approach for all outcomes.

For individual listed adverse effects, 99% CIs were quoted to make allowances for multiple testing.

Unit of analysis issues

We did not expect any unit of analysis issues, except possibly for repeated measures (data measured at different time points). We considered measurements at three months, six months, one year, and two years, and we analysed the outcomes at each of these time points separately. If studies were found that used other times for measuring outcomes, they were considered on a case-by-case basis.

Dealing with missing data

We collected data missing from published studies, abstracts, and posters by accessing data from unpublished sources, which we attempted to obtain from the authors. We undertook further sensitivity analysis to determine the effect of the addition of these data on the final results.

We investigated, where data were missing, why they are missing and whether the data were missing at random.

We did not attempt to complete missing individual patient data.

Assessment of heterogeneity

We planned to assess clinical heterogeneity by comparing the distribution of participant demographic factors (age, seizure type, number of antiepileptic drugs (AEDs) taken at randomisation) included in the trials. Statistical heterogeneity was planned to be assessed by visually inspecting forest plots and using a Chi² test for heterogeneity (with a P value of 0.10 for significance) and the 1² statistic as a measure of inconsistency across studies [\(Higgins](#page-15-21) [2011](#page-15-21)).

The interpretation of I 2 values was the following:

- 0% to 40%, may not be important;
- 30% to 60%, may represent moderate heterogeneity;
- 50% to 90%, may represent substantial heterogeneity;
- 75% to 100%, represents considerable heterogeneity.

If significant statistical heterogeneity was found to be present according to the Chi² test, or considerable heterogeneity according to the I 2 statistic, we planned to perform meta-analysis with the random-effects model rather than a fixed-effect model, and sensitivity analyses investigating differences in study design and characteristics or participant demographic factors, unless we could clearly explain the source of the heterogeneity.

Assessment of reporting biases

We used the ORBIT study classification scheme to classify trials and assign a risk of bias for the primary outcome ([Kirkham 2010](#page-15-20)).

Funnel plot asymmetry was planned to be assessed if more than 10 studies were found. Cochrane recommends a minimum of 10 studies to be combined when examining funnel plots [\(Higgins](#page-15-21) [2011](#page-15-21)). Reasons for asymmetry include publication bias, outcome reporting bias, language bias, citation bias, poor methodological design, and heterogeneity. These can be assessed for each trial.

Data synthesis

We would have liked to have been able to perform an individual participant data analysis, since we expected that different trials would report different time endpoints. An individual participant data analysis could standardize the different outcomes to a single outcome (Engel Class Outcome System) for meta-analysis ([Engel](#page-14-6) [1993](#page-14-6)). If we were able to obtain individual patient data, we could have combined the data in a stratified fixed-effect model analysis.

As we were not able to obtain individual patient data for all the trials, we did not try to perform a combined individual patient data and aggregate analysis. Instead, we planned to carry out a conventional aggregate data fixed-effect model meta-analysis.

If considerable statistical heterogeneity was found to be present (Chi² test for heterogeneity P value < 0.1 or l^2 greater than 75%, or both), and we could not readily explain the source of the heterogeneity, we could have performed a random-effects model meta-analysis rather than a fixed-effect model meta-analysis and we would have investigated differences in study characteristics and participant demographics.

A Bayesian analysis for combining randomised and nonrandomised evidence could have been performed if the data that we obtained allowed for it.

If any outcome was not reported sufficiently to perform a metaanalysis (for example adverse events or quality of life), we described such outcomes narratively.

Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

If there were randomised trials and non-randomised trials, we would have examined the randomised trials alone to see if the combined estimate of effect was similar to the combination of randomised and non-randomised trials.

Sensitivity analysis

We would have performed a sensitivity analysis for any outcome involving a trial with substantial missing data (more than 10% of data missing).

For missing outcome data, we planned to use a best-case and worstcase scenario analysis where the best case assumed all participants with missing outcome data had a good outcome (Engel class I) and the worst case assumed all participants with missing outcome data had a bad outcome (Engel class IV).

Summary of Findings

We used the GRADE process to consider the quality of the evidence. A Summary of Findings table was created which summarized the GRADE process for primary and secondary outcomes of the review.

R E S U L T S

Description of studies

See: [Characteristics](#page-16-9) of included studies; [Characteristics](#page-19-0) of excluded [studies.](#page-19-0)

Results of the search

The search yielded 742 abstracts, of which 26 were deemed likely to be relevant and 717 were excluded because they did not meet the inclusion criteria. Searching the references of the 26 likely relevant papers led to one additional paper ([Khosravani](#page-13-0) 2009). Of the 27 papers, two met the inclusion criteria. An updated search found 127 abstracts of which six were deemed likely to be relevant. There were an additional six papers that the authors were aware of, which had been published after the search was completed, and one additional paper found by searching the references. A second updated search found 67 abstracts, of which six were deemed to be likely relevant. There was five additional abstracts of which the authors were aware, two were grey literature, and three were published after the search. None of these additional papers met the inclusion criteria.

Included studies

Two studies met the inclusion criteria and included Engel class outcome data. Neither were randomised studies and neither had a specific time point for analysis, but as both included participants whose outcome was measured at least at 12 months, both papers were included.

In [Modur 2011,](#page-12-1) a prospective cohort study, there were six participants with medically refractory neocortical epilepsy undergoing intracranial EEG recording with subdural grids and depth electrodes. The six participants were three females and three males between the ages of 19 and 32 years with a duration of epilepsy ranging from 6 to 30 years. The delineation of the

seizure onset zone for surgical resection was based on contiguous recording sites that contained sustained evolution of ictal HFOs (> 70 Hz), including areas of spread during the first 2 sec of ictus, plus 1 cm of cortex surrounding the seizure-onset zone. The surgical boundaries were modified to exclude eloquent areas identified with functional stimulation, as well as sites with or without ictal HFOs that were not contiguous with the area of the seizure onset zone. There was no control group in the study.

In [Ramachandrannair](#page-12-2) 2008, a prospective cohort study, there were five participants with medically refractory epileptic spasms undergoing intracranial EEG recording with subdural grids. The five participants were three females and two males between the ages of 4 and 14 years with a duration of epilepsy ranging from 0.4 to 8 years. A combination of neocortical ictal HFOs (80 to 250 Hz), magnetoencephalography (MEG) dipole spike source localization, lesions present on MRI, and eloquent cortex were used to determine the resective zone for epilepsy surgery. There was no control group in the study.

Excluded studies

Of the 49 studies that were excluded, 21 were retrospective series that specifically looked at HFOs. 12 were retrospective series that looked in higher frequency bands that included HFOs, but did not specifically look at HFOs. Ten provided HFO data but the data were not included in epilepsy surgery decision making. Four did not provide any outcome data at all, in any format. Two were a case series (of two cases) and a case report.

Risk of bias in included studies

See: [Characteristics](#page-16-9) of included studies.

Allocation

There was no randomisation in either trial. Therefore, there was no allocation concealment.

Blinding

Neither trial had blinding of either researchers or participants and, therefore, there was a high risk of performance bias in both studies.

Incomplete outcome data

There was no evidence of incomplete follow-up. Every participant reported in both of the papers had a follow-up long enough to be included in the epilepsy surgery outcome (Engel class outcome).

Selective reporting

We were unable to look for reporting bias in a funnel plot due to the small number of papers included. We do not know of any negative reports that were not published. The ORBIT classification was F (low risk of bias) for both papers.

Other potential sources of bias

Both trials involved extremely small numbers of participants, making it hard to draw any conclusions from the trials. Because of the small numbers of participants, there is a high risk for spectrum bias. Neither trial examined possible confounders.

Effects of interventions

See: **Summary of findings for the main [comparison](#page-4-1)** High frequency [oscillations](#page-4-1) for epilepsy surgery in medically refractory [epilepsy](#page-4-1)

We are not able to extract sufficient data from the two studies to perform a meta-analysis as neither study included a comparator group and the two studies reported outcomes at different time points. Therefore, we could only combine the outcomes narratively for the 11 participants in the two groups.

In [Modur 2011,](#page-12-1) the outcome of the six participants was determined over a follow-up period of 20 to 38 months (mean 26.5 months). The outcome was Engel class I in three participants (50%), II in three participants (33.3%), and III in one participant (16.7%). No adverse effects were reported. Quality of life data were not gathered. In [Ramachandrannair](#page-12-2) 2008, the outcome of the five participants was determined over a period of 12 to 29 months (mean 19.6 months). The outcome was reported to be seizure free in three participants (60%), 50% to 75% seizure reduction in one participant (20%), > 90% seizure reduction in one participant (20%). Converting to Engel class, three participants (60%) had Engel class I and two participants (40%) had Engel class III. There were no adverse effects reported. Quality of life data were not gathered.

Taken together, the two studies included 11 participants that prospectively used ictal HFOs for epilepsy surgery decision making. For the primary outcome of Engel class, determined over a period of 12 to 38 months (mean 23.4 months), six participants (54.5%) had Engel class outcome I, two participants (18.2%) had class II, and three participants (27.3%) had class III.

With respect to secondary outcomes, eight participants (72.7%) had a good (Engel class I or II) outcome and three participants (27.3%) had a poor (Engel class III) outcome. For one trial [\(Modur](#page-12-1) [2011\)](#page-12-1), one participant was classified as Engel class III, which meant worthwhile improvement. It was unclear if this meant more or less than 50% improvement. Due to the small numbers of participants, and the fact that we would had to exclude one (9% of total 11 participants) due to lack of information, we did not think it was reliable to provide a responder rate. Quality of life data were not provided. No adverse effects were reported.

D I S C U S S I O N

Summary of main results

No reliable conclusions can be drawn at present regarding the efficacy of HFO recordings in epilepsy surgery decision making. The use of ictal HFOs in epilepsy surgery decision making may be safe, although the number of participants treated is too small to be sure, and no adverse effects of the use of HFOs in surgery decision making were reported.

Overall completeness and applicability of evidence

The evidence from the two trials is far from complete. The two included studies are of very low quality for assessing the outcome of the use of HFOs in epilepsy surgery decision making. Neither was randomised. Neither had blinding of either researchers or participants. Neither had a comparator group. There was a high risk of bias in both trials, with the treating provider determining a non-objective outcome. The total number of participants included

in both trials was 11, which is too small a number to suggest recommending a new intervention.

Quality of the evidence

See: Summary of findings for the main [comparison](#page-4-1)

Under contemporary standards, both of the small non-randomised trials provide evidence of very low quality. Neither study was blinded, had a comparator group, and both were at high risk of spectrum bias. Due to the low number of participants, we also considered there to be serious imprecision.

There were many retrospective studies excluded. When writing the protocol, we decided a priori to exclude retrospective studies since they are less likely to show causality of the intervention and are at higher risk of bias than prospective studies.

Potential biases in the review process

No source of bias was identified.

Agreements and disagreements with other studies or reviews

There is no other comprehensive review of HFOs used in epilepsy surgery decision making of which we are aware, which was part of the reason for undertaking this review.

A U T H O R S ' C O N C L U S I O N S

Implications for practice

No reliable conclusions can be drawn at present regarding the efficacy of using ictal or interictal HFOs in epilepsy surgery decision

making. The use of ictal HFOs in epilepsy surgery decision making may be safe although the number of participants treated is too small to be sure and no adverse effects following the use of HFOs in surgery decision making were recorded.

Implications for research

Due to the size of the current two trials, there is a need for additional trials to show the safety of using ictal or interictal HFOs in epilepsy surgery decision making. Preferably the trials should have a comparator group and measure the safety of using HFOs in surgery decision making. The safety question is particularly important for HFOs because, in the epileptic mammalian brain, there are both normal and pathologic HFOs, and we do not yet have a reliable way to distinguish between the two. We do not even know if we need to distinguish between the normal and pathologic HFOs when dealing with ictal HFOs. Once safety is assured, there is a need for properly designed, high quality, and adequately powered, randomised trials to determine if ictal or interictal HFOs are effective and should be recommended for use in epilepsy surgery decision making.

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

We would like to thank Tony Marson for fruitful discussions regarding this review. We would also like to thank Jenifer Weston for providing us with the tools for assessing bias.

REFERENCES

References to studies included in this review

Modur 2011 *{published data only}*

Modur PN, Zhang S, Vitaz TW. Ictal high-frequency oscillations in neocortical epilepsy: implications for seizure localization and surgical resection. *Epilepsia* 2011;**52**(10):1792-801.

Ramachandrannair 2008 *{published data only}*

RamachandranNair R, Ochi A, Imai K, Benifla M, Akiyama T, Holowka S, et al. Epileptic spasms in older pediatric patients: MEG and ictal high-frequency oscillations suggest focal-onset seizures in a subset of epileptic spasms. *Epilepsy Research* 2008;**78**(2-3):216-24.

References to studies excluded from this review

Akiyama 2009 *{published data only}*

Akiyama T, Go C, Ochi A, Sugiyama I, Donner EJ, Weiss Sk, et al. Concordance between distribution of interictal fast ripples and resection area may contribute to seizure freedom for epilepsy surgery. *Epilepsia* 2009;**50**(S11):448-9, Abstract no: 3.281.

Akiyama 2011 *{published data only}*

Akiyama T, McCoy B, Go CY, Ochi A, Elliot IM, Akiyama M, et al. Focal resection of fast ripples on extra operative intracranial EEG improves seizures outcome in pediatric epilepsy. *Epilepsia* 2011;**52**(10):1802-11.

Aubert 2009 *{published data only}*

Aubert S, Wendling F, Regis J, McGonigal A, Figarella-Branger D, Peragut J-C, et al. Local and remote epileptogenicity in focal cortical dysplasias and neurodevelopmental tumors. *Brain* 2009;**132**:3072-86.

Bartolomei 2008 *{published data only}*

Bartolomei F, Chauvel P, Wendling F. Epilpeptogenicty of brain structures in human temporal lobe epilepsy: a quantified study from intracerebral EEG. *Brain* 2008;**131**(7):1818-30.

Cho 2012 *{published data only}*

Cho JR, Joo EY, Koo DL, Hong SC, Hong SB. Clinical utility of interictal high-frequency oscillations recorded with subdural macroelectrodes in partial epilepsy. *Journal of Clinical Neurophysiology* 2012;**8**(1):22-34.

Cho 2014 *{published data only}*

Cho JR, Koo DL, Joo EY, Seo DW, Hong S-C, Jiruska P, et al. Resection of individually identified high-rate high-frequency oscillations region is associated with favorable outcome in neocortical epilepsy. *Epilepsia* 2014;**55**(11):1872-83.

De Silva 2015 *{published data only}*

Da Silva AB. High frequency oscillation in neocortical epilepsy: a case report. North East Epilepsy Research Network Meeting, Beamish, UK. Tyne and Wear: Newcastle University, Institute of Neuroscience, 2015:15.

Epstein 2014 *{published data only}*

Epstein CM, Adhikari BM, Gross R, Willie J, Dhamala M. Application of high-frequency Granger causality to analysis of epileptic seizures and surgical decision making. *Epilepsia* 2014;**55**(12):2038-47.

Fujiwara 2012 *{published data only}*

Fujiwara H, Greiner HM, Lee KH, Holland-Bouley KD, Seo JH, Arthur T, et al. Resection of ictal high-frequency oscillations leads to favorable surgical outcome in pediatric epilepsy. *Epilepsia* 2012;**53**(9):1607-17.

Gnatkovsky 2014 *{published data only}*

Gnatkovsky V, De Curtis M, Pastori C, Cardinale F, Russo GL, Nobili L, et al. Biomarkers of epileptiogenic zone defined by quantified stereo-EEG analysis. *Epilepsia* 2014;**55**(2):296-305.

Guggisberg 2008 *{published data only}*

Guggisberg AG, Kirsch HE, Mantle MM, Barbaro NM, Nagarajan SS. Fast oscillations associated with interictal spikes localize the epileptogenic zone in patients with partial epilepsy. *NeuroImage* 2008;**39**:661-8.

Haegelen 2013 *{published data only}*

Haegelen C, Perucca P, Chatillon C-E, Andrade-Valenca L, Zelmann R, Jacobs J, et al. High-frequency oscillations, extent of surgical resection, and surgical outcome in drug-resistant focal epilepsy. *Epilepsia* 2013;**54**(5):848-57. [DOI: [http://](https://doi.org/http%3A%2F%2Fdx.doi.org%2F10.1111%2Fepi.12075) [dx.doi.org/10.1111/epi.12075](https://doi.org/http%3A%2F%2Fdx.doi.org%2F10.1111%2Fepi.12075); PUBMED: 23294353]

Hong 2013 *{published data only}*

Hong SB, Cho JR, Kim JH, Hong SC, Jiruska P, Hwang KJ. Surgical resection of high-frequency oscillation regions predicts favorable outcome in neocortical epilepsy. *Epilepsia* 2013;**54**(S3):284.

Jacobs 2010 *{published data only}*

Jacobs J, Zijlmans M, Zelmann R, Chatillon C-E, Hall J, Olivier A, et al. High-frequency electroencephalographic oscillations correlate with outcome of epilepsy surgery. *Annals of Neurology* 2010;**67**(2):209-20. [DOI: [10.1002/ana.21847;](https://doi.org/10.1002%2Fana.21847) PUBMED: 20225281]

Jacobs 2016 *{published data only}*

[*](#page-16-10) Jacobs J, Vogt C, LeVan P, Zelmann R, Gotman J, Kobayashi K. The identification of distinct high-frequency oscillations during spikes delineates the seizure onset zone better than highfrequency spectral power changes. *Clinical Neurophysiology* 2016;**127**:129-42.

Kanazawa 2012 *{published data only}*

Kanazawa K, Matsumoto R, Imamura H, Matsuhashi M, Kuneida T, Mikuni N, et al. Are ictal DC shifts and high frequency oscillation complimentary? A study of subdural electrodes in partial epilepsy. *Neurology* 2012;**78**(1 Meeting Abstracts):P04.012.

Kerber 2013 *{published data only}*

Kerber K, LeVan P, Dumpelmann M, Fauser S, Korinthenberg R, Schilze-Bonhage A, et al. High frequency oscillations mirror disease activity in patients with focal cortical dysplasia. *Epilepsia* 2013;**54**(8):1428-36.

Kerber 2014 *{published data only}*

Kerber K, Dumpelmann M, Schelter B, Le Van P, Korinthenberg R, Schulze-Bonhage A, et al. Differentiation of specific ripple patterns helps to identify areas for surgical procedures. *Clinical Neurophysiology* 2014;**125**:1339-45.

Khosravani 2009 *{published data only}*

Khosravani H, Mehrotra N, Rigby M, Hader WJ, Pinnegar CR, Pillay N, et al. Spatial localization and time-dependent changes of electrographic high frequency oscillations in human temporal lobe. *Epilepsia* 2009;**50**(4):605-16.

Kobayashi 2011 *{published data only}*

Kobayashi K, Yoshinaga H, Toda Y, Inoue T, Oka M, Ohtsuka Y. High-frequency oscillations in idiopathic partial epilepsy of childhood. *Epilepsia* 2011;**52**(10):1812-9.

Lemesiou 2012 *{published data only}*

Lemesiou A, Walker MC, Rodionov R, Diehl B, Rugg-Gunn F. The utility of high frequency oscillations on MEG and intracranial EEG in localizing seizure foci in patients with refractory epilepsy. *Epilepsia* 2012;**53**(S5):198.

Matsumoto 2013 *{published data only}*

Matsumoto A, Brinkmann BH, Stead SM, Matsumoto J, Kucewicz M, Marsh WR, et al. Pathological and physiological high frequency oscillations in focal human epilepsy. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 110;**8**:1958-64.

Miocinovic 2012 *{published data only}*

Miocinovic S, Modur P. Interictal versus ictal high frequency oscillation in neocortical epilepsy. *Neurology* 2012;**78**(1 Meeting Abstracts):PD3.007.

Modur 2012 *{published data only}*

Modur PN, Vitaz TW, Zhang S. Seizure localization using broadband EEG: comparison of conventional frequency activity, high-frequency oscillations, and infraslow activity. *Journal of Clinical Neurophysiology* 2012;**29**(4):309-19.

Mohamed 2012 *{published data only}*

Mohamed AR, Bailed CA, Freeman JL, Maixner W, Jackson GD, Harvey AS. Intrinsic epileptogenicity of cortical tubers revealed by intracranial monitoring. *Neurology* 2012;**79**(23):2249-57. [DOI: [10.1212/WNL.0b013e3182768923](https://doi.org/10.1212%2FWNL.0b013e3182768923)]

Nariai 2011 *{published data only}*

Nariai H, Nagasawa T, Juhasz C, Sood S, Chuganai HT, Asano E. Statistical mapping of ictal high-frequency oscillations in epileptic spasms. *Epilepsia* 2011;**52**(1):63-74.

Nowacki 2012 *{published data only}*

Nowacki T, Gross D, Wheatley B, Ahmed SN, Jirsch J. The location of fast ripples is stationary as focal seizures evolve. *Epilepsia* 2012;**53**(S5):198.

Ochi 2007 *{published data only}*

Ochi A, Otsubo H, Donner EJ, Elliott I, Iwata R, Funaki T, et al. Dynamic changes of ictal high-frequency oscillations in neocortical epilepsy: using multiple band frequency analysis. *Epilepsia* 2007;**48**(2):286-96.

Okanishi 2014 *{published data only}*

Okanishi T, Akiyama T, Tanaka S-I, Mayo E, Mitsuke A, Boelman C, et al. Interictal high frequency oscillations correlating with seizure outcome in patients with widespread networks in tuberous sclerosis complex. *Epilepsia* 2014;**55**(10):1602-1610.

Park 2012 *{published data only}*

Park S-C, Lee SK, Che H, Chung CK. Ictal high-gamma oscillation (60-99 Hz) in intracranial electroencephalography and postoperative seizure outcome in neocortical epilepsy. *Clinical Neurophysiology* 2012;**123**(6):1100-10.

Pearce 2013 *{published data only}*

Pearce A, Wulsin D, Blanco JA, Krieger A, Litt B, Stacey WC. Temporal changes of neocortical high-frequency oscillations in epilepsy. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 2013;**110**:1167-79.

Ramp 2014 *{published data only}*

Ramp S, Schmitt HJ, Heers M, Schonherr M, Schmitt FC, Hopfengartner R, et al. Etomidate activates epileptic high frequency oscillations. *Clinical Neurophysiology* 2014;**125**(2):223-30. [DOI: [10.1016/j.clinph.2013.07.006;](https://doi.org/10.1016%2Fj.clinph.2013.07.006) PUBMED: 23911722]

Ray 2008 *{published data only}*

Ray S, Niebur E, Hasiao SS, Sinai A, Crone NE. High-frequency gamma activity (80-150 Hz) is increased in human cortex during selective attention. *Clinical Neurophysiology* 2008;**119**:116-33.

Ren 2015 *{published data only}*

Ren L, Kucewicz MT, Cimbalnik J, Matsumoto JY, Brinkmann BH, Hu W, et al. Gamma oscillations precede interictal epileptiform spikes in the seizure onset zone. *Neurology* 2015;**84**:602-8.

Schindler 2010 *{published data only}*

Schindler K, Amor F, Gast H, Muller M, Stibal A, Mariani L, Rummel C. Peri-ictal correlation dynamics of high-frequency (80-200 Hz) intracranial EEG. *Epilepsy Research* 2010;**89**:72-81.

Smart 2011 *{published data only}*

Smart O, Tsoulos IG, Gavrilis D, Georgoulas G. Grammatical evolution for features of epileptic oscillations in clinical intracranial electroencephalograms. *Expert Systems with Applications* 2011;**38**:9991-9.

Stamoulis 2012 *{published data only}*

Stamoulis C, Gruber LJ, Schomer DL, Chang BS. High-frequency neuronal network modulations encoded in scalp EEG precede the onset of focal seizures. *Epilepsy & Behavior* 2012;**23**:471-80.

Stamoulis 2013 *{published data only}*

Stamoulis C, Schomer DL, Chang BS. Information theoretic measures of network coordination in high-frequency scalp EEG

reveal dynamic patterns associated with seizure termination. *Epilepsy Research* 2013;**105**:299-315.

Sun 2015 *{published data only}*

Sun Y-P, Wang Y-P, Wang Z-H, Wu F-Y, Tang L-O, Zhang S-W, et al. High-frequency oscillations and seizure onset zones in neocortical epilepsy. *Chinese Medical Journal (English)* 2015;**128**(13):1724-8.

Usui 2011 *{published data only}*

Usui N, Terada K, Baba K, Matsua K, Nakamura F, Usui K, et al. Clinical significance of ictal high frequency oscillations in medial temporal lobe epilepsy. *Clinical Neurophysiology* 2011;**122**:1693-700.

Van't Klooster 2011 *{published data only}*

Van't Klooster MA, Zijlmans M, Leijten FS, Ferrier CH, van Putten MJ, Huiskamp GJ. Time-frequency analysis of single pulse electrical stimulation to assist delineation of epileptogenic cortex. *Brain* 2011;**134**(10):2855-66. [DOI: [10.1093/](https://doi.org/10.1093%2Fbrain%2Fawr211) [brain/awr211](https://doi.org/10.1093%2Fbrain%2Fawr211); PUBMED: 21900209]

Van Diessen 2013 *{published data only}*

Van Diessen E, Hanemaaijer JI, Otte WM, Zelmann R, Jacobs J, Jansen FE, et al. Are high frequency oscillations associated with altered network topology in partial epilepsy?. *NeuroImage* 2013;**82**:564-73.

Van Klink 2014 *{published data only}*

Van Klink NEC, Van't Klooster MA, Zilmann R, Leijten FSS, Ferrier CH, Braun KPJ, et al. High frequency oscillations in intra-operative electrocorticography before and after epilepsy surgery. *Clinical Neurophysiology* 2014;**125**:2212-9.

Wang 2013 *{published data only}*

Wang S, Wang IZ, Bulacio JC, Mosher JC, Gonzalez-Martinez J, Alexopoulos AV, et al. Ripple classification helps to localize the seizure-onset zone in neocortical epilepsy. *Epilepsia* 2013;**54**(2):370-6.

Wetjen 2009 *{published data only}*

Wetjen NM, Marsh WR, Meyer FB, Cascino GD, So E, Britton JW, et al. Intracranial electroencephalography seizure onset patterns and surgical outcomes in non lesional extratemporal epilepsy. *Journal of Neurosurgy* 2009;**110**(6):1147-52.

Wu 2010 *{published data only}*

Wu JY, Sankar R, Lerner JT, Matsumoto JH, Vinters HV, Mathern GW. Removing interictal fast ripples on electrocorticography linked with seizure freedom in children. *Neurology* 2010;**75**:1686-94.

Wu 2010a *{published data only}*

Wu M, Wineski K, Schalk G, Sharma M, Roland J, Breshears J, et al. Electrocorticographic frequency alteration mapping for extraoperative localization of speech cortex. *Neurosurgery* 2010;**66**:E407-9.

Wu 2012 *{published data only}*

Wu S, Luders H. Direct current (DC) shifts and high frequency oscillations in mesial temporal lobe epilepsy patients. *Neurology* 2012;**78**(1 Meeting Abstracts):P04.013.

Zijlmans 2012 *{published data only}*

Zijlmans M, Huiskamp GM, Cremer OL, Ferrier CH, Van Huffelen AC, Leijten FSS. Epileptic high-frequency oscillations in intraoperative electrocorticography: the effect of propofol. *Epilepsia* 2012;**53**(10):1799-809.

References to ongoing studies

NCT02320136 *{unpublished data only}*

Recording high frequency oscillations in patients with tumors and epilepsy. Ongoing study June 2014.

Van't Klooster 2015 *{published data only}*

Van't Klooster MA, Leijten FS, Huiskamp G, Ronner HE, Baayen JC, Van Rijn PC, et al. High frequency oscillations in the intra-operative ECoG to guide epilepsy surgery ("The HFO Trial"): study protocol for a randomized controlled trial. *Trials* 2015;**16**:422-30.

Additional references

Annegers 1999

Annegers JF, Dubinsky S, Coan SP, Newmark ME, Roht L. The incidence of epilepsy and unprovoked seizures in multiethnic, urban health maintenance organizations. *Epilepsia* 1999;**40**(4):502-6.

Bautista 1999

Bautista RED, Cobbs MA, Spencer DD, Spencer SS. Prediction of surgical outcome by interictal epileptiform abnormalities during intracranial EEG monitoring in patients with extrahippocampal seizures. *Epilepsia* 1999;**40**(7):880-90.

Berg 2003

Berg AT, Langfitt J, Shinnar S, Vickrey BG, Sperling MR, Walczak T, et al. How long does it take for partial epilepsy to become intractable?. *Neurology* 2003;**60**:186-90.

Berg 2006

Berg AT, Vickrey BG, Testa FM, Levy SR, Shinnar S, DiMario F, et al. How long does it take for epilepsy to become intractable? A prospective investigation. *Annals of Neurology* 2006;**60**:73-9.

Bragin 2000

Bragin A, Wilson CL, Engel J. Chronic epileptogenesis requires development of a pathologically interconnected neuron clusters: a hypothesis. *Epilepsia* 2000;**41**(S6):S144-52.

Bragin 2010

Bragin A, Engel J, Staba RJ. High-frequency oscillations in the human brain. *Current Opinion in Neurology* 2010;**23**:151-6.

Engel 1993

Engel J. Surgical Treatment of Epilepsies. 2nd Edition. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott, Williams, and Wilkins, 1993.

Engel 2003

Engel J, Wiebe S, French J, Sperling M, Williamson P, Spencer D, et al. Practice parameter: temporal lobe and neocortical resections for epilepsy. *Neurology* 2003;**60**:538-47.

Engel 2009

Engel J, Bragin A, Staba R, Mody I. High-frequency oscillations: what is normal and what is not. *Epilepsia* 2009;**50**(4):598-604.

Hauser 1993

Hauser WA, Annegers JF, Kurland LT. Incidence of epilepsy and unprovoked seizures in Rochester, Minnesota: 1935 - 1984. *Epilepsia* 1993;**34**(3):453-68.

Hennessy 2001

Hennessy MJ, Elwes RDC, Rabe-Hesketh S, Binnie CD, Polkey CE. Prognostic factors in the surgical treatment of medically intractable epilepsy associated with mesial temporal sclerosis. *Acta Neurologica Scandinavica* 2001;**103**:344-50.

Higgins 2011

Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions, version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011). The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from http://handbook.cochrane.org/.

Hirtz 2007

Hirtz D, Thurman DJ, Gwinn-Hardy K, Mohamed M, Chaudhuri AR, Zalutsky R. How common are the "common" neurologic disorders?. *Neurology* 2007;**68**:326-37.

Jacobs 2008

Jacobs J, LeVan P, Chander R, Hall J, Dubeasu F, Gotman J. Interictal high-frequency oscillations (80-500 Hz) are an indicator of seizure onset areas independent of spikes in the human epileptic brain. *Epilepsia* 2008;**49**(11):1893-907.

Jacobs 2010

Jacobs J, Zijlmans M, Zelmann R, Chatillon C-E, Hall J, Olivier A, et al. High-frequency electroencephalographic oscillations correlate with outcome of epilepsy surgery. *Annals of Neurology* 2010;**67**:209-20.

Jehi 2009

Jehi LE, O'Dwyer R, Najm I, Alexopoulos A, Bingaman W. A longitudinal study of surgical outcome and its determinants following posterior cortex epilepsy surgery. *Epilepsia* 2009;**50**:2040-52.

Jirsch 2006

Jirsch JD, Urrestarazu E, LeVan P, Olivier A, Dubeau F, Gotman J. High-frequency oscillations during human focal seizures. *Brain* 2006;**129**:1593-608.

Juul-Jenson 1983

Juul-Jenson P, Foldspang A. Natural history of epileptic seizures. *Epilepsia* 1983;**24**:297-312.

Khosravani 2009

Khosravani H, Mehotra N, Rigby M, Hader WJ, Pinnegar CR, Pillay N, et al. Spatial location and time-dependent changes of

electrographic high frequency oscillations in human temporal lobe epilepsy. *Epilepsia* 2009;**50**(4):605-16.

Kirkham 2010

Kirkham JJ, Dwan KM, Altman DG, Gamble C, Dodd S, Smyth R, et al. The impact of outcome reporting bias in randomised controlled trials on a cohort of systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2010;**340**:c365.

Kwan 2000

Kwan P, Brodie MJ. Early identification of refractory epilepsy. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2000;**342**:314-9.

Kwan 2010

Kwan P, Arzimanoglou A, Berg AT, Brodie MJ, Hauser WA, Mathern G, et al. Definition of drug resistance epilepsy: consensus proposal by the ad hoc Task Force of the ILAE Commission on Therapeutic Strategies. *Epilepsia* 2010;**51**(6):1069-77.

MacDonald 2000

MacDonald BK, Johnson AL, Goodridge DM, Cockerell OC, Sander JWA, Shorvon SD. Factors predicting prognosis of epilepsy after presentation with seizures. Annals of Neurology 2000;**48**:833-41.

Mathern 2007

Mathern GW, Sperling M. Presurgical evaluation: general principles and methods. In: Engel J, Pedley TA editor(s). Epilepsy: A Comprehensive Textbook. 2nd Edition. Philadelphia (PA): Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins, 2007:1771-8.

Mohanraj 2006

Mohanraj R, Brodie MJ. Diagnosing refractory epilepsy: response to sequential treatment schedules. *European Journal of Neurology* 2006;**13**:277-82.

Murray 1994

Murray CJL, Lopez AD. Global Comparative Assessments in the Health Sector. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1994.

Ngugi 2010

Ngugi AK, Bottomley C, Kleinschmidt I, Sander JW, Newton CR. Estimation of the burden of active and life-time epilepsy: a meta-analytic approach. *Epilepsia* 2010;**51**:883-90.

Ogren 2009

Ogren JA, Wilson CL, Bragin A, Lin JL, Salamon N, Dutton RA, et al. Three-dimensional surface maps link local atrophy and fast ripples in human epileptic hippocampus. *Annals of Neurology* 2009;**66**:783-91.

Olafsson 2005

Olafsson E, Ludvigsson P, Gudmundsson G, Hesdorfer D, Kjartansson O, Hauser WA. Incidence of unprovoked seizures and epilepsy in Iceland and assessment of the epilepsy syndrome classification: a prospective study. *Lancet Neurology* 2005;**4**:627-34.

RevMan 2011 [Computer program]

Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration. Review Manager 5 (RevMan 5). Version 5.1. Copenhagen: Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.

Shadish 2002

Shadish WR, Cook TD, Campbell DT. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference. Boston. (MA): Houghton Mifflin, 2002.

Staba 2004

Staba RJ, Wilson CL, Bragin A, Jhung D, Fried I, Engel J. Highfrequency oscillations recorded in human medial temporal lobe during sleep. *Annals of Neurology* 2004;**56**:108-15.

Staba 2011

Staba RJ, Bragin A. High-frequency oscillations and other electrophysiological biomarkers of epilepsy: underlying mechanisms. *Biomarkers in Medicine* 2011;**5**(5):545-56.

Wiebe 2001

Wiebe S, Blume WT, Girvin JP, Elisziw M. A randomized, controlled trial of surgery for temporal-lobe epilepsy. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2001;**345**(5):311-8.

Wiser 2001

Wiser HG, Blume WT, Fish D, Goldensohn E, Hufnagel A, King D, et al. Proposal for a new classification of outcome with respect to epileptic seizures following epilepsy surgery. *Epilepsia* 2001;**42**(2):282-6.

Worrell 2004

Worrell GA, Parish L, Cranstoun SD, Jonas R, Baltuch G, Litt B. High-frequency oscillations and seizure generation in neocortical epilepsy. *Brain* 2004;**127**:1496-506.

Worrell 2008

Worrell GA, Gardner AB, Stead SM, Hu S, Goerss S, Cascino GJ, et al. High-frequency oscillations in human temporal lobe: simultaneous microwire and clinical macroelectrode recordings. *Brain* 2008;**131**:928-37.

Wu 2010

Wu JY, Sankar R, Lerner JT, Matsumoto JH, Vinters HV, Mathern GW. Removing interictal fast ripples on electrocorticography linked with seizure freedom in children. *Neurology* 2010;**75**:1686-94.

References to other published versions of this review

Gloss 2012

Gloss D, Nolan SJ, Staba R. The role of high-frequency oscillations in epilepsy surgery planning. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2012, Issue 11. [DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD010235\]](https://doi.org/10.1002%2F14651858.CD010235)

Gloss 2014

Gloss D, Nolan SJ, Staba R. The role of high-frequency oscillations in epilepsy surgery planning. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2014, Issue 1. [DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD010235.pub2\]](https://doi.org/10.1002%2F14651858.CD010235.pub2)

* Indicates the major publication for the study

C H A R A C T E R I S T I C S O F S T U D I E S

Characteristics of included studies *[ordered by study ID]*

Modu

[Ramachandrannair](#page-12-2) 2008

Characteristics of excluded studies *[ordered by study ID]*

The role of high-frequency oscillations in epilepsy surgery planning (Review)

Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Characteristics of ongoing studies *[ordered by study ID]*

[NCT02320136](#page-14-18)

Van't [Klooster](#page-14-19) 2015

Van't [Klooster](#page-14-19) 2015 *(Continued)*

A P P E N D I C E S

Appendix 1. Cochrane Epilepsy Group Specialized Register search strategy

- #1 "high frequency oscillation*" OR "ripple*"
- #2 surger* OR surgical*
- #3 MeSH DESCRIPTOR Epilepsy Explode All WITH QUALIFIER SU
- #4 MeSH DESCRIPTOR Seizures Explode All WITH QUALIFIER SU

#5 #2 OR #3 OR 4

#6 #1 AND #5 AND >09/04/2015:CRSCREATED

Appendix 2. CENTRAL via CRSsearch strategy

- #1 ("high frequency oscillation?"):TI,AB,KY
- #2 ripple*:TI,AB,KY
- #3 #1 OR #2
- #4 MESH DESCRIPTOR Epilepsy EXPLODE ALL TREES WITH QUALIFIERS SU
- #5 MESH DESCRIPTOR Seizures EXPLODE ALL TREES WITH QUALIFIERS SU
- #6 ((epilep* OR seizure*) NEAR4 (surger* OR surgical*)):TI,AB,KY
- #7 #4 OR #5 OR #6
- #8 #3 AND #7
- #9 09/04/2015 TO 25/07/2016:CD

#10 #8 AND #9

Appendix 3. MEDLINE search strategy

- 1. exp Epilepsy/su [Surgery]
- 2. exp Seizures/su [Surgery]
- 3. ((epilep\$ or seizure\$) adj4 surg\$).tw.
- 4. 1 or 2 or 3
- 5. high frequency oscillation\$.tw.

The role of high-frequency oscillations in epilepsy surgery planning (Review) Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

6. ripple\$.tw.

7. 5 or 6

8. 4 and 7

9. remove duplicates from 8

10. limit 9 to ed=20150409-20160725

Appendix 4. CINAHL Plus search strategy

S8 S4 AND S7 Published 20140901-

S7 S5 OR S6

S6 TX ripple*

S5 TX "high frequency oscillation" OR TX "high-frequency oscillation" OR TX "high frequency oscillations" OR TX "high-frequency oscillations"

S4 S1 OR S2 OR S3

S3 TX ((epilep* OR seizure*) N4 surg*)

S2 (MH "Seizures+/SU")

S1 (MH "Epilepsy+/SU")

Appendix 5. Web of Science search strategy

#4 #3 AND #2 AND #1

DocType=All document types; Language=All languages; Timespan=2015-2016

#3 TS=(surgery OR surgical) OR TI=(surgery OR surgical)

DocType=All document types; Language=All languages;

#2 TS=(epilep*) OR TI=(epilep*) OR TS=(seizure*) OR TI=(seizure*)

DocType=All document types; Language=All languages;

#1 TS=(high frequency oscillation*) OR TI=(high frequency oscillation*) OR TS=(ripple*) OR TI=(ripple*)

DocType=All document types; Language=All languages;

Appendix 6. ClinicalTrials.gov search strategy

frequency oscillation AND epilepsy

Appendix 7. WHO International ClinicalTrials Registry Platform (ICTRP) search strategy

epilepsy AND high-frequency OR seizure AND high-frequency

Appendix 8. Risk of bias (randomised trials)

Risk of bias assessment (completed for all articles meeting eligibility)

(Continued)

1. Sequence generation

2. Allocation concealment

Judgment High/Low/Unclear

See *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Chapter 8 for assessing risk of bias for RCT evidence [\(Higgins 2011](#page-15-21)).

Appendix 9. Risk of bias (non-randomised studies)

Risk of bias table (non-randomised studies)

 (Continued)

6b. Free of selective reporting? The Contract of Cutcome 2

7. Free of other bias?

8. A priori protocol? c

9. A priori analysis plan? d

a Some items on low/high risk/unclear scale (items 1-2), some on 5-point scale/unclear (items 3-7), some on yes/no/unclear scale (items 8-9). For all items, record 'unclear' if inadequate reporting prevents a judgment being made.

b Based on list of confounders considered important at the outset and defined in the protocol for the review (*and assessment against worksheet*)

 c Did the researchers write a protocol defining the study population, intervention and comparator, primary and other outcomes, data collection methods, etc. in advance of starting the study? N.B. May be outcome specific.

 d Did the researchers have an analysis plan defining the primary and other outcomes, statistical methods, subgroup analyses, etc. in advance of starting the study?

Risk of bias (RoB) tool for non-randomised studies (NRS)

Studies for which RoB tool is intended

Only suitable for'cohort-like' studies, individually or cluster-allocated. This can include secondary analyses of clinical databases providing the analysis is clearly structured as a comparison of control and intervention participants. Refer to Ch. 13, tables 13.2.a and b:

Table 13.2.a: individually allocated study designs

- RCT randomised controlled trial
- Q-RCT quasi-randomised controlled trial
- NRCT non-randomised controlled trial
- CBA controlled before and after study (not common use of this label, see CChBA below)
- PCS prospective cohort study
- RCS retrospective cohort study

Table 13.2.b: cluster allocated study designs

- ClRCT cluster randomised controlled trial
- ClQ-RCT cluster quasi-randomised controlled trial
- ClNRCT cluster non-randomised controlled trial
- CITS controlled interrupted time series
- CChBA controlled cohort before and after study ([Shadish 2002\)](#page-16-11)

Assessment of risk of bias

Issues when using modified RoB tool to assess cohort-like non-randomized studies:

- Follow principle for existing Cochrane RoB tool: score judgment and provide information (preferably direct quote) to support judgment;
- Modified RoB tool include an additional item on confounding;
- 5-point scale for some items (distinguish 'unclear' from intermediate risk of bias);
- Keep in mind the general philosophy assessment is not about whether researchers could have done better but about risk of bias; the assessment tool must be used in a standard way whatever the difficulty/circumstances of investigating the research question of interest and whatever study design features were used;
- Use of a 5-point scale is uncharted territory; very interested to know whether this makes things easier or more difficult for reviewers;
- Anchors for 5-point scale: '1/No/low risk' of bias should correspond to a high quality RCT. '5/high risk' of bias should correspond to a risk of bias that means the findings should not be considered (too risky, too much bias, more likely to mislead than inform).
- 1. Sequence generation
- Low/high/unclear RoB item
- Always high RoB (not random) for a non-randomised study
- Might argue that this item redundant for NRS since always high RoB but important to include in RoB table ('level playing field' argument)
- 2. Allocation concealment
- Low/high/unclear RoB item
- Potentially low RoB for a non-randomised study, e.g. quasi-randomised (so high RoB to sequence generation) but concealed (reviewer judges that the people making decisions about including participants didn't know how allocation was being done, e.g. odd/even date of birth/hospital number)
- 3. RoB from confounding (additional item for NRS; assess for each outcome)
- Assumes a pre-specified list of potential confounders defined in the protocol for the systematic review
- Low (1)/2/3/4/high (5)/unclear RoB item
- Judgment needs to factor in (see 'worksheet'):
- proportion of confounders (from pre-specified list) that were considered
- whether most important confounders (from pre-specified list) were considered
- * resolution/precision with which confounders were measured
- extent of imbalance between groups at baseline
- care with which adjustment was done (typically a judgment about the statistical modeling carried out by authors)
- Low RoB requires that all important confounders are balanced at baseline, i.e.
- not primarily/not only a statistical judgment, OR
	- * measured 'well' and 'carefully' controlled for in the analysis.

We have provided an optional 'worksheet' to help reviewers to focus on the task (rows=confounders and columns=factors to consider). Reviewers should make a RoB judgment about each factor first and then combine these (by eyeballing rather than quantitatively) to make the judgment in the main RoB table.

- 4. RoB from lack of blinding (assess for each outcome, as per existing RoB tool)
- Low (1)/2/3/4/high (5)/unclear RoB item
- Judgment needs to factor in:
	- nature of outcome (subjective / objective; source of information)
	- who was/was not blinded and the risk that those who were not blinded could introduce performance or detection bias
	- see Ch. 8
- 5. RoB from incomplete outcome data (assess for each outcome, as per existing RoB tool)
- Low (1)/2/3/4/high (5)/unclear RoB item

- Judgment needs to factor in:
	- * reasons for missing data
	- * whether amount of missing data balanced across groups, with similar reasons
	- * whether group comparison appropriate (e.g. 'analysed in allocated group' issue)
	- see Ch. 8

6. RoB from selective reporting (assess for each outcome, N.B. more wide ranging than existing Ch. 8 recommendation). Key issue is whether outcomes were clearly defined, and methods of analysis, were prespecified and adhered to.

- Low (1)/2/3/4/high (5)/unclear RoB item
- Judgment needs to factor in:
	- * existing RoB guidance on selective outcome reporting, see Ch. 8
	- * also, extent to which analyses (and potentially other choices) could have been manipulated to bias the findings reported, e.g. choice of method of model fitting, potential confounders considered/included
	- * look for evidence that there was a protocol in advance of doing any analysis/obtaining the data (difficult unless explicitly reported); NRS very different from RCTs. RCTs must have a protocol in advance of starting to recruit (for REC/IRB/other regulatory approval); NRS need not (especially older studies)
	- * Hence, separate yes/no items asking reviewers whether they think the researchers had a pre-specified protocol and analysis plan?

Appendix 10. Assessment of confounding

 (Continued)

Describe confounders controlled for below

Confounders described by researchers

Enter / preprint prespecified list of confounders (rank order in importance? Important in bold?) Tick (yes/no judgment) if confounder considered by the researchers [Cons'd?] Score (1 to 5) precision with which confounder measured Score (1 to 5) imbalance between groups Score (1 to 5) care with which adjustment for confounder was carried out.

W H A T ' S N E W

H I S T O R Y

Protocol first published: Issue 11, 2012 Review first published: Issue 1, 2014

C O N T R I B U T I O N S O F A U T H O R S

David Gloss wrote the draft and made additions to it.

Rick Staba reviewed and added to the draft.

Sarah Nevitt modified the draft and wrote part of the statistical sections of the review.

D E C L A R A T I O N S O F I N T E R E S T

David Gloss received a Research and Training Fellowship for Clinicians from the Epilepsy Foundation of America to perform research on HFOs. Dr Gloss is an evidence-based medicine methodologist for the American Academy of Neurology.

Rick Staba has participated in NIH/NINDS RO1 NS33310, which relates to the study of HFOs

Sarah Nevitt has no known declarations of interest.

S O U R C E S O F S U P P O R T

Internal sources

• No sources of support supplied

External sources

• National Institute of Health Research (NIHR), UK.

This review was supported by the National Institute for Health Research, via Cochrane Infrastructure funding to the Epilepsy Group. The views and opinions expressed therein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Systematic Reviews Programme, NIHR, NHS or the Department of Health.

N O T E S

Sarah J Nolan (author of the protocol and previous versions of the review) is now Sarah J Nevitt.

I N D E X T E R M S

MedicalSubject Headings (MeSH)

*Clinical Decision-Making; Electroencephalography [*methods]; Epilepsy [*surgery]; Non-Randomized Controlled Trials as Topic; Seizures [surgery]; Treatment Outcome

MeSH check words

Humans