

Needs for aids and equipment for the management of epilepsy in an Australian cohort

Chris L Peterson^{ae} Honor Coleman^{bce} Christine Walker^{de}

^a School of Humanities and Social Sciences, La Trobe University, Bundoora, Australia
c.peterson@latrobe.edu.au

^b School of Psychological Sciences, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia
hcoleman@epilepsyfoundation.org.au

^c Department of Neuroscience, Faculty of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences, Monash
University, Melbourne, Australia

^d Chronic Illness Alliance, Moonee Ponds, Australia cwalker@chronicillness.org.au

^e Epilepsy Foundation, Surrey Hills, Victoria, Australia

*Corresponding author

CL Peterson

La Trobe University, Australia

c.peterson@latrobe.edu.au

Needs for aids and equipment for the management of epilepsy in an Australian cohort

Abstract

Aim This paper investigates the bases of needs for a range of epilepsy aids and equipment and expressed concerns about the use of such devices.

Method There was a 29.6% response rate (n=393 of 1,328) to Wave 4 of the Australian Epilepsy Longitudinal Study (AELS). The focus of Wave 4 was on the expressed needs and affordability of aids and equipment for people with epilepsy (PWE), and quality of life (QoL). Quantitative analysis was used to examine the association between self-reported need for aids and equipment, sociodemographic information and QoL. Open-ended responses were subject to qualitative analysis.

Results Approximately one fifth of the sample felt they needed specific aids, including emergency ID bracelets, seizure alarms and seizure monitors. Those respondents who felt they needed aids had more frequent seizures, had been recently injured by a seizure and were less prosperous. The QoL of those in need of equipment was lower than for those who felt they did not need it. Qualitative analysis revealed a need for more information about the aids available, issues associated with affordability, and some concern about the utility of these aids for those who lived alone.

Discussion Much research to date has focussed on the development and validation of devices for PWE, and standards for testing. Fewer studies deal with the needs and experiences of PWE with regards to the use of such equipment. The development of these devices needs to ensure patient comfort and acceptability. In addition, there is a need to canvas the views of family, caregivers and primary care providers on the useability of epilepsy aids and equipment.

Conclusion Further person-centred research is needed in assessing the need for and usability of aids and equipment for the management of epilepsy.

Keywords

Aids and equipment; Needs; Affordability; Quality of Life

1. Introduction

Epilepsy is a neurological condition characterised by recurrent and unpredictable seizures, which the World Health Organisation reports affects approximately 50 million people worldwide [1]. Unpredictability in epilepsy remains one of the most distressing factors for people with epilepsy (PWE) in the community, due to the associated anxiety, as well as increased risk of injury and other vulnerabilities [2]. In order to assist in the management of risks associated with seizures, a number of different aids and equipment have been brought onto the market over the years [3]. We define aids and equipment as those items and assistive technologies designed to improve the ability to predict seizures, and increase safety in epilepsy in the event of a seizure. These include seizure alert devices, anti-suffocation pillows and seizure dogs.

Over recent years, there has been a steady increase in the development and examination of the efficacy and quality of devices. A recent systemic review of the evidence for seizure detection devices pointed towards a paucity of studies in this area [4]. No single device could accurately predict all seizures and there are ongoing difficulties predicting and/or detecting focal seizures. Wearable devices were typically rated highly for use by PWE and for seizure detection, whereas less common aids such as seizure dogs show mixed efficacy for seizure prediction [4]. As such, current research indicates that the effectiveness and useability of seizure detection devices is still in the relatively early stages. Beyond devices for seizure detection, useful aids and equipment for the management of epilepsy include anti-suffocation pillows, intended to reduce the risk of SUDEP or suffocation following a nocturnal seizure, as well as home alterations such as double-hinged doors to increase ease-of-access for support persons in the event of a seizure.

Despite a recent surge in interest in seizure detection and the development of useful devices, there has been little systematic examination of the views of PWE with regards to the aids and equipment available to them [2]. Focussing on the human side of technological advances has been argued to be a key requirement of the process of testing and evaluating new devices, with acceptance and comfort of devices by PWE critical to their successful uptake [5]. Understanding if, how and why PWE use aids and equipment for the management of their epilepsy can direct research towards the development of tools that are more likely to have real-world benefits.

Schulz-Bonhage et al. [6] consulted patients with uncontrolled epilepsy in Germany and Portugal and concluded that the devices available on the market at that time would need to

improve in their predictive effectiveness to meet safety and wearability expectations of users. A more recent study examining patient, caregiver and health care professionals' views of remote health management technology (including internet and smart phone apps and seizure detection devices) identified a number of common experiences [6]. Namely, over half of the PWE did not own any wearable devices, but many (>60%) were interested in them. This interest was not dependent on age, gender, seizure type or frequency. PWE were interested in the benefits of increased knowledge of their epilepsy for self-management, as well as for sharing with healthcare professionals and for altering relatives in the event of an emergency [7].

This early research into understanding the perspectives of PWE on the devices, aids and equipment available to them is a critical part of the process of technology development. The current study seeks to further extend upon this work by gaining an understanding of the mix of factors involved in PWE's need for aids and equipment, including affordability, and quality of life (QoL) in relation to self-reported ability to access important aids and equipment. This aim was investigated via a mixed methodology, utilising both quantitative and qualitative data in order to gain an understanding of the perspectives of PWE with regards to their knowledge of relevant aids and circumstances affecting their use.

2. Method

2.1 Participants

As part of the Australian Epilepsy Longitudinal Survey (AELS), participants are sent survey 'Waves' approximately every three years, with previous waves conducted in 2006, 2010, and 2013. In 2016/17, 393 or 29.6% self-selecting participants from the Australian Epilepsy Research Register (AERR) completed the Wave 4 survey. This included 355 (91.3%) who identified as a person with epilepsy >18 years and 34 (8.7%) who identified as the parent or caregiver of someone with epilepsy <18 years. Given the focus on QoL as measured by a self-report instrument, and due to the small numbers, information relating to those under the age of 18 years was excluded from the current study. The majority (70.2%) identified as living in urban areas and were also predominantly from Victoria, Australia. (61.8%).

Participation is voluntary and all participants provided informed consent in line with the Declaration of Helsinki. Ethics approval was gained from Deakin University Human Ethics (2013 – 011).

2.2 Wave 4 Survey

A questionnaire was distributed to participants of the AERR, either in hardcopy or online (Survey Monkey) in 2016/17. For each Wave of the AELS, information is obtained on sociodemographic, epilepsy diagnosis, seizure information and treatment, QoL, as well as participants' perspectives on living with epilepsy. For the purposes of the current study, self-reported prosperity was judged according to participant response regarding whether they feel they are: "prosperous", "very comfortable", "reasonably comfortable", "just getting along", "poor", or "very poor". A particular focus for Wave 4 was on collecting information on the experiences of utilising services and equipment for the treatment and management of epilepsy. Previous publications from Wave 4 have detailed participant experiences of Emergency Department and need for services at first diagnosis [8].

The survey instrument had the following sections:

Sociodemographic information (12 questions); Living with epilepsy (23 questions) Quality of life (31 questions) Access to treatment and medical care (7 questions); Needs and services for epilepsy (15 questions). The current study set out to examine participant experiences with the aids and equipment listed in Table 1. This included forced choice questions about whether participants; (i) needed but did not have the relevant equipment, (ii) needed but could not afford the equipment, as well as (iii) reasons for the difficulty in accessing aids and equipment. Open-ended questions also allowed participants to elaborate on the equipment they needed. Twenty-one participants responded to the open-ended questions, and this data was used for the qualitative analysis. Further information on the survey questions can be found in Supplementary Figure 2. .

Table 1. Information on the aids/ devices included in the survey

Aid/ Device	Information
Emergency ID bracelet	A tag outlining the epilepsy condition on a medical bracelet which can help in the case of an emergency. Various prices starting from AUD\$8.
Seizure alarm	There are a number of devices to provide a seizure alarm. Some of these may be worn or attached to a bed., Prices may be up to AUD\$880 There are a number of apps available also, mostly free of charge.
Seizure monitor	A device that detects seizures. These can include a bed sensor; a video-based movement detection system; a wearable device detecting falls; a smart watch, and others. Starting purchase price from approx. AUD\$400.
Anti-suffocation pillow	Pillows manufactured to help an individual stay in a safe and secure sleeping position, with layering in the pillow designed to ensure breathability. Cost from AUD\$145
Emergency door hinges	These are double hinges for doors so that they can be opened either way in case something is blocking the doorway.
Other (e.g., lifting aids)	A range of devices that may help to increase safety around the home.

Note. This information is provided for publication only. Participants were provided with the name of the aid/ equipment only.

2.2.1 *Quality of Life*

The Quality of Life in Epilepsy-31 Items (QOLIE-31), a well-established measure of QoL specifically in PWE, was also included in Wave 4. The QOLIE-31, an abbreviated version of the QOLIE-89, includes subscales focussing on the impact of epilepsy on important areas of physical (effects of medication, energy/fatigue and cognitive functioning), social (work, driving and social restrictions) and psychological/ emotional functioning (seizure worry, overall QoL, and emotional well-being). Higher scores reflect better QoL. The overall QOLIE-31 and sub-scales have been reported to demonstrate good internal consistency and test-retest reliability [9].

2.3 *Data analysis*

Quantitative analyses were undertaken with the statistical package SPSS Version 24 (IBM Corp. 2016, NY). For categorical and ordinal data (presented in Table 2), correlational analysis is undertaken using Cramer's V and Gamma. Where continuous data such as QoL is used (see Table 3) t – tests are used. In both cases significance <.05 is used. Effect sizes (Cohen's d) have

also been presented. Missing data was excluded listwise from each analysis, with further details of missing (n) reported in Table 3.

For the qualitative analysis, open-ended responses of 33 respondents were analysed using a thematic approach. An explicit thematic approach was chosen, which aims to classify data into meaningful and relevant categories based on the assumption that an understanding of participant experiences can be ‘explicitly’ identified in their responses [10, 11]. Data was first coded inductively, line-by-line by HC. Common themes were then sought within and between codes. Thematic saturation is considered to have occurred when examination of the responses does not reveal any further themes. Consensus on final themes was then reached through discussion among the researchers (CP, HC & CW).

3. Results


3.1 Participant demographics

Mean age at the time of survey was 45.15 years (SD = 14.61) n 355 [Range 18-83], with 67.5% female. Briefly 34.0% had a university degree or higher; 50.0% were in paid employment ; 18.8% lived alone; 36.4% had been diagnosed with epilepsy in the last 16 years; 15.1% had seizures at least once per week; 41.8% were taking \leq one anti-epileptic drug (AED); and 44.3% considered themselves to be at the lower end of the income range (‘very poor’ to ‘just getting along’).

3.2 Supports needed to manage the epilepsy

The most common device that participants felt would be helpful to manage their epilepsy was an emergency ID bracelet (24.2%), followed by seizure alarm (11.6%), seizure monitor (10.1%), and anti-suffocation pillow (9.6%).

Figure 1 Aids and devices patients feel they needed



3.3 Factors associated with a desire for aids and equipment

Factors associated with reported need for the different devices were then explored using Gamma and Cramer's V correlations (Table 2). Overall, a reported need for seizure monitoring devices was more likely to be reported by those participants with more severe epilepsy and a lower self-reported prosperity. Specifically, reported need for aids and equipment was reported more commonly among those who were less well off; less likely to be in paid employment; having more frequent seizures; and those more likely to have been injured during a seizure.

Among those participants living alone (n=65, 18.8% of the adult sample), there was a relatively higher proportion reporting need for aids or equipment. This included 17 (41.5%) of those needing a seizure alarm; nine (25.0 %) who needed a seizure monitor; six (33.3%) needing other equipment such as. lifting aids; and six (40.0%) of those needing emergency door hinges.

Table 2 Contributing factors to need for equipment among adults living with epilepsy

Equipment	Contributing factors	Correlation Co efficient	p
ID bracelet n=86	<i>No clear medical communication</i>	.204 ^g	.035
Seizure alarm n=41	<i>Not employed</i>	.134 ^{cv}	.013
	<i>Living alone</i>	.212 ^{cv}	.000
	<i>More frequent seizures</i>	.308 ^g	.009
	<i>Greater time since diagnosis</i>	.325 ^g	.015
	<i>*Been injured</i>	.169 ^{cv}	.009
	<i>More AEDs</i>	.383 ^{cv}	.029
	<i>Less prosperous</i>	.339 ^g	.006
Seizure monitor n=36	<i>More frequent seizures</i>	.506 ^g	.000
	<i>*Been injured</i>	.175 ^{cv}	.006
	<i>More AEDs</i>	.325 ^g	.013
	<i>No clear medical communication</i>	-.323 ^g	.013
	<i>Less prosperous</i>	.369 ^g	.007
Anti-suffocation pillows n=34	<i>Living alone</i>	.115 ^{cv}	.032
	<i>More frequent seizures</i>	.417 ^g	.001
	<i>*Been injured</i>	.159 ^{cv}	.003
	<i>Less prosperous</i>	.277 ^g	.038
Emergency door hinges n=15	<i>Not employed</i>	.182 ^{cv}	.000
	<i>*Been injured</i>	.182 ^{cv}	.001
	<i>Less prosperous</i>	.458 ^g	.029
Other (e.g., lifting aids) n=18	<i>Male</i>	.171 ^{cv}	.006
	<i>Not employed</i>	.130 ^{cv}	.016
	<i>More frequent seizures</i>	.409 ^g	.030
	<i>*Been injured</i>	.206 ^{cv}	.001
	<i>Less prosperous</i>	.464 ^g	.015

^g Gamma ^{cv} Cramer's V

* Been injured due to a seizure in the last 12 months

3.4 Those in need of aids and equipment reported lower QoL

The total QOLIE-31 score for the sample was 55.98 (SD = 19.78, n=3420 [Range 6.34-96.20]. Table 3 outlines the QoL for those who felt that they needed aids and equipment versus those who did not. In line with the epilepsy burden associated with needing equipment (described above), this group also reported lower QoL.

Table 3 Quality of Life [M(SD)] of those adults in need of equipment compared those who felt that it was not needed

Equipment		n (%)	Mean (S/D)	t	p	Difference <i>Cohen's d</i>
ID bracelet	Need	85 (26.6%)	50.39(18.71)	3.07	.002	7.61 <i>0.40 Small</i>
	Don't need	235 (73.4.%)	58.00(19.81)			
	Missing	34				
Seizure alarm	Need	41 (12.8%)	47.22 (18.57)	3.07	.002	10.04 <i>0.53 Medium</i>
	Don't need	279 (87.2%)	57.27 (19.75)			
	Missing	35				
Seizure monitor	Need	36 (11.3%)	41.71 (16.42)	4.75	.000	16.08 <i>0.90 Large</i>
	Don't need	284 (88.7%)	57.79 (19.53)			
	Missing	35				
Anti-suffocation pillow	Need	34 (10.6%)	43.56 (15.36)	3.96	.000	13.98 <i>0.79 Large</i>
	Don't need	286 (89.4%)	57.45 (19.76)			
	Missing	35				
Emergency door hinges	Need	15 (4.7%)	47.30 (23.22)	1.75	ns	9.10 <i>0.43 Small</i>
	Don't need	325 (95.3%)	56.41 (19.55)			
	Missing	35				
Other (e.g., lifting aids)	Need	18 (5.6%)	39.30 (16.35)	3.77	.000	17.67 <i>0.98 Large</i>
	Don't need	302 (94.4%)	56.97 (19.55)			
	Missing	35				

Note. M = Mean; Need = Those PWE who reported a subjective need for the equipment (versus those who did not); SD = Standard deviation

The largest differences in QoL was seen with regards to needing 'other' equipment (such as lifting aids), seizure monitors and anti-suffocation pillows (Table 3).

3.5 The importance of ability to afford aids and equipment

Given the increased reported need for equipment among those with lower self-reported prosperity (Table 2), we also sought to examine the impact of ability to afford equipment on QoL. For each device, those who reported need were separated according to self-reported ability to afford said devices. More than half of the respondents who needed certain equipment reported they could not afford them. Typically, those who could not afford the aids and devices reported lower QoL (Table 4). It must be noted however that the numbers in this analysis are small.

Table 4 Comparison of QoL for adults based on ability to afford equipment

Equipment	n (%)	Mean QoL (SD) of those who cannot afford equipment		Difference in QoL compared to those who can afford equipment	
ID bracelet	20 (23.5%)	41.53 (15.27)	34.38, 48.67	-11.59	p .014
Seizure alarm	22 (53.7%)	44.05 (15.16)	37.32, 50.77	-6.85	ns
Seizure monitor	24 (66.7%)	41.21 (16.12)	34.41, 48.02	-1.49	ns
Anti-suffocation pillow	14 (41.2%)	45.73 (14.00)	37.64, 53.80	+3.68	ns
Emergency door hinges	7 (46.7%)	49.24 (32.82)	18.88, 79.60	+3.63	ns
Other (e.g., lifting aids)	11 (63.6%)	37.62 (16.75)	26.37, 48.88	-4.31	ns

Note. QoL = Quality of life; SD = Standard deviation

3.6 Qualitative responses

The qualitative responses of participants revealed that the two main reasons preventing use of equipment were a lack of knowledge about the equipment available and/or the cost.

“I have never heard of a seizure alarm or seizure monitor”

“Have never heard of these door hinges.”

“I struggle to pay rent and bills, groceries and bring up a child let alone trying to buy something for myself.”

“I wear a medical bracelet from the chemist as it’s the cheapest one.”

Those reporting why they used equipment typically referred to a need for reassurance.

“Anything to ease my fear.”

This was often the case for those living alone, however, PWE living alone often felt that the devices and equipment available was not useful or relevant for them because the outcome often involved alerting other people.

“The whole thing is, I live alone. So there's very little I can do with many items (As they are warning devices for others like alarms etc. etc.) Not much bloody good, when I'm out of it doing as I do really, eh ?”

“I cannot find anything for anyone living alone????”

Some participants noted specific aids or equipment that they would have preferred, including seizure companion dogs, special glasses for photosensitive epilepsy and home modifications.

One participant reported that the use of an ID bracelet was not useful because *“no one read it.”*

4. Discussion

The current study presents findings of an Australian community sample of PWE with regards to their experiences and needs for a range of equipment and aids. Overall, approximately one fifth of our sample reported a subjective need for equipment to help manage risks associated with their seizures. They tended to be those PWE with more severe epilepsy as well as those with less social and financial support available – i.e., those PWE more likely to be living alone and reporting a lower level of prosperity. Those who reported a need for aids and equipment also reported lower QoL, although this was no doubt also influenced by the socioeconomic profile of this group. It should also be noted that self-report of need for equipment is likely to result in an underestimation of those who may benefit from aids and equipment for epilepsy due to the self-reported lack of knowledge within the community of the types of aids available.

On further examination of need for specific types of aids and equipment, there was a clear relationship between epilepsy-related factors and type of equipment needed. For example, those PWE wanting seizure alarms, seizure monitors, anti-suffocation pillows and equipment such as lifting aids had more frequent seizures that in most cases were more likely to result in injury, and reported a lower income. Those PWE reporting a need for emergency door hinges (which open both ways to allow ease of access for others if the door is obstructed) were more likely to have been injured in a seizure and to be unemployed. Finally, those requiring an ID bracelet reported poorer communication from their medical provider. Given ID bracelets are relatively inexpensive and serve a primary function of communicating one's diagnosis, some PWE may feel an increased sense of security having a tool to clearly communicate their diagnosis. In this way, PWE may also be drawing on the use of aids and equipment to compensate for perceived gaps in the healthcare system. This suggests a greater need for

communication between healthcare professionals and PWE around how and why aids and equipment are used, as well as a need for greater understanding as to how others around the PWE, including healthcare providers and first responders, use these devices.

Self-reported prosperity emerged as an important factor related to perceived need across all types of aids and equipment. In explaining that a proportion of PWE could not afford particular aids or equipment, the characteristics of the self-selecting community sample are important to consider. Employment and self-reported financial difficulties characterised a small but significant proportion of the sample surveyed, despite a reasonable proportion of people with a university level education. Less than half of respondents were in paid employment. This contributes to the financial strain associated with living with epilepsy, and therefore ability to access aids and equipment for epilepsy management. The impact of socioeconomic status on ability to access important aids and equipment has also been reported in other neurological conditions. A self-report study of the use of assistive technologies for multiple sclerosis, found that those participants who were older and less educated, with a greater level of disability were the least likely to have aids [12]. The importance of considering socioeconomic status can also be clearly seen when noting that, for multiple sclerosis (in Australia in 2017), personal costs for accessing aids and equipment were between \$2729 and \$16,995 per year [13].). To date, there is far less known about access to aids and equipment and their availability and affordability for PWE.

Currently, much of the literature on aids and equipment for the management of epilepsy focusses on seizure detection, including: choices about which devices best suit the seizure profiles of PWE [14], and whether devices may be able to predict seizures [15, 16]. Typically, seizure detection devices are designed to detect motor movement, which only occurs in some seizure types. While they are seen as important to keeping partners, family and other carers involved in the management and control of seizures [7], as noted by our participants, the ability to detect a seizure and alert a carer or family member may be less useful for those PWE living alone.

In a study of 141 PWE, more than 90% felt developing seizure detection was important [17]. Previous studies examining patient perspectives of seizure detection devices point to the benefits of increased epilepsy-related knowledge for self-management; providing more security in an emergency; alleviating some of the concerns of caregivers and reducing the carer workload; and improving general care by providing clinicians with more information [7].

However, the current study found that a number of PWE did not know about different types of equipment and wanted better information about what was available. There was also a high need reported for aids and equipment other than seizure detection devices, including ID bracelets to communicate diagnostic information, as well as equipment to ensure the safety of PWE in the event of a seizure at home. This broader perspective of considering both prediction and seizure management is important to promote greater self-control and self-mastery through limiting the impact of severe epilepsy where possible. As noted by Bruno et al. [7], caregivers are also supported by the use of devices which may help to reduce caregiver anxiety, and improve both caregiver and PWE QoL. Understanding the perspectives of family and caregivers with regards to the use of aids and equipment is therefore an important avenue for further research.

5. Strengths and Limitations

A number of limitations with the current study must be acknowledged. While the overall sample was robust for quantitative analysis, the relatively smaller numbers providing open-ended responses, resulted in a small sample size for the qualitative data. Furthermore, the study cohort was largely represented by those PWE living in Victoria. As such their views may not be representative of the broader Australian community of PWE, particularly those living in more rural and remote areas.

It would also have been useful to gauge participant understanding of devices from the sample, as they were not provided with specific definitions for each aid/piece of equipment. Participant understanding of the relevant devices was felt to be reflected in the qualitative data, which showed a relatively good understanding of what the equipment was but perhaps less clarity on the degree of usefulness of all of the aids/ equipment.

It should also be noted that there were other variables important to QoL not included in the current analysis. Factors such as mood and social support are known to impact QoL and may moderate or mediate the impact of being able to afford aids and equipment. The focus of Wave 4 of the AELS was specifically on participants' use of services, aids and equipment for the management of their epilepsy. Further questions about broader factors that may be influencing QoL were not included in order to keep the survey shorter to ensure tolerability of the overall survey and maintain rapport with the participants of the AELS. The current study was not, however, intended to characterise QoL in a community sample of PWE per se, but rather to

highlight factors associated with participant use of different aids and equipment for the management of their epilepsy.

Strengths of this research lie in the large number of participants recruited from a community sample, as well as the ability to examine QoL against self-reported access to aids and equipment across the whole sample. The mixed methods approach also provided a richer view of the respondents' needs and their distress at a lack of access to those aids and equipment they felt would assist them.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, the current study points towards a relationship between more severe epilepsy, lower financial and social resources and greater perceived need for aids and equipment among PWE. Those reporting a need for aids and equipment for the management of their epilepsy also reported lower QoL. Qualitative responses from participants pointed towards a lack of knowledge about the range of resources available. Current research in this field shows a general lack of information on whether PWE have access to digital services and technology for seizure detection [7], but a notable desire on the part of PWE for aids that are able to detect all seizure types [18]. While this technology may still be many years away, it is important to continue to include the perspectives of stakeholders throughout the process of research and development. Person-centred research focussing on the needs of PWE and their families, such as that presented in the current paper, is therefore critical

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank UCB Pharma for supporting the research undertaken. We also wish to thank the people on the Australian Epilepsy Research Register for their participation in this research.

Ethical publication statement

We confirm that we have read the Journal's position on issues involved in ethical publication and affirm that this paper is consistent with those guidelines.

Declaration of competing interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could appear to influence the work reported in this paper.

Supplementary Figure 2 Questions on aids and equipment

Key questions from the survey are outlined below:

Q Because of your epilepsy do you need but currently do not have any of the following aids, equipment or modifications. Please indicate all that you would like:

Emergency ID bracelet
Seizure alarm
Seizure monitor
Anti suffocation pillow
Emergency door hinges
Other
Etc

Q If you indicated any of the above can you afford to purchase such aids?

Q If you answered no to the above question please indicate which aids you cannot afford to purchase

Emergency ID bracelet
Seizure alarm
Seizure monitor
Anti suffocation pillow
Emergency door hinges
Other
Etc

References

- [1] Epilepsy World Health Organisation 2019 Retrieved from https://www.who.int/health-topics/epilepsy#tab=tab_1 11th March, 2020.
- [2] Ring A, Jacoby A, Baker, G, Holmes, E, Hughes, D, Kierans, C et al. What really matters? A mixed methods study of treatment preferences and priorities among people with epilepsy in the UK. *Epilepsy Behav* 2019;95:181-91.
- [3] Safety aids and equipment Retrieved from <https://www.epilepsy.org.uk/info/daily-life/safety-aids-equipment> 11th Feb, 2020.
- [4] Jory C, Shankar R, Cocker R, McLean B, Hanna J, Neuman C. Safe and sound? A systematic literature review of seizure detection methods for personal use *Seizure* 2016; 36: 4-15.
- [5] Baumgartner C, Koren JP, Rothmayer M. Automatic computer – based detection of epileptic seizures. *Front Neurol*. 2018; <https://doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2018.00639>.
- [6] Schulz – Bonhage A, Sales, F, Wagner K, Teotoio R, Carius A, Schelle A et al. Views of patients with epilepsy on seizure prediction devices. *Epilepsy Behav*, 2010;18:388-96.
- [7] Bruno E, Simblett S, Lang A, Biondi A, Odoi C, Schulze - Bonhage A et al. Wearable technology in epilepsy: The views of patients, caregivers, and healthcare professionals. *Epilepsy Behav*. 2018;85:141-9.
- [8] Peterson C. L, Walker, C & Coleman H ‘I hate wasting the hospital’s time’: Experiences of emergency department admissions of Australian people with epilepsy. *Epilepsy Behav* 2019 90; 228-23
- [9] Cramer JA, Perrine K, Devinsky O, Bryant-Comstock L, Meador K, Hermann BP Development and cross-cultural translation of a 31-item quality of life questionnaire (QOLIE-31) *Epilepsia* 1998; 39: 81-88.
- [10] Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Taylor & Francis Group; 2006;3(2):77–101.
- [11] Rapport F, Clement C, Doel MA, Hutchings HA. Qualitative research and its methods in epilepsy: Contributing to an understanding of patients' lived experiences of the disease. *Epilepsy Behav*. 2015 Apr;45:94–100.
- [12] Johnson K, Bamer AM, Yorkston KM, Amtmann D. Use of cognitive aids and other assistive technology by individuals with multiple sclerosis. *Disabil Rehabil Assist Technol*. 2009;4(1);1-8.

- [13] Ahmad H, Palmer AJ, Campbell JA, van der Mei I. Health economic impact of multiple sclerosis in Australia in 2017. 2017; Menzies Institute for Medical Research; Tasmania. https://msra.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/health-economic-impact-of-ms-in-australia-in-2017_ms-research-australia_web.pdf [Accessed 10 Dec 2019]
- [14] Ulate –Campos A, Coughlin F, Gainza – Lein M, Fernandez IS, Pearl PL, Loddenkemper T. Automated seizure detection systems and their effectiveness for each type of seizure. *Seizure*. 2016;40:88-101.
- [15] Bates M. Controlling seizures with technology. *IEEE Pulse* 2018. <https://pulse.embs.org/july-2018/controlling-seizures-with-technology/> [Accessed 10 Dec 2019].
- [16] Pathan SA, Jain GK, Akhter S, Vohora D, Ahmad FJ, Khar RK. Insight into the novel three ‘D’s of epilepsy treatment: drugs, delivery systems and devices *Drug Discov Today*. 2010; 15(17-18);717-32.
- [17] Ramgopala S, Souza ST, S, Jackson M, Kadish NE, Fernandez IS, Klehm J et al. Seizure detection, seizure prediction, and closed-loop warning systems in epilepsy. *Epilepsy Behav*. 2014;4:291-307.
- [18] Patel AD, Moss R, Rust SW, Patterson J, Strouse R, Gedela S, et al. Patient-centred design criteria for wearable seizure detection devices. *Epilepsy Behav*. 2016;64(Pt A):116-21. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2016.09.012.