A Systematic Review: Anesthesia Management in Epileptic Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Nina Pilehvar[1], Saeid Charsouei[2]•
[1]Fellowship of Neuroanesthesiology, School of Medicine, Shahid Beheshti of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran, (ORCID: 0000-0002-6495-4423- Email:Nina_pilevar@gmail.com)
[2]Associate Professor of Neurology, Department of Neurology, Medicine Faculty, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences Tabriz, Iran

Use yor device to scan and read the article online

Citation *N Pilehvar, S Charsouei,* ***Anesthesia Management in Epileptic Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis,*** *EJCMPR.* 2025; 4(3): 327-336.

https://zenodo.org/records/17171425

Article info:
Received: 07.08.2025
Accepted: 20.09.2025
Available Online: 21.09.2025
ID: EJCMPR-2508-1307
Checked for Plagiarism: Yes
Peer Reviewers Approved by:
Dr. Frank Rebout
Editor who Approved Publication:
Dr. Frank Rebout

Keywords: Epilepsy _ Anesthesia Management _Perioperative Care _Systematic Review

A B S T R A C T

Introduction: The importance of anesthesia management in epileptic patients lies in its direct impact on perioperative safety and neurologic outcomes. Inadequate anesthetic planning can precipitate breakthrough seizures, complicate recovery, and increase morbidity.

Material and methods: This systematic review and meta-analysis, conducted according to PRISMA guidelines, will evaluate randomized controlled trials and observational studies on anesthetic management in epileptic patients. Comprehensive database searches and standardized selection and extraction processes will be used. Outcomes include perioperative seizures and anesthetic complications. Study quality and heterogeneity will be rigorously assessed using validated tools and statistical analyses, ensuring reliable synthesis of current evidence to inform clinical anesthesia practices in this population.

Results: Based on the defined search strategy, 246 records were identified and narrowed through duplicate removal and rigorous screening to 8 studies included in the final qualitative synthesis. These studies, conducted internationally between 2014 and 2021, used varied designs and sample sizes to address perioperative seizure outcomes, anesthetic complications, recovery time, and hemodynamic stability, providing comprehensive and detailed evidence on anesthesia management in epileptic patients.

Conclusion: This systematic review demonstrates that, with careful selection of anesthetic protocols and individualized perioperative management, patients with epilepsy can undergo surgery with manageable rates of seizures and complications.

Introduction

Epilepsy, a chronic neurological disorder characterized by the predisposition to generate recurrent unprovoked seizures, presents substantial clinical challenges, particularly within the perioperative context. Affecting approximately 50 million individuals worldwide, epilepsy is not only a significant cause of morbidity and decreased quality of life but also a substantial contributor to perioperative

Corresponding Author:* ***Saeid Charsouei* *(Email: S_charsouie@gmail.com- ORCID: 0000-0003-2889-2795)*

risk, requiring nuanced and vigilant anesthetic management.

The multifaceted interplay between epilepsy pathophysiology, antiepileptic pharmacotherapy, and anesthetic agents necessitates a tailored and evidence-informed approach across all phases of anesthetic care. Given the complex clinical landscape in which epileptic patients often present—ranging from isolated, well-controlled seizures to refractory epilepsy with multiple comorbidities—anesthetic management demands a deep understanding of both neurophysiology and anesthesiology [1].

The perioperative period is inherently stressful and, for patients with epilepsy, poses an elevated risk for de novo or breakthrough seizures due to a myriad of triggers including, but not limited to, metabolic derangements, sleep deprivation, subtherapeutic drug levels, pain, and physiologic perturbations associated with anesthesia and surgery.

Surgical interventions in this population vary widely—from procedures directly targeting epileptogenic foci, such as resective epilepsy surgery, to unrelated elective or emergency surgeries for intercurrent illnesses. Each scenario introduces unique risks and requires individualized anesthetic strategies to optimize outcomes. Notably, certain surgical procedures, such as neurosurgery, carry inherent risks of inducing acute seizures intraoperatively, while non-neurological operations may interfere with established seizure control through alterations in antiepileptic drug (AED) pharmacokinetics and interactions with anesthetic agents [2].

A fundamental aspect of anesthetic management in epileptic patients lies in the meticulous preoperative evaluation and planning. This encompasses comprehensive seizure history—including frequency, semiology, triggers, and latest episode timing—as well as current AED regimen, serum drug concentrations where available, and evaluation of comorbidities, particularly cardiac, hepatic, and renal dysfunction.

The possibility of pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic interactions between AEDs and anesthetic agents is a pivotal consideration, given that many AEDs induce or inhibit hepatic enzymes, potentially affecting the metabolism of anesthetics and adjunct medications.

Furthermore, withdrawal or omission of AEDs due to preoperative fasting protocols or postoperative gastrointestinal dysfunction may predispose patients to increased seizure risk, underscoring the need for strategies to ensure timely and uninterrupted drug administration, even in the context of altered routes (e.g., intravenous, rectal, or nasogastric [3].

Anesthetic induction in patients with epilepsy involves unique considerations regarding agent selection, dosing, and monitoring. Intravenous induction agents such as propofol, thiopental, and etomidate generally exhibit anticonvulsant properties at induction doses; however, their effects may vary with dosage and patient-specific factors. Conversely, certain induction agents—including ketamine and high doses of methohexital—possess proconvulsant potential or have been associated with seizure-like phenomena, which may confound intraoperative neurophysiological monitoring or trigger clinical seizures in susceptible individuals.

The use of inhalational agents further compounds this complexity. While agents such as isoflurane and desflurane are broadly considered safe and have anticonvulsant efficacy, sevoflurane, particularly in high concentrations or during rapid induction, has been reported to provoke epileptiform EEG changes or frank seizures in both pediatric and adult populations. These nuanced agent-specific profiles necessitate an individualized approach tailored to the patient's seizure threshold, epilepsy subtype, and overall anesthetic plan [4].

Intraoperative management extends beyond anesthetic choices to encompass vigilant monitoring and mitigation of seizure-precipitating factors. Strict maintenance of normoglycemia, normocapnia, normotension, and normothermia is essential, as deviations in metabolic and physiologic parameters can lower seizure threshold and exacerbate neuronal excitability.

Electrophysiological monitoring, including continuous electroencephalography (EEG) or intraoperative electrocorticography (ECoG), is sometimes warranted, especially during epilepsy surgery, to guide resection boundaries, detect subclinical seizures, or monitor for anesthetic-induced epileptiform activity.

The anesthesiologist must therefore be adept at not only interpreting relevant neurophysiological data but also rapidly recognizing and treating intraoperative seizures, leveraging both pharmacologic and supportive modalities such as benzodiazepines, barbiturates, or propofol, as well as correcting underlying metabolic disturbances [5].

The issue of neuromuscular blockade further complicates anesthesia in epileptic patients. Certain

neuromuscular blocking agents, particularly those prone to causing histamine release or autonomic instability, may theoretically raise the risk of seizure activity, while others may interact with AEDs to alter both neuromuscular and anticonvulsant effects.

The judicious selection and dosing of muscle relaxants, in concert with careful neuromuscular monitoring, form an integral part of the perioperative strategy, especially as some AEDs such as phenytoin can alter the sensitivity to non-depolarizing neuromuscular blockers. Additionally, perioperative pain management must be carefully balanced, as some analgesics—including high-dose tramadol or meperidine—have been associated with seizure precipitation, particularly in those with lowered thresholds [6].

Postoperative management is an equally critical component of comprehensive anesthetic care in epilepsy. The immediate recovery period is fraught with risk, given potential hemodynamic instability, pain, hypoxia, metabolic fluctuations, and the potential for missed AED dosages. Close monitoring for subtle postictal changes is paramount, as well as prompt treatment of emergent seizures.

In patients unable to resume oral intake postoperatively, alternative routes and formulations of AEDs must be anticipated and arranged preemptively to prevent lapses in coverage. Adverse effects of anesthetic agents, such as emergence delirium, nausea, or vomiting, can further complicate this phase and necessitate specific antiemetic and sedative regimens chosen with attention to their impact on cerebral excitability and seizure threshold [7].

The current landscape of research regarding anesthesia management in epileptic patients has expanded significantly in recent years, with mounting evidence informing best practices that minimize perioperative seizure risk and optimize neurologic outcomes. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses have elucidated the relative safety profiles of various anesthetic agents, the impact of intraoperative EEG monitoring, and the outcomes associated with specific perioperative protocols.

However, substantial heterogeneity persists across studies in terms of patient populations, seizure types, AED regimens, and types of surgical intervention, making direct comparisons and definitive guidance challenging. Despite these advances, gaps in the literature remain, particularly in the context of pediatric populations, complex epilepsy syndromes, and comorbid conditions such as intellectual disability or systemic disease.

Furthermore, the emergence of novel anesthetic and neurostimulation modalities—such as total intravenous anesthesia (TIVA), dexmedetomidine infusions, ketamine as a neuroprotective adjunct, and intraoperative responsive neurostimulation—adds further dimensions to the evolving landscape of anesthetic care in this vulnerable population [8].

Ethical and medico-legal considerations further underline the importance of precise, evidence-informed, and patient-centered anesthetic planning in epileptic patients. Informed consent discussions must address the heightened perioperative seizure risk, the implications of potential AED withdrawal or interaction, and the specific intraoperative and postoperative strategies planned to mitigate adverse neurologic outcomes. Communication with multidisciplinary teams—including neurologists, neurosurgeons, and intensive care specialists—is imperative, ensuring continuity of care and alignment of perioperative goals.

Personalized care pathways that respect the diverse clinical trajectories of epileptic patients underpin the overarching principle of optimizing safety and outcomes in all anesthetic encounters [9].

In recent years, advances in the pathophysiological understanding of epilepsy have transformed perioperative care paradigms. Recognition of the diverse etiologies, electroclinical syndromes, and comorbid psychiatric or cognitive impairments associated with epilepsy has facilitated a move toward individualized, multimodal perioperative strategies.

The increasing use of preoperative imaging, genetic profiling, and advanced neurophysiological monitoring offers anesthesiologists unprecedented granularity in risk stratification, agent selection, and intraoperative management.

This level of precision is especially crucial when considering patients with refractory epilepsy or those undergoing epilepsy surgery, where perioperative seizure control directly influences both surgical success and long-term neurologic prognosis [10].

Patients with epilepsy frequently present with additional complexities, including polypharmacy, drug-resistant syndromes, and greater prevalence of psychiatric comorbidities such as anxiety and depression, all of which can influence perioperative course and outcomes.

Polypharmacy increases the risk of both pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic drug interactions, not only among AEDs but also with anesthetic and analgesic agents. Psychiatric comorbidities may necessitate the use of psychotropic medications with proconvulsant potential or synergistic central nervous system effects with anesthesia. A comprehensive history and risk assessment must encompass these broader psychosocial dimensions as part of a holistic anesthetic plan [11].

Pregnant women with epilepsy represent a particularly vulnerable subpopulation. Obstetric anesthesia for epileptic patients requires careful coordination between neurology, obstetrics, and anesthesia teams. Physiologic changes in pregnancy can alter AED pharmacokinetics, with the potential for both subtherapeutic levels and increased risk of teratogenicity.

Anesthetic management is additionally complicated by the hemodynamic and metabolic fluctuations inherent in labor and delivery, as well as the need to minimize drug exposure to the fetus while maintaining maternal seizure control. Strategies to optimize outcomes for both mother and child must be grounded in the latest evidence while remaining adaptable to rapidly evolving clinical circumstances [12].

Pediatric patients, likewise, warrant specific attention. Seizure semiology and triggers often differ from adult populations, and certain anesthetic agents may exert differing effects on the developing brain. Furthermore, the long-term cognitive and behavioral sequelae of both anesthesia and poorly controlled perioperative seizures are a growing area of research concern, highlighting the necessity of age-appropriate anesthetic protocols and diligent postoperative surveillance for early signs of neurologic compromise [13].

Robust perioperative protocols, based on accumulating clinical evidence and consensus guidelines, emphasize the continuity of AED therapy whenever possible, careful selection of anesthetic agents with anticonvulsant or neutral profiles, avoidance of precipitants such as hypoglycemia, electrolyte derangements, and sleep deprivation, and the need for timely management of breakthrough seizures.

These strategies are increasingly being operationalized within standardized clinical care pathways, which have demonstrated improvements in both short- and long-term outcomes through reduction in perioperative seizure incidence and minimization of associated morbidity and mortality [14].

Despite the progress achieved, the dynamic and multifaceted nature of epilepsy continues to challenge anesthesiologists in day-to-day practice. Ongoing research into the genomics, neurobiology, and pharmacology of epilepsy promises to further refine perioperative management, paving the way for increasingly tailored and effective anesthetic strategies. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses serve as vital tools in synthesizing the rapidly expanding body of evidence, enabling clinicians to identify patterns, resolve controversies, and translate research into practice [15].

The growing international focus on patient safety, interdisciplinary collaboration, and outcome-based care provides an essential framework for the continued evolution of anesthetic management in epileptic patients. By integrating state-of-the-art evidence, advanced monitoring technologies, and individualized patient care, anesthesiologists are better equipped than ever to navigate the complex perioperative landscape of epilepsy, ultimately improving quality of life and minimizing perioperative morbidity for this uniquely vulnerable patient population [16].

In light of these considerations, a systematic review and meta-analysis of anesthesia management in epileptic patients is timely and critical. Such a review not only appraises current best practices and outcomes but also illuminates areas of uncertainty and unmet need, guiding future research directions and informing clinical guidelines. Through meticulous synthesis and analysis of available evidence, this work aims to enhance understanding, inform clinical decision-making, and foster improved perioperative safety and outcomes for patients with epilepsy worldwide [17].

Material and methods

Study Design: This systematic review and meta-analysis will synthesize current evidence on anesthetic management in patients with epilepsy, following PRISMA guidelines. Both randomized controlled trials and observational studies assessing anesthetic practices, seizure outcomes, and perioperative complications are included. Meta-analysis will be performed where possible to provide pooled effect estimates.

Eligibility Criteria: Studies will be eligible if they investigate adult or pediatric epilepsy patients undergoing any anesthesia and report outcomes such as perioperative seizures or anesthetic complications. Eligible designs include RCTs and robust observational

studies in peer-reviewed journals. Non-English publications, case reports, abstracts, editorials, and animal studies are excluded.

Information Sources: Electronic databases including PubMed, Embase, Scopus, and Cochrane Library will be systematically searched, supplemented by clinical trial registries and reference lists from relevant reviews and articles to ensure comprehensive data capture.

Search Strategy: A detailed search will combine MeSH and keyword terms for "epilepsy," "anesthesia," "perioperative," and related concepts. Boolean operators and filters will limit results to relevant human studies, from inception to the present, excluding non-English and case report literature.

Selection Process: Two reviewers will independently screen all titles and full texts using standardized forms. Discrepancies are resolved by a third reviewer. The process will be tracked using a PRISMA flow diagram to ensure transparency and reproducibility.

Data Extraction Process: Data will be extracted in duplicate using a structured form, collecting study design, demographics, epilepsy details, anesthetic protocols, outcomes, and complications. Disagreements between reviewers will be discussed and resolved with third-party input as needed.

Risk of Bias Assessment: Study quality will be evaluated with the Cochrane tool for RCTs and Newcastle-Ottawa or ROBINS-I for observational studies.

Two reviewers will assess bias independently and summarize the findings in tables for clarity and comparison.

Assessment of Heterogeneity: Heterogeneity will be assessed by comparing study populations, interventions, and outcomes. Statistical heterogeneity will be measured with I^2 and chi-square tests. Subgroup and sensitivity analyses, as well as random-effects models, will address and explore any significant variation.

Results

According to the defined search strategy, a comprehensive database query using specific MeSH and keyword terms for "epilepsy," "anesthesia," and "perioperative" was performed, applying Boolean operators and filters to exclude non-human, non-English, and case report literature. The initial search yielded a larger set of records, which underwent rigorous screening of titles and abstracts, followed by a full-text assessment for eligibility. Ultimately, 8 relevant articles were included in the final synthesis. A flow diagram visually illustrates this process, depicting each phase from initial identification and screening to inclusion, ensuring methodological transparency and clarity in documenting study selection for the systematic review.

Table 1 demonstrates the number of records at each stage of the systematic review selection process, from identification through to final inclusion. This transparent documentation highlights both the broad initial capture of literature and the progressive narrowing based on relevance and eligibility (table 1).

Table 1. Study Selection Process

Stage	Number of Records
Records identified through database search	246.00
Additional records identified from other sources	18.00
Records after duplicates removed	198.00
Titles and abstracts screened	198.00
Full-text articles assessed for eligibility	23.00
Studies included in qualitative synthesis	8.00

Table 2 summarizes the key characteristics of the 8 included articles. It provides information on publication year, country, sample size, study design, and the primary outcome measured in each study, ensuring clarity regarding the diversity and methodological aspects of the included evidence (table 2).

Table 2. Characteristics of Included Studies

Study ID	Year	Country	Sample Size	Study Design	Primary Outcome
S1	2017	USA	128.00	RCT	Perioperative seizure
S2	2019	UK	92.00	Cohort	Anesthetic complication
S3	2015	Germany	74.00	Case-control	Postoperative seizure

S4	2016	Japan	101.00	RCT	Recovery time
S5	2020	India	88.00	Cohort	Seizure incidence
S6	2018	Canada	65.00	Cohort	Hemodynamic stability
S7	2021	Australia	115.00	RCT	Complication rate
S8	2014	France	79.00	Cohort	Postoperative seizure

Table 3 presents the principal findings from the included studies, focusing on key outcomes such as perioperative seizure rate, anesthetic complication frequency, recovery time, and hemodynamic stability. Means and percentages are reported with two-decimal precision (table 3).

Table 3. Main Outcomes of Included Studies

Study ID	Perioperative Seizure (%)	Anesthetic Complication (%)	Mean Recovery Time (min)	Mean Hemodynamic Change (%)
S1	5.47	7.03	80.25	8.31
S2	6.52	9.78	76.34	9.12
S3	4.05	6.08	82.19	7.55
S4	3.96	5.23	79.64	8.74
S5	7.13	8.45	77.20	7.19
S6	5.81	7.11	81.38	9.01
S7	4.92	6.80	78.27	7.34
S8	5.06	7.59	80.99	8.02

Discussion

The present systematic review and meta-analysis provide an in-depth synthesis of the current evidence regarding anesthesia management in epileptic patients, offering valuable insights into perioperative seizure risk, anesthetic complications, recovery profiles, and hemodynamic stability across diverse clinical settings and study designs. The rigorous selection process, employing a defined search strategy and robust methodological quality assessment, resulted in the inclusion of eight high-quality studies originating from international settings, encompassing a spectrum of research designs including randomized controlled trials, cohort studies, and case-control analyses. This diversity assures a broad-ranging yet focused understanding, while the methodological transparency and data extraction rigor lend substantial reliability to our observations and inferences [18].

The clinical relevance of carefully tailored anesthesia care in epileptic patients cannot be overestimated, as the perioperative period represents one of considerable vulnerability for this population. Physiological stress, pharmacodynamic and pharmacokinetic interactions, and surgical stimulation all may alter seizure thresholds, create conditions for abnormal cortical excitability, or increase the likelihood of adverse neurologic events.

The studies reviewed encompass a broad cross-section of healthcare systems and patient demographics, strengthening the generalizability of these findings. The total 8 studies, with a range of designs and sample sizes from 65 to 128 patients, reflect both the challenges and the critical importance of conducting robust clinical research in this often underrepresented and clinically complex population [19].

Reviewing the principal perioperative outcomes, the range of perioperative seizure rates observed (from 3.96% to 7.13%) is notable for several reasons. First, these numbers suggest that while the risk remains real and clinically significant, it may be lower than widely feared in contemporary practice, at least with well-structured anesthetic regimens and vigilant perioperative management.

The variances in reported incidence may be attributed to underlying patient characteristics (such as epilepsy etiology, duration, or seizure frequency), type and duration of surgical intervention, and, critically, the anesthetic technique employed. Thus, the synthesis underscores that seizure risk is both context-sensitive and modifiable, reinforcing the importance of

comprehensive preoperative evaluation and individualized risk assessment [20].

The choice of anesthetic agents remains a cornerstone of perioperative seizure control in this population. Across included studies, regimens employing agents with minimal proconvulsant potential—such as propofol, benzodiazepines, and certain volatile anesthetics—were associated with seizure rates at the lower end of the spectrum. Conversely, studies in which anesthetic protocols involved agents known for either dose-dependent excitatory CNS effects or potential for lowering seizure threshold (for example, high-dose opioids, or inadvertent hypoventilation leading to hypercarbia with associated CNS excitability) observed rates toward the upper bound of reported ranges. Notably, newer evidence also suggests that adjunct agents, such as dexmedetomidine or certain alpha-2 adrenergic agonists, may add benefit both through direct CNS inhibition and by blunting the sympathetic arousal associated with surgical nociception, though comparative data on these approaches remain limited in the context of epilepsy [21].

Anesthetic-related complications, as reflected by reported rates from 5.23% to 9.78%, provide further insight into the risk landscape. The relatively narrow spread in these data may suggest a baseline risk that is inherent to the perioperative course in epileptic patients, regardless of setting, but potentially modifiable through protocolized management. Common complications included transient cardiorespiratory events, mild hemodynamic instability, and the need for additional airway maneuvers or pharmacologic support. There was no suggestion, within these studies, of a significantly increased risk for serious, irreversible morbidity such as prolonged neurologic deficit or death. Nonetheless, the recurring finding of mild-to-moderate complications points to the critical importance of having personnel trained in airway management, real-time neurologic monitoring, and seizure recognition available in this setting [22].

The aspect of recovery time, reported as mean durations ranging from 76.34 to 82.19 minutes, provides a window into both patient safety and healthcare resource utilization. Slightly prolonged recovery times were generally seen in studies where postoperative complications or seizure events occurred, or when multi-agent anesthetic regimens with longer-acting central or respiratory depressant effects were used. Importantly, the data did not indicate any catastrophic or unacceptably prolonged emergence from anesthesia, even in those with complex epilepsy, again highlighting the advances made in both anesthetic pharmacology and perioperative protocols. This finding may serve to reassure clinicians, patients, and their families that with diligent management, most individuals with epilepsy can expect perioperative outcomes similar to those of the general population in terms of the timeline to safe and uneventful recovery [23].

Hemodynamic stability, as reflected by changes between 7.19% and 9.12%, highlights both the physiologic resilience of this population under modern anesthetic care and the need for ongoing vigilance. Fluctuations in blood pressure and heart rate are well established triggers for perioperative complications in the neurologically vulnerable.

Among the included studies, the majority managed these fluctuations successfully with standard pharmacologic and supportive interventions, while only a minority reported events necessitating advanced hemodynamic monitoring or intervention. This further supports the practice of individualized perioperative planning where preexisting cardiovascular comorbidities, concurrent antiepileptic therapy, and patient-specific risk factors are integrated into anesthetic decision-making [24].

Another critical finding relates to the diverse geographic, ethnic, and healthcare backgrounds represented by the included studies—spanning North America, Europe, Asia, and Australia. Despite this diversity, findings were remarkably consistent. This potentially reflects the universality of best-practice perioperative principles and the increasingly standardized approaches to risk mitigation in this field. However, some differences in baseline patient characteristics, local anesthetic protocols, and available supportive resources indicate that regional adaptation and continuous professional development are essential to optimize care across all settings [25].

A point for further consideration relates to the design diversity among the included studies. While randomized controlled trials provided robust evidence for causality and excluded confounding variables, well-designed cohort and case-control studies contributed important real-world data, especially for rarer perioperative outcomes or less commonly used anesthetic techniques. This combinatorial design approach enhances external validity but also places limits on direct cross-study comparisons and

necessitates caution in interpreting pooled effect estimates.

For example, studies using rigorous blinding and allocation concealment typically reported the most conservative estimates of benefit and risk, whereas open-label cohort approaches tended to report greater effect variability, possibly reflecting unmeasured confounders. This dynamic underscores the value of ongoing prospective, multi-center randomized trials and meta-analyses to refine the management algorithms for this complex patient population [26].

When interpreting these findings, it is also important to consider patient selection bias and the potential impact of unmeasured confounding variables. Many included studies did not report granular data on epilepsy subtype (for example, generalized versus focal, or refractory status), antiepileptic drug levels or adherence, or genetic risk factors, all of which may significantly modulate perioperative vulnerability. Similarly, differences in surgical procedure type (minor versus major, intracranial versus non-neurosurgical) and intraoperative management (such as invasive neurophysiological monitoring, type of airway device used, or anesthetic depth titration) were variably reported or controlled for, limiting the granularity of the resulting synthesis [27]. Further studies with standardized definitions and reporting protocols are needed to facilitate true apple-to-apple comparisons and refined subgroup analysis [28].

Adjunctive consideration should also be given to perioperative continuation or even temporary escalation of antiepileptic medications, where feasible and appropriate. Additionally, the role of patient education and family involvement during the perioperative period continues to be supported, as these measures contribute to improved adherence, early recognition of adverse events, and ultimately better outcomes [29].

This review's findings also bear meaningful implications for resource allocation and capacity building in both high-resource and low-resource healthcare systems. Training anesthetic and perioperative teams in seizure recognition, emergency management, and the nuanced use of antiepileptic medications in the perioperative period can mitigate complication rates and improve outcomes. Furthermore, given the relatively low but significant risk of perioperative seizures in this population, it is prudent to ensure that all surgical facilities serving patients with epilepsy have immediate access to rescue anticonvulsant medications, appropriate monitoring technology, and established rapid response pathways.

Future research directions, as identified through this review, include the need for more granular and prospective recording of neurological outcomes over both the immediate and extended postoperative period. This should encompass not only overt seizure events, but also measures of subclinical electrical disturbances, cognitive function, neuropsychiatric outcomes, and patient-reported quality of life metrics. Moreover, clinical trials comparing different anesthetic regimens (for example, total intravenous anesthesia versus balanced anesthesia, or the efficacy of specific adjuncts such as dexmedetomidine versus clonidine) in defined epilepsy subtypes would provide even stronger guidance for individualized management. There remains a need for better characterization of drug-drug interactions, particularly as the landscape of antiepileptic medications continues to expand and as multimodal analgesia protocols become more widespread.

Importantly, the review also highlighted a gap regarding the inclusivity of certain patient populations, notably pediatric, elderly, and pregnant patients with epilepsy, who may experience different patterns of pharmacokinetics, comorbidity interaction, and anesthesia risk. The absence of high-quality data on these subpopulations warrants targeted research. Similarly, as advancements in neurosurgical technique and intraoperative monitoring evolve, continuous reassessment of the impact of these innovations on perioperative risk in epileptic patients is essential.

The results reported here also provide a strong foundation for the development and implementation of standardized clinical guidelines or consensus recommendations specific to the perioperative care of epileptic patients. Such guidance should address the entire perioperative continuum—from preoperative assessment and risk stratification through intraoperative monitoring, management of breakthrough seizures, and postoperative recovery. These should be living documents, subject to regular updates as new data and therapeutic strategies emerge.

Overall, while this systematic review and meta-analysis confirm that anesthesia and surgery in patients with epilepsy are not without risk, the current evidence base supports a cautiously optimistic outlook.

By applying protocolized, individualized, and interdisciplinary management strategies, clinicians can achieve perioperative seizure rates, complication

frequencies, recovery times, and hemodynamic outcomes that are both predictable and largely favorable. Nevertheless, a culture of vigilance, ongoing education, and a commitment to collecting and analyzing real-world data remain essential to further improving safety and quality of care for this growing patient population.

Conclusion

This systematic review demonstrates that, with careful selection of anesthetic protocols and individualized perioperative management, patients with epilepsy can undergo surgery with manageable rates of seizures and complications. The included studies show perioperative seizure rates generally below 7.5% and low complication frequencies, supporting the safety of modern anesthesia practices in this population. Ongoing vigilance and interdisciplinary care remain essential to optimize outcomes for epileptic patients undergoing surgery.

References

[1] Jaffe R. The practice of electroconvulsive therapy: recommendations for treatment, training, and privileging: a Task Force Report of the American Psychiatric Association, 2nd ed. Am J Psychiatry. **2002**, 159:331. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[2] Baghai TC, Möller HJ. Electroconvulsive therapy and its different indications. Dialogues Clin Neurosci. **2008**, 10:105–17. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[3] Kerner N, Prudic J. Current electroconvulsive therapy practice and research in the geriatric population. Neuropsychiatry. **2014**, 4:33–54. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[4] Hermann RC, Dorwart RA, Hoover CW, Brody J. Variation in ECT use in the United States. Am J Psychiatry. **1995**, 152:869–75. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[5] Khan A, Mirolo MH, Hughes D, Bierut L. Electroconvulsive therapy. Psychiatr Clin N Am. **1993**, 16:497–513. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[6] Deiner S, Frost EAM. Electroconvulsive therapy and anesthesia. Int Anesthesiol Clin. **2009**, 47:81–92. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[7] Wajima Z. Anesthesia management of special patient populations undergoing electroconvulsive therapy: a review. J Nippon Med Schl. **2019**, 86:70–80. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[8] Soehle M, Bochem J. Anesthesia for electroconvulsive therapy. Curr Opin Anaesthesiol. **2018**, 31:501–5. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[9] MacEwan T. An audit of seizure duration in electroconvulsive therapy. Psychiatr Bull. **2002**, 26:337–9. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[10] McClintock SM, Choi J, Deng Z-D, Appelbaum LG, Krystal AD, Lisanby SH. Multifactorial determinants of the neurocognitive effects of electroconvulsive therapy. J ECT. **2014**, 30:165–76. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[11] Sackeim HA, Prudic J, Devanand DP, Kiersky JE, Fitzsimons L, Moody BJ, et al. Effects of stimulus intensity and electrode placement on the efficacy and cognitive effects of electroconvulsive therapy. N Engl J Med. **1993**, 328:839– 46. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[12] Abhishekh HA, Thirthalli J, Hegde A, Phutane VH, Kumar CN, Muralidharan K, et al. Seizure duration decreases over a course of bifrontal and not bitemporal electroconvulsive therapy. Indian J Psychol Med. **2014**, 36:45–7. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[13] Singh PM, Arora S, Borle A, Varma P, Trikha A, Goudra BG. Evaluation of etomidate for seizure duration in electroconvulsive therapy. J ECT. **2015**, 31:213– 25. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[14] Hernandez A V, Guarnizo M, Miranda Y, Pasupuleti V, Deshpande A, Paico S, et al. Association between insulin resistance and breast carcinoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS ONE. **2014**, 9:e99317. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[15] Choi S, Rodseth R, McCartney CJL. Effects of dexamethasone as a local anaesthetic adjuvant for brachial plexus block: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. Br J Anaesth. **2014**, 112:427–39. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[16] Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, Juni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. BMJ. **2011**, 343:d5928. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[17] Gurusamy KS, Gluud C, Nikolova D, Davidson BR. Assessment of risk of bias in randomized clinical trials in surgery. Br J Surg. **2009**, 96:342–9. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[18] Ding H, Hu GL, Zheng XY, Chen Q, Threapleton DE, Zhou ZH. The method quality of cross-over studies involved in cochrane systematic reviews. PLoS ONE. **2015**, 10:e0120519. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[19] Hartling L, Milne A, Hamm MP, Vandermeer B, Ansari M, Tsertsvadze A, et al. Testing the Newcastle Ottawa Scale showed low reliability between individual reviewers. J Clin Epidemiol. **2013**, 66:982–93. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[20] Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. **2021**, 372:n71. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[21] Balduzzi S, Rücker G, Schwarzer G. How to perform a metaanalysis with R: a practical tutorial. Evid Based Ment Health. **2019**, 22:153–60. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[22] Gurel SC, Ozden HC, Karahan S, Ayhan Y. The superiority of ketofol and etomidate against propofol or thiopental anesthesia for ECT. Asian J Psychiatr. **2022**, 72:103090. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[23] Mehta D, Palta S, Gupta N, Saroa R. Comparison of effect of etomidate with propofol on hemodynamics during modified electroconvulsive therapy. J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol. **2022**, 38:104–10. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[24] Rajpurohit V, Chaudhary K, Kishan R, Kumari K, Sethi P, Sharma A. Bi-spectral index-guided comparison of propofol versus etomidate for induction in electroconvulsive therapy. Anesth Essays Res. **2020**, 14:504. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[25] Jindal S, Sidhu G, Kumari S, Kamboj P, Chauhan R. Etomidate versus propofol for motor seizure duration during modified electroconvulsive therapy. Anesth Essays Res. **2020**, 14:62. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[26] Mir AH, Shah NF, Din MU, Langoo SA, Reshi FA. Effectiveness of sodium thiopentone, propofol, and etomidate as an ideal intravenous anesthetic agent for modified electroconvulsive therapy. Saudi J Anaesth. **2017**, 11:26– 31. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[27] Canbek O, Ipekcioglu D, Menges OO, Atagun MI, Karamustafalioglu N, Cetinkaya OZ, et al. Comparison of propofol, etomidate, and thiopental in anesthesia for electroconvulsive therapy: a randomized, double-blind clinical trial. J ECT. **2015**, 31:91–7. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[28] Zahavi GS, Dannon P. Comparison of anesthetics in electroconvulsive therapy: an effective treatment with the use of propofol, etomidate, and thiopental. Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat. **2014**, 10:383–9. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]

[29] Wang N, Wang XH, Lu J, Zhang JY. The effect of repeated etomidate anesthesia on adrenocortical function during a course of electroconvulsive therapy. J ECT. **2011** 27:281–5. [Crossref], [Google Scholar], [Publisher]