Title: Social cognition in frontal and temporal lobe epilepsy: systematic review and meta-analysis

Abbreviated title: Social cognition and Epilepsy

Maryam Ziaei[1], Charlotte Arnold[1], Kate Thompson[2,3] & David Reutens[1]

[1] Centre for Advanced Imaging, the University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

[2] Psychology Department, Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Brisbane, Australia

[3] School of Psychology, the University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

*Corresponding Author: Maryam Ziaei; Centre for Advanced Imaging, The University of Queensland, St. Lucia, QLD 4072, Australia; Email: maryamziae@gmail.com and maryam.ziaei@cai.uq.edu.au; Tel: +61- 422 916 362

Abstract

Despite the importance of social cognitive functions to mental health and social adjustment, assessment of these functions is absent in routine epilepsy patients' examinations. Hence, there is a clear need for developing a clinical and practical assessment which is a critical step towards designing new interventions. To do so, we first need to gain a nuanced understanding of the difficulties patients face in different domains of social cognition, including emotion recognition, empathy, the theory of mind, and social adjustment. The aim of this paper is, thus, to provide a comprehensive overview of the existing literature on social cognitive functions and changes among epileptic patients: frontal and temporal lobe epilepsy. Papers from 1990-2021 were reviewed and examined for inclusion in this study and after the deduplication process, 44 papers (out of 6181 numbers that were first identified) were included in the systematic review and 40 papers in the meta-analysis. Our results indicated that first, all patients, both frontal and temporal lobe epilepsy, have difficulties in all aspects of social cognition relative to non-clinical controls. However, the effect sizes were larger for theory of mind (TOM) relative to emotion domain, suggesting sensitivity of the TOM for assessing social cognitive functions among this population. Additionally, right temporal lobe epilepsy patients performed more poorly than non-clinical control relative to left side seizure focus patients, specifically in the TOM domain. Results from the empathy and social behavior domains need to be considered cautiously as these two domains are the least studied and more research is warranted in these domains of social cognition. Finally, we suggest a step-by-step pipeline for the assessment of impairments in social cognition that can be integrated into standard clinical practices for epilepsy treatment.

Keywords: Social cognition; empathy; theory of mind; emotion recognition; social behavior, frontal lobe epilepsy; temporal lobe epilepsy

Introduction

Social cognition broadly refers to one's ability to perceive and understand other people's thoughts, feelings, and behaviours and respond appropriately. The most researched aspects of social cognition are emotion recognition, theory of mind (ToM) and empathy. Emotion recognition is the ability to identify and discriminate emotional states from verbal and nonverbal cues. Theory of mind refers to the ability to understand what other people are thinking and feeling and infer complex mental states such as intention and disposition of others. Empathy is the ability to understand and respond to the emotional experiences of others and has been shown to contribute to successful social interaction and to promote prosocial actions (Sun et al., 2019). The literature typically differentiates between two components of empathy: affective empathy, which entails affective sharing of other people's emotional states, and cognitive empathy, which refers to the ability to decode and understand other people's perspective (Singer & Lamm, 2009).

A recent meta-analysis revealed that social cognitive impairment is a hallmark feature of many developmental, psychiatric, neurological and neurodegenerative conditions (Cotter et al., 2018). Social cognition is an important determinant of psychosocial outcome. In recognition of this, recent diagnostic manual updates (e.g., Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Version 5; American Psychiatric Association, 2013) and clinical guidelines advocate social cognition as a core domain for psychometric assessment (e.g., Wilson et al., 2007). Social cognition is complex and multifaceted, subserved by an intricate network of interconnected brain regions collectively referred to as the "social brain". These regions include the amygdala, medial prefrontal cortex, temporoparietal junction, anterior cingulate and insula. Many of these structures are adversely affected in conditions such as schizophrenia (Green et al., 2015), stroke (Hillis, 2014), and neurodegenerative disorders (Christidi et al., 2018), giving rise to the propensity for social cognitive impairment in these groups.

Epilepsy is the most common chronic neurological disorder worldwide, with estimates that 1 in 26 individuals will experience epilepsy at some point in their lives (Brodie et al., 2005). People with epilepsy demonstrate impairments in social cognition (for instance, Giovagnoli et al., 2011; Giovagnoli et al., 2013) negatively impact patients' quality of life, their employability as well as other cognitive functions. Behavioural characteristics of the "epileptic personality" associated with the most common focal epilepsy syndrome, medial temporal lobe epilepsy, may actually be explained by impaired social cognition. However, it remains unclear the extent to which social cognitive difficulties are caused by medication, psychological and social factors

(e.g., fear of seizures, perceived stigma, discrimination, lack of social support), recurrent seizures or the underlying epileptogenic brain lesion. This area of research, however, has been severely neglected by clinicians and researchers until recently. Identifying the nature and magnitude of social cognitive impairments in people with epilepsy has both theoretical and clinical implications, including the potential to inform guidelines for clinical assessment and psychosocial intervention.

Four prior meta-analyses evaluated theory of mind and emotion recognition among patients with epilepsy and outcomes slightly differ depending on the groups of patients studied or the outcome measures. Overall, these studies reveal several findings: (a) theory of mind ability was mostly affected among patients with focal seizure such as frontal lobe epilepsy (FLE) and temporal lobe epilepsy (TLE), but not outside these areas (extra-TLE/FLE; Stewart et al., 2016); (b) deficient recognition of fear, followed by sadness and disgust, among patients with epilepsy across both visual and auditory modalities have been reported (Edwards et al., 2017; Monti et al., 2015); (c) the right-sided TLE patients exhibited more significant impairments recognizing fear, disgust, and sadness compared to left-sided TLE (Bora et al., 2016); (d) and lastly, surgery did not change the social cognitive outcomes (emotion recognition and theory of mind) relative to the groups who did not undergo surgery (Bora et al., 2016).

While these previous meta-analytic reviews provide a valuable contribution to the literature, it is still unknown how empathy and social behaviour is affected by epilepsy. This study is the first to evaluate the four major components of social cognition among patients with frontal and temporal lobe epilepsy. The primary aim of this study was twofold: (a) to determine whether social cognitive impairment is global or specific to one domain of social cognition among people with frontal and temporal lobe epilepsy, and (b) to investigate if the severity and patterns of impairment are moderated by the epileptic focus: temporal vs. frontal lobe. We conclude this review with suggestion of a pathway and clinically useful tools to support routine screening of social cognition in people with epilepsy.

Method

This systematic review was conducted in line with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (Moher et al., 2009).

Identification of studies

Search strategy

We searched several databases from 1990 to January 2021 including PsycINFO and MEDLINE (via EBSCOhost), Embase, and Web of Science Core Collection (via Clarivate Analytics). We constructed a comprehensive search strategy using variant terms for the focal epilepsy subtypes and social cognition constructs. The search strategy developed for database is presented below; the full search strategy can be made available upon request.

("epilep*" OR "focal epilepsy" OR "temporal lobe epilepsy" OR "frontal lobe epilepsy" OR "seizure" OR (("amygdala" OR "hippocamp*") AND "damage")) AND ("perc*" OR "identif*" OR "recogni*" OR "process*" OR "label*") AND ("emotion recognition" OR (("face" OR "facial") AND ("affect*" OR "emotion*" OR "expression*")) OR "theory of mind" OR "social cognition" OR "social perception" OR "perspective task*" OR "mentalis*" OR "mind read*" OR "empath*" OR "social competence" OR "social outcome*" OR "social adjustment" OR "social behavio*" OR "social skill*" OR "social interaction*").

Duplicate results were removed automatically in EndNote. Using the Ancestry Method, first and second authors (MZ & CA) searched the reference lists of appropriate reviews and eligible studies to identify additional papers.

Inclusion criteria

The review included studies that: 1. reported primary research published in English-language peer-reviewed journals; 2. included samples of people diagnosed with temporal lobe (TLE) or frontal lobe epilepsy (FLE) and reported the data separately for each patient group; 3. included a non-clinical comparison group; 4. used validated measures each of the four components of social cognition (as detailed in Table 1); and 5. included either paediatric or adult patient populations.

[Insert Table 1 here]

Exclusion criteria

The review excluded: 1. Case studies, non-clinical outcome studies (e.g., psychometric validation studies), secondary research or special papers (e.g., reviews, editorial, commentaries, or letters); 2. Studies that did not include a control group; 3. Studies that recruited heterogenous focal epilepsy groups (e.g., frontal lobe epilepsy with temporal lobe epilepsy); 4. Studies that used qualitative measures such as interviews or behavioural tasks other than those specified in Table 1; 6. Studies with inadequate data to calculate a mean or

weighted effect; 7. fMRI studies that investigated one of these domains in TLE or FLE patients but without overt, explicit, behavioral measures during the fMRI task; 8. included patients with unilateral or bilateral amygdala or hippocampal damage, but without seizures; 9. Included only post-operative patients, or grouped patients with and without lobectomy together. Studies were not excluded based on other premorbid conditions, cause of epilepsy (e.g., acquired lesions, tumours, congenital structural abnormalities), or medication use.

Definition of social cognitive domains

Emotion recognition

In this study, we defined emotion recognition as any task that required participants to label, recognize, rate, match or select the emotions expressed within the stimuli. Stimuli could be visual or auditory and may consist of static faces, videos, or sounds. As reported in Table 1, our review was limited to the universal emotions (fear, happiness, disgust, anger, and sadness) and thus, did not include studies measuring complex emotions such as trustworthiness, pride, or embarrassment. We excluded studies looking exclusively at mood, emotion production, or semantic knowledge (e.g., about situations expected to induce emotions). In epilepsy samples, tasks requiring identification and discrimination of emotions conveyed by facial expression have most frequently been used (e.g., stimuli from Ekman, NimStim, Karolinska, and FACES databases). All eligible studies of emotion recognition and their effect sizes are reported in Table 2.

[Insert Table 2 about here]

Theory of mind

As reported in Table 1, we only included studies that used the following commonly used measures in ToM literature: Reading the Mind in the Eyes Test (RMET), Cartoon ToM vignettes, Strange Stories Test, False Belief tasks, Faux-Pas Test, Moving triangles test, The Awareness of Social Inference Test (TASIT) and the Story-Based Empathy Task. All eligible ToM studies and their effect sizes are reported in Table 3.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

Empathy

We included studies that looked at the generalized construct as well as the cognitive and affective sub-components. Compared to other social cognitive domains, fewer studies have investigated empathy in people with epilepsy; self-report using the interpersonal reactivity

index (IRI) has been the most common method of enquiry. All eligible studies of empathy and their effect sizes are reported in Table 4.

Social behavior

Given that social behavior has been operationalized differently in the literature, we only included studies that used one or more widely used measures considered relevant to this construct (See Table 1) such as: Frontal Systems Behaviour Scale (previously known as the Frontal Lobe Personality Scale), Frontal Behavioral Inventory, Socioemotional Dysfunction Scale, Peer-Report Social Functioning Scale, Social Impairment Rating Scale, and the Disturbed Social Behaviour subscale of the Iowa Scales of Personality Change; Social Responsiveness Scale, Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) and Social Adjustment Scale. All eligible studies evaluating social behavior and their effect sizes are reported in Table 4.

[Insert Table 4 about here]

Data extraction and data entry

We extracted the available participant characteristics (e.g., mean age, standard deviation and number of participants) in each clinical and non-clinical control group for each study. For clinical groups, we recorded the mean age of onset, duration of epilepsy, and the number of seizures per month, where available. For each social cognition domain, the mean and standard deviation of items reported (accuracy or errors) for each task was extracted for each clinical and non-clinical control group. Where the mean of errors was reported (Amlerova et al., 2014; Cohn et al., 2015; Laurent et al., 2014; Schacher et al., 2006), the effect size calculation was reversed to account for this difference in the direction of effect. Alternatively, for studies where raw values were not available, other statistics such as events rates (Gomez-ibanez et al., 2014), *p* values and sample size were used to calculate effect sizes (Amlerova et al., 2014; Batut et al., 2018; Meletti et al., 2003b; Schacher et al., 2006). We contacted authors to request subgroup raw values when focal epilepsy groups or laterality data was combined. Data was made available in several instances (Cohn et al., 2015; Laurent et al., 2014; Tanaka et al., 2013; Toller et al., 2015a & 2015b; Stewart et al., 2019a & 2019b; Bujarski et al., 2016; Morou et al., 2018; Lunn et al., 2015). Estimation of effect sizes in the analyses and studies that only included post-operative patients were excluded from the analyses (studies such as for Emotion: Carvajal et al., 2009; McClelland et al., 2006; Wendling et al., 2015; Ammerlaan et al., 2008; Brierley et al., 2004; Jiang et al., 2014; Gosselin et al., 2011; Meletti et al., 2014; for Empathy: Boucher et al., 2015; ToM: Giovagnoli et al., 2009; Stone et al., 2003). Data that was published more than 10 years ago assumed to be unavailable.

For studies with more than one outcome measure in each social-cognitive domain, effect sizes were pooled to calculate an overall effect for each of the construct. If studies reported both pre- and post-operative data, only pre-operative data were included. For studies where different intensities of emotional expression were used to evaluate emotion recognition, we included the data for the 100% intensity of facial expression in the meta-analyses and the rest of intensity data are narratively synthesised (Sedda et al., 2013). In studies where different task instructions were used, the index reported by the authors was included in the analysis (Shaw et al., 2007). Due to the limited number of studies using widely used measures of social behaviour and empathy, these studies as extensively discussed as part of the systematic review but results from meta-analyses are provisional and require replication in future studies.

Tables 2-4 present a study-by-study breakdown of effect sizes for each domain of social cognition among clinical relative to non-clinical controls.

Quality rating

The Downs and Black Checklist (1998) was used to evaluate the methodological quality of included studies in the meta-analysis. The checklist includes measures for the psychometric properties of the papers for randomized and non-randomized studies. The checklist shows good test-retest reliability (r= .88), inter-rater reliability (r= .75), and internal consistency (Kruder-Richardson formula 20= .89; Downs and Black, 1998). The adapted 17-item version of this checklist was used; items related to interventional trials were omitted as studies of this nature were not included for review. This checklist evaluates the quality of reporting (items 1-8), external validity (item 9), internal validity (statistical and methodological bias, items 10-12; selection bias, items 13-16), and power (item 17). All items are scored from 0 (no, or unable to be determined) to 1 (yes), except for item 4, which is scored 0 (no, unable to be determined), 1 (partially), or 2 (yes). Items 7 and 16 were only scored for studies with a longitudinal design. Therefore, scores for cross-sectional studies, ranged from 0-16, while longitudinal studies scores ranged from 0-18. Studies were categorized into three categories with high (0-5 points for cross-sectional and longitudinal studies), average (6-10 points for cross-sectional and 6-11 points for longitudinal), and low (11-16 points for cross-sectional and 12-18 points for longitudinal studies) risk of bias. Similar procedure as reported in Edwards et al., 2017; Stewart et al., 2016 were used for quality rating using this checklist. Two authors (MZ & CA) independently reviewed and scored each paper and discrepancies were resolved through discussion.

Methods of Review

Figure 1 displays the flow diagram describing the process of study selection for the review. The initial search retrieved 6181 articles. After duplicates were removed, 3847 titles and abstracts were screened for the relevance and eligibility of the papers, 108 full texts were assessed for the final eligibility. Articles were split between two authors for screening according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Both first and second authors (MZ & CA) discussed uncertainty for eligibility criteria and extracting data from the papers. Forty-four eligible papers remained for the systematic review, 40 of which were included for meta-analysis.

[Insert Figure 1 about here]

Statistical analysis

Data were analyzed using the Comprehensive Meta Analyses Program, Version 3 (Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2013). Effect sizes were calculated as Hedges' *g*. We interpreted the importance and strength of our effect in line with the Cohen's *d* guidelines, with 0.2, 0.5, and 0.8 corresponding to small, medium, and large effects, respectively (Cohen, 1988). A negative effect indicates that the epilepsy group performed more poorly than non-clinical controls and positive effect indicates the reverse. The effect size by task type was also compared using the *Q*-test, indicating the degree of variability within each effect in question where the larger values indicate larger between-groups variability. In other words, the *Q* value larger than the number of pooled effects (k-1 degree of freedom) indicates that differences between groups were significant within each task domain.

The analyses examined the overall and specific effects for each social cognitive construct: (1) overall social cognition performance (emotion recognition, theory of mind and empathy) between frontal and temporal lobe epilepsy compared to the non-clinical control, and within temporal lobe epilepsy (side of seizure focus; left versus right); (2) performance for specific emotions (anger, sadness, happiness, disgust, and fear) between frontal and temporal lobe epilepsy, and within temporal lobe epilepsy (side of seizure focus; left versus right); (3) performance for sub-components of ToM (e.g., Faux Pas and False Belief tasks) between frontal and temporal lobe epilepsy, and within temporal lobe epilepsy (side of seizure focus; left versus right). Due to known variation, random-effect models were used for all analyses to ensure we captured the heterogeneous effects present for clinical populations. Where permitted, comparison between lateralization of epilepsy and different tasks characteristics (e.g., visual vs. auditory emotion recognition) were conducted in each social cognitive domain.

First, sets of analyses included calculating the weighted mean effect size for each domain of social cognition (e.g., a single effect size for each dependent measure for each independent study). Second, subsets of analyses focused on left and right-side seizure focus vs. non-clinical control participants in each domain of social cognitive functions. Third, exploratory analyses were conducted on the specific emotions and specific theory of mind tasks for TLE vs. non-clinical controls.

Patient Demographics

Overall studies included 2830 non-clinical control participants and 1595 patients with epilepsy, 113 patients with FLE and 1482 patients with TLE. The age ranged from 10.06 to 48.05 years old in the non-clinical group and 12.24 to 52.03 years old in the patient group. For the patient group, the mean age-of-onset of epilepsy was 12.58 years for the emotion recognition studies, 13.39 years for theory of mind studies, 17.39 years for the empathy studies, and 19.74 years for social behavior studies. The average duration of epilepsy was 12.04 years for emotion recognition studies, 11.28 years for theory of mind studies, 15.74 years for empathy studies, 10.44 for social behavior studies.

Results of systematic review & meta-analyses

Emotion Recognition

Temporal Lobe Epilepsy (TLE)

Facial emotion recognition: Twenty-three studies examined facial emotion recognition in TLE patients, including the use of static and dynamic stimuli as well as stimuli displaying facial expressions at varying intensities (Table 1). Among these studies, 17 of 18 (100%) reported impaired emotion recognition using a composite score. Of the individual emotions, deficits were most commonly reported in fear recognition (11 of 18 studies), followed by disgust (10 of 17 studies) and then sadness (6 of 19 studies) in all types of stimuli (e.g., dynamic or static). Two of 15 studies found deficits in recognising angry facial expressions, whereas only one of 18 studies found deficits in recognising happy facial expressions.

Lateralisation: Eleven of the above studies reported impairments according to lateralised epileptic focus when compared with non-clinical controls (seven included right TLE (RTLE) and six left TLE (LTLE)). For overall emotional recognition ability, four of five studies found impairments in right TLE patients and three of five studies found impairments in left TLE patients when compared with non-clinical controls. In terms of recognising specific emotions, three of seven studies examining fear demonstrated deficits in RTLE and one of seven studies

demonstrated impairments in LTLE. Two of six studies showed that RTLE patients were impaired in their recognition of sadness (Melleti et al., 2003a; Melleti et al., 2003b) whereas LTLE patients exhibited intact recognition of sadness compared to non-clinical controls (Seven of seven studies). One of six studies measuring happiness found that RTLE patients were impaired in their recognition of happiness (Cohn et al., 2015); however, no deficits emerged for LTLE patients among all seven studies (See supplementary table 1). Seven studies compared the performance between right-side epilepsy patients and controls in recognizing disgust with three of these studies reporting deficits in RTLE patients (Golobouff et al., 2008; Melletti et al., 2003a; Melletti et al., 2003b) whereas none of six reported deficits in LTLE patients. Last, none of the five studies examining anger found impairments in either RTLE or LTLE patients.

Thirteen studies made direct comparisons between LTLE and RTLE when examining facial emotion recognition. A minority of the studies that reported the composite score found lateralised differences in total emotion recognition (three of 11), in which RTLE patients performed worse than LTLE patients (Meletti et al., 2003b; Meletti et al. 2009; Sedda et al., 2013). Meletti et al. (2009) reported that bilateral TLE (BTLE) patients performed worse than RTLE patients, and RTLE performed worse than LTLE patients. Additionally, Sedda et al., (2013) found that RTLE patients were more impaired at recognising emotions at 75% intensity than LTLE patients; however, these differences were non-significant when expressions were presented at 100%.

Eight studies examined fear recognition in patients with RTLE and LTLE. Five of these studies found differences according to seizure lateralisation. Specifically, four studies found that RTLE patients were more impaired in fear recognition than LTLE patients. Meletti et al. (2009) showed that fear recognition was comparable in BTLE and RTLE patients, with both groups performing worse than LTLE patients. In contrast, one study reported that LTLE patients performed worse than RTLE patients in fear recognition (Golobouff et al., 2008). Three studies found a non-significant difference (Reynders et al., 2005; Stewart et al., et al., 2019; Shaw et al., 2007).

Finally, six studies inspected the differences in recognising other emotions (i.e., happiness, anger, sadness and disgust), in addition to fear, according to seizure lateralisation. One study reported significant differences between RTLE and LTLE patients in the recognition of anger and sadness (Meletti et al., 2009). Meletti et al. (2009) found that BTLE and RTLE patients

performed equally in recognizing anger and sadness but were worse than LTLE patients. No differences were found according to seizure laterality for happiness or disgust.

Auditory emotion recognition. Five studies evaluated vocal emotion recognition in TLE patients using verbal and speech prosody. Total emotion recognition score was impaired in more than half of studies that calculated the composite score (three of five studies). Three studies reported deficits by individual emotion (i.e., happiness, anger, fear, sadness and disgust). Two of three studies reported impairments in the recognition of fear, which were found for and sentences (Bonora, et al., 2011) and nonverbal sounds (Hennion, et al., 2015a). Only one of three studies reported impairments in the recognition of anger, sadness, and disgust (Bonora, et al., 2011), specifically for sentences. No impairments were found in the recognition of happiness in any of the three studies (Bonora et al., 2011; Fowler et al., 2005; Hennion et al., 2015). In terms of lateralisation, LTLE and RTLE patients were not impaired relative to controls (one study) (Fowler et al., 2006). Differences between LTLE and RTLE patients were also not found to be significant (Bonora et al. 2011; Laurent et al., 2014; Hennion et al., 2015a).

Results from the meta-analysis on all included emotion recognition studies in TLE produced a Hedge's g of 0.69 and a 95% confidence interval (CI) for the effect of between 0.35 to 1.04; Z score = 3.93, $p < 0.001$; Table 5), meaning that the mean effect of all comparable studies could fall within this range. As this range does not include zero, the effects are considered significantly different from zero. Therefore, we can reject null hypotheses and conclude that TLE patients significantly and substantially performed worse than non-clinical groups on emotion recognition tasks on average.

For the meta-analysis, TLE patients with left versus right-sided seizure lateralisation were compared to a non-clinical population. Our meta-analysis suggested that the mean effect was small for left temporal lobe epilepsy (Hedge's g = 0.35; 95% CI = -0.01-0.68; Z score = 2.06, p =0.039) and right temporal lobe epilepsy compared to the non-clinical group (Hedge's g = 0.42; 95% CI = -0.04-0.80; Z score = 2.21, p =0.027; Table 5). Given that the CIs cross zero, the effects are not significant, suggesting that there is no statistical difference in emotion recognition in any of the LTLE and RTL when compared with a non-clinical group.

Frontal Lobe Epilepsy (FLE)

Overall, three studies have looked at facial emotion recognition in FLE (Farrant et al., 2005; Golouboff et al., 2008; Hu et al., 2016). Two studies evaluated overall emotional recognition ability, one study revealing impairments in FLE (Farrant et al., 2005) while the other did not

(Golouboff et al., 2008; Hu et al., 2016). In terms of specific emotions, the greatest number of impairments were found in the recognition of anger, fear and sadness (two of three: Farrant et al., 2005; Hu et al., 2016); However, Golouboff et al. (2008) did not find impairments in these emotions. Only one of three studies found deficits in the recognition of happiness (Farrant et al., 2005) and disgust (Hu et al., 2016). Differences between sides were not reported in any of the mentioned studies.

At meta-analytic review, a large effect size was achieved for emotion recognition in FLE (Hedge's g = 1.18; 95% CI = 0.56-1.80). The Z-value for testing the null hypotheses was 3.71 for emotion recognition (p-value < 0.001; Table 5), suggesting that patients with FLE had poorer performance than non-clinical controls.

Theory of Mind

Temporal Lobe Epilepsy

Seventeen studies included at least one measure of Theory of Mind with the Faux Pas test being the most used task (Table 3). None of the 17 studies that looked at the Theory of Mind in focal epilepsy provided composite scores; thus, the results of each task will be examined separately. For the Faux Pas task, 12 of 13 studies reported lower performance among TLE patients than non-clinical controls. Regarding seizure lateralisation, four of four studies found that both RTLE and LTLE patients were impaired compared with non-clinical controls, in which one also showed that BTLE performed equal to RTLE and LTLE patients (Li et al., 2013). Furthermore, one of four studies found that RTLE patients were more impaired than LTLE patients (Broichera et al., 2012a), and the remaining studies reported a non-significant difference according to seizure lateralisation (Broicher et al., 2012b; Hennion et al., 2015b; Shaw et al., 2007; Stewart et al., 2019; see supplementary table 2 for breakdown of studies).

For the False Beliefs task, two of three studies found that patients with TLE scored lower than non-clinical controls (Wang et al., 2015; Li et al., 2013). One study comparing epileptic seizure lateralisation to non-clinical controls reported that RTLE and BTLE patients were impaired but LTLE was not impaired (Li et al., 2013). For the Reading the Mind in the Eye test, one of two studies reported that mesial TLE patients were more impaired than non-clinical controls (Okruzek et al., 2017), and no study identified significant differences according to seizure lateralisation (Broichera et al., 2012b).

Of the studies that have used the Strange Stories test, four studies found that TLE patients were more impaired than controls (Li et al., 2013, Shaw et al., 2004, Stewart et al., 2019; Wang

et al., 2015) while one study did not find any difference (Shaw et al., 2007). In the only study comparing TLE subgroups according to seizure lateralisation with non-clinical controls, deficits were reported amongst RTLE patients, but not LTLE or BTLE patients (Li et al., 2013). However, no significant differences emerged between patients with epilepsy grouped by seizure lateralisation and controls on this task in two studies (Shaw et al., 2007; Stewart et al., 2019).

In terms of the Cartoon Vignettes task, only two studies (Li et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2015) used this task and found impairment in TLE relative to non-clinical controls. One study showed that both RTLE and LTLE patients were impaired compared to non-clinical controls on the implicit form of the task but only RTLE patients were impaired on the explicit form (Li et al., 2013). BTLE patients did not differ from non-clinical controls on either form of these test (Li et al, 2013).

All three studies that used the moving triangles task reported that mesial TLE patients performed worse than non-clinical controls (Bala et al., 2018; Broichera et al., 2012b; Hennion et al., 2016). Only one study reported that both right and left mesial TLE performed worse relative to non-clinical controls (Hennion et al., 2016); however, when comparing patients according to seizure lateralisation, left or right-TLE patients performed comparably (Broichera et al., 2012b; Hennion et al., 2016). Additionally, Hennion et al. (2016) reported that brain activation in a ToM-interaction condition relative to non-ToM interaction showed activation of inferior and middle occipital gyrus among right mesial TLE compared with non-clinical controls. Non-clinical control participants, however, activated inferior and middle occipital gyrus, left temporoparietal junction, fusiform gyri, and superior temporal sulcus more than patients.

The awareness of social inference test (TASIT) was used in one study and found that TLE patients performed worse than non-clinical controls on sarcastic exchanges and deceitful exchanges, but no difference was found for sincere exchanges (Cohn et al., 2015). RTLE patients, however, were more impaired than LTLE patients on deceitful exchanges. No other difference between sides was reported for other sub measures.

The one study that used sarcasm comprehension and action comprehension tasks found that TLE scored lower than non-clinical controls (Hennion et al., 2015b). No study attempted to identify differences in TLE patients according to seizure lateralisation. TLE deficits also emerged on a conflicting belief and emotion task, and a metaphor and irony task used in only

one study (Shaw et al., 2004). However, TLE patients were specifically impaired on irony as opposed to metaphor. Shaw et al (2004) also compared TLE patients according to seizure lateralisation on an overall ToM score calculated from patients' performance on faux pas, false belief, strange stories, metaphor and irony and conflicting belief and emotion tasks. No significant differences between sides were found.

Results from meta-analysis suggested that the effect for ToM was large (Hedge's g = 0.95; 95% CI = 0.61-1.29; Z score = 5.55, $p < 0.001$; Table 5). As the confidence interval does not include zero, the effects were significantly different from zero; hence, we can reject null hypotheses and conclude that on average, TLE patients performed significantly, and substantially, worse than non-clinical groups on ToM. Additionally, our results indicated large effect sizes for both right and left lateralized TLE. However, the magnitude of this impairment was larger for patients with right-sided TLE (Hedge's g = 1.10; 95% CI = 0.55-1.66; Z score = 3.91, $p < 0.001$) compared to left-sided TLE (Hedge's g = 0.90; 95% CI = 0.37-1.42; Z score = 3.36, p =0.001). The difference between the two means yields by a Q-value of 64.86 for right side ($p < 0.001$) and 63.10 for left side ($p < 0.001$) (Table 5). We reject the null hypotheses here that the means of two groups are identical and conclude that patients had more severe theory of mind difficulties than non-clinical group and also the right-sided TLE patients had more deficits than non-clinical control compared the left-sided TLE patients. Table 6 summarizes the results for comparison between LTLE and RTLE in emotion recognition and theory of mind constructs.

[Insert Table 6 about here]

Frontal Lobe Epilepsy

Overall, studies that have evaluated ToM in FLE patients reported lower performance on the Faux Pas test (two of three studies) the RMET (two of two studies), and cartoon vignettes (only one study) compared to non-clinical controls (Table 3). One study that used the Yoni task found that FLE patients performed worse than controls on the sub measures of second-order ToM, "fortune of others", envy, gloating, and identification (Hu et al., 2016). However, FLE patients were not impaired relative to controls on the Strange Stories task (Farrant et al., 2005). At meta-analytic review, a large effect size was achieved for emotion recognition (Hedge's g = 0.90; 95% CI = 0.48-1.31). The Z-value for testing the null hypotheses was 4.27 (p-value < 0.001), suggesting that patients with frontal lobe epilepsy had poorer performance than non-clinical controls in ToM.

Empathy

Temporal Lobe Epilepsy

Four studies measured empathy in TLE patients (Broicher et al., 2012b; Hennion et al., 2015b; Toller et al., 2015a; Toller et al., 2015b), and each study reported a different combination of the total score and subscale scores (Table 4). Two studies looking at the total empathy score each found that TLE patients were unimpaired relative to non-clinical controls (Hennion et al., 2015b; Broicher et al., 2012b). Regarding the cognitive component of empathy, one study revealed deficits in TLE patients (Hennion et al., 2015b) while another did not (Broicher 2012b). For the perspective-taking subscale, deficits were reported in the right mesial TLE compared with non-clinical controls (Toller et al., 2015b). However, no deficits were found in the fantasy subscale (Broicher et al., 2015b). No differences between TLE groups according to seizure lateralisation were found on the total score, cognitive component score, or fantasy subscore (Broicher et al. 2012b), or perspective-taking subscore (Toller et al., 2015b).

In respect to studies examining various aspects of the affective component, no impairments were found in the total affective score (Broicher et al., 2012b; Hennion et al., 2015b). Two of three studies reporting empathic concern found deficits in RTLE but not LTLE patients (Toller et al., 2015a; Toller et al., 2015b). For the personal distress scale, one of two studies showed that RTLE and LTLE patients had higher scores than non-clinical controls (Toller et al., 2015a). Overall, three studies compared right- and left-side seizure focus. RTLE patients were impaired in empathic concern relative to LTLE patients in two of three studies (Toller et al., 2015a; Toller et al., 2015b), whereas no differences between sides were reported in personal distress (two of two studies) (Broicher et al., 2012b; Toller et al., 2015a) or the overall affective component (one of one study) (Broicher et al., 2012b). Results from meta-analysis revealed that for the empathy domain the effect was moderate with a Hedge's g of 0.57 (95% CI = 0.32-0.82; Z score = 4.43, $p < 0.001$; Table 5). As the confidence interval does not include zero, the effects were significantly different from zero, so, we can reject the null hypotheses and conclude that on average, TLE patients performed significantly, and substantially, worse than non-clinical groups on empathy.

Frontal Lobe Epilepsy

Two studies measured empathy in FLE patients (Gul & Ahmad, 2017; Hu et al., 2016). One study reported the total score from the IRI, which showed that FLE patients were impaired in empathy relative to non-clinical controls (Hu et al., 2016). Both studies showed impairments in cognitive empathy but no impairments in affective empathy. Of the two studies, only Hu et

al. (2016) reported results of the four cognitive subscales (i.e., perspective taking, fantasy, empathic concern, and personal distress). Deficits were found on the perspective taking subscale but not the fantasy subscale, and no impairments were found on either empathic concern or personal distress. Differences between FLE patients grouped according to seizure lateralisation were not reported in any study (Table 4).

Due to the low number of studies in the analysis, statistical measures need to be interpreted cautiously. Overall, we found high Hedge's g of 0.96 (95% CI = 0.27-1.65; Z score = 2.75, $p < 0.001$; Table 5) suggesting that FLE patients had lower empathic response than non-clinical population.

Social behavior

Temporal Lobe Epilepsy

Studies included in this systematic review employed only three of these scales: Social Responsiveness Scale, Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) and Social Adjustment Scale. Four studies compared TLE patients with non-clinical controls on different aspects of social behaviour (Gois, et al., 2011; Gascoigne, et al., 2019; Stewart et al., 2019a; Stewart, et al., 2019b). One study investigated social adjustment in adults with TLE compared to non-clinical controls (Gois, et al., 2011) and found impairments in overall social adjustment as well as subdomains pertaining to work and leisure. However, the remaining subdomains (i.e., family relationship, marital relationship, relationship with children, domestic life, and financial situation) were unaffected in patients with TLE (Table 4).

The remaining three studies investigated social behaviour in children and adolescents. Two studies assessed participants on the Social Competence Scale from the Child Behaviour Checklist (CBCL), in which one reported impairment (Stewart, et al., 2019b) whereas the other did not (Stewart, et al., 2019a). Another study assessed and reported significantly elevated scores on the Social Problems and Aggressive behaviours subscales but not on the Rule-Breaking subscale from the CBCL (Gascoigne, et al., 2019). Lastly, one study administered the Social Responsiveness scale, and found deficits on the social communication subscale but not the prosocial behaviour subscale (Stewart et al., 2019a).

Results from meta-analysis revealed that for social behavior the effect in TLE was low with a Hedge’s g of 0.13 (95% CI = -1.26-0.98; Z score = -.24, $p = 0.80$; Table 5). As this range does include zero, the effects were not significantly different from zero, so we cannot reject null hypotheses. Thus, on average, patients were not significantly different from non-clinical

control groups in social behavior. However, due to the small number of studies included, the results need to be interpreted cautiously for this construct. The effect was also not significant for patients with frontal epilepsy (Hedge's g of 0.47 (95% CI = -0.44-1.40; Z score = 1.01, p = 0.31).

[Insert Table 5 about here]

Exploratory analyses

Although the primary aim of this study was to compare the profile of temporal and frontal epilepsy patients in social cognitive functioning, two other exploratory analyses were conducted to measure whether patients (combined frontal and temporal lobe patients) were significantly different from non-clinical controls when specific emotions were considered. Additionally, we investigated whether there were any differences between patients and non-clinical control group across specific TOM tasks (Table 5).

Specific emotions: Patients vs. non-clinical control

We included studies that specifically measured and reported performance for specific emotions; anger, sadness, fear, surprise, happiness, disgust. All patients performed poorly relative to non-clinical group evident by the Hedge's g and Z values (Table 5). Based on the effect size values, disgust (Hedge's g = 0.42; 95% CI = 0.21-0.59; Z score = 3.78, $p < 0.001$), fear (Hedge's g = 0.40; 95% CI = 0.17-0.59; Z score = 3.32, p = 0.001), anger (Hedge's g = 0.36; 95% CI = 0.04-0.61; Z score = 2.23, p = 0.025), and sadness (Hedge's g = 0.38; 95% CI = 0.16-0.56; Z score = 3.28, p = 0.001) showed large effect sizes, meaning that patients significantly and substantially recognized these emotions more poorly than the non-clinical group.

Specific ToM task: Patients vs. non-clinical control

For the specific ToM tasks, we included Faux Pas, False Belief, and Reading the Mind in the Eye tests as common tasks used in the literature (Table 5). Overall, patients showed poorer performance in all these measures relative to the non-clinical group, with large effect sizes. However, in the Faux Pas test, more studies (14 studies) were included (Hedge's g = 1.15; 95% CI = 0.57-1.72; Z score = 3.94, $p < 0.001$) and False Belief (Hedge's g = 1.84; 95% CI = 0.47-3.21; Z score = 2.64, $p < 0.001$) and RMET (Hedge's g = 0.86; 95% CI = 0.54-1.18; Z score = 5.33, $p < 0.001$) only included 2 and 6 studies, respectively.

Quality ratings

The results of quality rating using the 17-item Downs and Black checklist revealed that each study included in the meta-analytic review was deemed to be of low methodological bias. Cross sectional studies' scores ranged from 11-16 out of 16 and longitudinal studies' scores ranged from 12-16 out of 18 points. Overall, the studies reported in the emotion recognition domain were assessed as exhibiting the lowest quality when compared to the other social cognitive domains, albeit still within the range considered to be 'low risk'. Most studies failed to report the statistical metrics required such as reporting actual probability (item 8) or estimation of random variability in the data (item 6). Only few studies included confounding variables as covariates in the analyses, but all studies scored perfectly for the methodological biases and all studies had sufficient power. The ratings of each study from the Downs and Black checklist are included in the supplementary results.

Conclusion

We examined the four major domains of social cognition: emotion recognition, theory of mind, empathy, and social behavior, among patients with temporal and frontal lobe epilepsy. Both narrative synthesis and meta-analyses were conducted to compare patients with temporal lobe and frontal lobe epilepsy with non-clinical controls as well as comparing between left and right-side of lesion among temporal lobe (TLE) patients. Next, we discuss the theoretical and clinical implications of these findings alongside suggestions to support routine clinical assessment of social cognition for people with epilepsy.

Magnitude of Social Cognitive Deficits Following Epilepsy

This is the first review, to our knowledge, to comprehensively examine functioning across the four major domains of social cognition in people with frontal and temporal lobe epilepsy. Compared to non-clinical controls, these focal epilepsy groups exhibited moderate to large deficits across each of the four social cognitive domains. These deficits were most notable within the domains of emotion recognition and theory of mind, which are in line with previous meta-analyses in this area suggesting deficits in the emotion recognition and theory of mind among focal epilepsy patients (Stewart et al., 2016; Edwards et al., 2017). Our findings are also in accordance with the broader literature on social cognitive deficits among many clinical populations (Cotter et al., 2018). Additionally, our results converge with previous meta-analyses work suggesting the magnitude of social cognitive impairment varies according to focal epilepsy syndromes. Specifically, FLE patients exhibit significantly greater impairment

in emotion recognition compared to TLE patients while the effects were comparable for theory of mind.

More specifically, while the effect size for emotion perception was large among patients with frontal, compared to the temporal lobe epilepsy, suggesting that frontal lobe patients might demonstrate more deficits in recognizing emotional expressions relative to the temporal lobe epilepsy group. Such differences might relate to the differential disruption to the underlying neural substrates subserving emotion perception according to the location of the epileptogenic focus. Converging evidence suggests importance of the prefrontal cortex and limbic areas such as the during processing emotional facial expression (Todorov 2013; Lopatina et al., 2018). While the importance of limbic areas has been established in the literature for processing social cues (Pessoa 2010; Adolphs, 2008; Adolphs 2010), damage to prefrontal cortex, such as the case of Phineas Gage, has adverse impact on the processing of social and emotional cues (Perry et al., 2017; Martins et al., 2012). Our results are in line with this notion that prefrontal areas are critical for processing and regulation of social and emotional cues (Buhl et al., 2014) and perhaps insults to this area could result in more adverse impact on the performance among patients with frontal relative to temporal lobe epilepsy.

Additionally, it is worth mentioning that the age of were early among patients with the frontal lobe epilepsy, relative to the TLE group. Although there are controversial findings in the development of social cognitive skills, ability to understand emotions may facilitates the acquisition of emotional skills as the child continues to develop (Conte et al., 2019). Thus, the insults to these areas could have impact on the ability to perceive social and emotional cues in later life more severely (Korkmaz 2011). It remains an open question for further investigation, however, to clarify the phenomenology and social cognitive performance, and specifically emotion recognition, among patients with epilepsy at different stages of disease' development.

While the number of studies were limited for the empathy construct (5 studies among TLE and only one study among FLE), nevertheless, we found deficits among TLE patients relative to non-clinical group. To date, self-report measures have been the primary method of enquiry for this domain of social cognition. Further experimental designs along with self-report studies are needed to investigate performance of patients with frontal and temporal lobe epilepsy in the empathy task. Another caveat in the literature worth mentioning is the lack of studies using social behaviour measures among patients with frontal and temporal lobe epilepsy. Future studies are needed to aim for a comprehensive picture of social cognitive performance among patients with epilepsy considering the location of the epilepsy too.

Laterality of Temporal Lobe Epilepsy

Our results indicate that patients with right-side seizure focus show more substantial difficulties specifically in the theory of mind domain, relative to left-side seizure. Previous studies on the laterality of the social cognitive functions indicated that the right hemisphere may play an important role in the theory of mind than left hemisphere (Giovagnoli et al., 2011; Bora et al., 2016). Recent meta-analysis on stroke patients also indicated that the magnitude of social cognitive impairment was more pronounced following right relative to left-hemisphere insult (Adam et al., 2019). While crude, this distinction might lie in light of studies that have shown that the right temporo-parietal junction is particularly important for theory of mind processing (Saxe & Wexler, 2005). Thus, the damage to the right hemisphere might reveal more difficulties in theory of mind ability whereas for the emotion recognition, such deficits were comparable between the two hemispheres.

Task Feature on Performance

As it stands, there is insufficient evidence to distinguish the discrete neural networks underlying specific theory of mind tasks. However, a recent meta-analysis suggests the temporo-parietal junction, medial prefrontal cortex, posterior superior temporal sulcus, and inferior parietal lobe are critical in theory of mind (Schurz et al., 2014). Given that these areas are heavily affected in epilepsy, it is not surprising that patients with epilepsy might show difficulties during performing these TOM tasks. Interestingly, our results suggest distinctions in types of tasks that are affected by the epilepsy within the theory of mind construct. While we found large effects for faux pas, false belief and reading the mind in the eye tests (RMET), the faux pas is more affected in these patients than the other two tasks. More studies are needed to completely rule out whether there might be differences between people with epilepsy and non-clinical control groups in the development and trajectory of different types of tasks. Our results are also in line with the Steward and colleagues (2016) finding that the RMET was less impaired among patients. Given that the RMET might impose fewer demand on cognitive and executive functions relative to other theory of mind measures, it might be the reason that RMET was less affected/impaired among patients. Another potential possibility for this effect is that faux pas test relies heavily on the language understanding and skills more than the RMET for instance. While there is an association between language skills and TOM skills (Milligan et al., 2007), this explanation does not seem to be supported by the difference in performance among left vs. right-sided epilepsy patients in this review. We found that right-sided patients performed worse than left-side seizure focused patients. Additionally, none of the studies

reported the relationships between language performance and theory of mind skills in their population. Therefore, future studies should aim for examination of executive cognitive functioning and social cognitive skills among patients with epilepsy for both research and clinical-based practices and decision makings.

Clinical Recommendation and Future Directions

Accumulating evidence emphasizes that in addition to the influence of disease characteristics and cognitive or psychiatric comorbidities, changes in social cognition modulates psychosocial outcomes for people with epilepsy (Yogarajah & Mula, 2019). Clinically, deficits in social cognition remain under-recognized, likely due to oversight of this domain during routine clinical evaluation and omission of targeted testing during psychometric assessment (Wilson et al., 2015). Deficient social cognition has wide-ranging functional implications across multiple psychosocial domains (Wang et al., 2015). Therefore, disclosure of psychosocial challenges ought to trigger consideration of social cognitive impairment as a possible aetiological factor. While problems in other cognitive domains (e.g., language) may be the root of dysfunctional social behaviour, the modularity of social cognition means that impairment may also occur in isolation (McDonald & Cassel, 2017). Further, the integrity of social cognition cannot be determined from performances across other higher cognitive domains alone, necessitating the inclusion of targeted measures of social cognition within comprehensive psychometric batteries.

Systematic screening and targeted psychometric assessment are paramount to accurate identification and characterization of social cognitive impairment. Clinicians are encouraged to remain vigilant to indicators of social cognitive dysfunction when consulting patients with frontal and temporal lobe epilepsy given compelling evidence for the presence of social cognitive impairment in this population, particularly in the domains of emotion perception and theory of mind. To guide clinic-based screening, we provide some example probes that clinicians can use to guide their clinical interview (see Table 7). This list is not exhaustive but provides a starting point for clinicians to discuss an individual's social behaviour. Collateral information is vital because deficits in social cognition may be subtle or self-appraisal limited, for example by insight/awareness, emotional state, feelings of stigma, and capacity to understand and articulate responses to questions about abstract social cognitive constructs.

[Insert Table 7 about here]

Clinical indicators of possible social cognitive impairment should prompt comprehensive psychometric evaluation, incorporating tests of social cognition. To assist psychologists in test selection, we provide tentative suggestions, pending confirmation via systematic review, of measures to evaluate each of the four social cognitive domains in people with epilepsy (see Table 8). A systematic review of the psychometric properties of social cognitive measures pertinent to people with epilepsy is an essential priority for future research. Such a review could unite the clinical and research communities by recommending a set of psychometrically appropriate measures for this population and, if possible, pooling available results to derive robust meta-normative data. We based our suggestions on the most frequently used measures within this review. We also provide contextual information regarding the age-appropriateness, availability and considerations for use in clinical and research contexts. This list is not exhaustive. Many other potentially useful measures exist, some of which have been included in this review (see Table 1) but remain minimally investigated, and other measures exist in clinical and research spheres that have yet to be applied to focal epilepsy populations at all.

[Insert Table 8 about here]

Multiple data sources are required to appropriately determine whether social difficulties are primary manifestations of impaired social cognition or secondary to one or more psychosocial comorbidities. Interpretation and formulation of findings from multiple psychometric tests is a core capability of clinical and neuropsychologists; disciplines which are well placed to aid in the differential diagnosis of the basis of impaired social behaviour. Determining the nature, aetiology, and functional implications of impaired social behaviour is imperative to deciding upon appropriate therapeutic avenues. To achieve this, we encourage clinicians to seek both patient and collateral report, including clear examples of problematic behaviours that manifest in everyday life. Further, a comprehensive psychometric assessment is central to diagnosing the root cause of impaired social behaviour.

While many avenues exist for treating secondary causes of social difficulties (e.g., compensatory strategies for impaired memory and executive functions, psychotherapy or antidepressants for mood dysfunction), treatment options for primary social cognitive deficits remain limited and specific to select disease groups (McDonald & Cassel, 2017). The last decade has seen an evolving evidence base for treatments targeting specific social cognitive domains (e.g., emotion perception: Bornhofen & McDonald, 2009) as well as broader social skill and communication interventions (e.g., McDonald et al., 2010; Penn et al., 2007). However, these studies are limited to other neurological and psychiatric populations with no

studies to date evaluating the outcomes in epilepsy patients. Translating these interventions and programs developed for use with people with epilepsy offers another avenue for future research.

Conclusion

This study was the first to investigate all four domains of social cognition among patients with epilepsy using both systematic and statistical meta-analysis reports. We investigated performance of people with frontal and temporal lobe epilepsy on emotion recognition, theory of mind, empathy and social behavior. Our results from meta-analysis revealed that patients with frontal lobe epilepsy demonstrated poorer performance relative to temporal lobe epilepsy patients mainly in emotion recognition tasks. While our results highlight the variability of social cognitive functions within the epilepsy patients' group, it demonstrates the importance of frontal lobe in social cognitive performance. Our results provide future directions for clinical and experimental research with the emphasis on the inclusion of social cognitive tasks in the clinical setting. Furthermore, more experimental research is needed to explore underlying neural correlates of social cognition among patients with epilepsy in both frontal and temporal lobe patients. Lack of enough studies in the empathy and social behavior domains call for more studies in this area of research in the future.

References

Adams, A. G., Schweitzer, D., Molenberghs, P., & Henry, J. D. (2019). A meta-analytic review of social cognitive function following stroke. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev, 102*, 400-416. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2019.03.011

Adolphs, R. (2008). Fear, faces, and the human amygdala. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology, 18*(2), 166-172. doi:10.1016/j.conb.2008.06.006

Adolphs, R. (2010). What does the amygdala contribute to social cognition? *Ann N Y Acad Sci, 1191*, 42-61. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2010.05445.x

Amlerova, J., Cavanna, A. E., Bradac, O., Javurkova, A., Raudenska, J., & Marusic, P. (2014). Emotion recognition and social cognition in temporal lobe epilepsy and the effect of epilepsy surgery. *Epilep & Beh, 36*, 86-89. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2014.05.001

Ammerlaan, E. J., Hendriks, M. P., Colon, A. J., & Kessels, R. P. (2008). Emotion perception and interpersonal behavior in epilepsy patients after unilateral amygdalohippocampectomy.

Bala, A., Okruszek, L., Piejka, A., Glebicka, A., Szewczyk, E., Bosak, K., . . . Marchel, A. (2018). Social Perception in Mesial Temporal Lobe Epilepsy: Interpreting Social Information From Moving Shapes and Biological Motion. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci, 30*(3), 228-235. doi:10.1176/appi.neuropsych.17080153

Batut, A. C., Gounot, D., Namer, I. J., Hirsch, E., Kehrli, P., & Metz-Lutz, M. N. (2006). Neural responses associated with positive and negative emotion processing in patients with left versus right temporal lobe epilepsy. *Epilepsy Behav, 9*(3), 415-423. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2006.07.013

Bonora, A., Benuzzi, F., Monti, G., Mirandola, L., Pugnaghi, M., Nichelli, P., & Meletti, S. (2011). Recognition of emotions from faces and voices in medial temporal lobe epilepsy. *Epilep & Beh, 20*(4), 648-654. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2011.01.027

Bora, E., & Meletti, S. (2016). Social cognition in temporal lobe epilepsy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Epilepsy Behav, 60*, 50-57. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2016.04.024

Borenstein, M., Hedges, L., Higgins, J., & Rothstein, H. (2013). Comprehensive Meta-Analysis Version 3 [Computer software].

Bornhofen, C., & McDonald, S. (2009). *Reading a smile (and other great expressions): an emotion perception treatment program*: Australian Society for the Study of Brain Impairment.

Boucher, O., Rouleau, I., Lassonde, M., Lepore, F., Bouthillier, A., & Nguyen, D. K. J. N. (2015). Social information processing following resection of the insular cortex. *71*, 1-10.

Brierley, B., Medford, N., Shaw, P., & David, A. (2004). Emotional memory and perception in temporal lobectomy patients with amygdala damage. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry, 75*(4), 593-599.

Broicher, S. D., Frings, L., Huppertz, H. J., Grunwald, T., Kurthen, M., Kramer, G., & Jokeit, H. (2012a). Alterations in functional connectivity of the amygdala in unilateral mesial temporal lobe epilepsy. *J Neurol, 259*(12), 2546-2554. doi:10.1007/s00415-012-6533-3

Broicher, S. D., Kuchukhidze, G., Grunwald, T., Kramer, G., Kurthen, M., & Jokeit, H. (2012b). "Tell me how do I feel"--emotion recognition and theory of mind in symptomatic mesial temporal lobe epilepsy. *Neuropsychologia, 50*(1), 118-128. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2011.11.005

Buhle, J. T., Silvers, J. A., Wager, T. D., Lopez, R., Onyemekwu, C., Kober, H., . . . Ochsner, K. N. (2014). Cognitive reappraisal of emotion: a meta-analysis of human neuroimaging studies. *Cerebral Cortex, 24*, 2981-2990.

Bujarski, K. A., Flashman, L., Li, Z., Tosteson, T. D., Jobst, B. C., Thadani, V. M., . . . Roth, R. M. J. E. (2016). Investigating social cognition in epilepsy using a naturalistic task. *57*(9), 1515-1520.

Christidi, F., Migliaccio, R., Santamaría-García, H., Santangelo, G., & Trojsi, F. (2018). Social Cognition Dysfunctions in Neurodegenerative Diseases: Neuroanatomical Correlates and Clinical Implications. *Behav Neurol, 2018*, 1849794. doi:10.1155/2018/1849794

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences.* (2nd edn. ed.). Hillsdale, New Jersey: L. Erlbaum.

Cohn, M., St-Laurent, M., Barnett, A., & McAndrews, M. P. (2015). Social inference deficits in temporal lobe epilepsy and lobectomy: risk factors and neural substrates. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci, 10*(5), 636-644. doi:10.1093/scan/nsu101

Conte, E., Ornaghi, V., Grazzani, I., Pepe, A., & Cavioni, V. (2019). Emotion Knowledge, Theory of Mind, and Language in Young Children: Testing a Comprehensive Conceptual Model. *10*(2144). doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02144

Cotter, J., Granger, K., Backx, R., Hobbs, M., Looi, C. Y., & Barnett, J. H. (2018). Social cognitive dysfunction as a clinical marker: A systematic review of meta-analyses across 30 clinical conditions. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev, 84*, 92-99. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.11.014

Davis, M. H. A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy.

Downs, S. H., Black, N. J. J. o. E., & Health, C. (1998). The feasibility of creating a checklist for the assessment of the methodological quality both of randomised and non-randomised studies of health care interventions. *52*(6), 377-384.

Edwards, M., Stewart, E., Palermo, R., & Lah, S. (2017). Facial emotion perception in patients with epilepsy: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev, 83*, 212-225. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.10.013

Farrant, A., Morris, R. G., Russell, T., Elwes, R., Akanuma, N., Alarcon, G., & Koutroumanidis, M. (2005). Social cognition in frontal lobe epilepsy. *Epilepsy Behav, 7*(3), 506-516. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2005.07.018

Gascoigne, M. B., Smith, M. L., Barton, B., Webster, R., Gill, D., & Lah, S. (2019). Accelerated long-term forgetting and behavioural difficulties in children with epilepsy. *Cortex, 110*, 92-100. doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2018.03.021

Giovagnoli, A. R., Canafoglia, L., Reati, F., Raviglione, F., & Franceschetti, S. J. E. r. (2009). The neuropsychological pattern of Unverricht–Lundborg disease. *84*(2-3), 217-223.

Giovagnoli, A. R., Franceschetti, S., Reati, F., Parente, A., Maccagnano, C., Villani, F., & Spreafico, R. (2011). Theory of mind in frontal and temporal lobe epilepsy: cognitive and neural aspects. *Epilepsia, 52*(11), 1995-2002. doi:10.1111/j.1528-1167.2011.03215.x

Giovagnoli, A. R., Parente, A., Didato, G., Deleo, F., & Villani, F. (2016). Expanding the spectrum of cognitive outcomes after temporal lobe epilepsy surgery: A prospective study of theory of mind. *Epilepsia, 57*(6), 920-930. doi:10.1111/epi.13384

Giovagnoli, A. R., Parente, A., Villani, F., Franceschetti, S., & Spreafico, R. (2013). Theory of mind and epilepsy: what clinical implications? *Epilepsia, 54*(9), 1639-1646. doi:10.1111/epi.12255

Gois, J., Valente, K., Vicentiis, S., Moschetta, S., Kuczynski, E., Fiore, L., & Fuentes, D. (2011). Assessment of psychosocial adjustment in patients with temporal lobe epilepsy using a standard measure. *Epilepsy Behav, 20*(1), 89-94. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2010.10.033

Golouboff, N., Fiori, N., Delalande, O., Fohlen, M., Dellatolas, G., & Jambaque, I. (2008). Impaired facial expression recognition in children with temporal lobe epilepsy: impact

of early seizure onset on fear recognition. *Neuropsychologia, 46*(5), 1415-1428. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2007.12.019

Gomez-Ibanez, A., Urrestarazu, E., & Viteri, C. (2014). Recognition of facial emotions and identity in mesial temporal lobe and idiopathic generalized epilepsy: an eye-tracking study. *Seizure, 23*(10), 892-898. doi:10.1016/j.seizure.2014.08.012

Gosselin, N., Peretz, I., Hasboun, D., Baulac, M., & Samson, S. (2011). Impaired recognition of musical emotions and facial expressions following anteromedial temporal lobe excision. *Cortex, 47*(9), 1116-1125. doi:10.1016/j.cortex.2011.05.012

Green, M. F., Horan, W. P., & Lee, J. (2015). Social cognition in schizophrenia. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 16*(10), 620-631. doi:10.1038/nrn4005

Gregory, C., Lough, S., Stone, V., Erzinclioglu, S., Martin, L., Baron-Cohen, S., & Hodges, J. R. (2002). Theory of mind in patients with frontal variant frontotemporal dementia and Alzheimer's disease" theoretical and practical implications. *Brain, 125*, 752-764.

Hennion, S., Delbeuck, X., Duhamel, A., Lopes, R., Semah, F., Tyvaert, L., . . . Szurhaj, W. (2015b). Characterization and prediction of theory of mind disorders in temporal lobe epilepsy. *Neuropsychology, 29*(3), 485-492.

Hennion, S., Delbeuck, X., Koelkebeck, K., Brion, M., Tyvaert, L., Plomhause, L., . . . Szurhaj, W. (2016). A functional magnetic resonance imaging investigation of theory of mind impairments in patients with temporal lobe epilepsy. *Neuropsychologia, 93*(Pt A), 271-279. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2016.11.007

Hennion, S., Szurhaj, W., Duhamel, A., Lopes, R., Tyvaert, L., Derambure, P., & Delbeuck, X. (2015a). Characterization and prediction of the recognition of emotional faces and emotional bursts in temporal lobe epilepsy. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol, 37*(9), 931-945. doi:10.1080/13803395.2015.1068280

Hillis, A. E. (2014). Inability to empathize: brain lesions that disrupt sharing and understanding another's emotions. *Brain : a journal of neurology, 137*(Pt 4), 981-997. doi:10.1093/brain/awt317

Hlobil, U., Rathore, C., Alexander, A., Sarma, S., & Radhakrishnan, K. (2008). Impaired facial emotion recognition in patients with mesial temporal lobe epilepsy associated with hippocampal sclerosis (MTLE-HS): Side and age at onset matters. *Epilepsy Res, 80*(2-3), 150-157. doi:10.1016/j.eplepsyres.2008.03.018

Hu, Y., Jiang, Y., Hu, P., Ma, H., & Wang, K. (2016). Impaired social cognition in patients with interictal epileptiform discharges in the frontal lobe. *Epilepsy Behav, 57*(Pt A), 46-54. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2016.01.027

Jiang, Y., Hu, Y., Wang, Y., Zhou, N., Zhu, L., & Wang, K. (2014). Empathy and emotion recognition in patients with idiopathic generalized epilepsy. *Epilepsy Behav, 37*, 139-144. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2014.06.005

Korkmaz, B. (2011). Theory of Mind and Neurodevelopmental Disorders of Childhood. *Pediatric Research, 69*(8), 101-108. doi:10.1203/PDR.0b013e318212c177

Laurent, A., Arzimanoglou, A., Panagiotakaki, E., Sfaello, I., Kahane, P., Ryvlin, P., . . . de Schonen, S. (2014). Visual and auditory socio-cognitive perception in unilateral temporal lobe epilepsy in children and adolescents: a prospective controlled study. *Epileptic Disord, 16*(4), 456-470. doi:10.1684/epd.2014.0716

Lew, A. R., Lewis, C., Lunn, J., Tomlin, P., Basu, H., Roach, J., . . . Martland, T. (2015). Social cognition in children with epilepsy in mainstream education. *Dev Med Child Neurol, 57*(1), 53-59. doi:10.1111/dmcn.12613

Li, Y. H., Chiu, M. J., Yeh, Z. T., Liou, H. H., Cheng, T. W., & Hua, M. S. (2013). Theory of mind in patients with temporal lobe epilepsy. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc, 19*(5), 594-600. doi:10.1017/S1355617713000143

Lopatina, O. L., Komleva, Y. K., Gorina, Y. V., Higashida, H., & Salmina, A. B. J. F. i. b. n. (2018). Neurobiological aspects of face recognition: the role of oxytocin. *12*, 195.

Lundqvist, D. The Karolinska directed emotional faces (KDEF).

Lunn, J., Lewis, C., Sherlock, C. J. E., & Behavior. (2015). Impaired performance on advanced Theory of Mind tasks in children with epilepsy is related to poor communication and increased attention problems. *43*, 109-116.

Martins, A. T., Faísca, L., Esteves, F., Simão, C., Justo, M. G., Muresan, A., & Reis, A. (2012). Changes in social emotion recognition following traumatic frontal lobe injury. *Neural regeneration research, 7*(2), 101-108. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1673-5374.2012.02.004

McClelland III, S., Garcia, R. E., Peraza, D. M., Shih, T. T., Hirsch, L. J., Hirsch, J., & Goodman, R. R. J. E. (2006). Facial emotion recognition after curative nondominant temporal lobectomy in patients with mesial temporal sclerosis. *47*(8), 1337-1342.

McDonald, S., Bornhofen, C., Togher, L., Flanagan, S., Gertler, P., & Bowen, R. (2010). Improving first impressions: A step-by-step social skills program. . *Australian Society for the Study of Brain Impairment: Australia.*

Mcdonald, S., & Cassel, A. J. N. r. T. I. h. (2017). Rehabilitation of social cognition disorders. 266-281.

Meletti, S., Benuzzi, F., Cantalupo, G., Rubboli, G., Tassinari, C. A., & Nichelli, P. (2009). Facial emotion recognition impairment in chronic temporal lobe epilepsy. *Epilepsia, 50*(6), 1547-1559.

Meletti, S., Benuzzi, F., Rubboli, G., Cantalupo, G., M., S., Nichelli, P., & Tassinari, C. A. (2003b). Impaired facial emotion recognition in early-onset right mesial temporal lobe epilepsy. *Neurology, 60*, 426-431.

Meletti, S., Cantalupo, G., Santoro, F., Benuzzi, F., Marliani, A. F., Tassinari, C. A., & Rubboli, G. (2014). Temporal lobe epilepsy and emotion recognition without amygdala: a case study of Urbach-Wiethe disease and review of the literature. *16*(4), 518-527. doi:https://doi.org/10.1684/epd.2014.0696

Milligan, K., Astington, J. W., & Dack, L. A. J. C. d. (2007). Language and theory of mind: Meta-analysis of the relation between language ability and false-belief understanding. *78*(2), 622-646.

Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & The, P. G. (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLOS Medicine, 6*(7), e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097

Monti, G., & Meletti, S. (2015). Emotion recognition in temporal lobe epilepsy: a systematic review. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev, 55*, 280-293. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2015.05.009

Morou, N., Papaliagkas, V., Markouli, E., Karagianni, M., Nazlidou, E., Spilioti, M., . . . Kosmidis, M. H. (2018). Theory of Mind impairment in focal versus generalized epilepsy. *Epilepsy Behav, 88*, 244-250. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2018.09.026

Morou, N., Papaliagkas, V., Markouli, E., Karagianni, M., Nazlidou, E., Spilioti, M., . . . Behavior. (2018). Theory of Mind impairment in focal versus generalized epilepsy. *88*, 244-250.

Okruszek, L., Bala, A., Wordecha, M., Jarkiewicz, M., Wysokinski, A., Szczepocka, E., . . . Marchel, A. (2017). Social cognition in neuropsychiatric populations: a comparison of theory of mind in schizophrenia and mesial temporal lobe epilepsy. *Sci Rep, 7*(1), 484. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-00565-2

Penn, D. L., Roberts, D. L., Combs, D., & Sterne, A. (2007). Best practices: The development of the Social Cognition and Interaction Training program for schizophrenia spectrum disorders. *Psychiatr Serv, 58*(4), 449-451. doi:10.1176/ps.2007.58.4.449

Perry, A., Saunders, S. N., Stiso, J., Dewar, C., Lubell, J., Meling, T. R., . . . Knight, R. T. (2017). Effects of prefrontal cortex damage on emotion understanding: EEG and behavioural evidence. *Brain, 140*(4), 1086-1099. doi:10.1093/brain/awx031 %J Brain

Pessoa, L. (2010). Emotion and cognition and the amygdala: from "what is it?" to "what's to be done?". *Neuropsychologia, 48*(12), 3416-3429. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2010.06.038

Realmuto, S., Zummo, L., Cerami, C., Agro, L., Dodich, A., Canessa, N., . . . Daniele, O. (2015). Social cognition dysfunctions in patients with epilepsy: Evidence from patients with temporal lobe and idiopathic generalized epilepsies. *Epilepsy Behav, 47*, 98-103. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2015.04.048

Reynders, H. J., Broks, P., Dickson, J. M., Lee, C. E., & Turpin, G. (2005). Investigation of social and emotion information processing in temporal lobe epilepsy with ictal fear. *Epilepsy Behav, 7*(3), 419-429. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2005.07.013

Saxe, R., & Wexler, A. J. N. (2005). Making sense of another mind: the role of the right temporo-parietal junction. *43*(10), 1391-1399.

Schacher, M., Winkler, R., Grunwald, T., Kraemer, G., Kurthen, M., Reed, V., & Jokeit, H. (2006). Mesial temporal lobe epilepsy impairs advanced social cognition. *Epilepsia, 47*(12), 2141-2146. doi:10.1111/j.1528-1167.2006.00857.x

Schurz, M., Radua, J., Aichhorn, M., Richlan, F., & Perner, J. (2014). Fractionating theory of mind: a meta-analysis of functional brain imaging studies. *Neurosci Biobehav Rev, 42*, 9-34. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2014.01.009

Sedda, A., Rivolta, D., Scarpa, P., Burt, M., Frigerio, E., Zanardi, G., . . . Bottini, G. (2013). Ambiguous emotion recognition in temporal lobe epilepsy: the role of expression intensity. *Cognitive, Affective, & Behavioral Neuroscience, 13*(3), 452-463. doi:10.3758/s13415-013-0153-y

Shaw, P., Bramham, J., Lawrence, E. J., Morris, R., Baron-Cohen, S., & David, A. S. (2005). Differential Effects of Lesions of the Amygdala and Prefrontal Cortex on Recognizing Facial Expressions of Complex Emotions. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 17*(9), 1410-1419.

Shaw, P., Lawrence, E., Bramham, J., Brierley, B., Radbourne, C., & David, A. S. (2007). A prospective study of the effects of anterior temporal lobectomy on emotion recognition and theory of mind. *Neuropsychologia, 45*(12), 2783-2790. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2007.04.020

Shaw, P., Lawrence, E. J., Radbourne, C., Bramham, J., Polkey, C. E., & David, A. S. (2004). The impact of early and late damage to the human amygdala on 'theory of mind' reasoning. *Brain, 127*(Pt 7), 1535-1548. doi:10.1093/brain/awh168

Singer, T., & Lamm, C. (2009). The social neuroscience of empathy. *Ann N Y Acad Sci, 1156*, 81-96. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.04418.x

Stewart, E., Catroppa, C., Gonzalez, L., Gill, D., Webster, R., Lawson, J., . . . Lah, S. (2019A). Facial emotion perception and social competence in children (8 to 16years old) with genetic generalized epilepsy and temporal lobe epilepsy. *Epilepsy Behav, 100*(Pt B), 106301. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2019.04.054

Stewart, E., Catroppa, C., Gonzalez, L., Gill, D., Webster, R., Lawson, J., . . . Lah, S. (2019b). Theory of mind and social competence in children and adolescents with temporal lobe epilepsy. *Neuropsychology, 33*(7), 986-995.

Stewart, E., Catroppa, C., & Lah, S. (2016). Theory of mind in patients with epilepsy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Neuropsychology Review*, 3-24. doi:10.1007/s11065-015-9313-x

Stone, V. E., Baron-Cohen, S., Calder, A., Keane, J., & Young, A. (2003). Acquired theory of mind impairments in individuals with bilateral amygdala lesions. *Neuropsychologia, 41*(2), 209-220. doi:10.1016/S0028-3932(02)00151-3

Sun, R., Vuillier, L., Hui, B. P. H., & Kogan, A. (2019). Caring helps: Trait empathy is related to better coping strategies and differs in the poor versus the rich. *PLoS One, 14*(3), e0213142. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0213142

Szaflarski, J. P., Allendorfer, J. B., Heyse, H., Mendoza, L., Szaflarski, B. A., & Cohen, N. (2014). Functional MRI of facial emotion processing in left temporal lobe epilepsy. *Epilepsy Behav, 32*, 92-99. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2014.01.012

Tanaka, A., Akamatsu, N., Yamano, M., Nakagawa, M., Kawamura, M., & Tsuji, S. (2013). A more realistic approach, using dynamic stimuli, to test facial emotion recognition impairment in temporal lobe epilepsy. *Epilepsy Behav, 28*(1), 12-16. doi:10.1016/j.yebeh.2013.03.022

Todorov, A., Mende-Siedlecki, P., & Dotsch, R. (2013). Social judgments from faces. *Curr Opin Neurobiol, 23*(3), 373-380. doi:10.1016/j.conb.2012.12.010

Toller, G., Adhimoolam, B., Grunwald, T., Huppertz, H. J., Kurthen, M., Rankin, K. P., & Jokeit, H. (2015). Right mesial temporal lobe epilepsy impairs empathy-related brain responses to dynamic fearful faces. *J Neurol, 262*(3), 729-741. doi:10.1007/s00415-014-7622-2

Toller, G., Adhimoolam, B., Grunwald, T., Huppertz, H. J., Kurthen, M., Rankin, K. P., & Jokeit, H. (2015b). Right mesial temporal lobe epilepsy impairs empathy-related brain responses to dynamic fearful faces. *J Neurol, 262*(3), 729-741. doi:10.1007/s00415-014-7622-2

Toller, G., Adhimoolam, B., Rankin, K. P., Huppertz, H. J., Kurthen, M., & Jokeit, H. (2015). Right fronto-limbic atrophy is associated with reduced empathy in refractory unilateral mesial temporal lobe epilepsy. *Neuropsychologia, 78*, 80-87. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.09.010

Toller, G., Adhimoolam, B., Rankin, K. P., Huppertz, H. J., Kurthen, M., & Jokeit, H. (2015a). Right fronto-limbic atrophy is associated with reduced empathy in refractory unilateral mesial temporal lobe epilepsy. *Neuropsychologia, 78*, 80-87. doi:10.1016/j.neuropsychologia.2015.09.010

Tottenham, N., Tanaka, J. W., Leon, A. C., McCarry, T., Nurse, M., Hare, T. A., . . . Nelson, C. J. P. r. (2009). The NimStim set of facial expressions: judgments from untrained research participants. *168*(3), 242-249.

Wang, W. H., Shih, Y. H., Yu, H. Y., Yen, D. J., Lin, Y. Y., Kwan, S. Y., . . . Hua, M. S. (2015). Theory of mind and social functioning in patients with temporal lobe epilepsy. *Epilepsia, 56*(7), 1117-1123. doi:10.1111/epi.13023

Wendling, A.-S., Steinhoff, B. J., Bodin, F., Staack, A. M., Zentner, J., Scholly, J., . . . Hirsch, E. J. E. r. (2015). Selective amygdalohippocampectomy versus standard temporal lobectomy in patients with mesiotemporal lobe epilepsy and unilateral hippocampal sclerosis: post-operative facial emotion recognition abilities. *111*, 26-32.

Wilson, S. J., Baxendale, S., Barr, W., Hamed, S., Langfitt, J., Samson, S., . . . Smith, M. L. (2015). Indications and expectations for neuropsychological assessment in routine epilepsy care: Report of the ILAE Neuropsychology Task Force, Diagnostic Methods Commission, 2013-2017. *Epilepsia, 56*(5), 674-681. doi:10.1111/epi.12962

Wilson, S. J., Bladin, P. F., & Saling, M. M. (2007). The burden of normality: a framework for rehabilitation after epilepsy surgery. *Epilepsia, 48 Suppl 9*, 13-16. doi:10.1111/j.1528-1167.2007.01393.x

Yogarajah, M., Mula, M. J. E., & Behavior. (2019). Social cognition, psychiatric comorbidities, and quality of life in adults with epilepsy. *100*, 106321.

Captions

Figure 1. Flow diagram of identification and selection procedure of studies based on PRISMA guideline

Figures

Figure 1



Table 1. Description of measures used for each social cognitive function

Emotion recognition	Refs	Description of the task
Emotion Labelling using Ekman and Friesan, NimStim Set of Facial Expressions, or Karolinska's facial databases.	Amlerova et al. (2014); Bonora et al. (2011); Batut et al. (2006); Farrant et al. (2005); Gomez-Ibanez et al. (2014); Golouboff et al. (2008); Hennion et al. (2015a); Hlobil et al. (2008); Meletti et al. (2003a); Meletti et al. (2003b); Meletti et al. (2009); Realmuto et al. (2015); Reynders et al. (2005); Shaw et al. (2007); Stewart et al. (2019a); Szaflarski et al. (2014); Walpole et al. (2008)	Participants are presented with photographs of faces depicting one of six basic emotions (i.e., happy, angry, fearful, sad, disgust or surprise) and are required to choose an emotion label that best corresponds to that facial expression. Alternatively, participants may have to rate the intensity of each emotional expression.
Emotional Prosody Task	Bonora et al (2011)	Participants are presented with audio of brief sentences with neutral meaning, which are spoken to produce one of five basic emotions (i.e., happy, angry, fearful, sad or disgust). Participants choose a corresponding label for each emotion conveyed by the intonation of the sentence.
Comprehensive Affect Testing System	Broicher et al. (2012b)	An assessment battery consisting of 13 subtests designed to measure perception of emotion from facial expressions, prosody and linguistic material.
The Test de Reconnaissance des Emotions Faciales pour Enfants	Golouboff (2008)	An emotion recognition test designed for children and adolescents with photographs of actors aged between 5 - 15 expressing one of five basic emotions (i.e., happy, angry, fearful, sad or disgust) and neutrality. Participants choose the corresponding emotion label for each facial expression displayed.
The Animated Full Facial Expression Test–Revised	Sedda et al. (2013)	Five basic facial expressions (i.e., happy, angry, fearful, sad or disgust) from the Ekman and Friesan (1976) series were adapted to be

		displayed at four different emotional intensity levels (35%, 50%, 75%, 100%) using a morphing technique. Participants choose the corresponding emotion label for each facial expression displayed.
Moving FER task	Tanaka et al. (2013)	Stimuli consists of videotaped facial expressions (i.e., happiness, anger, fear, sadness, disgust and surprise) of professional actors with emotional expressions lasting 2-seconds with no sound. Participants choose the corresponding emotion label for each facial expression displayed.
Explicit Emotion Recognition Task	Banks et al. (2014)	Faces are selected from the Gur Face Set - one of six basic emotions are presented - for each emotion presented, participants choose between two emotion labels that best correspond to the facial expression displayed.
The Awareness of Social Inference Test	Cohn et al. (2015)	Part 1 "the Emotional Evaluation Test" is designed to measure emotion recognition ability. Video clips are presented of an actor displaying one of seven emotional states (i.e., happiness, anger, fear, sadness, disgust, anxiety and neutrality). Participants choose the corresponding emotion label for each emotional expression displayed.
Emotional burst recognition task from the Montreal Affective Voices	Hennion et al. (2015a)	"Emotional bursts" (short, nonverbal, auditory emotional expressions) representing one of five basic emotions (i.e., happy, angry, fear, sad or disgust) are presented. Participants choose the corresponding emotion label for each emotional expression displayed.
Four computer-generated tasks (stimulus type: visual nonverbal, visual verbal, auditory nonverbal, auditory verbal)	Fowler et al. (2006)	Recognition of the five basic emotions (i.e., happy, angry, fearful, sad and disgust) are tested from presenting facial expressions, sentences describing emotion-provoking situations, nonverbal sounds and emotional prosody.
Socio-visual and socio-auditory tasks	Laurent et al. (2014)	In the facial emotion recognition task, participants are required to identify which one of two different emotional expressions match with a target emotional expression presented

		previously. In the emotional prosody recognition task, participants are required to identify which one of voices correspond to a target emotion provided. Happy, surprise, angry and sad are the four basic emotions used in both tasks.
Theory of mind		
Reading the Mind in the Eyes Task	Broicher et al. (2012b); Farrant et al. (2005); Hu et al. (2016); Okruszek et al. (2017); Shaw et al., (2005)	Participants are shown photographs of eye regions and are asked to select from one of the four options that best describe what the person in the photograph is thinking or feeling.
Cartoon ToM vignettes	Farrant et al. (2005); Li et al. (2013); Wang et al. (2015)	Participants are presented with funny cartoons and are required to infer the beliefs, intentions, and motivations of the characters.
Strange Stories Test (Implication Stories)	Farrant et al. (2005); Li et al. (2013); Shaw et al. (2004); Shaw et al. (2007); Wang et al. (2015); Stewart et al. (2019b)	Participants are assessed on their ability to understand why a character in a story used non-literal forms of speech (e.g., joke, white lie, sarcasm, irony) by answering comprehension questions (e.g., "Is it true what James said?") and justification questions (e.g., "Why did he say that?").
False Belief tasks	Li et al. (2013); Shaw et al. (2004); Wang et al. (2015)	This task targets the participant's ability to understand that someone can hold a false impression about something that is separate from their own accurate perception of it (i.e., false belief). In various versions of the task, participants may be required to predict a character's motivations, actions or thoughts based on a false belief.
Faux-Pas Test	Amlerova et al. (2014); Broicher et al. (2012a); Broicher et al. (2012b); Farrant et al. (2005); Giovagnoli et al. (2011); Giovagnoli et al. (2016); Giovagnoli et al. (2013); Hennion et al. (2015b); Li et al. (2013); Schacher et al. (2006); Shaw et al.	Participants are required to detect whether a social faux pas been committed in a story and answer questions about the feelings, intentions and beliefs of the different characters involved (e.g., "Why shouldn't he have said it or why was it awkward?").

	(2004); Shaw (2007); Wang et al. (2015); Stewart et al. (2019b)	
"Yoni" Task	Hu et al. (2016)	A computerized task in which participants infer the mental state of a character using verbal, eye gaze and facial expression cues.
The Awareness of Social Inference Test	Cohn et al. (2015)	Parts 2 and 3 of this task is designed to measure theory of mind. Audio Visual vignettes are used to test the participant's ability to understand literal and non-literal conversational remarks (i.e., sincere remarks and lies, and sarcasm, respectively).
Moving Triangles	Bala et al. (2018); Broicher et al. (2012b); Hennion et al. (2016)	Participants are shown animations in which geometric shapes move around the screen in an intentional or random fashion. Participants are asked to determine whether the shape's movement is mentalistic and subsequently the type of emotion the shape is portraying with its movement.
Sarcasm Comprehension Task; Action Comprehension Task	Hennion et al. (2015b)	Participants are required to interpret the intent behind a sarcastic remark (Sarcasm Comprehension Task) or a mentalistic action (Action Comprehension Task) as made by a character in a story.
Metaphor and Irony Task	Shaw et al. (2004)	Participants are asked to interpret the intent behind metaphoric and ironic comments as made by a character in a story.
Conflicting belief and emotion task	Shaw et al. (2004)	Tests participants' ability to understand conflicting beliefs and emotions between two different people in a scenario involving social exclusion or threat.
Story-Based Empathy Task	Realmuto et al. (2015)	Participants are shown cartoons and are asked to identify the emotional and intentional states of the characters.
Empathy		
Interpersonal Reactivity Index	Broicher et al. (2012b); Gul & Ahmad (2017); Hennion et al. (2015a); Hu et al. (2016); Toller	A self-report questionnaire used to measure dispositional empathy. The IRI is comprised of four dimensions, two of which indicate affective empathy (empathic concern and

	et al. (2015a); Toller et al. (2015b)	personal distress), and two of which indicate cognitive empathy (perspective taking and fantasy). Empathic concern is the tendency to experience feelings of sympathy and concern for others undergoing negative experiences, and personal distress is the tendency to experience feelings of distress and discomfort for others undergoing negative experience. Perspective taking is the tendency to spontaneously adopt another person's psychological perspective, and fantasy is the degree to which a person identifies with a fictional character.
Social behaviour		
Social Adjustment Scale (SAS)	Gois et al. (2011)	A self-report questionnaire used to measure instrumental and expressive role performance over past two weeks in several areas: work (i.e., paid, unpaid, student activity), social and leisure activities, relationships with extended family, marital relationship, relationship with children, relationships within the family unit, and perceptions of economic functioning. Questions within each area pertain to performance in expected tasks, friction with people, finer aspects of interpersonal relationships, and feelings and satisfaction.
Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) (6 – 18 years)	Stewart et al. (2019a); Stewart et al. (2019b); Gascogine et al. (2019)	The CBCL is a parent-administered questionnaire that assesses behavioral and emotional problems in children and adolescents using numerous scales and subscales. The CBCL scales used in the current literature pertain to the Social Competence, Social Problems, Aggressive Behavior and Rule-Breakings subscales. The Social Competence subscale (e.g., participation in clubs and social groups, number of and frequency of contact with friends, behaviour with others) is part of a wider Competence scale, Additionally, Social Problems (e.g., dependant, lonely, gets teased, not liked by others), Aggressive Behaviour (e.g., teases a lot, temper tantrums, screams a lot, threatens,

		destroys things) and Rule-Breaking (e.g., alcohol, uses drugs, swears, truancy, steals, cheats) subscales form part of the Syndrome scales.
Social Responsiveness Scale	Stewart et al. (2019a)	A parent-administered scale indexing social impairment. Specifically, the prosocial behaviour and social communication subscales have been administered in the current literature.

Table 2. ***Study characteristics and effect sizes (Hedge's g) reported individually for studies included in the meta-analysis pertaining to emotion perception***

Study	**Non-clinical group**		**Epilepsy group**						***Hedge's g***	**Included in the SR /MA**
	N.	**Age**	**N.**	**Age**	**Age of onset (years)**	**Duration (years)**	**Seizures p/month**	**No. AED**		
Amlerova et al. (2014)	20	33	TLE = 46 24 left TLE 22 right TLE	37	21	-	Median (6)	-	***-0.98***	SR / MA
Banks et al. (2013)	23	31.6	TLE = 21	37	-	13.79	-	1.37	-	SR
Batut et al. (2006)	15	NS	MTL = 12 6 left TLE 6 right TLE	35.5	16.5	-	-	-	***1.04***	SR / MA
Bonora et al. (2011)	50	34.90	TLE = 41 17 left TLE 20 right TLE 4 bilateral TLE	48.05	20.72	27.65	-	-	***5.23***	SR /MA
Broicher et al. (2012b)	29	33.69	TLE = 28 17 left TLE 11 right TLE	34.43	20.21	14.25	-	-	***0.15***	SR /MA
Cohn et al. (2015)	15	38.3	TLE = 50 24 left TLE 26 right TLE	38.45	20.4	18.05	-	-	***1.06***	SR /MA
Farrant et al. (2005)	14	35.79	FLE = 14 8 left FLE 5 right FLE 1 bilateral FLE	34.36	11.8	-	-	-	***1.77***	SR /MA
Fowler et al. (2006)	18	NS	TLE & AAD=28 15 left TLE 13 right TLE	38	10	28	-	-	-	SR

Golobouff et al. (2008)	37	12.6	TLE = 9 16 left TLE 13 right TLE 8 FCE	13.3 12.6	5.4 5.8	6.5 4.7	-	-	***0.63*** ***0.61***	SR /MA
Gomez-Ibanez et al. (2014)	23	37.3	MTLE = 19	41.90	20.60	21.30	-	1	**-**	SR
Hennion et al. (2015a)	50	42.81	TLE = 50	42.4	21.06	21.34	13.2	2.14	***0.50***	SR /MA
Hlobil et al. (2008)	28	31.1	MTLE = 36 12 left TLE 24 right TLE	29.15	-	20.1	5.05	1.71	***0.62***	SR /MA
Hu et al. (2016)	60	17.18	Frontal IED = 10	18.87	15.14	3.74	-	-	***1.23***	SR /MA
Laurent (2014)	78	12.24	TLE = 39 25 left TLE 14 right TLE	10.6	5.5	5.1	-	1.41	***-0.53***	SR /MA
Meletti et al. (2003a)	50	34	TLE = 63	35.9	-	-	-	-	**-**	SR
Meletti et al. (2003b)	50	34	MTLE = 33	36.1	11.3	24.8	-	-	***1.23***	SR /MA
Meletti et al. (2009)	50	34.9	MTLE = 140 59 left TLE 68 right TLE 13 bilateral TLE	38.6	13.3	25.3	-	-	***0.70***	SR /MA
Realmuto et al. (2015)	21	31.95	TLE = 21	37	24.3	12.9	-	1.3	***0.40***	SR /MA
Reynders et al. (2005)	12	39.92	TLE = 27 18 left TLE 9 right TLE	39.40	11.88	27.53	-	-	***0.83***	SR /MA

Sedda et al. (2013)	54	35.7	TLE = 57 32 left TLE 24 right TLE	36.72	-	-	-	-	***0.52***	SR /MA
Shaw et al. (2007)	19	33	TLE = 19	37.21	-	26	-	-	***0.88***	SR /MA
Szaflarski et al. (2014)	30	39	LTLE = 34	41	27	-	2.0	1.8	***0.26***	SR /MA
Stewart et al. (2019a)	22	12.43	TLE = 12 8 left TLE 4 Right TLE	13.72	8.86	4.84	15.56	1.42	***0.60***	SR/MA
Tanaka et al. (2013)	32	33	MTLE = 63 26 left TLE 17 right TLE 20 bilateral TLE	41.5	30.83	16.9	-	-	***0.55***	SR /MA
Walpole et al. (2008)	14	43.86	TLE = 16	45.31	12.31	32.38	3.34	-	-	SR

Note: N = number; MTLE = mesial temporal lobe epilepsy; TLE = temporal lobe epilepsy; FLE = frontal lobe epilepsy; AAD = asymmetrical amygdala damage; FCE = fronto-central epilepsy; No. AED = Average of number of antiepileptic drugs; NS = not specified; SR = systematic review; MA = meta-analysis.

Table 3. Study characteristics and effect sizes (Hedge's g) reported individually for studies included in the meta-analysis pertaining theory of mind (ToM)

Study	Non-clinical group		Epilepsy group						*Hedge's g*	Included in SR/MA
	N.	Age	N.	Age	Age of onset (years)	Duration (years)	Seizures p/month	No. AED		
Amlerova et al. (2014)	20	33	TLE = 74 37 left TLE 37 right TLE	35.5	17.50	-	-	-	***-0.76***	SR /MA
Bala et al. (2018)	20	30.23	MTLE = 40 21 without ATL 19 with ATL	34.52	12.19	21.54	7.84	-	***1.13***	SR/MA
Broicher et al. (2012a)	18	31.2	MTLE = 28 16 left TLE 12 right TLE	37.4	16.57	20.82	-	-	***2.30***	SR /MA
Broicher et al. (2012b)	29	33.69	TLE = 28 17 left TLE 11 right TLE	34.43	20.21	14.25	-	-	***0.66***	SR /MA
Cohn et al. (2015)	15	38.3	TLE = 50 24 left TLE 26 right TLE ATL = 37 18 left TLE 19 right TLE	39.57	18.52	20.02	-	-	***0.81***	SR /MA
Farrant et al. (2005)	14	35.79	FLE = 14 8 left FLE 5 right FLE 1 bilateral FLE	34.36	11.8	22.56	-	-	***1.55***	SR /MA
Giovagnolini et al. (2011)	69	52.03	TLE = 109 62 left TLE 47 right TLE	37.01	21.39	15.58	9.17	2.09	***0.57***	SR /MA
			FLE = 29 4 left FLE 3 right FLE 22 bilateral FLE	35.77	26.07	8.32	8.91	1.91	***1.34***	

Giovagnolini et al. (2013)	42	NS	TLE = 54 FLE = 12	37.8 37.17	18.7 25.33	18.89 11.83	9.33 14.73	2.13 2.09	***0.44*** ***0.39***	SR /MA
Giovagnolini et al. (2016)	40	36.05	TLE = 85 39 left TLE 46 right TLE	33.83	17.9	15.91	8.82	2.155	***0.62***	SR /MA
Hennion et al. (2015b)	50	42.81	TLE = 50 27 left TLE 23 right TLE	42.50	21.06	21.34	0.44	2.14	***1.48***	SR /MA
Hennion et al. (2016)	25	42.5	MTLE = 25 13 left TLE 12 right TLE	42.32	17.55	24.28	3.62	2.04	***0.88***	SR /MA
Hu et al. (2016)	60	17.18	Frontal IED = 10	18.87	15.14	3.74	-	-	***1.29***	SR /MA
Li et al. (2013)	24	37.75	TLE = 31 11 left TLE 13 right TLE 7 bilateral TLE	42.33	24.58	19.31	1.32	2.09	***4.61***	SR /MA
Lunn et al. (2015)			FLE =						***1.09***	
Morou			FLE						***0.39***	
Okruzek et al. (2017)	47	32.3	MTLE = 31	30.9	12	-	23	2.3	***1.12***	SR /MA
Realmuto et al. (2015)	21	31.95	TLE = 21	37	24.3	12.9	-	1.3	***0.70***	SR /MA
Schacher et al. (2006)	12	33.8	TLE = 27 13 left TLE 14 right TLE	36.5	13.3	22.2	-	-	***-1.21***	SR /MA
Shaw et al. (2004)	38	36	TLE = 26 15 early onset 11 late onset	33.5	14.5	19	-	-	***1.57***	SR /MA

Shaw et al. (2005)	91	34	TLE =54, 27 left TLE 27 right TLE FLE = 31 15 left FLE 16 right FLE	34.5 40	15	-	-	-	***0.74*** ***0.38***	SR /MA
Shaw et al (2007)	19	33	TLE =19	37.21	-	26	-	-	***0.44***	SR /MA
Stewart et al. (2019b)	22	12.43	TLE = 12 8 left TLE 4 Right TLE	13.72	8.86	4.84	15.56	1.42	***1.22***	SR /MA
Wang et al. (2015)	30	33.4	TLE = 67	32.19	18.51	13.72	3.2	2.61	***1.30***	SR /MA

Note: N = number; MTLE = mesial temporal lobe epilepsy; TLE = temporal lobe epilepsy; FLE = frontal lobe epilepsy; IED = interictal epileptiform discharges; ATL = Anterior temporal lobectomy; No. AED = Average of number of antiepileptic drugs; NS = not specified; SR = systematic review; MA = meta-analysis; F

Table 4. Study characteristics and effect sizes (Hedge's g) reported individually for studies included in the meta-analysis pertaining to empathy and social behavior

Study	**Non-clinical group**		**Epilepsy group**						***Hedge's g***	**Included in the SR / MA**
	N	**Age**	**N**	**Age**	**Age of onset (years)**	**Duration (years)**	**Seizures p/month**	**No. AED/**		
Empathy										
Broicher et al. (2012b)	29	33.69	MTLE = 28	34.43	20.21	14.25	-	-	***0.17***	SR /MA
Gul & Ahmad et al. (2017)	60	28.83	FLE = 60	28.7	13.23	-	-	-	-	SR
Hennion et al. (2015a)	50	42.81	TLE = 50 27 left TLE 23 Right TLE	42.50	21.06	21.34	12.32	2.14	***0.41***	SR /MA
Hu et al. (2016)	60	17.18	Frontal IED = 10 43 extrafrontal	18.87	15.14	3.74	-	-	***0.96***	SR /MA
Realmuto et al. (2015)	21	31.95	TLE = 21	37	24.3	12.9	-	1.3	***0.69***	SR /MA
Toller et al. (2015a)	30	38.2	MTLE = 34 16 left TLE 18 right TLE 16 extra-MTLE	38.3	11.5	21.5	-	-	***0.83***	SR /MA
Toller et al. (2015b)	33	39.1	MTLE = 22 9 left TLE 13 right TLE	36.65	16.3	20.75	-	-	***0.83***	SR /MA
Social behavior										

Gois et al. (2011)	38	28.61	TLE = 35 16 right TLE 19 right TLE	39.82	13.89	25.91	54.3 more 45.7 less than 1	7 on mono 28 on poly	***-0.90***	SR /MA
Gascoigne et al. (2019)	58		TLE = 23 6 right TLE 15 left TLE	11.7	5.71	5.36	-	1.3	***-1.39***	SR /MA
Lunn et al. (2015)	62	10.5	TLE = 6 FLE = 5	11.5	6.5	4	2	18 on mono 5 on poly	***1.28***	MA
Stewart et al. (2019a)	22	12.43	TLE = 12 8 left TLE 4 Right TLE	13.72	8.86	4.84	15.56	1.42		SR /MA
Stewart et al. (2019b)	22	12.43	TLE = 12 8 left TLE 4 Right TLE	13.72	8.86	4.84	15.56	1.42	***0.63***	SR /MA

Note: N = number; MTLE = mesial temporal lobe epilepsy; TLE = temporal lobe epilepsy; FLE = frontal lobe epilepsy; IED = interictal epileptiform discharges; No. AED = Average of number of antiepileptic drugs; NS = not specified; SR = systematic review; MA = meta-analysis.

Table 5. Hedges' g for social cognitive measures, comparing control with temporal and frontal lobe epilepsy. Data are presented separately according to each social cognitive domain and for each patients' subgroups as well as subtypes within each social cognitive domain.

Comparison	**Number of studies**	**Number of participants**		**Hedges' *g***	**95% CI**	***Z-Value***	***p***	***Q-value***	***P value***
		Epilepsy	**Control**						
Emotion									
All studies TLE vs. control	18	726	983	0.69	0.35-1.04	3.93	0.000	181.200	0.000
All studies FLE vs. control	3	32	111	1.18	0.56-1.81	3.71	0.000	4.004	0.13
Left TLE vs. control	11	265	354	0.35	-0.01-0.68	2.06	0.039	37.82	0.000
Right TLE vs. control	10	221	317	0.42	-0.04-0.80	2.21	0.027	34.62	0.000
Specific emotional category Patients vs. control									
Angry	13	528	861	0.36	0.04-0.61	2.23	0.025	511.38	0.000
Sadness	12	551	833	0.38	0.16-0.568	3.28	0.001	264.64	0.000
Happiness	13	559	916	0.24	0.09-0.38	3.17	0.002	112.68	0.000
Fear	14	587	945	0.40	0.17-0.59	3.32	0.001	362.07	0.000

Disgust	12	517	803	0.42	0.21-0.59	3.78	0.000	217.45	0.000
Surprise	6	168	268	0.21	0.08-0.33	3.26	0.001	9.77	0.102
Theory of Mind									
All studies TLE vs. control	20	794	1195	0.95	0.61-1.29	5.55	0.000	204.50	0.000
All studies FLE vs. control	7	105	498	0.90	0.48-1.31	4.27	0.000	16.90	0.010
Left TLE vs. control	9	233	411	0.90	0.37-1.42	3.36	0.001	63.10	0.000
Right TLE vs. control	9	217	411	1.10	0.55-1.66	3.91	0.000	64.86	0.000
Specific Theory of Mind Tasks Patients vs. control									
False Belief	2	98	102	1.84	0.47-3.21	2.64	0.008	14.72	0.000
Faux Pas	14	625	963	1.15	0.57-1.72	3.94	0.000	299.79	0.000
Eye	6	173	576	0.86	0.54-1.18	5.33	0.000	10.44	0.064
Empathy									
All studies TLE vs. control	5	141	223	0.57	0.32-0.82	4.43	0.000	5.23	0.26
All studies FLE vs. control	1	10	60	0.96	0.27-1.65	2.75	0.006	0.000	1.00

Social behavior									
All studies TLE vs. control	4	76	149	0.13	-1.26-0.98	-0.24	0.80	38.91	0.000
All studies FLE vs. control	1	5	36	0.47	-0.44-1.40	1.01	0.31	0.000	1.000

Table 6. Comparison of temporal lobe epileptic lesion sides to non-clinical controls and to each other in emotion recognition and theory of mind ability.

Author	LTLE vs HC	RTLE vs HC	LTLE VS RTLE
Emotion Recognition			
Visual/Facial stimuli			
Amlerova	🟢 = T	🟢 = T	🔴 = T
Batut	🔴 = T, F	🟢 = T, F	🔴 = T
Bonora	-	-	🔴 = T
Broicher	-	-	🟢 = F (RTLE < LTLE) 🔴 = T, H, A, S, D
Cohn	🟢 = T 🔴 = H, S, D	🟢 = T, H 🔴 = S, D	-
Fowler	🔴 = H, A, F, S, D	🔴 = H, A, F, S, D	-
Golouboff	🟢 = T, F 🔴 = H, A, S, D	🟢 = D 🔴 = T, H, A, F, S	🟢 = F (LTLE < RTLE) 🔴 = T, H, A, S, D
Hennion (2016)	-	-	🔴 = T
Hlobil	-	🟢= F	🟢= F (RMTLE < LMTLE)
Laurent	-	-	🔴 = T
Meletti (2003a)	-	🟢 = S, D	-
Meletti (2003b)	🔴 = H, A, F, S, D	🟢 = F, S, D 🔴 = H, A	🟢 = T, F (RTLE < LTLE)
Meletti (2009)	-	-	🟢= T (BTLE < RTLE < LTLE); S, F, A (BLTE = RTLE < LTLE). 🔴 = H, D
Reynders	-	-	🔴= F
Sedda	**35%, 50%, 75%, 100% intensity:** 🟤 = T, H, A, F, S, D	**35%, 50%, 75% intensity:** ⚪ = T 🟤 = H, A, F, S, D **100% intensity** 🟤 = T, H, A, F, S, D	**35%, 50% intensity:** 🟤 = T, H, A, F, S, D **75% intensity:** ⚪ = T (RTLE < LTLE) 🟤 = H, A, F, S, D
Shaw	🔴 = H, A, F, S, D	🔴 = H, A, F, S, D	🔴 = H, A, F, S, D
Stewart	-	-	🔴 = T, H, A, F, S, D
Szaflarski	🔴 = H, F, S	-	-
Auditory			

Bonora	-	-	◍ = T
Fowler	🔴 = T, H, A, F, S, D	🔴 = T, H, A, F, S, D	-
Hennion	-	-	◍ = T
Laurent	-	-	◍ = T
Author	**LTLE vs HC**	**RTLE vs HC**	**LTLE VS RTLE**
Theory of Mind			
Amlerova	🟢 = FP	🟢 = FP	-
Broicher 2012a	-	-	🟢 = FP (RMTLE < LMTLE)
Broicher 2012b	-	-	🔴 = FP, RMET, MS,
Cohn	-	-	🟢 = TASIT deceitful exchanges (RTLE < LTLE)
Giovagnoli 2011	🟢 = FP	🟢 = FP	-
Giovagnoli 2016	🟢 = FP	🟢 = FP	-
Hennion 2016	🟢 = MT	🟢 = MT	🔴 = MT
Li	🟢 = FP, CTN implicit form 🔴 = FB, SS, CTN explicit form	🟢 = FP, FB, SS, CTN implicit & explicit form	-
Shaw 2004	-	-	🔴 = Cumulative ToM score (i.e., FP, FB, SS, MIT, CBET)
Shaw 2007	-	-	🔴 = FP, SS
Stewart (2019)	-	-	🔴 = FP, SS

Studies are included if they compared the different lesion sides to non-clinical controls and to each other. LTLE = Left temporal lobe epilepsy. RTLE = Right temporal lobe epilepsy. BTLE = Bilateral temporal lobe epilepsy. T = total score. H = happy. A = angry. F = fearful. S = sad. D = disgust. FP = faux pas task. FB = false belief task. RMET = reading mind in the eyes task. MS = moving shapes task. SS = strange stories task. CTN = cartoon vignettes task. % = Intensity of the facial expression presented in Sedda et al. (2013). 🟢 = significant difference ($p < .05$). 🔴 = non-significant difference.

Table 7. Probe Questions for Social Cognition Domains*

Opening Probes

What do you think might be the cause of (insert problematic psychosocial domain suspected as related to social cognition deficits)? (e.g., what do you think might be the cause of your difficulties at work / maintaining friendships?)

Do you have any concerns in terms of how you interact with other people? *For example, ability to maintain friendships, 'get on' with your school mates / teachers / co-workers, communicate well with others, respond appropriately to others emotions, say the right thing for the social situation (choose one or two)?*[#]

Has anyone commented that you have difficulties interacting with other people?[#]

Emotion Perception:

Do you have difficulties recognizing how other people might be feeling?[#]

What clues do you look for to tell how other people are feeling? *How might you tell if someone is feeling angry?*

> Note - Indicators of others emotional state could be verbal (e.g., spoken content - "I'm angry with you") and/or non-verbal – tone of voice, body language / posture, physical (e.g., turning away, crying) and vocal gestures (e.g., grunts, sigh).

Theory of Mind:

Do you have a habit of 'missing the point' when other people make jokes or use sarcasm?[#]

Has anyone mentioned that you tend to say things that are inappropriate or rude?[#]

Has anyone commented that you have difficulty understanding another person's perspective? *For example, understanding why another person may feel sad when something happens even though it may not be something that would make you feel sad.* [#]

Do you struggle to understand why a person has responded a certain way or expressed a certain emotion about a particular situation? *For example, understanding why another person may express anger at a situation that does not necessarily make you feel angry.* [#]

Has anyone commented that you struggle to pick up on others social cues? *For example, if someone hints that they want help with something without directly asking for help?*[#]

Empathy:

Do you find it hard to connect with others emotional experience? *To emotionally connect with someone who is grieving a family member, for example.*[#]

Are you able to feel and express happiness toward others when positive things happen in their lives?[#]

How have you responded in the past if someone close to you has been upset or crying and you haven't understood why?[#]

Have others commented that you seem cold or uncaring when they are upset? [#]

Have others commented that they feel you don't understand their perspective? [#]

Social Behaviour:

Are you involved in organized social activities? If so what?

Has anyone commented that you seem withdrawn or tend to avoid social settings? [#]

Has anyone raised concerns about your behaviour at school/work or in social settings?[#]

What are your relationships like with your immediate family members?

Who would you consider your friends? How long have they been in your life and how often do you have contact with them?

Has anyone commented that you tend to ramble or struggle to get to the point in conversation? #

Has anyone commented that you tend to interrupt others during conversation? #

---

* Questions can be phrased in the second person when interviewing the patient (e.g., "what does your main support network look like?") or in the third person when interviewing parent/family/friends (e.g., "describe (patients name)'s support network").

Prompt for specific examples if themes are endorsed (e.g., "can you give me some examples of when this has happened? What happened?").

Table 8. Suggestion of Commonly Used Social Cognition Tasks in Focal Epilepsy

Domain / Measure	Discriminate from non-clinical Controls	Target Age Group	Availability	Considerations
Emotional Recognition[1]				
Emotion Labelling Tasks (e.g., Ekman and Friesan, NimStim Set of Facial Expressions, or Karolinska's facial databases)	All of studies reported impaired performance among patients relative to HC in either total score or in the subcategory of emotions.[5]	No age limit	Some publicly available Ekman faces (https://www.paulekman.com/resources/photographs/) NimStim; Tottenham et al., 2009 http://www.macbrain.org/resources) Karolinska Facial Databases; Lundqvist (https://www.kdef.se/)	Differing stimuli types need to be considered based on goal of the assessment e.g., black and white vs. colour photos, faces of single age group vs. range of ages.
Theory of Mind[2]				
Faux Pas Test	Twelve out of 14 studies resported impaired performance among patients relative to HC[6].	Adult	Freely Available (Adult version: Gregory et al., 2002; https://www.autismresearchcentre.com/tests/faux-pas-test-adult/; Child version: Baron-Cohen et al., 1999: (https://www.autismresearchcentre.com/tests/faux-pas-test-child/)	Concentration and language demand due to need to process lengthy verbal passages. Short version of this test has been used in some studies with 10 or 12 stories.
RMET	Four out of 5 studies reported impaired performance	Adult	Freely Available (Adult version: Baron-Cohen et al., 2001; https://www.autismresearchcentre.com/tests/eyes-test-adult/; Child version: Baron-Cohen et al., 2001;	This test requires a broad vocabulary knowledge. Ensure that participants know the words

	among patients relative to HC. [7]		https://www.autismresearchcentre.com/tests/eyes-test-child/)	when administering this test.
Empathy[3]				
IRI	Five out of 6 studies reported impaired performance among patients relative to HC.[8]	Adolescent / Adult	Freely Available (Davis et al., 1980; https://www.eckerd.edu/psychology/iri/)	There are four subcomponents: empathic concern, personal distress; perspective tasking, and fantasy scales. Ensure to report performance within each of this subscale when using this scale.
Social Behavior[4]				
Social Adjustment Scale	Only one study reported impaired performance among patients relative to HC.	Adult	Rzepa and Weissman (https://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007%2F978-94-007-0753-5_103620)	
Child Behaviour Checklist	All three studies reported impaired performance among patients relative to HC.	Child / adolescent	Licenced	

[1] Selected tasks represent one visual and one auditory task within this domain.

[2] Selected tasks represent one visual and verbal tasks within this domain.

[3] Only a single empathy measure was used across all studies included in this review.

[4] Selected questionnaires represent one adult and one paediatric measure.

[5] Most studies failed to report differences between patients and non-clinical controls for happy expression.

[6] Shaw et al., 2007 & Farrant et al., 2005 did not report any difference using this measure.

[7] Broicher et al., (2012b) did not report any difference using this measure.

[7] Hennion et al., (2015a) did not report any difference using this measure.

Supplementary tables

Supplementary table 1. Temporal and frontal lobe epilepsy in the recognition of basic emotions

First author	Total	Happiness	Anger	Fear	Sadness	Disgust
Temporal lobe epilepsy						
Visual/Facial stimuli						
Amlerova (2014)	TLE < HC	-	-	-	-	-
Banks (2014)	-	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Batut (2006)	MTLE < HC	NS	-	MTLE < HC	MTLE < HC	-
Bonora (2011)	MTLE < HC	NS	MTLE < HC	MTLE < HC	MTLE < HC	MTLE < HC
Broicher (2012b)	MTLE < HC	NS	NS	MTLE < HC	NS	MTLE < HC
Cohn (2015)	LTLE & RTLE < HC	RTLE < HC	-	-	NS	NS
Fowler (2006)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Golobouff (2008)	LTLE < HC	NS	NS	LTLE < HC	NS	RTLE < HC
Gomez-Ibanez (2014)	MTLE < HC	NS	NS	MTLE < HC	NS	MTLE < HC
Hennion (2015a)	TLE < HC	NS	NS	TLE < HC	NS	TLE < HC
Hlobil (2008)	-	-	-	RMTLE (EOS) < HC	-	-
Laurent (2014)	TLE < HC	-	-	-	-	-
Meletti (2003a)	-	-	-	-	RTLE (EOS) < HC	RTLE (EOS) < HC
Meletti (2003b)	TLE (MTS) < HC	NS	NS	RTLE < HC	RTLE < HC	RTLE < HC
Meletti (2009)	MTLE < HC	NS	MTLE < HC	MTLE < HC	MTLE < HC	MTLE < HC
Realmutto (2015)	TLE < HC	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Reynders (2005)	TLE < HC	NS	NS	TLE < HC	NS	NS
Sedda (2013)	**35%, 50%:** RTLE < HC **75%:** RTLE < HC	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

	100%: NS					
Shaw (2007)	-	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Stewart (2019)	TLE < HC	NS	NS	NS	TLE < HC	TLE < HC
Szaflarski (2014)	-	NS	-	NS	NS	-
Tanaka (2013)	MTLE < HC	NS	NS	MTLE < HC	NS	MTLE < HC
Walpole (2008)	TLE < HC	-	-	-	-	-
Auditory stimuli						
Bonora (2011)	MTLE < HC	NS	MTLE < HC	MTLE < HC	MTLE < HC	MTLE < HC
Broicher (2012)	MTLE < HC	-	-	-	-	-
Fowler (2006)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Hennion (2015a)	TLE < HC	NS	NS	TLE < HC	NS	NS
Laurent (2014)	NS	-	-	-	-	-
Frontal lobe epilepsy						
Farrant (2005)	FLE < HC	NS	FLE < HC	FLE < HC	FLE < HC	NS
Golouboff (2008)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Hu (2016)	-	FLE < HC	FLE < HC	FLE < HC	FLE < HC	FLE < HC

Studies are included if they reported results comparing focal epilepsy and non-clinical controls, the different lesion sides to non-clinical controls and the different lesion sides to each other. LTLE = Left temporal lobe epilepsy. RTLE = Right temporal lobe epilepsy. BTLE = Bilateral temporal lobe epilepsy. FLE = frontal lobe epilepsy. LADD = Left asymmetrical amy . RADD = . EOS = Early onset. L Late onset. % = Intensity of the facial expression presented in Sedda et al. (2013). NS = non-significant difference between focal epilepsy and non-clinical controls.

Supplementary table 2. Temporal and frontal lobe epilepsy in the recognition of theory of mind

First author	Faux Pas	False Belief	RMET	Strange Stories	Cartoon Vignettes	TASIT	Moving shapes	Sarcasm Comp.	Action Comp.	Yoni	Metaphor Irony	Conflicting belief and emotion
Temporal lobe epilspey												
Amlerova (2014)	TLE < HC											
Bala (2018)							MTLE < HC					
Broicher (2012a)	MTLE < HC											
Broicher (2012b)	MTLE < HC		NS				MTLE < HC					
Cohn (2015)						TLE < HC (deceitful exchanges)						
Giovagnoli (2011)	LTLE & RTLE < HC											
Giovagnoli (2013)	TLE < HC											
Giovagnoli (2016)	LTLE & RTLE < HC											
Hennion (2015b)	TLE < HC							TLE < HC	TLE < HC			
Hennion (2016)							RMTLE & LTLE < HC					
Li (2013)	TLE < HC	TLE < HC		TLE < HC	TLE < HC							
Okruzek (2017)			MTLE < HC									
Schacher (2006)	Pre-MTLE < HC											
Shaw (2004)	TLE (EA) < HC	NS		TLE (EA) < HC							TLE (EA) < HC on irony; NS on metaphor	TLE (EA) < HC

Shaw (2007)	NS			NS			
Stewart (2019)	TLE < HC			TLE < HC			
Wang (2015)	TLE < HC	TLE < HC		TLE < HC	TLE < HC		
Frontal lobe epilepsy							
Farrant	NS		FLE < HC	NS	FLE < HC		
Giovagnoli (2011)	FLE < HC						
Giovagnoli (2013)	FLE < HC						
Hu (2016)			FLE < HC				FLE < HC

Studies are included if they reported results comparing focal epilepsy and non-clinical controls, the different lesion sides to non-clinical controls and the different lesion sides to each other. LTLE = Left temporal lobe epilepsy. RTLE = Right temporal lobe epilepsy. BTLE = Bilateral temporal lobe epilepsy. FLE = frontal lobe epilepsy. EA = Early amygdala

Supplementary table 3. Quality assessment of emotion recognition studies included in the review from quality rating checklist adapted from Downs & Black checklist

Studies	**Quality of reporting**								**External validity**	**Statistical and methodological bias**			**Selection bias**				
Amlerova (2014)	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	14/18
Banks (2013)	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	NA	1	10/18
Batut (2006)	1	1	1	2	1	0	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	NA	1	14/16
Bonora (2011)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	NA	1	13/16
Broicher (2012b)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	NA	1	15/16
Cohn (2015)	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	16/18
Farrant (2005)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	NA	1	12/16
Fowler (2006)	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	NA	1	13/16
Golobouff (2008)	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	NA	1	12/16
Gomez-Ibanez (2014)	1	1	1	1	1	0	NA	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	NA	1	12/16
Hennion (2015a)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	NA	1	14/16
Hlobil (2008)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	NA	1	15/16
Laurent (2014)	1	1	1	2	1	0	NA	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA	1	14/16
Meletti (2003a)	1	1	1	1	1	0	NA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	NA	1	7/16
Meletti (2003b)	1	1	1	2	1	0	NA	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	NA	1	11/16
Meletti (2009)	1	1	1	2	1	0	NA	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	NA	1	13/16
Realmuto (2015)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	NA	1	14/16
Reynders (2005)	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	NA	1	13/16
Sedda (2013)	1	1	1	2	1	0	NA	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	NA	1	13/16
Shaw (2007)	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	13/18
Szaflarski (2014)	1	1	1	2	1	0	NA	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	NA	1	13/16
Stewart (2019a)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA	1	16/16
Tanaka (2013)	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	12/18
Walpole (2008)	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	NA	1	12/16

Supplementary table 4. Quality assessment of theory of mind studies included in the review from quality rating checklist adapted from Downs & Black checklist

Studies	**Quality of reporting**								**External validity**		**Statistical and methodological bias**		**Selection bias**				
Amlerova (2014)	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	13/18
Bala (2018)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA	1	15/16
Broicher (2012a)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA	1	15/16
Broicher (2012b)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	NA	1	15/16
Cohn (2015)	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	16/18
Farrant (2005)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	NA	1	13/16
Giovagnolini (2011)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA	1	16/16
Giovagnolini (2013)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	NA	1	15/16
Giovagnolini (2016)	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	15/18
Hennion (2015b)	1	1	1	2	1	0	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA	1	15/16
Hennion (2016)	1	1	1	2	1	0	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA	1	15/16
Hu (2016)	1	1	1	2	1	0	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	NA	1	14/16
Li (2013)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	NA	1	14/16
Okruzek (2017)	1	1	1	1	1	0	NA	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	NA	1	12/16
Schacher (2006)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	NA	1	15/16
Shaw (2004)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	NA	1	14/16
Shaw (2005)	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	14/16
Shaw et al (2007)	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	16/18
Stewart (2019b)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	NA	1	15/16
Wang (2015)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	NA	1	13/16

Supplementary table 5. Quality assessment of empathy and social behavior studies included in the review from quality rating checklist adapted from Downs & Black checklist

Studies	Quality of reporting							External validity		Statistical and methodological bias			Selection bias					
Empathy																		
Broicher (2012b)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	NA	1	15/16
Hennion (2015a)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	NA	1	14/16
Hu (2016)	1	1	1	2	1	0	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	NA	1	14/16
Realmuto (2015)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	NA	1	14/16
Toller (2015a)	1	1	1	2	1	0	NA	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA	1	14/16
Toller (2015b)	1	1	1	2	1	0	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA	1	15/16
Social behavior																		
Gois (2011)	1	1	1	2	1	0	Na	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA	1	15/16
Gascoigne (2019)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA	1	16/16
Stewart (2019a)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	NA	1	16/16
Stewart (2019b)	1	1	1	2	1	1	NA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	NA	1	15/16

Items: (1) Is the hypothesis/aim/objective of the study clearly described? (2) Are the main outcomes to be measured clearly described in the Introduction or Methods section? (3) Are the characteristics of the patients included in the study described clearly? (4) Are the distributions of principal confounders in each group of subjects to be compared described clearly? (5) Are the main findings of the study described clearly? (6) Does the study provide estimates of the random variability in the data for the main outcomes? (7) Have the characteristics of patients lost to follow-up been described? (8) Have actual probability values been reported (for example, 0.035 rather than < 0.05) for the main outcomes except where the probability value is less than 0.001? (9) Were the subjects asked to participate in the study representative of the entire population from which they were recruited? (10) If any of the results of the study were based on 'data dredging', was this made clear? (11) Were the statistical tests used to assess the main outcomes appropriate? (12) Were the main outcome measures used accurate (valid and reliable)? (13) Were the patients in different groups recruited from the same population? (14) Were study subjects recruited over the same period of time? (15) Was there adequate adjustment for confounding in the analyses from which the main findings were drawn? (16) Were losses of patients to follow-up taken into account? (17) Did the study have sufficient power to detect a clinically important effect where the probability value for a difference being due to chance is less than 5 %?

All items are scored from 0 (no, or unable to be determined) to 1 (yes), except for item 4, which is scored 0 (no, unable to be determined), 1 (partially), or 2 (yes). Items 7 and 16 were only scored for studies with a longitudinal design. Therefore, scores for cross-sectional studies, ranged from 0-16, while longitudinal studies scores ranged from 0-18. Papers were categorized into three categories with high (0-5 points for cross-sectional and longitudinal studies), average (6-10 points for cross-sectional and 6-11 points for longitudinal), and low (11-16 points for cross-sectional and 12-18 points for longitudinal studies) risk of bias. NA = not applicable.