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Objective: There is not yet a clear consensus on the incidence of sudden unexpected death in epilepsy (SUDEP) or the extent of its burden on public health. In this systematic review, we seek to summarize the incidence of SUDEP and its age distribution, as well as the years of potential life lost and cumulative risks of SUDEP for persons with epilepsy.

Methods: We conducted a systematic search for epidemiologic studies of sudden death in epilepsy and rated their quality of evidence. We pooled data from comparable higher quality population-based studies of SUDEP incidence across all age groups, calculating the overall incidence of SUDEP per 100,000 population, and per 1,000 people with epilepsy. Using standard formulas, we also calculated the years of potential life lost and cumulative risks associated with SUDEP.

Results: SUDEP has an estimated overall crude annual incidence rate of 0.81 cases per 100,000 population, or 1.16 cases per 1,000 patients with epilepsy. Comparing years of potential life lost from SUDEP with selected other neurologic diseases, SUDEP ranks second only to stroke.

Significance: Despite limitations to the data on which our analysis is based, we conclude that the public health burden of SUDEP, which has previously been underappreciated, is substantial and deserves much more attention from clinicians, researchers, and the public health community.
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There are a number of causes of increased mortality related to epilepsy, including those that are a direct cause (accidental death, sudden unexpected death in epilepsy [SUDEP], status epilepticus) and those that are epilepsy related (underlying brain diseases or comorbidities, suicides, complications of antiepileptic therapy). Recently SUDEP has received a great deal of attention, as its occurrence is unanticipated and highly traumatic to the families of victims. Despite increased recognition of the importance of SUDEP, there is not yet a clear consensus on its incidence or the extent of the burden it imposes on public health. The recent U.S. Institute of Medicine report on the public health dimensions of epilepsy emphasizes the importance of SUDEP, but notes major deficiencies in the current capabilities of public health surveillance systems—vital records and coroner or medical examiner offices—charged with measuring its occurrence. A small number of community-based studies of SUDEP occurrence have yielded widely varying estimates of incidence; their methods have varied substantially. Several population-based study reports have acknowledged challenges in obtaining complete case ascertainment and the consequent likelihood that their results are underestimates of true occurrence.

A better understanding of the incidence and public health burden of SUDEP is important to inform priorities in medical and prevention research and to inform people with epilepsy and their families more accurately of their risk. Accordingly, in this systematic review, we seek to identify and evaluate studies of the incidence of SUDEP in general
populations and to estimate its incidence in high-income countries. In addition, we describe the age distribution of SUDEP occurrence in these populations, estimate the years of potential life lost due to SUDEP using the United States as an example, and estimate the average lifetime risk of SUDEP for persons with chronic epilepsy.

**Methods**

We searched the OVID MEDLINE and EMBASE databases for English-language articles indexed under all the medical subject headings of “epilepsy,” “mortality,” and “sudden death,” excluding reviews, editorials, and letter publications. We screened these titles and abstracts, selecting only studies estimating the incidence of SUDEP in general, geographically defined populations. The full texts of selected studies were then each reviewed and rated by two of us according to criteria we developed specifically to assess the quality of evidence and risk of bias of population-based studies of SUDEP incidence. These criteria are described in Table 1. Briefly, under the criteria for each evidence level, we intend the inclusion of:

1. **Level 1**—studies qualitatively judged to have highly sensitive SUDEP case ascertainment, a high positive predictive value, and minimal risk of bias;
2. **Level 2**—studies qualitatively judged to have reasonably good sensitivity of case ascertainment, a reasonably high positive predictive value, and relatively low risk of bias;
3. **Level 3**—studies qualitative judged to have only fair sensitivity of case ascertainment, a reasonably high positive predictive value, and an intermediate risk of bias;
4. **Level 4**—studies that have severe limitations in methods of case ascertainment, case verification or a high risk of bias.

One of us (DT) extracted and pooled data from comparable studies representing the best available evidence for SUDEP incidence and age distributions in general populations encompassing all age groups. Based on the pooled numbers of cases reported and total person-years of follow-up in the populations studied, we calculated an overall incidence of SUDEP per 100,000 population, with 95% confidence intervals using the method of Fleiss.9 If the original study did not provide information on person-years of follow-up, we calculated this based on the duration of the study and census information provided either by the study or from published information available from government sources.

We used the median estimate of epilepsy prevalence provided by Hirtz et al.10 as a basis for calculating SUDEP rates per 1,000 people with epilepsy and to estimate the numbers of people with epilepsy in the United States and in the European Union in 2013. Multiplying the pooled age distribution (proportions of total reported cases within each age group) by the total number of SUDEP cases estimated for the United States and European Union, we estimated the general population rate and the number of SUDEP cases expected to occur in these regions in each age group in 2013.

We calculated years of potential life lost up to age 75 by using this formula:

\[
YPLL = \sum_{i=0}^{75} n_i (75 - a_i),
\]

where “i” refers to age intervals between 0 and 75, “n” refers to estimated numbers of U.S. SUDEP cases within the age interval, and “a” refers to the mean age of SUDEP deaths within the age interval, estimated as the interval midpoint. For comparison, years of potential life lost due to selected other neurologic conditions were similarly calculated based on age-specific numbers of fatalities reported in U.S. mortality data by underlying cause of death, available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Study population represents a defined cohort of all persons with clinical diagnosis of epilepsy within a defined geographic area, followed for a specified period. Define or probable SUDEP defined by standard criteria. SUDEP cases ascertained and confirmed using information from multiple sources, including population death registers, death certificates, medical examiner or coroner investigation and autopsy reports, and other available medical or autopsy records. At the time of investigation, medical examiner or coroner office(s) have active protocol to identify epilepsy and SUDEP in decedents, and authority and resources to investigate all sudden and unexplained deaths within the study area. Rates may be defined per population of all persons with epilepsy and per general population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Study population represents all residents of a defined geographic area. Define or probable SUDEP defined by standard criteria. SUDEP cases ascertained and confirmed principally through medical examiner or coroner office(s), which at the time of investigation have active protocol to identify epilepsy and SUDEP in decedents, and authority to investigate all sudden and unexplained deaths within the study area. Death investigation protocols include gathering information from death certificates, clinical records, and autopsies. Rates are defined per the general population of the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Study population represents all residents of a defined geographic area. Define or probable SUDEP defined by standard criteria. SUDEP cases ascertained and confirmed from multiple sources, including medical examiner or coroner offices, death certificates, other available clinical records, and available autopsy reports. Rates may be defined per the general population of the study area or per an estimate of the number of people with epilepsy in the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Studies that do not meet criteria describing levels 1–3, above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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for the year 2010 from the U.S. National Center for Health Statistics.\textsuperscript{11}

We calculated standardized cumulative risks (R) of SUDEP among the population of people with epilepsy by the method of Sasieni and Adams\textsuperscript{12} according to the formula $R = \sum_{j=0}^{99} S_j \cdot R_j$, where S is the probability of survival to end of age interval j, and R is the risk during age interval j. The interval probabilities of survival ($S_j$) were taken from U.S. life tables 2000, modified to account for additional reduction in survival in preceding intervals due to SUDEP. The interval SUDEP risks ($R_j$) were derived from age-specific estimates of general population rates, described above, divided by age-specific estimates of epilepsy prevalence obtained from a study by Hauser.\textsuperscript{13} All calculations were made using Excel 2010 software (Microsoft, Redmond, WA, U.S.A.).

**Findings**

**Literature search**

The literature search of MEDLINE and EMBASE conducted in January 2014 yielded 199 unique references after excluding reviews, letters, and editorials. Our review of these titles and abstracts yielded 17 articles that we considered relevant population-based studies. Of these, six addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children), and the other 11 addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children). Of these, six addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children), and the other 11 addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children). Of these, six addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children), and the other 11 addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children). Of these, six addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children), and the other 11 addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children). Of these, six addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children), and the other 11 addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children). Of these, six addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children), and the other 11 addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children). Of these, six addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children), and the other 11 addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children). Of these, six addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children), and the other 11 addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children). Of these, six addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children), and the other 11 addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children). Of these, six addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children), and the other 11 addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children). Of these, six addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children), and the other 11 addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children). Of these, six addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children), and the other 11 addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children). Of these, six addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children), and the other 11 addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children). Of these, six addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children), and the other 11 addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children). Of these, six addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children), and the other 11 addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children). Of these, six addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children), and the other 11 addressed only partial age spans (four limited to children).

**Incidence**

Table 2 describes pooled data of three level 2 studies.\textsuperscript{7,20} From this we estimated an overall crude rate of 0.81 cases of SUDEP annually per 100,000 population. Assuming an overall epilepsy prevalence of 7.1 per 100,000 population,\textsuperscript{2,10} we also estimated a crude annual incidence of SUDEP of 1.16 cases per 1,000 persons with epilepsy.

**Age distribution**

The level 2 studies we reviewed did not provide age-specific numbers or rates. Accordingly, we pooled data from the four level 3 studies that provided such information.\textsuperscript{8,21–23} Combined, these studies encompassed 228 cases; these were proportionately distributed among specific age ranges as shown in Figure 1. Few reported cases occurred in the first decade of life; reported numbers were highest in the third and fourth decades, and reported numbers declined markedly in the sixth decade. Using this age distribution, as well as the estimated total number of cases, an estimated epilepsy prevalence of 7.1 per 1,000, and the age-specific epilepsy prevalence distribution described by Hauser,\textsuperscript{13} we estimated the annual incidence of SUDEP. Using the U.S. Standard Population for 2000,\textsuperscript{24} we found 1.22 cases per 1,000 persons with epilepsy. Using the proposed European Standard Population for 2013,\textsuperscript{25} we found 1.11 cases per 1,000. Applying these age-adjusted rates to U.S. and E.U. population estimates,\textsuperscript{26,27} we can estimate that in 2013, SUDEP resulted in 2,750 deaths in the United States and 3,994 deaths in the 28 nations of the European Union.

**Comparisons of fatalities and years of potential life lost**

In Figure 2A, using the U.S. population as an example, we compared our estimate of the number of SUDEP deaths with the numbers of deaths reported for other selected underlying neurologic conditions in 2010.\textsuperscript{8} As illustrated in this figure, the numbers of SUDEP deaths in comparison are far smaller than deaths reported for Alzheimer’s disease.

\textsuperscript{*}The most recent data from the U.S. National Vital Statistics System described deaths for these neurologic conditions in 2010. Accordingly, for the comparisons in Figure 2, we used a crude estimate of the number of SUDEP deaths calculated for 2010 (2,501) rather than the estimate for 2013.

---

**Table 2. Population-based studies of SUDEP incidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Population person-years</th>
<th>Crude annual rate (95% CI) per 100,000 population</th>
<th>Crude annual rate (95% CI) per 1,000 PWE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leestma\textsuperscript{20} (Cook County, Illinois, U.S.A.)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5,250,000</td>
<td>1.14 (0.88–1.48)</td>
<td>1.63 (1.24–2.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langan\textsuperscript{5} (South Dublin and Wicklow, Ireland)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2,043,000</td>
<td>0.73 (0.43–1.24)</td>
<td>1.05 (0.60–1.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opeskin\textsuperscript{7} (Victoria, Australia)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8,146,140</td>
<td>0.61 (0.46–0.82)</td>
<td>0.88 (0.65–1.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined studies</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>15,439,140</td>
<td>0.81 (0.68–0.97)</td>
<td>1.16 (0.95–1.36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected estimates for selected countries

- Estimated populations, 2013: United States, 316,971,485; European Union (EU28), 505,730,500
- Estimated no. PWE: US, 2,237,673; EU, 3,590,687
- Estimated age-adjusted annual SUDEP rates per 100,000 PWE: US, 1.22; EU, 1.11
- Estimated no. SUDEP cases in 2013 (age-adjusted): US, 2,750; EU, 3,994
stroke, and even Parkinson’s disease. However, when we examined the years of potential life lost for these conditions, the relative burden from SUDEP assumes much greater importance, second only to stroke. In 2010, we estimated there were 100,510 years of potential life lost in the United States due to SUDEP.

Cumulative risk of SUDEP among people with epilepsy

We calculated the cumulative risk of SUDEP for a cohort of people with epilepsy under three different assumptions differing by age of onset of epilepsy: 1, 15, and 30 years. The calculations also assumed that epilepsy would not fully remit after diagnosis, that is, that it would require lifetime treatment for control thereafter. Epilepsy onset at age 1 year yielded a cumulative (“lifetime”) risk of SUDEP of 8.0% by age 70; epilepsy onset at age 15 years yielded a corresponding risk of 7.2% by age 70; and epilepsy onset at age 30 years yielded a corresponding risk of 4.6%. These findings are illustrated in Figure 3.

Discussion

Limitations

The limitations of our analysis are substantial and our findings, therefore, must be considered provisional. First, our search found no studies qualitatively judged to have highly sensitive SUDEP case ascertainment across all ages. Therefore, our estimates of incidence rest on level 2 studies relying on data from coroner or medical examiner offices that are likely to have undercounted cases to an unknown extent. Although these offices had protocols in place for the identification of SUDEP among cases coming to autopsy, not all cases of sudden or unattended death in their jurisdictions may have been referred to them. And it should be noted that these three coroner and medical examiner offices were exceptional: Most coroners and medical examiners do not use the diagnosis of SUDEP and therefore can be assumed not to have criteria or protocols for its identification.

The undercount of SUDEP cases may be greatest in older age groups. Our data show a markedly decreasing number of deaths attributed to SUDEP in people 50 years of age or older. One possible explanation may be the decreased population size in older age strata, thus reducing the pool of at-risk persons representing the denominator. However, this is unlikely the full explanation for the reduced number of identified SUDEP cases in older adults, as the reduction in numbers of SUDEP cases reported from the fourth to the fifth decades of life appear proportionately greater than the corresponding reductions in both the U.S. and E.U. popula-
Although this estimate of prevalence is now widely cited,2 and we consider it a reasonable approximation to the true prevalence of epilepsy in the general population of the United States and probably other high-income countries, it is a potential source of error in our analysis. The same can be said for the age-specific epilepsy rates drawn from the same study,13 which are the basis for our calculations of age-adjusted incidence and cumulative risk of SUDEP among people with epilepsy. This study13 is dated, as are some SUDEP incidence studies used in our analysis;20,22 thus, some changes in epilepsy and SUDEP occurrence, especially in the age distribution of prevalent cases of epilepsy, may have occurred since their publication. The age-adjustment we employed in our estimates of SUDEP incidence may partially mitigate the potential error arising from such changes.

Our analysis relied on data obtained solely from high-income countries. Accordingly, we are unable to confidently generalize these findings to the populations of lower-income countries, from which we did not find corresponding data.

Finally, our analysis addresses only overall SUDEP risk, and risk stratified by age, in general populations of people with epilepsy. For individuals with epilepsy, such risks may vary greatly, depending on factors such as type and frequency of seizures, comorbid conditions, and others, as elucidated in other systematic reviews.3,4

**Interpretation**

The limitations noted above suggest that our estimate of the incidence of SUDEP in the general population is probably conservative and likely to be revised upward with future studies incorporating methods with more complete case ascertainment. In any event, it is clear from our analysis that the public health burden of SUDEP is substantial and deserves greater attention from clinicians and the medical research community. The estimated annual number of U.S. deaths from SUDEP—2,750—exceeds the corresponding number of deaths attributed to SIDS, of which 2,063 were reported in 2010.29 For more than two decades, SIDS has received a great deal of attention from clinicians, researchers, and public health professionals, who through public education have achieved substantial reductions in its occurrence. SUDEP deserves the same attention. And in relation to other neurologic disorders, the relative importance of SUDEP is underscored by the years of potential life lost to it, a more complete measure of public health burden than mortality alone.

**Implications for further research**

The limitations of existing data point to the need for additional population-based studies of SUDEP occurrence. These studies need to prospectively involve medical examiner or coroner offices with active protocols to identify epilepsy and SUDEP occurrence in decedents, cross-referencing information from clinical as well as vital
records and death certificates, ideally in communities with population-based databases identifying confirmed epilepsy cases. Beyond assessing the true incidence of SUDEP, such studies can provide additional information regarding modifiable risk factors and circumstances of death that is of great value in the development of prevention strategies and programs. Although studies of special populations of people with epilepsy—cohorts based on enrollment in referral clinics and cohorts of people with refractory seizures—were not within the scope of our review, such studies also continue to be important, providing additional information about risk and etiology that can applied to SUDEP prevention.

Finally, we note that SUDEP represents one among several important causes of premature mortality among people with epilepsy, who as a group have an increased risk of mortality two to three times greater than the general population.1 This should be considered when interpreting comparisons to other neurologic diseases, where all causes of mortality related to those diseases are considered. Studies designed to address SUDEP occurrence and risk factors can afford opportunities to address other important preventable causes of epilepsy-related mortality as well.
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