

Accepted Manuscript

BJGP OPEN

Valproate use in women aged 15-44 years: Observational study in general practice.

Beardsley, Samantha; Dostal, Isabel; Cole, James; Gutierrez, Ana; Robson, John

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3399/BJGPO-2020-0104>

To access the most recent version of this article, please click the DOI URL in the line above.

Received 17 June 2020

Revised 01 November 2020

Accepted 13 November 2020

© 2021 The Author(s). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Published by BJGP Open. For editorial process and policies, see: <https://bjgpopen.org/authors/bjgp-open-editorial-process-and-policies>

When citing this article please include the DOI provided above.

Author Accepted Manuscript

This is an 'author accepted manuscript': a manuscript that has been accepted for publication in BJGP Open, but which has not yet undergone subediting, typesetting, or correction. Errors discovered and corrected during this process may materially alter the content of this manuscript, and the latest published version (the Version of Record) should be used in preference to any preceding versions

Valproate use in women aged 15-44 years: Observational study in general practice.

Authors: Samantha J Beardsley, Isabel Dostal, Jim Cole, Ana Gutierrez, John Robson

Dr Samantha J Beardsley, BMBS PhD, Academic Foundation Year 2 doctor, 1, 2

Ms Isabel Dostal, MSc Data analyst, 2

Dr James Cole, MRCGP General practitioner, 2

Ms Ana Gutierrez, Primary Care Facilitator, 2

Dr John Robson, FRCGP Reader in Primary Care, 2

1.

Barts Health NHS Trust

The Royal London Hospital

Whitechapel Road

E1 1BB

2.

Institute of Population Health Sciences

Queen Mary University of London

58 Turner Street E1 2AB

Corresponding author: Dr Samantha J Beardsley

email samantha.beardsley@nhs.net

Abstract

Background:

Valproate is a known teratogen. In April 2018, the Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency (MHRA) restricted use in women and banned use in pregnancy, except for epilepsy with no other effective treatment. To date, there is limited information on valproate prescribing within primary care.

Aim:

To characterise valproate prescribing to women of childbearing age, recorded advice or general practitioner prescribed contraception and recorded pregnancies.

Design and setting:

A cross-sectional study of patients from all 141 general practices across three Clinical Commissioning Groups in East London.

Method:

Women aged 15-44 years prescribed valproate between 1/10/2017-1/1/2020 were included. Exclusion criteria were early menopause, sterilisation procedures or hysterectomy. Pseudonymised data on valproate indication, pregnancy, pre-conception and contraception advice were retrospectively extracted from general practice consultation data. Data were analysed by quarter using univariate statistics.

Results:

Of the total 1,042,463 registered patients, 344 women aged 15-44 years were prescribed valproate during the study period; 14 were excluded. There were 10 pregnancies during possible valproate exposure; one was terminated. During the study period, the number of women prescribed valproate significantly decreased ($p=0.003$). The pregnancy rate decreased from 9.9/1000 on valproate before the MHRA April 2018 warning, to an average of 2.8/1000 afterwards. Recorded pre-conception/contraception advice increased by 79%, from 24% to 43%, of women prescribed valproate.

Conclusion:

With continued pregnancies in women aged 15-44 years prescribed valproate, patient education and foetal outcomes remain ongoing concerns. Further improvements are needed to ensure women make informed reproductive choices and safeguard future pregnancies from valproate exposure.

Keywords: primary care; valproate; women; adverse drug related event; pregnancy

Introduction

Valproate is an anti-epileptic drug (AED) and mood stabiliser licensed in the UK for use in the treatment of all forms of epilepsy, mania in bipolar affective disorder and migraine prophylaxis.¹ Valproate is a known teratogen. The risks of valproate use in pregnancy are well-documented with wide-ranging effects of in utero valproate exposure including congenital malformations and neurodevelopmental delay.^{2,3}

Of the anti-epileptic drugs (AEDs), valproate has been consistently highlighted as having the highest rate of congenital malformations.^{2,4} Based on two major meta-analyses of data from studies worldwide, the rate of major congenital malformations in babies born to mothers taking valproate monotherapy during pregnancy has been estimated to be 11% compared to 3% in women without epilepsy.^{2,3}

Beyond birth, there is consistent evidence that valproate use during pregnancy is associated with persistently impaired neurodevelopment which affects 30-40% of children exposed to valproate during this time.⁴⁻⁷ The effects are varied and include four times increased risk of psychomotor delay, seven times increased risk of cognitive development delay and eight times increased risk of language delay.⁸ There are strong associations with the development of autism where risk is estimated to be increased up to 17 times.^{3,8} In utero valproate exposure is also associated with a significant decrease in intelligent quotient (IQ) of around 8 IQ points.³ This reduction in IQ alone is likely sufficient to affect education and occupation lifelong.³ Most congenital birth defects and neurodevelopmental complications arising from in utero valproate use will have a lifetime financial, medical and social care burden for affected families and the state.⁹

In response to the accumulating body of evidence of valproate risk, as well as pressure from patient advocate groups, there have been several stepwise changes in public policy and clinical guidelines. In the UK, the MHRA issued a press release in April 2018 restricting the use of valproate in women of childbearing potential unless they are on a pregnancy prevention programme.¹⁰ The pregnancy prevention programme aims to enable women and their clinicians to make informed decisions about their care by providing information about the risks of pregnancy and providing highly effective contraception including long-acting reversible contraception (LARC) methods such as intrauterine devices and the progesterone-only implant.¹¹ Overall trends since then suggest a substantial reduction in valproate prescriptions

in women of childbearing age¹² but little is known about the extent to which the 2018 MHRA guidance has been implemented.

This study aimed to characterise: valproate prescribing to women of childbearing age, recorded advice or contraception prescribed by general practitioners and recorded pregnancies between 2017 and 2020 across three Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG) areas of East London.

Method

This cross-sectional study included deidentified general practice data from all 141 GP practices in three adjacent inner urban CCGs in East London (City and Hackney, Tower Hamlets and Newham) between 1st October 2017 and 1st January 2020. These CCG areas are among the most ethnically diverse and deprived in both London and the UK. These GP practices all use EMIS Web (Egton Medical Information Systems) as an electronic health record to document patient interactions and all prescribing. Deidentified patient data for the relevant study items were centrally extracted and securely stored by the Clinical Effectiveness Group (CEG), Queen Mary University of London. The types of data accessed by the CEG and the information sharing role of the CEG has been described elsewhere.¹³

Deidentified data were retrospectively extracted for the start of each quarter between 01/10/17 and 01/01/20 to cover the six months prior to the release of the MHRA guidance in April 2018 and the time until this study. The cohort were women aged 15-44 years currently registered at the 141 practices who were prescribed valproate in the past three months, prior to the relevant start date in the quarter. Valproate prescriptions included all generic preparations of valproate, sodium valproate, semisodium valproate and all brand names available in the UK (Epilim Chrono, Epival, Depakote, Episenta, Convulex). Patients were excluded if they had previously undergone early menopause, sterilisation procedures or hysterectomy. Pregnancy was inferred through an algorithm combining a number of Read codes related to pregnancy and used in the national immunisation pregnancy codeset.¹⁴ Data extraction took place in February 2020; the database was not updated during this time.

Read codes of interest were identified relating to inclusion (women aged 15-44 years prescribed valproate) and exclusion criteria (early menopause, sterilisation, hysterectomy), pre-conception advice, contraception advice, provided/prescribed contraception and long-term problems as the likely indication for valproate prescription (Supplementary Table 1).

Data for these Read codes were extracted for specific timeframes, relative to the Read code date of the valproate prescription, within the quarter (Supplementary Table 1). Duplicates were removed with the first occurrence being used for analysis. All data were analysed using R version 3.6.2;¹⁵ including linear regression to compare outcomes and assess statistical significance. Missing data were interpreted as that outcome not being true for that patient at that time, as recorded by general practitioner. All patients were assigned a pseudonymised identifier as part of the extraction process; ethical approval was not required. This work was conducted according to STROBE guidelines on reporting observational studies.¹⁶

Results

Quarterly data were extracted between 01/10/2017 and 01/01/2020 for the three CCG areas with a total of 1,042,463 registered patients in 2018 (318,637 in City and Hackney, 398,907 in Newham and 324,919 in Tower Hamlets). There were a total of 344 women aged 15-44 years prescribed valproate of whom 14 patients were excluded; early menopause (n=1), sterilisation procedures (n=10) or hysterectomy (n=3) to give a final sample size of 330. The median age of the sample was 34 (interquartile range 27-41) years (Table 1). The ethnicity of the sample was predominantly White followed by South Asian (Table 1).

Of the total 330 unique individuals, 63 were prescribed valproate at every quarterly time point in the study period. Over this time, the total number of women prescribed valproate decreased by 35% from 214 in October 2017 to 136 in January 2020 (Figure 1). This decrease in valproate prescribing before and after the MHRA warning in April 2018 was statistically significant ($p=0.003$).

Figure 1.

Table 2.

In total, there were 10 pregnancies in 9 women prescribed valproate during the study period, one of which was terminated (Table 2). The pregnancy rate (defined as the number of pregnancies in the year divided by the number of women on valproate x 1000) averaged 9.9/1000 in the three quarters prior to the MHRA announcement in April 2018 to an average of 2.8/1000 in the quarters after April 2018 – a decrease of 71%. (Table 2). The median age

of these women was 30 years (interquartile range 28-32). Of these women, 89% (n=9) were recorded as having epilepsy, 22% (n=2) were recorded as having bipolar affective disorder and 11% (n=1) were on the learning disability register. In terms of ethnicity, 45% (n=4) of these women were in White and 55% (n=5) were in Black, South Asian and Other ethnic groups. Two of these women were recorded as having received pre-conception advice, however, only one of these was prior to the recorded pregnancy. Four of these women were recorded as having received contraception advice; this was recorded on two occasions prior to pregnancy.

Indications for valproate for these 330 individuals is shown in Table 3. The most common indication for women prescribed valproate, at both the start and end of the study period, was epilepsy (65%; n=139 and n=88, respectively) followed by bipolar disorder (14%, n=31 and 15%, n=20, respectively Table 3). The distribution of indications was largely unchanged at the end of the study period despite an overall reduction in the number of women prescribed valproate.

Table 3.

The proportion of women prescribed valproate receiving pre-conception advice or advice on contraception increased by 79% during the study period from 25% (52 of 214 women) to 43% (58 of 136 women; Figure 2). Recorded contraception prescribing rates stayed approximately constant at around 20% (Figure 2). At the beginning of the study period, 40% of women (84 of 214) prescribed valproate were given advice and/or contraception which had increased to 48% (66 of 136 women) by the end of the study period (Figure 2).

Figure 2.

Discussion

Summary

We identified 10 pregnancies potentially exposed to valproate between October 2017 and January 2020 in East London. Pre-conception or contraception advice was poorly recorded in the general practice record system prior to these pregnancies with only one woman with pre-

conception advice and two women with contraception or contraceptive advice recorded. This may be due a failure of appropriate counselling, or a failure to record such information or both. Such failures may limit the ability of women to make informed decisions about their treatment with valproate and about family planning.

Over the study period there was an overall improvement in the recording of pre-conception and contraception advice to women of childbearing age prescribed valproate in association with a 71% decrease in pregnancy rate in women of childbearing age prescribed valproate. This suggests the MHRA 2018 recommendations led to increased levels of recording and/or patient education with more women making informed decisions about their ongoing care in relation to valproate use and pregnancy.

There was a statistically significant decrease in the number of women prescribed valproate before, compared to after the April 2018 MHRA warning. This decrease was most pronounced in the year following the MHRA announcement. However, the decline has slowed since then and a valproate prescription in general practice continues to pose substantial risks to pregnancies in these women.

The MHRA guidance bans the use of valproate for women during pregnancy for psychiatric and all other indications except for epilepsy if it is the only option and restricts its use more generally unless combined with effective contraception and a pregnancy prevention plan.¹⁰ The majority of the 10 at-risk pregnancies identified were in women with epilepsy, which may reflect that there was no alternative treatment. However, despite an overall reduction in the number of women prescribed valproate, the proportion of women prescribed valproate for indications other than epilepsy remained largely unchanged between the start and end of the study period and a number of women were still prescribed valproate for bipolar affective disorder or learning disabilities where alternative treatments are more appropriate. Changing prescribing for these women will reduce the risk of further valproate-exposed pregnancies.

Strengths and limitations

These data are from a large number of urban GP practices which are located in areas of high ethnic diversity and deprivation which are factors well-documented to contribute to health inequalities.¹⁷ However, contraceptive and pre-pregnancy advice are activities undertaken by

all general practitioners and there is no reason to assume that those in the study locality differed in their advice and prescription from any other area.

Prescribing for long-term conditions is undertaken almost entirely by general practitioners for whom the electronic health record is an accurate record. However, not all prescribed medication may actually be dispensed or used by the patient and it is possible that use of prescribed valproate by patients was stopped before or at some time during pregnancy. This study is only able to identify where general practitioners have recorded that pre-conception/contraception advice was given so these figures may underestimate the true numbers of women who received such advice from other sources. Some women are likely to have contraception managed by third-party clinics or were using other methods including rhythm methods, condoms/diaphragms and partner vasectomy. These are all likely to be poorly recorded in a woman's record but may be more likely to be subsumed in the coding for 'contraception advice given'.

Current pregnancy was inferred in this study, using codes indicating a current pregnancy including pregnancy, antenatal care and a duration of 9 months from the earliest record of pregnancy. It is possible that some women were not pregnant at a time of overlapping valproate prescription. The number of pregnancies in this study is small and a larger scale study with mother and baby linkage is required to assess the effects of valproate on foetal outcomes.

Comparison with existing literature

We are not aware of any recent studies of valproate use that have considered contraceptive and pregnancy outcomes in UK general practice since the MHRA warning. Despite the recent input from the MHRA, there have been concerns for many years about a lack of patient education surrounding valproate use in women of childbearing potential.^{7 10 18} A 2017 survey of women of childbearing potential prescribed valproate for epilepsy conducted by the Epilepsy Society suggests around 70% of women surveyed had not received information about changes in advice about the pregnancy-associated risk.¹⁹ Further to the 2018 MHRA guidance, joint guidelines from the Royal College of GPs and Royal College of Physicians have provided advice to clinicians on how to broach, record and manage these conversations with girls and women of childbearing age.¹¹ GP recording of the pregnancy prevention

programme is in its infancy and there is currently no way to easily electronically access or record the MHRA consent form signed by patient and specialist.

The Neurodevelopment Effects of Antiepileptic Drugs study indicated that valproate use in pregnancy in the US and UK reduced between 1999 and 2007.²⁰ More recently, primary care data collected between 2010 and 2019 in the UK suggest an overall decline in the initiation of valproate prescription for females across all age groups under age 45 years.¹² In particular, the authors noted an 80% decrease in initiation of valproate in females in the first half of 2019 compared with the first half of 2010. This trend was noted across all indications (epilepsy, bipolar disorder, migraine, unknown), with epilepsy being the most common indication for valproate use.¹² The Cumberlege Report published after this study has underlined the substantial risks of valproate prescribing and the need to improve safety and monitoring of outcomes.^{21 22}

Implications for research and/or practice

There is currently no standard pathway in the UK for following up babies born to mothers who have taken valproate during pregnancy.¹¹ Given that some neurodevelopmental issues may not arise for several years, in utero medication exposure may be overlooked as a cause. Our study has identified 9 children that might benefit from follow-up in this locality. At a research level, this could be done through deidentified linkage of primary and secondary care information with an appropriately large sample size. There are also plans to create a valproate register for children of mothers taking valproate during pregnancy.¹¹

For clinicians, this work demonstrates the need to improve patient education for women of childbearing potential prescribed valproate. At a practice level, accurate recording of patient encounters is required to reflect the quality of care that is being provided.

Conclusion

Valproate prescribing to women under 45 years of age has significantly decreased since the April 2018 MHRA warning. However, our study shows that despite the MHRA recommendations, valproate prescription in association with a lack of recorded advice as well as continuing prescription outside of MHRA guidance may continue to place women and their children at risk of exposure during pregnancy. This demonstrates the need for improved

patient education and recording of patient encounters to ensure that women receive high quality care to inform reproductive choices.

Funding: At the time of this work, Dr Beardsley was a Foundation Year 2 academic doctor funded by Barts Health NHS Trust.

Ethical approval was not required for this study that uses deidentified patient data.

Competing interests: None

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Dr Ryan Beardsley for lending his expertise in data manipulation using R. We are grateful to the general practitioners and their practice teams for allowing use of their patient records and to the Clinical Effectiveness Group for providing coding, advice and access to these records and maintenance of a high quality dataset with agreed coding entries.

References

1. Joint Formulary Committee. British National Formulary (online): London: BMJ Group and Pharmaceutical Press; [Accessed 30/04/2020]. Available from: <http://www.medicinescomplete.com> accessed 30/04/2020 2020].
2. Weston J, Bromley R, Jackson CF, et al. Monotherapy treatment of epilepsy in pregnancy: congenital malformation outcomes in the child. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2016;11:CD010224.
3. Bromley R, Weston J, Adab N, et al. Treatment for epilepsy in pregnancy: neurodevelopmental outcomes in the child. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2014:CD010236.
4. Meador K, Reynolds MW, Crean S, et al. Pregnancy outcomes in women with epilepsy: a systematic review and meta-analysis of published pregnancy registries and cohorts. *Epilepsy Res* 2008;81:1-13.
5. Cummings C, Stewart M, Stevenson M, et al. Neurodevelopment of children exposed in utero to lamotrigine, sodium valproate and carbamazepine. *Arch Dis Child* 2011;96:643-7.
6. Thomas SV, Ajaykumar B, Sindhu K, et al. Motor and mental development of infants exposed to antiepileptic drugs in utero. *Epilepsy Behav* 2008;13:229-36.
7. European Medicines Agency. Valproate Article-31 referral - New measures to avoid valproate exposure in pregnancy endorsed, 2018.
8. Veroniki AA, Rios P, Cogo E, et al. Comparative safety of antiepileptic drugs for neurological development in children exposed during pregnancy and breast feeding: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *BMJ Open* 2017;7:e017248.
9. Sisodiya SM, Epilepsy Advisory Group for the Association of British N. Valproate and childbearing potential: new regulations. *Pract Neurol* 2018;18:176-78.

10. Medicines and Healthcare Regulatory Authority. Valproate use by women and girls: current advice 2018 [Accessed 28/03/2020]. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/valproate-use-by-women-and-girls>].
11. Shakespeare JS, S. M. Guidance Document on Valproate Use in Women and Girls of Childbearing Years. 2019:1-28.
12. Medicines and Healthcare Regulatory Authority. Valproate use by women and girls: monitoring impact 2020 [Accessed 28/03/2020]. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/valproate-use-by-women-and-girls>].
13. Pawa JR, J. Hull, S. Building managed primary care practice networks to deliver better clinical care: a qualitative semi-structured interview study. *British Journal of General Practice* 2017:e764-74.
14. Lovegrove E, Robson J, McGettigan P. Pregnancy protection and pregnancies in women prescribed ACE inhibitors or ARBs: a cross-sectional study in primary care. *British Journal of General Practice* 2020;6 October 2020
15. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2017 [Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>].
16. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008;61:344-9.
17. Arcaya M, Arcaya AL, Subramanian SV. Inequalities in health: definitions, concepts, and theories. *Global Health Action* 2015;8
18. Wieck A, Rao S, Sein K, et al. A survey of antiepileptic prescribing to women of childbearing potential in psychiatry. *Arch Womens Ment Health* 2007;10:83-5.
19. Epilepsy Society. Valproate And Pregnancy Awareness Survey 2019 2019 [Accessed 28/03/2020]. Available from: <https://www.epilepsy.org.uk/news/news/almost-one-fifth-women-taking-sodium-valproate-epilepsy-still-not-aware-risks-pregnancy> accessed 28/03/2020].
20. Meador K, Penovich P, Baker G, et al. Antiepileptic drug use in women of childbearing age. *Epilepsy Behav* 2009;15:339-43.
21. Robson J, McGettigan P, Beardsley S, Lovegrove E, Moss N, Dezateuz C. First do no harm. Valproate and medicines safety in pregnancy. *BJGP* 2020; 70 : 477-478.
22. Cumberlege B. First do no harm. The report of the Independent Medicines and Medical Devices Safety Review 2020. [Available from: <https://www.immdsreview.org.uk/Report.html>, accessed 10/10/20 accessed 10/10/2020].

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of 330 women aged 15-45 prescribed sodium valproate between 01/10/2017 and 01/01/2020 in East London

	n (%)
Age (years)*	
15-19	38 (12)
20-24	22 (7)
25-29	54 (16)
30-34	69 (21)
35-39	60 (18)
40+	87 (26)
Ethnicity*	
White	150 (45)
Black	49 (15)
South Asian	87 (26)
Other	22 (7)
Unknown	22 (7)
Received pre-conception or contraception advice**	151 (46)
Prescribed contraception**	90 (27)
Prescribed LARC***	48 (53)
Prescribed non-LARC***	42 (47)
Received advice or contraception**	191 (58)

*Data relate to most recent record for age and ethnicity

** At least once during study period

*** Long-acting reversible contraception (LARC): Copper intra-uterine device, levonorgestrel 13.5mg/19.5mg/52mg intrauterine system and progestogen-only implant. Non-LARC contraception: combined hormonal contraception including combined contraceptive pill, transdermal patch and vaginal ring, progestogen-only pill, progestogen-only injectable depot medroxyprogesterone acetate, condoms, diaphragms.

Table 2. Pregnancy and pregnancy rates by quarter between 01/10/2017 and 01/01/2020 in East London

	<i>n</i> (%) by quarter									
	10/17	01/18	04/18	07/18	10/18	01/19	04/19	07/19	10/19	01/20
<i>N</i>	214	198	194	179	178	162	148	143	142	136
Pregnancies*	4	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
Pregnancy rate (average per 1000 population)	9.9				2.8					

*New pregnancies in this quarter; corrected for 1 termination/miscarriage

Accepted Manuscript - BJGP Open - BJGPO-2020-104


Table 3. Indication for valproate for women included in the first and last quarters of the study period

Valproate indication*	Data extraction from 01/10/2017	Data extraction from 01/01/2020
	<i>n</i> (%)	<i>n</i> (%)
Epilepsy	139 (65)	88 (65)
Bipolar disorder	31 (14)	20 (15)
Migraine	4 (2)	2 (1)
Learning difficulties	5 (2)	5 (4)
Other/unknown	35 (16)	21 (15)
<i>Total patients</i>	<i>214</i>	<i>136</i>

*Likely indication inferred from recorded long-term conditions on electronic health record

Accepted Manuscript - BJGP Open - BJGPO.2020.0104

Fig 1. Number of women prescribed valproate 2017-2020 in East London



Accepted Manuscript - BJGP Open

5-0104

Figure 2. Change in pre-conception or contraception advice (blue), prescribed contraception (green) and women receiving advice and/or contraception (red), normalised to the number of women prescribed valproate.

