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Abstract:

Objective
Late-onset epilepsy (LOE) is closely associated with cerebrovascular disease, acting as both a marker of cerebrovascular disease (CVD) and occurring as a direct consequence. Despite this, our understanding of LOE as a cerebrovascular phenomenon is in its infancy. LOE also appears to be a harbinger of dementia.

Methods
A systematic review was performed to identify publications relating to LOE and identified observational studies, clinical studies and radiological studies.

Results
A meta-analysis of observational studies demonstrated that patients presenting with LOE experience an increased risk of subsequent stroke (weighted OR 3.88 (95% CI 2.76 - 5.46)). The additional studies demonstrated clinical and radiological evidence to support the premise that LOE is likely to reflect underlying cerebrovascular disease.

Significance
Cerebrovascular disease risk factors convey increased risk of LOE and LOE can precede stroke and dementia, acting as an early marker for cerebrovascular risk. This may represent a potential point for intervention. There are a number of suggested mechanisms relating LOE to stroke, however there is limited understanding of the natural history of LOE. Current data support the need for prospective research in order to understand the natural history of LOE and modify disease, in order to reduce the apparent sequelae of stroke and dementia.

Suggested Reviewers:
Laura Hamman
Universitatsmedizin Greifswald
laurahamann1412@web.de
Previously published work on late-onset epilepsy

Response to Reviewers:
Dear Colleague,
I am writing to re-submit our revised manuscript entitled "Late-Onset Epilepsy Predicts Stroke: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis" for consideration as an original research paper in Epilepsy and Behavior. This paper comprises systematic review of the existing literature, and meta-analysis of the studies to date observing risk of stroke after the onset of late-onset epilepsy. This meta-analysis supports the view that late-onset epilepsy can be a harbinger of subsequent increased stroke risk. This research forms the basis for considering change in clinical practice to address late-onset epilepsy as a potential intervention point for modification of cerebrovascular risk factors - including modification of high risk behaviors such as alcohol excess,
smoking and drug use - and avoidance of future stroke risk. The specific comments made during editorial review were: 
“This is an interesting review on an important topic. The methodology is robust. However, a very similar systematic review (although including only population-based cohort studies) was published early on this year in the same journal (Epilepsy Behav. 2020 Mar;104(Pt B):106307). Apparently, this review included a few more studies than that under consideration. Hence, I suggest Authors to consider including results of the prior review into their own, to provide an even more comprehensive summary of the available evidence."

Many thanks for these helpful comments. On review of the papers included in this review, (and excluding those pertaining to myocardial infarction), there were no additional papers which met the inclusion criteria for inclusion into meta-analysis, but where they contribute to the subject matter, they have been included to systematic review. With specific reference to the papers referenced, the paper by Olesen et al. 2011 does not directly compare epilepsy and non-epilepsy cohorts with reference to stroke, but rather directs investigation towards differences between anticonvulsants[1]. The role of anticonvulsants in stroke risk is an important and associated issue with regards to late-onset epilepsy, and an additional comment has been included to this effect.

A second paper by Hsu et al., (2019)[2] uses Taiwanese national insurance data which overlaps with the data in an included paper, that of Chang et al. (2014)[3] and so the inclusion of these papers is mutually exclusive. On balance, given that the former paper focuses on the risk of complication during a stroke admission, a decision was made to remain with the inclusion of the original Chang et al. (2014) paper. Additionally, the review by Brigo et al. (2020)[4] has been itself included in systematic review as a valuable observation that patients with late-onset epilepsy not only experience increased risk of hypertension, diabetes and smoking as vascular risk factors, but also experience increased risk of myocardial infarction as a vascular outcome.

I look forward to your response.
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Patients presenting with Late Onset Epilepsy have an increased risk of subsequent stroke.
There is also some evidence that late onset epilepsy can precede subsequent dementia.
Late Onset Epilepsy represents a potential intervention point to act: to identify treatable cerebrovascular risk factors such as smoking, diabetes and hypertension in order to reduce future stroke risk.
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ABSTRACT

Objective: Late-onset epilepsy (LOE) is closely associated with cerebrovascular disease, acting as both a marker of cerebrovascular disease (CVD) and occurring as a direct consequence. Despite this, our understanding of LOE as a cerebrovascular phenomenon is in its infancy. LOE also appears to be a harbinger of dementia.

Methods: A systematic review was performed to identify publications relating to LOE and identified observational studies, clinical studies and radiological studies.

Results: A meta-analysis of observational studies demonstrated that patients presenting with LOE experience an increased risk of subsequent stroke (weighted OR 3.88 (95% CI 2.76 - 5.46)). The additional studies demonstrated clinical and radiological evidence to support the premise that LOE is likely to reflect underlying cerebrovascular disease.

Significance: Cerebrovascular disease risk factors convey increased risk of LOE and LOE can precede stroke and dementia, acting as an early marker for cerebrovascular risk. This may represent a potential point for intervention. There are a number of suggested mechanisms relating LOE to stroke, however there is limited understanding of the natural history of LOE. Current data support the need for prospective research in order to understand the natural history of LOE and modify disease, in order to reduce the apparent sequelae of stroke and dementia.
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1. INTRODUCTION

There is no clear consensus as to the age from which new onset epilepsy indicates increased cerebrovascular disease risk, but studies have shown a relationship from the fourth decade onwards[1]. Above the age of fifty, incidence of new onset epilepsy is approximately 400/100,000 person years. Of individuals with a new diagnosis of seizure or epilepsy after age 50, 9.8-11.9% will have a stroke in the subsequent decade, equivalent to a population pre-stroke epilepsy rate of 25-55/100,000 person years[2].

The relationship between cerebrovascular disease (CVD)\(^1\) and epilepsy is bidirectional, and the most common cause of new onset seizures in adulthood is post-stroke epilepsy.

LOE patients have an increased risk of subsequent stroke, and observations on this topic date back from Hippocrates (circa. 400 BC) to Barolin (1970s)[3]. Yet consideration of LOE as a cerebrovascular phenomenon is in its infancy and there is only patchy evidence to explain the underlying mechanisms of disease. Despite the evidence of increased stroke risk after LOE, LOE is managed primarily symptomatically in order to achieve seizure control.

Recent data also indicate that LOE can herald dementia, with significant intersection between Alzheimer’s disease (AD), CVD and LOE[4]. Additionally, there is overlap in

---

\(^1\) Abbreviations:
CVD = cerebrovascular disease
LOE = late onset epilepsy
AD = Alzheimer’s disease
MRI = magnetic resonance imaging
ICH = intracerebral haemorrhage
WML = white matter lesions
APOE = apolipoprotein E
MMSE = mini mental state exam
ARIC = Atherosclerosis Risk In Communities (Study)
OR = odds ratio
the pathophysiology of CVD and vascular dementia[5]. However, the nature of the relationship between dementia, CVD and LOE remains poorly defined.

A systematic review in 2014 identified several observational studies examining the relationship between LOE and CVD, whilst identifying a paucity of radiological studies[6]. Brigo et al.[6] used the term ‘heraldic seizure’ to refer to idiopathic new onset epilepsy occurring in patients over the age of 60, ‘heralding’ increased probability of subsequent stroke. This echoes earlier terminology such as ‘vascular precursor epilepsy’ coined by Barolin[3]. Since then, contemporary access to high quality magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and operationalisation of large epidemiological level digital databases, have provided further insights into the risk of stroke following the onset of LOE, and the mechanisms through which this might occur. Studies employing these two approaches, alongside others using observational clinical data, have been used to investigate the relationship between LOE and CVD in the current study.

2. METHODS

A systematic review was performed using PubMed to search the MedLine database for papers published from 2014 to August 2019, using the previous systematic review in 2014 and references from the identified paper set to identify papers of interest from before this point. Search terms were set out as below:

(((("late onset epilepsy"[All Fields] OR "late onset epileptic"[All Fields]) OR "late onset epileptic seizures"[All Fields]) OR "late onset seizures"[All Fields]) OR "late onset seizure"[All Fields]) AND "2014/08/24"[PDat] : "2019/08/22"[PDat])
OR ((("seizures"[All Fields] OR "epilepsy"[All Fields]) AND "late onset"[All Fields]) AND "2014/08/24"[PDat] : "2019/08/22"[PDat])

A similar search strategy was performed over a longer period of 15 years in order to confirm that this timeframe was suitably inclusive; no additional papers were found that had not already been identified.

Articles were filtered by hand based on relevance of the title and abstract. Relevant references from these papers were added to the pool (Figure 1). These have been included where they represent seminal work, or contribute to meta-analysis. Inclusion criteria encompassed studies involving adult onset epilepsy, and also adult onset seizures. Exclusion criteria included post-stroke seizure and studies involving paediatric subjects. PRISMA guidelines were adhered to as detailed in Table 2.

Of all studies, 5 constituted retrospective quantitative studies, examining odds of stroke in patients with late-onset seizure(s) and/or LOE patients, compared to a control population (Table 1). Meta-analysis to provide a combined odds ratio was performed using a random-effects model using RevMan systematic review software[7].

Ideally, papers would use the International League Against Epilepsy definition of epilepsy i.e. "a disease of the brain defined by any of the following conditions: (1) At least two unprovoked (or reflex) seizures occurring >24 h apart; (2) one unprovoked (or reflex) seizure and a probability of further seizures similar to the general recurrence risk (at least 60%) after two unprovoked seizures, occurring over the next 10 years; (3) diagnosis of an epilepsy syndrome"[8]. Most papers have used a 'pragmatic' definition in order to operationalise large data-sets, such as newly coded epileptic diagnosis, or
commencement of anticonvulsants in the context of a new diagnosis of 'seizure' or 'epilepsy', as described in Table 1.
3. RESULTS

3.1 Observational studies

Five case-control or cohort studies were identified comparing incidence of stroke in LOE to a control population; their properties are summarised in Table 1. Meta-analysis demonstrated that patients presenting with LOE experience an increased risk of subsequent stroke ((weighted odds ratio 3.88 (95% CI 2.76 - 5.46)) as shown in Figure 2 and Table 3.

This odds ratio appears to be stable across a range of follow up intervals and across geographically disparate populations. This effect was preserved when defining age of "late-onset" as early as 30 in the study by Chang et al[1].

Although several of these studies did not differentiate between ischaemic stroke and ICH in the reporting of stroke, where they were differentiated, there was a disproportionately high incidence of ICH [1].

4. Systematic Review

4.1 Systematic Review

LOE emerges from the literature as a distinct phenotype of epilepsy. Josephson et al.[9] identified key characteristics of LOE, including an absence of learning disorders or mental health issues, higher prevalence of focal seizures, and a lower prevalence of generalised tonic-clonic seizures. Although this phenotype is more common with increasing age, it first emerges in the 30s, with an increasing prevalence in the 40s and peak incidence in 60s and 70s[9]. Furthermore, there is evidence that LOE associated
with white matter lesions (WMLs) more frequently exhibits a phenotype of temporal lobe onset; whereas post-stroke seizures are more commonly associated with a frontal lobe focus[10]. The existence of a distinct LOE phenotype suggests that LOE is a different phenomenon to post-stroke epilepsy, or to younger onset epilepsy.

People with LOE are more likely to have risk factors for CVD. The Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) Study constituted a large, prospective, observational study of people at high risk of cardiovascular events. Through retrospective subset analysis, it was demonstrated that a number of CVD risk factors, including APOE ε4 allele, diabetes, hypertension and smoking, independently conveyed increased risk of developing LOE[11]. By contrast, exercise and low alcohol intake conveyed reduced risk of subsequent LOE[11]. Hypertension has previously been recognised to convey increased epilepsy risk[12]. One possible mechanism for this might be cerebral microangiopathy, although other direct mechanisms have been proposed, such as modulation of the renin-angiotensin-aldosterone axis[13]. Additionally, patients with LOE appear to have an increased risk of myocardial infarction, a disease which is associated with similar atherosclerotic risk factors[14]. The risk of LOE conveyed by CVD risk factors suggests a role for LOE as a marker of CVD.

Additionally, LOE may predict dementia. Costa et al.[15] studied prospectively the progression to dementia in a small cohort of 40 patients aged >55 years presenting with LOE. They observed a significantly increased rate of conversion to Alzheimer's Disease (AD) in the 3.5 years following onset of seizures, with a rate of 17.5% conversion to dementia (46% AD) compared to 0% in the control population, despite similar MMSE scores in case and control cohorts at the start of the study. Although seizures are often
a feature of late AD, there is previous work recognising that epilepsy can be a feature of mild-moderate AD[16]. Costa et al.[15] hypothesise that parenchymal beta-amyloid may be pro-epileptogenic; but this mechanism alone would not explain the excess cases of non-Alzheimer's dementia in LOE.

4.2 Radiological studies

Early studies did not identify reliable evidence of structural disease in LOE[17]. As MRI technique and interpretation has developed, there are several reports of structural brain changes in the context of LOE.

Observational studies show that LOE patients have an increased volume of white matter lesions (WML), which is recognised to reflect cerebral small vessel disease in the absence of another disease process[18]. This remains a robust finding across a number of validated scoring systems including Cardiovascular Health Study White Matter Grade and the Age Related White Matter Changes rating[19][20].

The highest grade of evidence is from the ARIC study[11,19]. Not only did ARIC demonstrate an association between a higher burden of WMLs on MRI and increased likelihood of later development of LOE, but regression analysis demonstrated that this effect persisted after adjusting for demographics and vascular risk factors even after censoring at the time of stroke or dementia. Lower total cortical volumes (as a proportion of total intracranial volume) in LOE patients were also observed in ARIC[19]. Furthermore, LOE was significantly associated with low individual volumes of the frontal, parietal or occipital regions in a cross-sectional sample population. As imaging
was only available for 28 cases, it is difficult to comment on the comparative volume loss in these cortical areas.

Imaging studies immediately following seizure provide valuable insight into the natural history of seizure on the microvasculature. Imaging 24-48 hours after seizure has been linked to MRI evidence of microhaemorrhage[21]. It is a question for further research whether seizures may prompt a vicious cycle, whereby areas of cerebrovascular damage continue to be disrupted by further seizure, through damage to the microvasculature. There is separate exploratory work using arterial spin labelling to examine microvascular perfusion in patients presenting with LOE[18], and also evidence that diffusion maybe altered in the frontotemporal areas, the brainstem and internal capsule in adult onset temporal lobe epilepsy[22]. These avenues of investigation may yield non-invasive methods of exploring the immediate sequelae of seizures.

5. DISCUSSION

We have performed the first meta-analysis of observational studies of stroke risk after the development of LOE and have found an increased risk of subsequent stroke (weighted OR 3.88 (95% CI 2.76 to 5.46)). Our systematic review has identified clinical and radiological evidence to support the premise that LOE is likely to reflect underlying cerebrovascular disease.

Whilst we have been able to calculate a weighted odds ratio for the relative risk of stroke after the onset of LOE, the determination of absolute stroke risk is more problematic. The study providing the best available estimate is based on the Rikkstroke
register[2], which estimates that between 9.8% and 11.9% of individuals with a new seizure or epilepsy diagnosis after 50 years of age will have a stroke in the subsequent decade. This apparent absolute risk of 10% or greater of stroke after a diagnosis of LOE should signal the need for greater attention to be paid to this issue. Not least, considerable efforts are still required to ensure optimal clinical recognition and diagnosis of LOE, which is notoriously challenging because of the nature of its presentation, which differs from younger onset epilepsy phenotypes, as identified above.

Currently, the focus in clinical practice is very much on symptomatic seizure control, rather than modifying the potential stroke risk. Before change in practice can be recommended, such as the widespread use of antiplatelet medication, important gaps in knowledge about LOE, its pathophysiology and natural history need to be addressed. Most studies did not for instance discriminate the pathological subtypes of incident stroke after LOE onset. One study described a disproportionately increased risk of ICH compared to ischaemic stroke [1]. Little is known, for instance, about the potential contribution of cerebral amyloid angiopathy (CAA); it is interesting that in the ARIC study[14] the APOE ε4 allele was found to be independently associated with increased LOE risk. The APOE ε4 allele is also associated with both CAA and AD.

It is important to note that the risk of subsequent disease after LOE is not confined to stroke: there are also convincing data emerging that there is also significantly increased risk of dementia. Furthermore, there is important evidence emerging that the risk of stroke, and possibly also dementia, is not confined to the population developing LOE in later life. More recent data indicate that there is significantly increased risk conferred by LOE, perhaps better termed “adult onset epilepsy”, even from the third or fourth
decades of life. For example, in one study, the effect size, in terms of the risk of stroke, was most pronounced in those developing epilepsy below the age of 39 (HR 8.88, 95% CI 5.71 to 13.82)[1]. In future it will be necessary to consider whether the concept of 'late-onset epilepsy' might need to be replaced by 'adult-onset epilepsy' for the purpose of considering risk of subsequent disease.

There is however considerable heterogeneity in the design of the included studies. LOE, for example, is variably defined, with 'late-onset' varying between 30 and 60 years of age. Additionally, the period of observation varied from 1 to 8 years. However, where outcomes have been documented at several time intervals, the hazard ratio remains stable across a range of observation periods[1]. Considerable variation between studies is also evidenced by the high $I^2$ index which indicates between-study variability in odds ratio and standard deviation of outcomes. Several studies employ epidemiological data derived from insurance records, or clinical coding.[1,23,24]. However, clinically coded data is dependent on the correct interpretation of clinical records, which can be variable and can undermine the integrity of subsequent analysis (particularly if stroke mimics are miscoded, e.g. postictal paresis miscoded as stroke)[25]. A weakness of the broadly defined 'late-onset epilepsy' is that some studies have included all adult onset seizures, including single seizures due to a variety of aetiologies encompassing acute symptomatic, alcohol related, and other causes. This exemplifies the challenges of utilising retrospectively collected data and again emphasises the need for prospectively collected dedicated data for the purpose of research into LOE. Nonetheless, evidence of a real relationship between LOE and stroke is all the stronger given its persistence despite the ‘noise’ of such heterogeneous studies and data sources.
Conventionally, epilepsy is regarded as arising from cortical regions. However, it is believed that disruption of networks, including as a result of subcortical changes as seen in cerebrovascular small vessel disease, may contribute to epileptogenesis. A number of qualitative studies have failed to demonstrate a significant difference in subcortical cerebrovascular disease as defined radiologically by white matter lesions (WMLs)[25]. However, when analysed quantitatively, there is evidence of increased WML burden in patients with LOE compared to controls[18]. Differences between findings might be partly due to the use of semi-quantitative WML measures (Fazekas and Scheltens scales), which may be insufficiently robust for reliable statistical analysis by comparison with quantitative measures. The role of WMLs is however still debated[26]. Some radiological studies suggest that LOE is associated with lower cortical volumes[19]. There is however insufficient evidence because of a lack of longitudinal imaging studies to comment on the temporal relationship, or the extent of causation, between subcortical cerebrovascular disease and cortical atrophy in LOE.

Abraira et al. present evidence which would support the hypothesis that specific areas of the brain may be involved in epileptogenesis in LOE. They report a greater degree of hippocampal atrophy among patients with LOE by comparison with healthy controls. It is clearly necessary for future work to investigate the relationships between cerebrovascular disease, global and regional atrophy, and LOE. Other areas needing to be addressed in future work include the proposed role of antiepileptic drugs and their effects on cerebrovascular risk[27][28].
6. CONCLUSION

LOE signals risk of stroke and dementia. In the young population, cerebral insults leading to epilepsy are arguably better defined than in LOE, where the phenotype and aetiology are different. A 'late-onset phenotype' appears to emerge from the third or fourth decade and increases in incidence thereafter. Aging is associated with a shift towards a greater burden of cerebrovascular and neurodegenerative pathology, and this is accompanied by LOE. LOE may represent a point of intervention to modify the risk of stroke and dementia, but considerable advances in knowledge of natural history and pathophysiology are needed, through prospective studies.

7. AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

A standardised and evidence-based definition for LOE, including age of onset, is clearly needed. Further research is needed to explore the underlying mechanisms of LOE due to CVD. The apparent excess of ICH in one study needs validation, and the potential for a relationship between CAA and LOE needs to be explored.

LEGEND

Figure 1: Flowchart of systematic review methodology.

Figure 2: Forest Plot of Meta-analysis of risk of stroke following late-onset epilepsy compared to control populations.
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Table 1: Properties of observational studies of stroke risk after late-onset epilepsy. Key: ICH - intracranial haemorrhage; SAH - subarachnoid haemorrhage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Control population</th>
<th>Case finding</th>
<th>Age of onset (year)</th>
<th>Years follow up</th>
<th>Type of stroke included</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Sources of Bias</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shinton et al. 1987</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>Non stroke admissions</td>
<td>Serial admissions with stroke</td>
<td>18+</td>
<td>Ever</td>
<td>SAH, ischaemic stroke, ICH</td>
<td>Newly commenced anticonvulsants with seizures, or recurrent witnessed seizure</td>
<td>Alcohol excess, metastatic cancer, previous stroke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary et al. 2004</td>
<td>9418</td>
<td>Randomly selected</td>
<td>Population study from GP records</td>
<td>60+</td>
<td>Median 3 yrs, 14 yrs max</td>
<td>Ischaemic stroke, ICH</td>
<td>First seizure or newly commenced anticonvulsant with epilepsy diagnosis</td>
<td>Using clinically coded GP data</td>
<td>Cerebrovascular disease, alcohol or drug misuse, dementia, acquired brain injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang et al. 2014</td>
<td>4087</td>
<td>All eligible from population data</td>
<td>Population study from national insurance data</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>11 yrs max (8 year data used)</td>
<td>Ischaemic, ICH</td>
<td>Newly diagnosed epilepsy or newly commenced anticonvulsants</td>
<td>High case: control ratio (1:4) Using clinically coded Insurance data</td>
<td>Did not remove epilepsy of clear aetiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wannamaker et al. 2015</td>
<td>37671</td>
<td>Uncomplicated lower limb fracture</td>
<td>Serial epilepsy from ED, outpatients and inpatient discharges</td>
<td>35-60</td>
<td>10 yrs</td>
<td>Using ICD: any</td>
<td>Coded with new diagnosis of 'epilepsy' or 'seizures'</td>
<td>Incidence of epilepsy with preceding stroke particularly striking in the age bracket 35 to 45 at first epilepsy diagnosis compared with controls in the same age group (20.7% vs. 8.0%, respectively)</td>
<td>Brain cancer or traumatic brain injury, conditions known to lead to either epilepsy or seizures, and controls with concomitant injuries to other parts of the body were excluded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zelano et al. 2017</td>
<td>3507613</td>
<td>Population level data ICD-10</td>
<td>National stroke registry</td>
<td>60+</td>
<td>3 days - 10 yrs prior</td>
<td>Ischaemic, ICH</td>
<td>Coded with first seizure or new epilepsy diagnosis</td>
<td>Did not exclude epilepsy of clear aetiology</td>
<td>High case:control ratio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Prisma Checklist for systematic review and meta-analysis[30].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/topic</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Checklist item</th>
<th>Reported on page #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured summary</td>
<td>2</td>
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Table 2: Summary of meta-analysis of stroke risk in late-onset epilepsy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or subgroup</th>
<th>Log (Odds Ratio)</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Late-onset Epilepsy (n)</th>
<th>Control (n)</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Odds Ratio (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shinton et al. 1987</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>8.33 (1.02, 67.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary et al. 2004</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>4709</td>
<td>4709</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>2.89 (1.43, 5.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang et al. 2014</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>3378</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>6.30 (5.30, 7.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wannamaker et al. 2015</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>21035</td>
<td>16636</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>2.64 (2.36, 2.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zelano et al. 2017</td>
<td>1.351</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>13948</td>
<td>3493665</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>3.86 (3.63, 4.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (95% CI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40677</td>
<td>3518564</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>3.88 (2.76, 5.46)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.10$, $\chi^2 = 74.64$, df=4 ($P < 0.00001$), $I^2 = 95$

Test for overall effect: $Z = 7.80$ ($P < 0.00001$)
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