Association for Paediatric Palliative Medicine

## Seizures:

# **Stage A: SCOPING AND SET UP PROCESS**

,	
Topic and/or	Seizures in the palliative care setting, prioritising symptom experience over sustaining life at all cost
Title of proposed	with focus quality of life from the individual patient and families perspective.
guideline	
Specialty area(s) to be	Seizures benefiting from palliative care intervention or support where they are or have
Specialty area(s) to be addressed	1. Seizures benefiting from palliative care intervention or support where they are or have received optimal management from neurology and other specialist services.
audiesseu	Multi-professional approach to seizure management
	3. Management of seizures at end of life when they are expected to be the cause of death
	(terminal seizures)
	4. Management of seizures as a symptom occurring during the deteriorating and/or end of life
	phase
	5. Consideration of seizure management at different developmental stages eg neonates, child,
	adolescent
Background on the	NICE guidance- limited evidence shown
topic	Acknowledge patient populations that would benefit
	Management of seizures- anxiety about this from professionals/families
	Different patient experiencing different seizure phenotypes requiring different approaches -eg
	cluster, status, non-convulsive seizures
	Seizures at different phases of palliative care requiring different approaches eg deteriorating
	phase vs end of life phase
	<ul> <li>Local guidance has been developed in some places</li> <li>APLS/Neurology seizure guidance exists</li> </ul>
	APLS/Neurology seizure guidance exists     Adult palliative care seizure guidance
	Neonatal guidance (specific group)
Clinical need for	Gap in evidence
guideline	Non-pharmacological guidance needed eg triggers stimulation, light etc
	Differentiating management from that of movement disorders- dystonia vs spasms vs seizure
	in palliative care setting
	Management of escalating seizures (including status epilepticus) outside an intensive care
	setting
	Balancing risk of seizure and management of seizures including interference with perceived
	quality of life and interference of activities of daily living
Describe the specific	To generate definitions
issues planning to	To enable a consistent approach
address through key	To enable auditing practice (national)
recommendations	Other areas identified by APPM members
Overall objective(s) of	1. Quality of life for patient/carers
guidelines (scope)	2. Seizure reduction and reduction in associated symptoms
	3. Support desired place of care
	<ul><li>4. Empowering professionals- minimising health care distress</li><li>5. Supporting a good death</li></ul>
	6. Standardising paediatric palliative care across UK and across all health care settings
	7. Satisfaction experience-families
	8. To enable transferability of care between care settings and to optimise choice of care setting
	9. Define where seizure management in collaboration with palliative care is recommended
	10. To support risk/ benefit discussions with families, including young people when able.
	11. To consider liaison with specialist palliative care for complex symptom management when not
	at end of life.
	12. Consideration of transition to adult services

Specific Questions to	What pharmacological and non-pharmacological interventions are effective for the management of
be addressed	seizures in infants, children and young people with palliative care needs.
Current evidence	NICE guidance
existing guidelines?	CHSW seizure management guidance
consensus expert	Nicki Harris' paper
opinion	APPM master formulary
Include references	APLS guidance and National epilepsy guidance
	CCLG guidance Adult palliative care seizure guidance
	WHO neonatal seizure management
Target audience	Professionals caring for life-limited children from primary, secondary and tertiary services and third
ranget addience	sector providers
	CYP should ideally be cared for by multidisciplinary paediatric palliative care team. Funding and
	commissioning bodies
	Infants, children and young people and those caring for them
Age range	1. Neonates
	2. Children
	3. Adolescents and young people (up to 19years)- over 16yrs may be managed by adult guidance
Population	CYP with life limiting conditions and complex seizures, benefiting from a palliative care approach.
	This might be defined by complexity, route of drug administration, place of care or phase of illness.
Excluded populations	1. CYP best managed by neurology / neurodisability/ general paediatric teams who do not
	require palliative care input
	2. Children with complex seizures who are not life limited.
Clinian and thing (a)	3. Age 19 years and over
Clinical condition(s)	Terminal seizures.
	Epileptic encephalopathy (e.g mitochondrial conditions)
	Refractory epilepsy in the presence of space occupying lesions or meningeal disease.      Head the leaf restant a significant of the control of the con
	Uncontrolled refractory seizures ( Eg GMFCS level 5 CP)     Status (separation or pen separation) with secondary impact on respiratory reserve, where
	Status (convulsive or non-convulsive) with secondary impact on respiratory reserve, where focus is symptom management experience.
Intervention(s)	focus is symptom management experience.  Pharmacological:
intervention(s)	Midazolam, clobazam, clonazepam, levetiracetam, Phenobarbital, diazepam, lorazepam,
	paraldehyde, Steroids.
	Non-pharmacological:
	Trigger avoidance, music therapy
	Environmental triggers including sleep / pain/ agitation
	Information and support
	Surgery / radiotherapy
	Ketogenic diet
Comparison(s)	Placebo,
	No treatment / usual care
	Cross comparison between any of the above (within group and between group)  Combinations of the above – reducing triggers and pharmacological management.
	Routes of administration (same drug or same drug class)
Health care setting or	UK, Hospital, home, hospice and community settings where skills and resources allow. Managed
context	clinical network support may enable this.
Outcome(s)	Reduced frequency or intensity of seizures.
.,	2. Reduced distress as experienced by child and family.
	3. Care in place of choice.
	4. Improved patient and family experience/ carer satisfaction.
	5. Improved trust in healthcare support/ perceived quality of care / quality of experience.
	6. Reduction in presentation to acute care.
	7. Minimise harm / side effects - e.g unwanted levels of sedation.
	8. Acceptability to patients / families and professionals.
	9. Achieving a 'good' death as determined by patient and family.  10. Improving confidence and ability to participate in activities of daily living.
Stakeholders	10. Improving confidence and ability to participate in activities of daily living.  APPM Clinical guidelines group and tonic specific group.
Stakenoluers	APPM Clinical guidelines group and topic specific group Parents and users
	Before literature review:
	Neurologist (replied)
	BACCH and BACD (no reply)
	~ / zh.11

	After literature review:
	Wider APPM membership
	Neurologist (replied)
Conflict of interest	Completed
forms	No conflict of interest
Questions formulated	What pharmacological and non-pharmacological interventions in infants, children and young
Questions formulated	people with palliative care needs are effective for:
	A. the reduction in quantity and quality of seizures?
	B. the management of seizures at end of life?
	C. the reduction in symptoms associated with seizures?
	D supporting a good death?
	E. support desired place of care?
	2. What interventions or measures may be helpful:
	A. in improving quality of life for patients who experience seizures and/or carers?
	B. in empowering professionals- minimising health carer distress
	C. in standardising paediatric palliative care across UK and across all health care settings
	D. in ensuring family/carer satisfaction `(or minimising trauma)
	E. to enable transferability of care between care settings
	F. to optimise choice of care setting
	G. to support risk/ benefit discussions with families, including young people when able.
	3. How do we define when seizure management in collaboration with palliative care is
	recommended?
	4. How do we signpost liaison with specialist palliative care for complex symptom management
	when the patient is not at end of life.
Literature review	20 years
	Child only to start, including adult, dependant on results.
	All study design – including single case reports, posters and abstracts from meetings.
Search strategies	Embase, MEDLINE, PsyciNFO, CINAHL, Cochrane, CENTRAL, NICE, HDAS (Health education England),
	Grey literature (abstracts, unpublished papers, posters)
Search words	Epilepsy, seizures, end of life, terminal, infant, children, young people, paediatric, palliative,
	neonatal, adolescent, fits, quality of life, convulsions, trust, communication, confidence,
	reassurance, syringe driver, anti-epileptics, anti-convulsants, (all interventions),
	Adolescent, minors, terminally ill, dying, hospice care, letter, editorial, news, comment, case
	report, randomized controlled trial, midazolam, clobazam, clonazepam, levitiracetam,
	phenobarbital, diazepam, lorazepam, paraldehyde, trigger avoidance, music therapy, Ketamine,
	steroids, ketogenic diet, VNS (Vagal Nerve stimulation)

# **Seizures: Stage B: Development**

Guideline development	Scope identified and PICO created (stage A)
process outline	Systematic review (stage B)
process outline	<ol> <li>Systematic review (stage B)</li> <li>Expert opinion: draft developed against each scope identified using systematic review, where no evidence expert opinion used (Stage B)</li> </ol>
	3. Delphi survey- where no consensus was met with expert opinion
	4. Evidence linked to each statement
1. Systematic review	Completed by topic specific group and Cochrane Response Reports generated:
	1.Systematic review Protocol (Cochrane Response)
	2.Systematic review results
2. Expert opinion	Draft guidance created against each clinical statement
z. zxpercopiiion	Using systematic review but where no evidence expert opinion used
	Expert opinion process:
	-topic specific group created draft
	-wider clinical guidelines review (meeting and post-meeting written draft shared)
3. Delphi method	Delphi survey needed- for Phenobarbitone and Steroids. One round only required. Results
	reviewed by topic specific group and incorporated into guidelines.
4. Evidence	Each stated guidance has evidence link and grade/rating of quality of evidence.
	Reports generated:
	Evidence to Decision table
	Cochrane Protocol and report
Guideline	Completed January 2023
Additional Information	Methodology report
	2. Guidelines process summary
	3. Cochrane Response protocol for systematic review
	4. Cochrane Response systematic review results
	5. Evidence to Decision table
	6. Delphi Survey results
	7. Clinical guidelines participants list
	8. Conflict of interest forms (on request)
Funding	NHSE funding for completion of 3 topics and commencement of next 2 topics

### Guideline process for Seizures Stage A: Set up

### RCPCH Standards for development of Clinical guidelines Methodology report Conflict of interest form

### Group

- 42 Clinical guidelines group members
- 2 parents; 1 patient
- •1 Cochrane Response
- 7 core topic group members
- Conflict of interest forms completed
- External stakeholders identified: Palliative care and Neurology

#### Topic

- •Identify a topic lead: Emily Harrop
- Methodology report completed for stage A including Clinical question(s), scope, aims,PICOs, search strategy developed by Clinical guideline group over 3 x 2hour virtual sessions

#### Reviev

Documents:

- Reviewed by external Stakeholders:
   Paediatric Neurologist and Paediatric Palliative
- Call for evidence from stakeholders and group
- Process follow RCPCH Standards for development of clinical guidelines

#### Documents

RCPCH Setting standards for Clinical guidelines
Summary of Systematic review (Cochrane Response report)
Evidence to Decision table

### Stage B: Production

### Systematic

- Systematic review via PRISMA method with search strategy
- •Summary of Systematic review report (see Cochrane Response report

### Expert opinion meeting:

- •18 attendees including 2 laypeople
- Systematic review presented
- Where there was minimal or no evidence for questions then expert consensus discussion for each question
- Clear consensus for each question with no need for Delphi survey

### Delphi Survey

One round to APPM members and specialist PPM group on two questions related to Phenobarbitione and

### Draft guideline

- Short version developed by core topic group
- Evidence to Decision table: linking evidence to recommendations
- Draft presented to guidelines group (one meeting)
- Internal Guideline group review (via email over 6 weeks)
- External review to Stakeholders: Paediatric Neurology and Paediatric Palliative care

### Stage C: Completion

### Revision

- Responses received from Paediatric Neurology and Paediatric Palliative care
- Core topic review responses

### Dissemination

- •APPM Website
- •APPM Webinar 2023
- •APPM study day 2022
- •NHSE newsletter

### Guidance process completed (this document)

### Updatine

•Review date: January 2026

# Seizures: Stage C: REVIEW AND PUBLICAION

Guidance final	Final draft sent out to stakeholders including APPM membership, specialist paediatric palliative care group and those involved in the scoping.
Economic impact of guidance	As discussed in evidence to decision table, availability and range of non-pharmacological interventions may be a significant issue in many clinical settings. Specialist palliative care expertise workforce across the systems remain very low.
Barriers to guidance stated	Concern that providing guidance could lead to individual clinician's working beyond their scope of practice. It is a clinician's responsibility to consider and understand their level of experience when using the guidelines.
Audit recommendations	To be developed
Dissemination and publication plan	APPM website and webinar series NHSE newsletter
Review date agreed	January 2026