OPEN

Efficacy and Safety of Topiramate for Essential Tremor A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials

Kuo-Hsuan Chang, MD, PhD, Shu-Hui Wang, MD, MS, and Ching-Chi Chi, MD, MMS, DPhil

Abstract: Essential tremor (ET) is the most common movement disorder that is frequently treated by propranolol or primidone. However, 30% of patients with ET do not respond to either propranolol or primidone. The objective of this study was to assess the efficacy and safety of topiramate for ET.

We searched the MEDLINE, EMBASE, and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials for relevant randomized controlled trials on the effects of topiramate for ET. A meta-analysis technique was applied to estimate the efficacy and safety of topiramate. The primary outcome was the change in the Fahn–Tolosa–Marin tremor rating scale (TRS). The secondary outcomes included the respective change in the location, motor tasks/function and function disability scores, and adverse events.

We included 3 randomized controlled trials with a total of 294 participants. Topiramate was significantly better than placebo in reducing TRS of patients with ET (mean difference [MD] -8.58, 95% confidence interval [CI] -15.46 to -1.70). Changes from the scales of upper limb tremor severity (MD -5.12, 95% CI -7.79 to -2.45), motor tasks/function (MD -5.07, 95% CI -7.12 to -3.03), and functional disability (MD -4.72, 95% CI -6.77 to -2.67) were significantly greater with topiramate than with placebo. More participants taking topiramate experienced adverse events leading to withdrawal than those taking placebo (risk difference 19%, 95% CI 11%-27%).

There is consistent evidence supporting the efficacy of topiramate in treating ET; however, a significant proportion of participants withdrew due to its adverse effects.

(Medicine 94(43):e1809)

Abbreviations: AE = adverse event, AMPA = 2-amino-3-(3-hydroxy-5-methyl-isoxazol-4-yl) propanoic acid, CI = confidence interval, ET = essential tremor, GABA = γ -aminobutyric acid, MD = mean difference, RCT = randomized controlled trial, RD = risk difference, TRS = Fahn–Tolosa–Marin tremor rating scale.

Editor: Sarah Mosaad.

Copyright © 2015 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. All rights reserved.

INTRODUCTION

E ssential tremor (ET) is the most common movement disorder, affecting about 5% of those age 60 years or older.¹ ET usually affects both upper extremities and may involve the head, lower limbs, neck, and voice.¹ A small amount of alcohol temporarily ameliorate the tremor,² frequently leading to excessive alcohol intake in ET patients.³ Propranolol and primidone are considered the first-line treatments for ET.^{4,5} However, it has been estimated that 30% of patients with ET do not respond to either propranolol or primidone.^{6–8} Propranolol may cause fatigue, muscle weakness, impotence, and sleep disorders. Propranolol is contraindicated in patients with asthma and heart block and has clinical interactions with other drugs frequently used by the elderly, such as digoxin, calcium channel blockers, and antiarrhythmics.⁹ Primidone causes dizziness. Its active metabolite, phenobarbital, interferes with the metabolism of many drugs including warfarin.⁹ Hence, there is a need for alternative treatment options for ET.

Topiramate is an anticonvulsant medication with several different mechanisms of action including enhancement of the γ -aminobutyric acid (GABA) activity, carbonic anhydrase inhibition, antagonism of 2-amino-3-(3-hydroxy-5-methylisoxazol-4-yl) propanoic acid (AMPA)/kainite receptors, and blockade of voltage-dependent calcium and sodium channels.¹⁰ Topiramate has been approved for use in epilepsy and migraine prophylaxis,^{11,12} though not for ET yet. Based on the limited data from clinical trials, topiramate may lead to significant tremor reduction and improved functional disability compared with placebo,^{13–16} and has been proposed as a potential treat-ment of ET.¹⁷ On the other hand, adverse effects, including concentration deficit, paresthesia, and nausea, were common in the patients treated with topiramate.¹⁸ A systemic review is thus needed to clarify the evident level of topiramate in treating ET. Herein, we conducted a systemic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) to evaluate the efficacy and safety of topiramate in treating ET.

METHODS

We searched the MEDLINE, EMBASE, and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials for relevant RCTs from inception to May 9, 2015. We used a search strategy that combined "topiramate" and "tremor." When searching the MEDLINE and EMBASE, we applied the RCT search filters devised by the Cochrane Collaboration.¹⁹ The complete search strategy is listed in the Supporting Information. The inclusion criteria of studies were RCTs that assessed the efficacy of topiramate in treating ET and reported useable data that could be extracted to assess the following outcomes. The primary outcome was the change in the overall score of the Fahn–Tolosa–Marin tremor rating scale (TRS).²⁰ The secondary outcomes were the respective change in the location, motor tasks/function, function disability subscales, and adverse events (AEs).

Received: July 25, 2015; revised: September 4, 2015; accepted: September 17, 2015.

From the College of Medicine, Chang Gung University (K-HC, C-CC); Department of Neurology, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Linkou, Taoyuan (K-HC); Department of Dermatology, Far Eastern Memorial Hospital, New Taipei (S-HW); and Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine and Department of Dermatology, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Chiayi, Taiwan (C-CC).

Correspondence: Ching-Chi Chi, Department of Dermatology, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Chiayi, 6, Sec West, Chia-Pu Rd, Puzih, Chiayi 61363, Taiwan (e-mail: chingchi@cgmh.org.tw).

The authors have no funding and conflicts of interest to disclose.

This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License 4.0, where it is permissible to download, share and reproduce the work in any medium, provided it is properly cited. The work cannot be changed in any way or used commercially.

ISSN: 0025-7974 DOI: 10.1097/MD.000000000001809

Two authors (KC and CC), who were not blinded to the names of authors and institutions, screened the search results and selected relevant trials independently. One author (CC) extracted data from the relevant trials and used the Cochrane Collaboration tool for assessing risk of bias to evaluate the quality of the included trials.¹⁹ Another author (KC) checked the data and quality assessment. Disagreement was resolved by discussion, with a third author available for arbitration (SW).

We conducted a meta-analysis to obtain the pooled intervention effect estimates. We expressed the estimates as mean difference (MD) and 95% confidence interval (CI) for continuous outcomes, and as risk difference (RD) and 95% CI for dichotomous outcomes. We calculated the I² statistic to assess the degree of statistical heterogeneity across the included trials. A fixe-model was applied when there was no or low heterogeneity (I² < 50%), while a random-effects model was applied when there was substantial heterogeneity (I² \geq 50%).¹⁹ We used the Review Manager 5.2 (The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, Copenhagen, Denmark, 2012) for meta-analysis.

This study used published data and thus ethical approval was not necessary.

RESULTS

Description of Studies

The PRISMA study flow chart is shown in Figure 1. A total of 117 records were identified from our search and 2 additional records were obtained after screening relevant reviews. Five RCTs were identified from these records. We selected studies that had assessed primary outcomes by TRS during the follow-up. One RCT was excluded owing to the lack of TRS assessment.¹⁵ The data of 1 RCT²¹ were repeatedly used in another publication;¹⁶ therefore, we only included the latter in this meta-analysis. A total of 3 RCTs with 294 participants met our inclusion criteria and were included.^{13,14,16} The characteristics of these included trials are shown in Table 1. All the included trials were of moderate quality when appraised by using the Cochrane Collaboration tool for assessing risk of bias in randomized trials (Figure 2).¹⁹

Efficacy

The efficacy estimates of topiramate in ET are presented in Figure 3. All 3 included trials reported the Fahn–Tolosa–Marin TRS overall score, 13,14,16 with 2 of them reporting the respective scores of the subscales. 14,16 When compared to placebo, topiramate had a significantly greater reduction in TRS overall score (MD –8.58, 95% CI –15.46 to –1.70, Figure 3A). Also, improvement with topiramate was greater than with placebo in all subscales. Changes from the subscale of upper limb tremor severity were significantly greater with topiramate than with placebo (MD –5.12, 95% CI –7.79 to –2.45, Figure 3B). Also, topiramate demonstrated a significant greater reduction in the subscales of motor tasks/function (MD –5.07, 95% CI –7.12 to –3.03, Figure 3C) and functional disability (MD –4.72, 95% CI –6.77 to –2.67, Figure 3D) than placebo.

Safety

Two included trials reported data on AEs,^{14,16} but the other included trial did not.¹³ The safety data are presented in Figure 4. When compared to participants taking placebo, a higher proportion of those taking topiramate withdrew from treatments due



FIGURE 1. PRISMA study flow chart.

to AEs (RD 19%, 95% CI 11%–27%, Figure 4A). The following AEs were more frequently reported by participants taking topiramate than those taking placebo: paresthesia (RD 18%, 95% CI 11%–24%, Figure 4B), taste perversion (RD 16%, 95% CI 10%– 23%, Figure 4C), concentration/attention difficulty (RD 13%, 95% CI 4%–22%, Figure 4D) decreased appetite (RD 9%, 95% CI 4%–15%, Figure 4E), memory difficulty (RD 8%, 95% CI 4%–13%, Figure 4F). We found no significant differences between participants taking topiramate and those taking placebo as to the frequency of other AEs such as weight loss, nausea, headache, dizziness, thirst, and upper respiratory tract infection (data not shown).

Study Author, Publication Year	Participants	Interventions	Outcomes	Notes		
Publication Year Connor et al, 2008 ¹⁶ Ondo et al, 2006 ¹⁴	62 Patients with symptomatic essential tremor involving the hands, head, or voice according to the criteria of the Tremor Investigation Group	Topiramate (400 mg/ day or maximum tolerated dose) or placebo for 10 weeks	Fahn-Tolosa-Marin Tremor Rating Scale (TRS) overall score. Respective scores of location, motor tasks/function, and function disability subscales. Adverse events	Setting: University Medical Centers. Country: US. Funding source: Ortho- McNeil Neurologics, Inc.		
Ondo et al, 2006 ¹⁴	208 Patients with moderate to severe essential tremor of the upper limbs as defined by the Tremor Investigation Group	Topiramate (400 mg/ day or maximum tolerated dose) or placebo for 24 weeks	TRS overall score. Respective scores of location, motor tasks/ function, and function disability subscales. Adverse events	Setting: University Medical Centers. Country: US. Funding source: Ortho- McNeil Neurologics. Inc.		
Carrasco Vargas et al, 2011 ¹³	24 Patients with essential tremor in the hands or arms according to the criteria of the Tremor Investigation Group	Topiramate (200 mg/ day or maximum tolerated dose) or placebo for 15 days	TRS overall score	Setting: Medical Center. Country: Spain. Funding source: Not reported.		

TABLE 1. Characteristics of Included Trials

DISCUSSION

The present study found consistent evidence showing that topiramate significantly improved ET, including upper extremity tremor severity, motor task performance, and functional disability. These data support topiramate as an alternative therapeutic option in patients with ET that are unresponsive or who were intolerant to propranolol or primidone. However, the adverse effects of topiramate, including paresthesia, taste



FIGURE 2. Risk of bias of included trials (green refers to low risk of bias, yellow for unclear, and red for high risk of bias).

perversion, and concentration/attention difficulty, decreased appetite and memory difficulty, led to withdrawal of treatment, raising the concern of tolerability in treating ET with topiramate.

The observed efficacy of topiramate in treating ET could be explained by one of the proposed mechanisms of action of topiramate, such as modulation of GABA_A receptors.²² ET may be caused by a deficiency in the α 1-subunit of the GABA_A receptor, as demonstrated in a knockout model in mice.²³ This animal model overlaps, in some clinical characteristics, with ET in humans, and it seems likely that the model reflects the inherited pathophysiologic processes, where there is a loss of inhibitory neurotransmission by cerebellar Purkinje cells.²³ This mechanism elucidates that a dysfunction in the cerebellar GABAergic system in ET, while topiramate could treat ET via enhancement of this GABAergic neurotransmission.

On the other hand, our study revealed an increased risk of development of AEs, such as sensory changes (paresthesia or taste perversion), cognitive dysfunction (impaired attention, concentration, or memory), or decreased appetite, in the ET participants taking topiramate. Paresthesia or taste perversion induced by topiramate may be related to its carbonic anhydrase inhibition.¹⁸ Increased metabolic activities following high-frequency neuronal firings result in an increase in the intracellular concentration of bicarbonate.²⁴ Given the excitatory effect of bicarbonate, it is possible that the inhibition of carbonic anhydrase ameliorates the neuronal excitation. In addition, the ability of topiramate to inhibit carbonic anhydrase is also supposed to be related to the activation of hyperpolarizing K^+ conductance and then enhance the electrical stabilization of neurons.²⁵ As a leading cause of drug withdrawal,²⁶ topiramate-induced cognitive dysfunction is an important adverse effect that affects the tolerability of drug compliance. Neuroimaging studies have demonstrated a significant GABAergic potentiation with topiramate,^{27,28} which may disturb cognitive function by inhibitory enhancement.²⁹⁻

³¹ The suppression of appetite by topiramate drives its use in eating disorders.³² It has been shown that stimulation of the lateral hypothalamus by AMPA/kainite agonist causes an intense rapid dose-dependent increase in food intake.³³ Thus suppression of AMPA/kainite receptor by topiramate might contribute to decreased appetite. However, this appetite suppression in the patients with ET seemed not to result in the weight reduction, which is reported in the trials of topiramate for other diseases.^{34,35}

	Topiramate Placebo							Mean Difference	Mean Difference				
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	I IV. Random. 95% CI				
Connor 2008	-6.2	7.0866	62	-1.3	7.0866	62	33.3%	-4.90 [-7.39, -2.41]					
Ondo 2006	-10.8	9.5	108	-5.8	7.5	100	33.5%	-5.00 [-7.32, -2.68]	i —				
Vargas 2011	-15.75	4.49	12	0.17	1.59	12	33.1%	-15.92 [-18.61, -13.23]	i				
Total (95% CI)			182			174	100.0%	-8.58 [-15.46, -1.70]					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	35.35; C	hi ² = 45.5	64, df =	2 (P <)	0.00001);	² = 96	%						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.44	(P = 0.01)						Favours topiramate Favours placebo				
A Location													
	То	piramate	e		Placebo			Mean Difference	Mean Difference				
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Tota	Mean	S	D Tota	al Weigh	t IV, Fixed, 95% CI	I IV, Fixed, 95% CI				
Connor 2008	-8.7	11.0236	62	-2.3	10.236	2 6	2 50.8%	-6.40 [-10.14, -2.66]	1				
Ondo 2006	-12.7	14.8	108	-8.9	13.	2 10	0 49.2%	-3.80 [-7.61, 0.01]	i 🖣				
Total (95% CI)	170					16	2 100.0%	0.0% -5.12 [-7.79, -2.45]					
Heterogeneity: Chi2 =	0.91, df =	= 1 (P = 0).34); l ²	= 0%					100 50 0 50 10				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.76	(P = 0.0	002)						Favours topiramate Favours placebo				
B Motor task	s/fur	oction											
Witter dash													
Caudu as Cubasaus	Magn	piramat	Tatal	Maar	lacebo	Tetal	Malakt	Mean Difference	Mean Difference				
Gamma 2000	Mean	7.074	Total	Mean	7 074	Total	F4 00%	1001757 0.001	IV, FIXEd, 35% CI				
Connor 2008	-4.9	1.874	62	-0.1	1.8/4	62	54.3%	-4.80 [-7.57, -2.03]					
Ondo 2006	-10.3	12.6	108	-4.9	9.5	100	45.7%	-5.40 [-8.42, -2.38]					
Total (95% CI)			170			162	100.0%	-5.07 [-7.12, -3.03]	•				
Heterogeneity: Chi2 =	0.08, df	= 1 (P =	0.77);	12 = 0%									
Test for overall effect	: Z = 4.8	7 (P < 0.	00001)					-100 -50 0 50 100				
С		1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1							Favours topiramate Favours placebo				
11 Aug 11 Aug 12 Aug	2000	0.2020											

TRS overall score:

Functional disability

	Topiramate			Placebo				Mean Difference	Mean Difference				
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI		IV, F	ixed. 95°	%CI	
Connor 2008	-6.1	7.874	62	-2.2	7.874	62	54.7%	-3.90 [-6.67, -1.13]					
Ondo 2006	-9.4	13.3	108	-3.7	8.8	100	45.3%	-5.70 [-8.74, -2.66]			•		
Total (95% CI)			170			162	100.0%	-4.72 [-6.77, -2.67]			•		
Heterogeneity: Chi2 =	0.73, df	= 1 (P =	0.39);	l ² = 0%					100	50		1	100
Test for overall effect	Z = 4.51	(P < 0)	00001)	E.					Favour	-ou s topiram	ate Fav	ours plac	ebo

FIGURE 3. Efficacy of topiramate in treating essential tremor.

In addition to ET, topiramate is applied to the treatment of migraine,¹² epilepsy,¹¹ and diabetic neuropathy.³⁶ A few well-known complications of topiramate, such as visual events,³⁷ renal calculi,³⁸ and word finding difficulties,^{39,40} were identified in the trial focusing on these disorders. Ciliochoroidal effusion syndrome, uveitis, and visual field defects were reported in the patients with migraine or epilepsy receiving topiramate treatment.³⁷ The exact mechanism by which topiramate triggers these visual events is not completely understood. Most studies on topiramate and renal calculi are reported from epileptic patients.^{41,42} The majority of renal stones reported with topiramate are calcium phosphate or calcium oxalate,^{43,44} which is believed to be due to renal tubular acidosis by inhibition of carbonic anhydrase type II and IV in the proximal and distal renal tubules.^{45,46} Word-finding difficulties have been described in epileptic and migrainous patients treated with topiramate.^{39,40} The asymmetry of neurotransmitter systems may explain the greater susceptibility of language areas to

antiepileptic drugs containing sulfhydryl residues such as topiramate and zonisamide.⁴⁷ As a CYP3A4 inducer, topiramate may accelerate the hepatic elimination of oral contraceptives.⁴⁸ Female patients taking topiramate may at risks of contraceptive failure and unintended pregnancy. These adverse effects need to be attended in topiramate-treated patients with ET as well.

The interpretation of this meta-analysis may be constrained by publication bias, methodological rigor of the included trials, and statistical accuracy. It is possible that only studies showing a benefit in treating ET with topiramate have been published. However, we could not assess the publication bias by funnel plot because only 3 trials were included.¹⁹ The different treatment dosages (maximum dose: 400 mg in 2 trials,^{14,16} 200 mg in the other trial)¹³ and experimental duration (24 weeks,¹⁴ 10 weeks,¹⁶ and 15 days)¹⁶ may have affected the estimates of treatment effects. Since this is a meta-analysis of study-level data (instead of an individual patient data metaanalysis), we were unable to adjust for confounding variables.

Copyright © 2015 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. All rights reserved.

Adverse events leading to requiring withdrawal Topiramate Placebo **Risk Difference Risk Difference** Study or Subgroup Events Total Events Total Weight M-H, Fixed, 95% CI M-H. Fixed 95% Cl Connor 2008 55 50 32.2% 0.14 [-0.00, 0.28] 13 5 Ondo 2006 36 116 10 105 67.8% 0.22 [0.11, 0.32] 0.19 [0.11, 0.27] Total (95% CI) 171 155 100.0% Total events 49 15 Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.80, df = 1 (P = 0.37); I² = 0% -1 -0.5 0 0.5 Test for overall effect: Z = 4.53 (P < 0.00001) Favours topiramate Favours placebo A Paresthesia Topiramate Placebo **Risk Difference Risk Difference** Study or Subgroup Events Total Events Total Weight M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl M-H. Fixed. 95% Cl 0.15 10.05. 0.241 Connor 2008 10 62 36.0% 62 Ondo 2006 116 105 64.0% 0.19 [0.11, 0.28] 28 5 Total (95% CI) 167 100.0% 0.18 [0.11, 0.24] 178 Total events 38 6 Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.55, df = 1 (P = 0.46); l² = 0% -1 -0.5 0.5 Test for overall effect: Z = 5.22 (P < 0.00001) Favours topiramate Favours placebo B Taste perversion **Risk Difference Risk Difference** Topiramate Placebo M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Study or Subgroup Events Total Events Total Weight Ondo 2006 19 116 0 105 100.0% 0.16 [0.10, 0.23] Total (95% CI) 116 105 100.0% 0.16 [0.10, 0.23] Total events 19 0 Heterogeneity: Not applicable -0.5 0 0.5 Test for overall effect: Z = 4.67 (P < 0.00001) Favours topiramate Favours placebo C Concentration/attention difficulty Topiramate Placebo **Risk Difference Risk Difference** Study or Subgroup Events Total Events Total Weight M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl Connor 2008 62 62 100.0% 0.13 [0.04, 0.22] 8 0 Total (95% CI) 100.0% 0.13 [0.04, 0.22] 62 62 Total events 8 0 Heterogeneity: Not applicable -1 -0.5 Ó 0.5 Test for overall effect: Z = 2.90 (P = 0.004) Favours placebo Favours topiramate D Decreased appetite **Risk Difference** Topiramate Placebo **Risk Difference** Study or Subgroup Events Total **Events Total Weight** M-H. Fixed, 95% Cl M-H, Fixed, 95% C Connor 2008 62 0 10 10 02 0 181 6 0 62 36.0% Ondo 2006 116 105 64.0% 0.09 [0.02, 0.16] 14 3 Total (95% CI) 178 167 100.0% 0.09 [0.04, 0.15] Total events 20 3 Heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.01, df = 1 (P = 0.93); l² = 0% .1 -0.5 0 0.5 Test for overall effect: Z = 3.55 (P = 0.0004) Favours topiramate Favours placebo E Memory difficulty Placebo **Risk Difference Risk Difference** Topiramate Study or Subgroup M-H, Fixed, 95% CI M-H, Fixed. 95% Cl Events Total Events Total Weight Connor 2008 36.0% 0.05 [-0.02, 0.12] 4 62 62 Ondo 2006 13 116 105 64.0% 0.10 [0.04. 0.16] Total (95% CI) 167 100.0% 0.08 [0.04, 0.13] 178 Total events 17 Heterogeneity: Chi2 = 1.38, df = 1 (P = 0.24); I2 = 27% -1 -0.5 0 05 Test for overall effect: Z = 3.55 (P = 0.0004) Favours topiramate Favours placebo F



Nevertheless, the baseline characteristics of those taking topiramate and placebo across the 3 included trials were comparable. Topiramate has not been compared to propranolol or to primidone in treating ET. Therefore, the comparative effectiveness of topiramate is unknown.

CONCLUSIONS

This meta-analysis included 3 RCTs consistently demonstrating the efficacy of topiramate in treating ET, but also revealing a high risk of adverse effects that may lead to withdrawals. Further studies using more statistically sophisticated methods may be able to more precisely explore the effect and the optimal dose of topiramate in treating ET. Head-to-head trials comparing topiramate with propranolol or to primidone are needed to obtain their comparative effectiveness.

REFERENCES

- 1. Louis ED. Clinical practice. Essential tremor. N Engl J Med. 2001;345:887–891.
- Growdon JH, Shahani BT, Young RR. The effect of alcohol on essential tremor. *Neurology*. 1975;25:259–262.
- Schroeder D, Nasrallah HA. High alcoholism rate in patients with essential tremor. Am J Psychiatry. 1982;139:1471–1473.
- Chen JJ, Swope DM. Essential tremor: diagnosis and treatment. *Pharmacotherapy*. 2003;23:1105–1122.
- Lyons KE, Pahwa R, Comella CL, et al. Benefits and risks of pharmacological treatments for essential tremor. *Drug Saf.* 2003;26:461–481.
- Diaz NL, Louis ED. Survey of medication usage patterns among essential tremor patients: movement disorder specialists vs. general neurologists. *Parkinsonism Relat Disord*. 2010;16: 604–607.
- Findley LJ, Cleeves L, Calzetti S. Primidone in essential tremor of the hands and head: a double blind controlled clinical study. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 1985;48:911–915.
- Koller WC, Vetere-Overfield B. Acute and chronic effects of propranolol and primidone in essential tremor. *Neurology*. 1989;39:1587–1588.
- Hansten PD, Horn JR. Hansten and Horn Managing Clinically Important Drug Interactions. 2003; Facts & Comparisons.
- White HS. Mechanism of action of newer anticonvulsants. J Clin Psychiatry. 2003;64(Suppl 8):5–8.
- Reife R, Pledger G, Wu SC. Topiramate as add-on therapy: pooled analysis of randomized controlled trials in adults. *Epilepsia*. 2000;41(Suppl 1):S66–S71.
- Linde M, Mulleners WM, Chronicle EP, et al. Topiramate for the prophylaxis of episodic migraine in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2013;6:CD010610.
- Carrasco Vargas H, Castellanos Rodriguez J, Aceves Rodriguez R. Prospective double blind study of the use of topiramato vs. placebo in the treatment of essential tremor. *Neurol Neurocir Psiquiatr*. 2011;44:1–5.
- Ondo WG, Jankovic J, Connor GS, et al. Topiramate in essential tremor: a double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Neurology*. 2006;66:672–677.
- Frima N, Grunewald RA. A double-blind, placebo-controlled, crossover trial of topiramate in essential tremor. *Clin Neuropharmacol*. 2006;29:94–96.
- Connor GS, Edwards K, Tarsy D. Topiramate in essential tremor: findings from double-blind, placebo-controlled, crossover trials. *Clin Neuropharmacol.* 2008;31:97–103.
- Zesiewicz TA, Elble RJ, Louis ED, et al. Evidence-based guideline update: treatment of essential tremor: report of the Quality Standards Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. *Neurology*. 2011;77:1752–1755.
- Silberstein SD. Topiramate in migraine prevention. *Headache*. 2005;45(Suppl 1):S57–S65.
- Higgins JPT, Green S. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell; 2008.
- 20. Watts R, Koller W. Movement Disorders: Neurologic Principles and Practice New York: McGraw-Hill; 1995.

- Connor GS. A double-blind placebo-controlled trial of topiramate treatment for essential tremor. *Neurology*. 2002;59:132–134.
- White HS. Comparative anticonvulsant and mechanistic profile of the established and newer antiepileptic drugs. *Epilepsia*. 1999;40(Suppl 5):S2–S10.
- Kralic JE, Criswell HE, Osterman JL, et al. Genetic essential tremor in gamma-aminobutyric acidA receptor alpha1 subunit knockout mice. J Clin Invest. 2005;115:774–779.
- 24. Lee J, Taira T, Pihlaja P, et al. Effects of CO2 on excitatory transmission apparently caused by changes in intracellular pH in the rat hippocampal slice. *Brain Res.* 1996;706:210–216.
- Herrero AI, Del Olmo N, Gonzalez-Escalada JR, et al. Two new actions of topiramate: inhibition of depolarizing GABA(A)-mediated responses and activation of a potassium conductance. *Neuropharmacology*. 2002;42:210–220.
- Tatum WOt, French JA, Faught E, et al. Postmarketing experience with topiramate and cognition. *Epilepsia*. 2001;42:1134–1140.
- Kuzniecky R, Hetherington H, Ho S, et al. Topiramate increases cerebral GABA in healthy humans. *Neurology*. 1998;51:627–629.
- Kuzniecky R, Ho S, Pan J, et al. Modulation of cerebral GABA by topiramate, lamotrigine, and gabapentin in healthy adults. *Neurology*. 2002;58:368–372.
- Gomer B, Wagner K, Frings L, et al. The influence of antiepileptic drugs on cognition: a comparison of levetiracetam with topiramate. *Epilepsy Behav.* 2007;10:486–494.
- Jansen JF, Aldenkamp AP, Marian Majoie HJ, et al. Functional MRI reveals declined prefrontal cortex activation in patients with epilepsy on topiramate therapy. *Epilepsy Behav.* 2006;9:181–185.
- Kockelmann E, Elger CE, Helmstaedter C. Significant improvement in frontal lobe associated neuropsychological functions after withdrawal of topiramate in epilepsy patients. *Epilepsy Res.* 2003;54:171–178.
- McElroy SL, Hudson JI, Capece JA, et al. Topiramate for the treatment of binge eating disorder associated with obesity: a placebo-controlled study. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2007;61:1039–1048.
- 33. Stanley BG, Ha LH, Spears LC, et al. Lateral hypothalamic injections of glutamate, kainic acid, D,L-alpha-amino-3-hydroxy-5methyl-isoxazole propionic acid or N-methyl-D-aspartic acid rapidly elicit intense transient eating in rats. *Brain Res.* 1993;613:88–95.
- Klein KM, Theisen F, Knake S, et al. Topiramate, nutrition and weight change: a prospective study. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2008;79:590–593.
- Reiter E, Feucht M, Hauser E, et al. Changes in body mass index during long-term topiramate therapy in paediatric epilepsy patients-a retrospective analysis. *Seizure*. 2004;13:491–493.
- Jay GW, Barkin RL. Neuropathic pain: etiology, pathophysiology, mechanisms, and evaluations. *Dis Mon.* 2014;60:6–47.
- Abtahi MA, Abtahi SH, Fazel F, et al. Topiramate and the vision: a systematic review. *Clin Ophthalmol.* 2012;6:117–131.
- Jion YI, Raff A, Grosberg BM, et al. The risk and management of kidney stones from the use of topiramate and zonisamide in migraine and idiopathic intracranial hypertension. *Headache*. 2015;55:161–166.
- Mula M, Trimble MR, Thompson P, et al. Topiramate and wordfinding difficulties in patients with epilepsy. *Neurology*. 2003;60:1104–1107.
- Coppola F, Rossi C, Mancini ML, et al. Language disturbances as a side effect of prophylactic treatment of migraine. *Headache*. 2008;48:86–94.
- Shorvon SD. Safety of topiramate: adverse events and relationships to dosing. *Epilepsia*. 1996;37(Suppl 2):S18–S22.
- Maalouf NM, Langston JP, Van Ness PC, et al. Nephrolithiasis in topiramate users. Urol Res. 2011;39:303–307.

- Dell'Orto VG, Belotti EA, Goeggel-Simonetti B, et al. Metabolic disturbances and renal stone promotion on treatment with topiramate: a systematic review. Br J Clin Pharmacol. 2014;77:958–964.
- 44. Kaplon DM, Penniston KL, Nakada SY. Patients with and without prior urolithiasis have hypocitraturia and incident kidney stones while on topiramate. *Urology*. 2011;77:295–298.
- Nagai R, Kooh SW, Balfe JW, et al. Renal tubular acidosis and osteopetrosis with carbonic anhydrase II deficiency: pathogenesis of impaired acidification. *Pediatr Nephrol.* 1997;11:633–636.
- Welch BJ, Graybeal D, Moe OW, et al. Biochemical and stone-risk profiles with topiramate treatment. Am J Kidney Dis. 2006;48:555–563.
- Ojemann LM, Ojemann GA, Dodrill CB, et al. Language disturbances as side effects of topiramate and zonisamide therapy. *Epilepsy Behav.* 2001;2:579–584.
- Rosenfeld WE, Doose DR, Walker SA, et al. Effect of topiramate on the pharmacokinetics of an oral contraceptive containing norethindrone and ethinyl estradiol in patients with epilepsy. *Epilepsia*. 1997;38:317–323.