The cognitive phenotype of juvenile absence epilepsy and its heritability: An investigation of patients and unaffected siblings

Lorenzo Caciagli[1,2], Corey Ratcliffe[1,2], Fenglai Xiao[1,2], Louis A. van Graan[1,2], Karin Trimmel[1,2,3], Christian Vollmar[1,2,4], Maria Centeno[1,2,5], John S. Duncan[1,2], Sallie Baxendale[1,2], Pamela J. Thompson[1,2], Matthias J. Koepp [1,2]*, Britta Wandschneider[1,2]*

* *Equal contribution as senior author*

1) Department of Clinical and Experimental Epilepsy, UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology, London WC1N 3BG, United Kingdom
2) MRI Unit, Epilepsy Society, Chalfont St Peter, Buckinghamshire, SL9 0RJ United Kingdom
3) Department of Neurology, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria
4) Department of Neurology, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, 81377 Munich, Germany
5) Epilepsy Unit, Department of Neurology, Hospital Clínic de Barcelona, 08036 Barcelona, Spain

Corresponding Author

Dr Britta Wandschneider, MD PhD

UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology

Department of Clinical and Experimental Epilepsy

London WC1N 3BG, United Kingdom

E-mail: b.wandschneider@ucl.ac.uk

Submission type: Research Article

Running title: Cognitive endophenotypes of JAE

Search Terms: (1) juvenile absence epilepsy; (2) juvenile myoclonic epilepsy, (3) cognition; (4) endophenotype.

127 characters in Title; **249** words in Abstract, **4246** words in Manuscript Body, **50** References; **3** Color Figures, **4** Tables.

Tables and Figure Legends: placed at the end of the manuscript

Supplemental Data: 1-eTable.

Statistical analysis conducted by Dr. Lorenzo Caciagli, MD, PhD, UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology, London, UK; MRI Unit, Epilepsy Society, Chalfont St Peter, Buckinghamshire; and by Mr. Corey Ratcliffe, MRes, UCL Queen Square Institute of Neurology, London, UK.

Abbreviations. AUC= area under the curve; CAE= childhood absence epilepsy; COWAT = Controlled oral word association test; DEX= Dysexecutive questionnaire; FDR= false discovery rate; GTCS= generalized tonic-clonic seizures; HADS= Hospital anxiety and depression scale; IGE= idiopathic generalized epilepsy; IQR= interquartile range; JAE= Juvenile absence epilepsy; JME = Juvenile myoclonic epilepsy; MANCOVA= Multivariate analysis of covariance; MCAR= missing completely at random; NART= National adult reading test; PC(A)= Principal component (analysis); ROC= receiver operating characteristic; SE= standard error; WAIS = Wechsler adult intelligence scale.

Funding

Henry Smith Charity (20133416) awarded to MK and BW, Wellcome Trust (079474) awarded to MK, Brain Research UK (14181) awarded to LC. BW received salary support from the German Research Foundation (DFG; WA3135/1-1). KT was supported by scholarships from the European Academy of Neurology and the Austrian Neurology Society.

FX is supported by a Newton International Fellowship of Academy of Medical Sciences and the Newton Fund (NIF\R5\264) and acknowledges support from National Natural Science Foundation of China (82001369), China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (2020M683321), and Post-Doctor Research Project, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, China (2020HXBH053).

Financial Disclosures

All authors report no disclosures

Author contributions

LC, BW and MJK designed the study. MJK and BW supervised the study. LC and BW recruited participants. LC, BW, LAvG, KT, CV, MC, and FX acquired the data. LC, CR, and BW performed the statistical analysis. LC and BW wrote the paper, and revised it based on feedback by CR, FX, KT, CV, MC, LaVG, MJK, JSD, PJT and SB. LC, MJK and BW obtained funding.

ABSTRACT

Objective: The cognitive profile of juvenile absence epilepsy (JAE) remains uncharacterized. This study aimed to: (i) elucidate the neuropsychological profile of JAE; (ii) assess cognitive trait heritability, by investigating unaffected JAE siblings; (iii) determine whether cognitive traits across the idiopathic generalized epilepsy (IGE) spectrum are shared or syndrome-specific, by comparing JAE to JME.

Methods: We investigated 123 participants with a comprehensive neuropsychological test battery: 23 JAE patients, 16 unaffected siblings of JAE patients, 45 healthy controls, and 39 JME patients. We correlated clinical measures with cognitive performance data to decode effects of age of onset and duration of epilepsy.

Results: JAE patients performed worse than controls on tests of verbal comprehension, working memory, verbal fluency, psychomotor speed, mental flexibility, and learning. Patients and siblings were similarly impaired on measures of verbal comprehension, phonemic and semantic fluency compared to controls. Receiver operating characteristic curves indicated successful discrimination of JAE patients and siblings from controls via linguistic measures (area under the curve $\geq .77$, $p \leq .0001$). Individuals with JME were more impaired on response inhibition than those with JAE. Across all patients, those with older age at onset had better performance on psychomotor speed and executive function tests.

Conclusions: JAE is associated with wide-ranging cognitive difficulties that encompass domains reliant on frontal lobe processing, including expressive language, working memory, and executive function. JAE siblings demonstrate shared impairment with patients on linguistic measures, indicative of a familial trait. Executive function subdomains may be differentially affected across the IGE spectrum.

INTRODUCTION

Juvenile absence epilepsy (JAE) is an idiopathic generalized epilepsy syndrome (IGE),[1] and typically presents with onset of absence seizures in late childhood or adolescence. Most patients also experience generalized tonic-clonic seizures; subtle myoclonus during absence seizures is compatible with a JAE diagnosis.[2] JAE is assumed to be polygenetic in origin, similar to the other three IGE syndromes [childhood absence epilepsy (CAE), Juvenile Myoclonic Epilepsy (JME), and Generalized Tonic-Clonic Seizures Alone].[3] Seizure onset in JAE and JME is in late childhood or early puberty, and coincides with a crucial phase of neurodevelopment.[4] It is hypothesized that alterations in developmental trajectories in JAE and JME may also lead to impaired cognition.[5–7]

Cognitive comorbidities are increasingly recognized as part of the IGE phenotype,[8–10] can predate seizure onset by several years,[11,12] and persist even after seizure control is achieved.[9,13] Cognitive difficulties have also been reported in seizure-unaffected first-degree relatives of patients with IGE and JME, the most common IGE syndrome.[14–16] These cognitive traits are interpreted as intermediate phenotypes or *endophenotypes*, i.e., disease signatures that are more prevalent in patients and first-degree relatives than the general population, are more closely related to the underlying genotype than the final phenotype,[17] and allow differentiating the genetic underpinnings of cognitive traits from the effects of disease activity or antiseizure medication.

Cognitive studies in absence epilepsies have focused on CAE or combined CAE and JAE cohorts, given the overlap of disease mechanisms[18] and clinical presentation,[2] and revealed impairment of general intellectual abilities, visual-spatial processing, executive functions, attention and language.[8,19,20] However, investigations that detail the cognitive profile of JAE, and probe the syndrome-specificity of cognitive traits, are still lacking.

Here, we aimed to characterize the cognitive phenotype of a homogeneous, well-defined JAE cohort via a comprehensive neuropsychological test battery. We also investigated unaffected siblings of JAE patients, to determine the heritability of cognitive profiles, and identify JAE endophenotypes. Lastly, we directly compared JAE to JME to highlight syndrome-specific and shared traits, and provide further insights into the presumed overlap of cognitive comorbidities across the IGE spectrum.[8]

METHODS

Participants

In this prospective cross-sectional study, we investigated 123 consecutively recruited participants: 23 patients with JAE, 16 seizure-unaffected JAE siblings, 39 patients with JME, and 45 healthy control participants with no family history of epilepsy and other neurological disorders. All patients were recruited from epilepsy outpatient clinics at the National Hospital for Neurology and Neurosurgery (London, UK) and Epilepsy Society, Chalfont St Peter (Bucks, UK), between 2007 and 2019. Controls were recruited from local communities in North-West London and Chalfont St Peter, Buckinghamshire, UK.

JAE patients had a typical clinical presentation, with age at onset in late childhood or early puberty [median (interquartile range, IQR) =12 (6) years]. All had absence seizures, and 83% had generalized tonic-clonic seizures (GTCS).[2] Three patients (13%) reported infrequent, possible myoclonic seizures associated with absence seizures. All patients had a typical previous routine EEG with interictal 3-4 Hz generalized spike-wave discharges. Seven (30%) had been seizure-free for at least a year prior to the investigation. No JAE sibling had ever experienced seizures, except for one individual who had one clearly provoked GTCS episode following a head trauma during a motor vehicle accident. All JME patients had myoclonic seizures and GTCS, 14 of 39 patients (36%) had absences. All individuals with JME had a

typical EEG with interictal generalized polyspike-and-wave discharges; twenty of them (51%) had been seizure-free for at least a year. Clinical MRIs were normal in all participants. Some cognitive results of part of this cohort have been reported previously.[5,21]

Patients with JAE, their siblings and controls were comparable in age. Patients with JME were older than those with JAE and controls. Groups were comparable for sex. Patients with JAE and their siblings had lower levels of education than controls. Further demographic and clinical details, along with the accompanying statistical data, are provided in Table 1.

Standard protocol approvals, registrations, and patient consents

Participant recruitment received ethical approval from the University College London Institute of Neurology and University College London Hospitals Joint Research Ethics Committee (REC no. 11/LO/0439). Written informed consent was obtained from all participants in accordance with the standards of the Declaration of Helsinki.

Self-assessment questionnaires

We used the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS), a self-assessment questionnaire, to address current symptoms of anxiety (HADS-A) and low mood (HADS-D).[22] Participants also completed the Dysexecutive Questionnaire (DEX), which measures everyday life problems resulting from dysexecutive traits.[23]

Neuropsychological tests

All participants underwent a comprehensive neuropsychological test battery, as detailed elsewhere.[8] Completion of the whole neuropsychological test battery required 90 minutes on average, with standardized interspersed breaks.

We estimated General Intellectual level with the National Adult Reading Test (NART),[24] requiring participants to read British English words with irregular spelling and pronunciation. We assessed attention and psychomotor speed with the Trail Making Test (Part A),[25] which

entails connecting numbers in ascending order as quickly as possible, and with the Stroop Color-Word Test, which records the maximum number of color words (Stroop W) and named ink colors (Stroop C) read within 45 seconds.[26] We employed the Vocabulary and Similarities subtests of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS), III edition[27] for verbal comprehension and semantic knowledge; participants were asked to provide definitions for specific words (Vocabulary) and describe the common link between pairs of words (Similarities). We assessed expressive language function via the McKenna Graded Naming Test, which entails naming pictures of objects.[28] We probed verbal fluency with the Controlled Oral Word Association Test (COWAT) for phonemes, that requires participants to name words starting with a specific letter (F, A or S) in one minute, and with a category fluency test, that requires naming items subsumed under a specific category, i.e. Animals, Fruits or Vegetables, in one minute).[8,29] We measured verbal and visual learning were measured with the List Learning and Design Learning Subtests from the Adult Memory and Information Processing Battery,[5,30] which involves memorizing a 15-item word list over five trials (List A1-A5), and a 9-element design over five trials (Design A1-A5), respectively. For both tests, we also tested recall (List/Design A6) after distraction. For working memory, we used the Digit Span subtests, that involve repeating a set of numbers of increasing length in correct and reverse order, and the Mental Arithmetic WAIS subtest, that requires solving orally presented arithmetic problems without using pen and paper.[27] We also collected data pertaining to several executive function measures: (i) response inhibition, assessed with the Stroop Test (Colored Words— Interference measure), during which participants are asked to name the ink color of colr words written with an incongruent color as quickly as possible;[26] (ii) mental flexibility, assessed with the Trail Making Test (Part B-A, Task Switching),[25] that requires connecting numbers and letters of the alphabet in sequence, alternating between

letters and numbers, as quickly as possible; in addition, (iii) the above described fluency measures also rely on executive function.[31]

Statistical analyses

Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS v.28 and R 4.0.3. For analysis of demographic and clinical data, we used ANOVA, Kruskal-Wallis and Fisher's exact tests for continuous parametric, non-parametric and dichotomous data, respectively. Subsequent *post-hoc* tests used Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. Kruskal-Wallis and Fisher's exact test were used to compare clinical parameters between individuals with JAE and JME. Some data for education, questionnaires and some cognitive tests were missing because of slight changes in the study protocol. Thus, we used Little's missing completely at random (MCAR)[32] on all cases, all neuropsychological test measures, education, anxiety, depression and dysexecutive trait questionnaires, which showed no association between data missingness and any values ($\chi^2 = 506.8$, df=480, p=.19).

For group comparisons, we first used multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) to ascertain overall differences in cognitive profiles of controls, individuals with JAE and their siblings, having included age and (binary) sex as covariates. As sensitivity analyses, we repeated these models while addressing additional effects of depression and anxiety (first analysis), and educational level (second analysis), that differed among groups, using the respective measures as covariates in addition to age and sex. We also conducted a repeat MANCOVA comparing the JAE patient subgroup with uncontrolled seizures against healthy controls, to address the potential influence of disease severity. Moreover, we ran a separate MANCOVA comparing JAE and JME groups, with age and sex as covariates, to address the syndrome-specificity of cognitive phenotypes. For completeness, we also report results of a MANCOVA comparing JME patients with healthy controls. We used Wilk's lambda (λ) as multivariate test statistic in all models.

For each item (i.e., neuropsychological test) of the MANCOVAs, we then performed ANCOVAs, as in prior work,[5,16] and compared: (i) patients with JAE, JAE siblings and controls; (ii) patients with JAE and ongoing seizures versus controls; (iii) patients with JAE versus patients with JME; and, for completeness, (iv) patients with JME versus controls. For these 'test-wise' ANCOVAs , we used age and sex as covariates, and adjusted *p*-values of each test for multiple comparisons via the false discovery rate (FDR) procedure.[33] For ANCOVAs comparing patients with JAE, siblings and controls, all subsequent *post-hoc* tests were Bonferroni-corrected; Cohen's *d* was used as a measure of effect size. In all analyses, missing data were addressed via pairwise deletion.

Cognitive endophenotypes of JAE: individualized participant discrimination

We used a subset of tests yielding significant differences among JAE, siblings, and controls (verbal comprehension, phonemic and semantic fluency) for receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves analyses, which allowed us to assess accuracy of individual-level discrimination, and further validate neuropsychological test measures as JAE endophenotypes. Cognitive scores were first adjusted for age and sex via linear regression, and unstandardized residuals were then used. For all measures, we assessed (i) discrimination of individuals with JAE from controls, and (ii) discrimination of individuals in a combined group of patients and their siblings from controls, using the area under the curve (AUC) metric.[5]

Correlation analyses

We correlated cognitive test scores across all patients with age at onset, to address the potential influence of timing of disease onset on cognition. We also conducted correlation analyses of cognitive measures with disease duration as a marker of disease chronicity. First, we ran three Principal Components Analyses (PCA) to reduce data dimensionality,[5] and

obtained composite cognitive constructs for: (i) *psychomotor speed* (Trail Making A, Stroop Words, Stroop Colors); (ii) *linguistic processing* (graded naming test, phonemic and semantic fluency, WAIS Vocabulary and Similarities); and (iii) *executive function* (Digit span, Arithmetic, Trail Making Test B-A, Stroop response inhibition, phonemic and semantic fluency). For each PCA, we verified that the first principal component (PC) had an eigenvalue > 1 and explained a sizeable amount of variance (>40%), and retained the first PC for each cognitive constructs for correlation analyses. As the correlation between age at onset and disease duration approached statistical significance (ρ=-.24, p=.068), we opted for partial correlations of PCs with age at onset, covaried for duration, and vice versa. Notably, chronological age and age at onset were not significantly correlated (ρ=-.10, p=.46).

Data availability statement

Anonymized data are available from the corresponding authors upon reasonable request from any qualified investigator.

RESULTS

Demographic, clinical data and self-assessment questionnaires

Statistical details are provided in Table 1. Patients with JAE reported more symptoms of depression than their siblings and controls, and more symptoms of anxiety than their siblings. Median scores for anxiety and depression symptoms were largely smaller than cut-off scores used to define mild symptoms in all groups.[22] Self-reported dysexecutive traits were more pronounced in individuals with JAE than in siblings and controls. Patient groups were comparable for number of antiseizure medications (ASM), and proportions of patients treated

with topiramate or zonisamide, and with sodium valproate. Patients with JAE had younger age at onset and slightly shorter disease duration than those with JME.

Cognitive performance in JAE, JAE siblings and controls

Statistical details are provided in Table 2. MANCOVA yielded a significant effect of group for cognitive performance (Wilk's λ=.25, F_{72}=1.95, p=.010). Follow-up ANCOVAs showed significant group differences across multiple cognitive domains, including verbal comprehension, semantic knowledge, phonemic and semantic fluency (Figure 1A, 1B), attention and psychomotor speed, working memory, mental flexibility, (Figure 2A-C) verbal and visual learning (Figure 3A, 3B; for all the above, p_{FDR}<.05, Table 2). *Post-hoc* tests showed worse performance in JAE than controls on tests of verbal comprehension and semantic knowledge, phonemic and semantic fluency, working memory, attention and processing speed, mental flexibility, and visual learning (all $p \leq .025$, Bonferroni-corrected; Cohen's d range: |0.75| to |1.32|). Patients with JAE and their siblings had overlapping impairment on measures of verbal comprehension, phonemic and semantic fluency (all $p \leq .01$ versus controls, Bonferroni-corrected; d, vocabulary/phonemic fluency/semantic fluency= -1.10/-1.10/-1.00 for JAE, and -1.06/-1.13/-1.22 for siblings, respectively). For the remaining tests, JAE siblings had an intermediate position between patients and controls, and no statistically significant differences against either group.

Repeat MANCOVA additionally covarying for education confirmed a significant effect of group on cognitive performance (Wilk's λ=.23, F_{62}=1.80, p=.011). Significant effects of education were found for estimated IQ, working memory (digit span), psychomotor speed (Trail Making Test A), and mental flexibility (Trail Making Test, B-A). Covarying for education affected the statistical significance of group effects for attention and psychomotor speed (Trail Making Test A, Stroop–Words), list and design learning (A1-A5), but effect

sizes were overall comparable to those of the main analyses. No changes to other test results were observed, particularly those on which JAE patients and siblings showed similar impairment. Repeat MANCOVA covarying for self-reported anxiety and depression symptoms yielded a significant effect of group on cognitive performance (Wilk's λ=.28, F_{62}=1.85, p=.047). Significant effects of anxiety were found for semantic fluency; significant effects of depression were found for design recall (A6). Covarying for education affected significance levels of group effects for attention and psychomotor speed (Trail Making Test A, Stroop-Words), design learning (A1-A5) and recall (A6). No changes to other test results were observed, specifically those on which JAE patients and siblings demonstrated similar impairment.

Subgroup analysis: JAE patients with ongoing seizures

MANCOVA comparing JAE patients with ongoing seizures against controls showed a similar effect size as in the main JAE analysis (Wilk's λ=.28, F_{54}=2.16, p=.077; Table 3). Follow-up analyses showed intergroup differences across multiple cognitive domains, including verbal comprehension, semantic knowledge, phonemic and semantic fluency, working memory, attention/psychomotor speed, and mental flexibility, with similar effect sizes as those of comparisons between the whole JAE group and controls (all $p \leq .037$, Bonferroni-corrected; d range: |0.75| to |1.79|). As distinct from the whole JAE sample, JAE individuals with ongoing seizures had significantly worse naming, visual learning and recall scores than controls (all $p \leq .037$, d=-.75/-.78/-.80).

Individual-level discrimination of JAE and JAE siblings from controls

ROC curve analyses (Figure 1C) indicated highly accurate discrimination of patients with JAE from controls via measures of verbal comprehension, phonemic and semantic fluency [vocabulary: AUC=.76, standard error (SE)=.07, p=.002; phonemic fluency: AUC=.78,

SE=.06, p=.0003; semantic fluency: AUC=.74, SE=.07, p=.001]. Repeat analyses after combining patients with JAE and their siblings into one group once again showed successful discrimination of patients and siblings from controls, with comparable or slightly higher accuracy (vocabulary: AUC=.77, SE=.06, p=.0001; phonemic fluency: AUC=.79, SE=.05, p<.0001; semantic fluency: AUC=.78, SE=.05, p<.0001). Collectively, these findings show co-segregation of cognitive performance on linguistic tests in patients with JAE and their siblings, further corroborating their potential as JAE endophenotypes.

Cognitive performance in JAE versus JME

Statistical details are provided in Table 4. MANCOVA did not show a significant effect of group on cognitive performance (Wilk's λ=.43, F_{22}=2.08, p =.11). Follow-up ANCOVAs showed worse performance on the response inhibition task in JME compared to JAE (p=.015, uncorrected; d=0.62; Figure 2C), though statistical significance did not survive correction for multiple comparisons across all cognitive tests. For completeness, the cognitive profile of individuals with JME is detailed in Supplementary Table 1. MANCOVA of JME versus healthy controls showed a significant effect of group (Wilk's λ= .33, F_{17}= 3.40, p=.002). Performance of patients with JME was worse than in controls across several domains, including semantic knowledge, verbal comprehension, expressive language, phonemic fluency, working memory, psychomotor speed, mental flexibility, response inhibition, and verbal learning (all $p \leq .019$, Bonferroni-corrected; d range: |0.51| to |1.13|).

Correlation analyses

PCA applied to neuropsychological test measures yielded composite constructs probing the following superordinate domains: *psychomotor speed, linguistic processing,* and *executive function*. The first PC for *psychomotor speed/linguistic processing/executive function* had eigenvalues of 1.84/2.80/2.87 and explained 61.2/56.0/47.9% of the total variance,

respectively. Controlling for disease duration, we found significant correlations of age at onset with both *psychomotor speed* and *executive function* (ρ=.34, p=.014; and ρ=.37, p=.016, respectively; both p_{FDR}=.024, adjusted for number of superordinate domains). Later age of onset was associated with better performance on tests of psychomotor speed and executive function. Correlation of linguistic processing with age at onset was not statistically significant (ρ=.12, p=.385). *Executive function* and *linguistic processing*, but not *psychomotor speed*, were better in older subjects (ρ=.32, p=.031; and ρ=.30, p=.026, respectively; both p_{FDR}=.047; ρ=-.003 p=.99 for *psychomotor speed*). Correlations of cognitive domains with duration of epilepsy were not statistically significant.

DISCUSSION

Despite extensive investigation into the cognitive comorbidities of JME, CAE or mixed absence epilepsy cohorts,[8,34] a detailed assessment of the cognitive profile of JAE has been missing. In this study, we characterized the cognitive phenotype of a homogeneous, well-characterized JAE sample. We identified cognitive impairment spanning multiple domains, including attention and psychomotor speed, linguistic processing, visual learning, working memory and executive function. Unaffected JAE siblings were similarly affected as patients on tests of semantic knowledge and verbal fluency, that also rely on executive function, and showed no differences compared to either patients or controls for the remaining tests. In keeping with previous work in IGE samples[15] and in JME specifically,[14,16] our findings suggest that cognitive impairment in JAE is a familial trait, is heritable, likely genetic in origin, and forms part of the disease phenotype. Comparison of JME and JAE patients demonstrated slightly poorer response inhibition in JME patients, which points to syndrome-specificity of executive function profiles. Similar to JAE, several cognitive domains were

also affected in JME, consistent with an overlap of cognitive profiles across IGE syndromes.[1] Correlation analyses corroborated the existence of *discrete*[35] cognitive phenotypes, i.e., cognitive profiles that are independent of epilepsy syndrome, and are rather influenced by factors such as family history and neurodevelopment. Specifically, our findings indicate that an early timing of disease onset may affect higher-order cognition, particularly executive function, and align with the view that altered neurodevelopment is an important determinant of IGE-associated cognitive difficulties.

In our JAE sample, general intellectual abilities were comparable to controls. Previous studies in mixed absence epilepsy, including meta-analyses, reported lower intelligence measures in patients than controls.[8,34] However, such scores fell within a range considered as average for the majority of patients.[8] We also identified poor performance on attention tasks, including sustained, selective and divided attention. Attentional difficulties appear as a key feature of mixed absence epilepsy samples.[8,13,34,36] Prior work by Masur *et al*. found attentional deficits in a third of their new-onset CAE cohort, which persisted after up to 20 weeks following treatment initiation, irrespective of seizure control.[13] Collectively, attention deficits may be construed as core characteristic of the cognitive phenotype of JAE, and absence epilepsy more broadly. Interestingly, the above authors also revealed subsequent detrimental effects of attentional deficits on long-term memory, executive function and academic achievement, and other research also pointed to attention as the necessary prerequisite for successful memory and other higher-order abilities.[8,13] Thus, attentional difficulties may represent an important driver of the multidomain cognitive impairment reported in our and prior studies. Finally, we note that combined EEG-functional MRI studies demonstrated altered activity patterns of large-scale brain networks subserving attention, which appeared more prominent during pre-ictal and ictal states.[37,38] On balance, we conclude that attentional difficulties may also be modulated by disease activity.[18,37,38]

Similar to previous studies in mixed absence epilepsy,[34] executive function was affected in our JAE sample. Such pattern, however, was not homogeneous, as response inhibition appeared relatively spared. Consequently, we infer that performance on some executive function tests may not be exclusively contingent on attentional control. Executive dysfunction has been frequently observed in IGE, particularly in JME.[8] In our study, comparison of JME and JAE patients showed overall similar cognitive profiles, but highlighted differences in response inhibition. While the latter finding may be interpreted as exploratory, it supports the view that executive function profiles may diverge slightly along the IGE spectrum. We also note that response inhibition is elsewhere conceptualized as a marker of cognitive impulsivity and poor psychosocial outcome,[39] which appears more prominent in JME. Our findings may thus have considerable prognostic implications. We advocate replication on larger samples and with more extensive executive function batteries.

Language was affected in the JAE group, in line with previous mixed absence epilepsy studies and meta-analyses.[8,34] Language abilities appear impaired across the whole epilepsy spectrum, particularly in syndromes with childhood onset. However, severity of impairment appears slightly greater in absence epilepsies and temporal lobe epilepsy compared to JME and benign epilepsy with centrotemporal spikes.[40] Language difficulties in syndromes with earlier seizure onset indicates possible neurodevelopmental underpinnings of language dysfunction, which is corroborated by our findings of similar weaknesses in verbal comprehension and verbal fluency in JAE patients and their siblings. Overall, language compromise may thus be construed as a heritable disease trait. Prior work reported discordant associations in CAE patients and controls between verbal IQ and structural measures of neurodevelopment, i.e. cortical thickness and sulcal depth,[41] in medial frontal, superior frontal and superior temporal cortices. Such literature suggests that language dysfunction in absence epilepsies may result from aberrant cortical neurodevelopment or reorganization.

IGE have polygenetic etiology.[42] Investigating unaffected first-degree relatives can identify intermediate phenotypes or *endophenotypes*, i.e. heritable traits that co-segregate in affected families, are associated with the disease at the population level, and help untangle the genetic and familial contribution to cognitive profiles from other variables, such as disease duration or ASM.[17] Here, we identified similar patterns of language and executive dysfunction in JAE and their healthy siblings, which suggests that these are to some extent genetically-determined, and form part of the disease phenotype. More marked cognitive difficulties in JAE patients than their relatives, as previously documented for IGE and JME, may stem from the additional effects of disease burden, ASM and other factors predisposing to recurrent seizures.[8,14–16] We also note that frequent seizures, in particular, can undermine cognitive function.[8] Here, cognitive impairment in the subgroup of JAE patients with ongoing seizures overlapped with that of the whole JAE sample; further, effect sizes for linguistic and executive measures with endophenotypic potential were near-identical in the uncontrolled-seizure subgroup, indicating a somewhat limited influence of clinical characteristics. Individuals with JAE and ongoing seizures, however, exhibited more marked difficulties with naming as well as visual learning and recall, which both rely on mesiotemporal processing. We thus speculate that neural networks underlying cognitive dysfunction may be broader in those with more severe disease, and more prominently encompass extra-frontal areas, which echoes recent evidence of mesiotemporal alterations in IGE syndromes.[5,43,44]

To date, imaging findings in CAE indicate abnormal cortical geometry[41] and myelination[45], mainly affecting frontal and temporal regions, that suggests abnormal neurodevelopment. The timing of disease onset, ranging from late childhood to early adolescence in JAE and JME, may lead to disruption of neurodevelopmental trajectories in this critical phase, resulting in altered circuit maturation and abnormal cortical topography.[46] In our study, we found that older age at epilepsy onset related to better performance on psychomotor speed

and executive function tests. These findings imply that developmental trajectories of slow-maturing frontal networks,[47] and the higher-order cognitive functions subserved by these, may be detrimentally affected in cases with earlier disease onset. It is conceivable that patients with earlier disease onset could accumulate further injury to cognitive networks over time due to chronic disease. However, in our cohort, the effect of age at onset on these cognitive domains was independent of disease duration, indicating that cognitive impairment patterns may be established during neurodevelopment. Moreover, Hermann and colleagues[35] reported cognitive phenotypes in childhood epilepsies that were not syndrome-specific, but rather influenced by factors linked to brain development, such as age at onset, and spanned different syndromes. Here, younger age at onset was indeed associated with greater cognitive impairment across several cognitive domains. Thus, we conclude that early "injury" may be more universally harmful to development of cognitive network architecture, somewhat irrespective of syndromic classification.

Our study has limitations. Patients did not undergo simultaneous EEG monitoring during neuropsychological testing. While cognitive tests were conducted under the close monitoring of epilepsy specialists, who did not observe clear-cut absence seizures, any potential influence of concurrent subclinical epileptiform discharges on performance could not be formally assessed.[48] While we addressed the potential influence of poorly controlled seizures, we also note that ASM can detrimentally affect cognitive performance, particularly topiramate and zonisamide.[49] For absence epilepsies specifically, attention deficits appear more frequently associated with sodium valproate use than with other medications.[50] In our sample, some JAE patients were taking these medications [1 on zonisamide, 1 on topiramate; 10 (43.5%) on sodium valproate], which may have influenced cognition. However, as untreated, unaffected siblings were similarly affected in some domains, we conclude that such impairment cannot exclusively be attributed to medication effects.

In conclusion, our study characterizes the cognitive profile of JAE, identifying wide-ranging impairment across semantic knowledge, verbal fluency, processing speed, executive function, and memory. Weaknesses in vocabulary and verbal fluency co-segregate in patients with JAE and their unaffected siblings, representing heritable familial traits (endophenotypes). The cognitive profiles of JAE and JME overlap, but there is evidence of syndrome-specific impairment in response inhibition. Cognitive abilities, particularly psychomotor speed and executive function, appear detrimentally affected by an early seizure onset.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank all patients, their siblings, and controls for their participation in this study. Dr. Jonathan O'Muircheartaigh, Professor Veena Kumari and Professor Mark P. Richardson are acknowledged for their input on previous collaborative projects. Ms. Andrea Hill, Ms. Xandra Harman and Dr. Xin You Tai are acknowledged for their assistance with data acquisition.

CITATION DIVERSITY STATEMENT

Recent work in several fields of science has identified a bias in citation practices such that papers from women and other minority scholars are under-cited relative to the number of such papers in the field (https://github.com/dalejn/cleanBib). Here we sought to proactively consider choosing references that reflect the diversity of the field in thought, form of contribution, gender, race, ethnicity, and other factors. First, we obtained the predicted gender of the first and last author of each reference by using databases that store the probability of a first name being carried by a woman (5, 10). By this measure (and excluding self-citations to the first and last authors of our current paper), our references contain 12.4% woman(first)/woman(last), 22.57% man/woman, 22.57% woman/man, and 42.47% man/man.

This method is limited in that a) names, pronouns, and social media profiles used to construct the databases may not, in every case, be indicative of gender identity and b) it cannot account for intersex, non-binary, or transgender people. Second, we obtained predicted racial/ethnic category of the first and last author of each reference by databases that store the probability of a first and last name being carried by an author of color (11, 12). By this measure (and excluding self-citations), our references contain 9.49% author of color (first)/author of color(last), 9.61% white author/author of color, 22.97% author of color/white author, and 57.93% white author/white author. This method is limited in that a) names and Florida Voter Data to make the predictions may not be indicative of racial/ethnic identity, and b) it cannot account for Indigenous and mixed-race authors, or those who may face differential biases due to the ambiguous racialization or ethnicization of their names. We look forward to future work that could help us to better understand how to support equitable practices in science.

TABLE 1. Demographic data, clinical characteristics, and questionnaires.

	CTR (n = 45)	**JAE (n = 23)**	**SIB (n = 16)**	**JME (n = 39)**	**Test Statistic**	***P* value**	***Post-hoc* tests (Bonferroni corrected)**
Age, y, mean (SD)	28.4 (6.6)	24.4 (6.6)	26.0 (8.0)	34.3 (10.7)	*F* = 8.4	**<.001**	JAE vs CTR: .380 SIB vs CTR: 1.000 JAE vs SIB: 1.000 **JME vs JAE: <.001** **JME vs CTR: .009**
Sex, F/M	29/16	16/7	5/11	22/17	*FET* = 6.56	.079	N/A
Education, ordinal, median (IQR)	3.0 (1.5)	2.0 (2.0)	2.0 (1.8)	3.0 (1.0)	*H* = 20.7	**<.001**	**JAE vs CTR: .001** **SIB vs CTR: .001** JAE vs SIB: 1.00 JME vs JAE: .834 JME vs CTR: .154
Dysexecutive Traits (DEX) median (IQR)	14.0 (9.5)	27.5 (14.8)	10.0 (14.5)	27.5 (18.5)	*H* = 17.3	**<.001**	**JAE vs CTR: .008** SIB vs CTR: 1.000 **JAE vs SIB: .010** JME vs JAE: 1.000 JME vs CTR: .093
Anxiety (HADS-A) median (IQR)	5.0 (5.0)	5.0 (6.0)	2.5 (3.8)	6.0 (5.5)	*H* = 17.0	**<.001**	JAE vs CTR: .282 SIB vs CTR: .255 **JAE vs SIB: .004** JME vs JAE: 1.00 JME vs CTR: .230
Depression (HADS-D) median (IQR)	1.0 (2.0)	2.0 (3.0)	0.0 (2.8)	2.0 (4.3)	*H* = 18.0	**<.001**	**JAE vs CTR: .021** SIB vs CTR: 1.000 **JAE vs SIB: .030** JME vs JAE: 1.00 JME vs CTR: .009
ASM, median (IQR)	N/A	2.0 (1.0)	N/A	2.0 (1.0)	*H* = .008 (JME vs JAE)	.927	
Sodium valproate (yes/no)	N/A		N/A		*FET* = 1.9 (JME vs JAE)	.195	
Topiramate or zonisamide (yes/no)	N/A	2/21	N/A	3/36	*FET* = .020 (JME vs JAE)	.619	
Disease Duration, y, median (IQR)	N/A	11.3 (11.0)	N/A	16.0 (18.0)	*H* = 5.9 (JME vs JAE)	**.015**	
Age at Onset, y, median (IQR)	-	12.0 (6.0)	-	15.0 (4.0)	*H* = 9.33 (JME vs JAE)	**.002**	

Abbreviations. ASM= anti-seizure medication(s); CTR = Controls; FET = Fisher's Exact Test statistic; IQR= inter-quartile range; JAE = Juvenile Absence Epilepsy; JME = Juvenile Myoclonic Epilepsy; SD= standard deviation; SIB = Unaffected siblings of JAE patients.

TABLE 2. MANCOVA, JAE compared to JAE siblings and controls

Multivariate model. Wilk's lambda =.25, $F(error)_{72} = 1.95$, ***p* = .010**

	Effect of group (*F* statistic)	**P_{FDR} value (uncorr. *P*)**	**Mean (SD)**	**Post-hoc *P* value** (Bonferroni-corrected)	**Effect size (Cohen's *d*)**
Estimated IQ (NART)	$F_{2,75}$= 2.75	.092 (.070)	JAE: 103.4 (8.5) SIB: 106.4 (4.8) CTR: 108.8 (7.7)		JAE vs CTR: -.56 SIB vs CTR: -.29 JAE vs SIB: -33
Vocabulary	$F_{2,65}$ = 9.43	**.001 (.0003)**	JAE: 42.1 (11.4) SIB: 44.4 (7.6) CTR: 52.6 (7.0)	JAE vs CTR: **<.001** SIB vs CTR: **.010** JAE vs SIB: 1.00	JAE vs CTR: **-1.10** SIB vs CTR: **-1.06** JAE vs SIB: -.16
Similarities	$F_{2,65}$ = 10.81	**<.0001 (<.0001)**	JAE: 22.8 (4.9) SIB: 25.4 (4.5) CTR: 28.7 (3.6)	JAE vs CTR: **<.001** SIB vs CTR: .068 JAE vs SIB: .383	JAE vs CTR: **-1.32** SIB vs CTR: -.72 JAE vs SIB: -.53
McKenna Graded Naming	$F_{2,71}$ = 1.76	.217 (.179)	JAE: 16.8 (4.1) SIB: 18.8 (3.3) CTR: 19.5 (4.0)		JAE vs CTR: -.48 SIB vs CTR: -.13 JAE vs SIB: -.38
Phonemic Fluency (F, A, S; sum of all words per letter)	$F_{2,77}$ = 13.25	**<.0001 (<.0001)**	JAE: 36.8 (10.9) SIB: 38.1 (9.3) CTR: 48.6 (9.8)	JAE vs CTR: **<.001** SIB vs CTR: **.001** JAE vs SIB: 1.00	JAE vs CTR: **-1.10** SIB vs CTR: **-1.13** JAE vs SIB: -.02
Semantic Fluency (Animals, fruits, vegetables, sum of all items per category)	$F_{2,75}$= 12.10	**.0003 (<.0001)**	JAE: 48.5 (9.6) SIB: 47.1(6.8) CTR: 57.1 (8.1)	JAE vs CTR: **<.001** SIB vs CTR: **<.001** JAE vs SIB: 1.00	JAE vs CTR: **-1.00** SIB vs CTR: **-1.22** JAE vs SIB: .08
Digit Span	$F_{2,71}$= 1.45	.274 (.242)	JAE: 16.9 (4.0) SIB: 17.7 (3.2) CTR: 18.7 (4.3)		JAE vs CTR: -.41 SIB vs CTR: -.29 JAE vs SIB: -.16
Arithmetic	$F_{2,63}$= 9.80	**.0008 (.0002)**	JAE: 12.6 (4.2) SIB: 16.1 (4.0) CTR: 17.1 (3.0)	JAE vs CTR: **<.001** SIB vs CTR: .248 JAE vs SIB: .190	JAE vs CTR: **-1.30** SIB vs CTR: -.58 JAE vs SIB: -.64
Trail Making Test (A) (seconds)	$F_{2,73}$ = 3.90	**.047 (.025)**	JAE: 34.0 (11.2) SIB: 28.8 (10.8) CTR: 26.2 (7.7)	JAE vs CTR: **.020** SIB vs CTR: 1.00 JAE vs SIB: .489	JAE vs CTR: **.74** SIB vs CTR: .29 JAE vs SIB: .42
Trail Making Test (B-A) (seconds)	$F_{2,72}$ = 7.94	**.0023 (.0008)**	JAE: 41.6 (15.1) SIB: 29.6 (15.0) CTR: 26.2 (12.0)	JAE vs CTR: **<.001** SIB vs CTR: 1.00 JAE vs SIB: .062	JAE vs CTR: **1.07** SIB vs CTR: .28 JAE vs SIB: .71
Stroop - Words (items in 45 seconds)	$F_{2,63}$ = 3.71	**.048 (.030)**	JAE: 89.6 (14.4) SIB: 94.7 (12.0) CTR: 99.3 (11.5)	JAE vs CTR: **.025** SIB vs CTR: 1.00 JAE vs SIB: .500	JAE vs CTR: **-.75** SIB vs CTR: -.31 JAE vs SIB: -.46
Stroop - Colour (items in 45 seconds)	$F_{2,63}$ = 2.93	.085 (.060)	JAE: 74.7 (13.5) SIB: 78.8 (13.9) CTR: 83.0 (12.1)		JAE vs CTR: -.71 SIB vs CTR: -.15 JAE vs SIB: -.48
Stroop Interference (Words + Colour)/2 minus items in Colored Words)	$F_{2,63}$ = .30	.792 (.745)	JAE: 33.4 (11.2) SIB: 31.3 (10.5) CTR: 31.6 (8.5)		JAE vs CTR: .22 SIB vs CTR: .08 JAE vs SIB: .13
List Learning (A1-A5)	$F_{2,70}$ = 3.59	**.048 (.031)**	JAE: 56.2 (8.1) SIB: 56.9 (7.4) CTR: 60.1 (6.1)	JAE vs CTR: .078 SIB vs CTR: .132 JAE vs SIB: 1.00	JAE vs CTR: -.62 SIB vs CTR: -.64 JAE vs SIB: -.02
List Recall (A6)	$F_{2,68}$ = .21	.813 (.813)	JAE: 12.4 (2.8) SIB: 12.5 (2.7) CTR: 12.5 (2.8)		JAE vs CTR: -.17 SIB vs CTR: .00 JAE vs SIB: -.16
Design Learning (A1-A5)	$F_{2,70}$= 4.37	**.034 (.016)**	JAE: 35.3 (8.2) SIB: 38.1 (6.5) CTR: 39.3 (5.2)	JAE vs CTR: **.016** SIB vs CTR: .412 JAE vs SIB: .973	JAE vs CTR: **-.78** SIB vs CTR: -.50 JAE vs SIB: -.31
Design Recall (A6)^	$F_{2,69}$= 4.70	**.029^ (.012)**	JAE: 6.8 (3.1) SIB: 8.2 (1.5) CTR: 8.1 (1.5)	JAE vs CTR: **.009** SIB vs CTR: 1.00 JAE vs SIB: .280	JAE vs CTR: **-.80** SIB vs CTR: -.32 JAE vs SIB: -.50

Abbreviations. CTR = Controls; JAE = Juvenile Absence Epilepsy; NART= National Adult Reading Test; SD= standard deviation; SIB = Unaffected JAE siblings; uncorr. = uncorrected. ^Design recall (A6) data distribution appeared slightly

skewed (Figure 3). Repeat analyses using a Kruskal-Wallis test on residualized design recall scores, after adjusting for age and sex, confirmed a significant effect of group (H =6.56, p=0.038); a Bonferroni-corrected *post-hoc* test comparing individuals with JAE and controls showed no statistically significant differences (p=0.088).

TABLE 3. MANCOVA, JAE with ongoing seizures versus controls

Multivariate model. Wilk's lambda =.28, F(error)$_{54}$ = 2.16, p = .077				
	Effect of group (F statistic)	**P_{FDR} value (uncorr. P)**	**Mean (SD)**	**Effect size (Cohen's d)**
Estimated IQ (NART)	$F_{1,53}$= 4.31	.0562 (.043)	JAE: 103.1 (9.0) CTR: 108.8 (7.7)	JAE vs CTR: **-.60**
Vocabulary	$F_{1,43}$= 10.46	**.0043 (.002)**	JAE: 43.5 (10.1) CTR: 52.6 (7.0)	JAE vs CTR: **-1.04**
Similarities	$F_{1,43}$= 15.81	**.001 (.0003)**	JAE: 23.5 (4.2) CTR: 28.7 (3.6)	JAE vs CTR: **-1.27**
McKenna Graded Naming	$F_{1,49}$= 5.40	**.0368** (.024)	JAE: 16.1 (3.6) CTR: 19.5 (4.0)	JAE vs CTR: **-.70**
Phonemic Fluency (F, A, S; sum of all words per letter)	$F_{1,53}$ = 9.66	**.0057 (.003)**	JAE: 38.2 (12.5) CTR: 48.6 (9.8)	JAE vs CTR: **-.93**
Semantic Fluency (Animals, fruits, vegetables, sum of all items per category)	$F_{1,53}$= 16.03	**.001 (.0002)**	JAE: 47.2 (11.1) CTR: 57.1 (8.1)	JAE vs CTR: **-1.18**
Digit Span	$F_{1,49}$= 2.04	.180 (.159)	JAE: 17.0 (4.3) CTR: 18.7 (4.3)	JAE vs CTR: -.45
Arithmetic	$F_{1,43}$= 29.96	**<.0001 (.000002)**	JAE: 11.7 (4.0) CTR: 17.1 (3.0)	JAE vs CTR: **-1.79**
Trail Making Test (A) (seconds)	$F_{1,51}$= 11.45	**.0024 (.001)**	JAE: 35.2 (11.3) CTR: 26.2 (7.7)	JAE vs CTR: **1.02**
Trail Making Test (B-A) (seconds)	$F_{1,50}$ = 12.25	**.0024 (.001)**	JAE: 40.2 (14.1) CTR: 26.2 (12.0)	JAE vs CTR: **1.06**
Stroop - Words (items in 45 seconds)	$F_{1,41}$= 7.20	**.017 (.010)**	JAE: 89.8 (14.8) CTR: 99.3 (11.5)	JAE vs CTR: **-.87**
Stroop - Colour (items in 45 seconds)	$F_{1,41}$ = 5.37	**.0368** (.026)	JAE: 75.5 (13.4) CTR: 83.0 (12.1)	JAE vs CTR: **-.75**
Stroop Interference (Words + Colour)/2 minus items in Colored Words)	$F_{1,41}$ = .55	.465 (.465)	JAE: 33.9 (12.7) SIB: 31.3 (10.5) CTR: 31.6 (8.5)	JAE vs CTR: .24
List Learning (A1-A5)	$F_{1,48}$ = 3.43	.085 (.070)	JAE: 56.3 (9.2) CTR: 60.1 (6.1)	JAE vs CTR: -.58
List Recall (A6)	$F_{1,47}$ = .94	.3581 (.337)	JAE: 12.0 (23.3) CTR: 12.5 (2.8)	JAE vs CTR: -.32
Design Learning (A1-A5)	$F_{1,49}$= 15.86	**.001 (.0002)**	JAE: 32.7 (8.4) CTR: 39.3 (5.2)	JAE vs CTR: **-1.27**
Design Recall (A6)	$F_{2,69}$= 14.87	**.001 (.0003)**	JAE: 6.0 (3.5) CTR: 8.1 (1.5)	JAE vs CTR: **-1.23**

Abbreviations. CTR = Controls; JAE = Juvenile Absence Epilepsy; NART= National Adult Reading Test; SD= standard deviation; uncorr.= uncorrected.

TABLE 4. MANCOVA, JAE compared to JME

***Multivariate model*:** Wilks's lambda = .427, F_{22} = 2.08, p = .111

	Effect of group (*F* statistic)	**P_{FDR} value (uncorr. *P*)**	**Mean (SD)**	**Effect size (Cohen's *d*)**
Estimated IQ (NART)	$F_{1,54}$ = 2.14	.633 (.149)	JAE: 103.4 (8.5) JME: 108.4 (10.9)	JAE vs JME: -.35
Vocabulary	$F_{1,54}$ = .48	.823 (.494)	JAE: 42.1 (11.4) JME: 48.1 (9.5)	JAE vs JME: -.17
Similarities	$F_{1,54}$ = .38	.823 (.538)	JAE: 22.8 (4.9) JME: 23.6 (4.4)	JAE vs JME: .15
McKenna	$F_{1,56}$ = .24	.823 (.629)	JAE: 16.8 (4.1) JME: 18.3 (3.9)	JAE vs JME: .12
Phonemic Fluency (F, A, S; sum of all words per letter)	$F_{1,57}$ = .31	.823 (.579)	JAE: 36.8 (10.9) JME: 41.1 (11.08)	JAE vs JME: -.13
Semantic Fluency (Animals, fruits, vegetables, sum of all items per category)	$F_{1,57}$ = 1.62	.707 (.208)	JAE: 48.5 (9.6) JME: 52.2 (12.4)	JAE vs JME: -.31
Digit Span	$F_{1,54}$ = .32	.823 (.577)	JAE: 16.9 (4.0) JME: 19.0 (4.4)	JAE vs JME: -.14
Arithmetic	$F_{1,48}$ = .00	.986 (.949)	JAE: 12.6 (4.2) JME: 14.3 (4.2)	JAE vs JME: -.02
Trail Making Test (A) (seconds)	$F_{1,57}$ = .34	.823 (.564)	JAE: 34.0 (11.2) JME: 31.3 (10.3)	JAE vs JME: .14
Trail Making Test (B-A) (seconds)	$F_{1,57}$ = .42	.823 (.520)	JAE: 34.0 (11.2) JME: 37.4 (16.9)	JAE vs JME: .16
Stroop Words (items in 45 seconds)	$F_{1,52}$ = 3.09	.482 (.085)	JAE: 89.6 (14.4) JME: 99.7 (20.2)	JAE vs JME: -.43
Stroop Colour (items in 45 seconds)	$F_{1,52}$ = .273	.823 (.603)	JAE: 74.7 (13.5) JME: 74.3 (14.9)	JAE vs JME: -.13
Stroop Interference (Words + Colour)/2 minus items in Colored Words)	$F_{1,52}$ = 6.36	.256 **(.015)**	JAE: 33.4 (11.2) JME: 43.0 (13.4)	JAE vs JME: **.62**
List Learning (A1-A5)	$F_{1,56}$ = .02	.986 (.887)	JAE: 56.2 (8.1) JME: 54.2 (8.6)	JAE vs JME: .04
List Recall (A6)	$F_{1,55}$ = .00	.986 (.978)	JAE: 12.4 (2.8) JME: 11.6 (2.6)	JAE vs JME: -.01
Design Learning (A1-A5)	$F_{1,54}$ = .00	.986 (.986)	JAE: 35.3 (8.2) JME: 34.8 (8.9)	JAE vs JME: .01
Design Recall (A6)	$F_{1,54}$ = 3.30	.482 (.075)	JAE: 6.8 (3.1) JME: 7.4 (2.0)	JAE vs JME: -.46

Abbreviations. JAE = Juvenile Absence Epilepsy; JME= Juvenile Myoclonic Epilepsy; NART= National Adult Reading Test; SD= standard deviation; uncorr. = uncorrected.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. JAE, unaffected JAE Siblings, and controls: IQ and linguistic measures.

Panels A and B shows neuropsychological test data in individuals with JAE, unaffected JAE siblings (SIB) and controls (CTR) for measures of estimated IQ and verbal comprehension (vocabulary, similarities) (Panel A); and of verbal fluency (phonemic, semantic) and naming (Panel B). For each test, we used open-source code to generate *raincloud* plots (https://github.com/RainCloudPlots/RainCloudPlots), and show a combination of raw scores, single datapoints, boxplots, and probability distributions. All group comparisons used age and sex as covariates. Statistical details are reported in Table 2 and in the main manuscript text. Asterisks refer to *P*-values for Bonferroni-corrected *post-hoc* tests (JAE vs. controls, indicated by underlying orange bars; siblings vs. controls, indicated by underlying sunset (light orange) bars); ******* = $p<0.001$, corrected; ****** = $p<0.01$, corrected; ***** = $p<0.05$, corrected. Panel C shows receiver-operating characteristic (ROC) curves probing the accuracy with which linguistic measures (vocabulary, phonemic fluency, semantic fluency) can discriminate individuals with JAE from controls (left-sided plots), and a combined group of individuals with JAE and their siblings from controls (right-sided plots). Discrimination was accurate and successful in all instances; all statistical details are provided in the main manuscript text.

Figure 2. JAE, unaffected JAE siblings, JME, controls: attention, psychomotor speed, executive function.

Panels A and B show neuropsychological test data in individuals with JAE, unaffected JAE siblings (SIB) and controls (CTR) for measures of attention and psychomotor speed (Trail Making Test, A, Stroop Word, Stroop Color; Panel A), and executive function (Trail-making B-A, digit span, arithmetic; Panel B). Panel C shows data for a measure of response

inhibition (Stroop— Interference; addressing executive function) in people with JAE, unaffected JAE siblings and controls (left-sided plots), and in people with JAE juxtaposed to those with JME (right-sided plots, contoured by a rectangular box). For each test, we used open-source code (https://github.com/RainCloudPlots/RainCloudPlots) to generate *raincloud* plots, which show a combination of raw scores, single datapoints, boxplots, and probability distributions. Of note, all group comparisons used age and sex as covariates. Statistical details are reported in Tables 2 and 4, and in the main manuscript text. Asterisks refer to *P*-values for Bonferroni-corrected *post-hoc* tests (JAE vs. controls, indicated by underlying orange bars; JME versus JAE, indicated by underlying blue bar); ******* = $p<0.001$, corrected; ****** = $p<0.01$, corrected; ***** = $p<0.05$, corrected; ^ = $p<0.05$, uncorrected.

Figure 3. JAE, unaffected JAE Siblings, and controls: verbal and visual learning. Panels A and B shows neuropsychological test data in individuals with JAE, unaffected JAE siblings (SIB) and controls (CTR) for measures of verbal learning and recall (Panel A), and of visual learning and recall (Panel B). For each test, we used open-source code to generate *raincloud* plots (https://github.com/RainCloudPlots/RainCloudPlots), which show a combination of raw scores, single datapoints, boxplots, and probability distributions. All group comparisons used age and sex as covariates. Statistical details are reported in Table 2 and in the main manuscript text. Asterisks refer to *P*-values for Bonferroni-corrected *post-hoc* tests (JAE vs. controls, indicated by underlying orange bars); ****** = $p<0.01$, corrected; ***** = $p<0.05$, corrected.

REFERENCES

1. Scheffer IE, Berkovic S, Capovilla G, et al. ILAE classification of the epilepsies: Position paper of the ILAE Commission for Classification and Terminology. Epilepsia. 2017;58:512–521.

2. Loiseau P, Duché B, Pédespan J-M. Absence Epilepsies. Epilepsia. 1995;36:1182–1186.

3. Gardiner M. Genetics of Idiopathic Generalized Epilepsies. Epilepsia. 2005;46:15–20.

4. Jernigan TL, Baaré WFC, Stiles J, Madsen KS. Postnatal brain development: structural imaging of dynamic neurodevelopmental processes. Prog Brain Res. 2011;189:77–92.

5. Caciagli L, Wandschneider B, Xiao F, et al. Abnormal hippocampal structure and function in juvenile myoclonic epilepsy and unaffected siblings. Brain J Neurol. 2019;142:2670–2687.

6. Lin JJ, Dabbs K, Riley JD, et al. Neurodevelopment in new-onset juvenile myoclonic epilepsy over the first 2 years. Ann Neurol. 2014;76:660–668.

7. Wandschneider B, Hong S-J, Bernhardt BC, et al. Developmental MRI markers cosegregate juvenile patients with myoclonic epilepsy and their healthy siblings. Neurology. 2019;93:e1272–e1280.

8. Ratcliffe C, Wandschneider B, Baxendale S, Thompson P, Koepp MJ, Caciagli L. Cognitive Function in Genetic Generalized Epilepsies: Insights From Neuropsychology and Neuroimaging. Front Neurol. 2020;11.:144.

9. Camfield CS, Camfield PR. Juvenile myoclonic epilepsy 25 years after seizure onset: a population-based study. Neurology. 2009;73:1041–1045.

10. Nickels KC, Zaccariello MJ, Hamiwka LD, Wirrell EC. Cognitive and neurodevelopmental comorbidities in paediatric epilepsy. Nat Rev Neurol. 2016;12:465–476.

11. Almane DN, Jones JE, McMillan A, et al. The Timing, Nature and Range of Neurobehavioral Comorbidities in Juvenile Myoclonic Epilepsy. Pediatr Neurol. 2019;101:47–52.

12. Jennum P, Gyllenborg J, Kjellberg J. The social and economic consequences of epilepsy: a controlled national study. Epilepsia. 2011;52:949–956.

13. Masur D, Shinnar S, Cnaan A, et al. Pretreatment cognitive deficits and treatment effects on attention in childhood absence epilepsy. Neurology. 2013;81:1572–1580.

14. Iqbal N, Caswell H, Muir R, et al. Neuropsychological profiles of patients with juvenile myoclonic epilepsy and their siblings: An extended study. Epilepsia. 2015;56:1301–1308.

15. Chowdhury FA, Elwes RDC, Koutroumanidis M, Morris RG, Nashef L, Richardson MP. Impaired cognitive function in idiopathic generalized epilepsy and unaffected family members: an epilepsy endophenotype. Epilepsia. 2014;55:835–840.

16. Wandschneider B, Kopp UA, Kliegel M, et al. Prospective memory in patients with juvenile myoclonic epilepsy and their healthy siblings. Neurology. 2010;75:2161–2167.

17. Gottesman II, Gould TD. The endophenotype concept in psychiatry: etymology and strategic intentions. Am J Psychiatry. 2003;160:636–645.

18. Crunelli V, Lőrincz ML, McCafferty C, et al. Clinical and experimental insight into pathophysiology, comorbidity and therapy of absence seizures. Brain. 2020;143:2341–2368.

19. Pavone P, Bianchini R, Trifiletti RR, Incorpora G, Pavone A, Parano E. Neuropsychological assessment in children with absence epilepsy. Neurology. 2001;56:1047–1051.

20. Jackson DC, Dabbs K, Walker NM, et al. The neuropsychological and academic substrate of new/recent-onset epilepsies. J Pediatr. 2013;162:1047–1053.e1.

21. Caciagli L, Wandschneider B, Centeno M, et al. Motor hyperactivation during cognitive tasks: An endophenotype of juvenile myoclonic epilepsy. Epilepsia. 2020;61:1438–1452.

22. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. Acta Psychiatr Scand. 1983;67:361–370.

23. Shaw S, Oei TPS, Sawang S. Psychometric validation of the Dysexecutive Questionnaire (DEX). Psychol Assess. 2015. 27:138-147.

24. Nelson, HE. The National Adult Reading Test (NART): Test Manual. Windsor: NFER-Nelson; 1982.

25. Tombaugh TN. Trail Making Test A and B: Normative data stratified by age and education. Arch Clin Neuropsychol. 2004;19:203–214.

26. Homack S, Riccio C. A meta-analysis of the sensitivity and specificity of the Stroop Color and Word Test with children. Arch Clin Neuropsychol. 2004;19:725–743.

27. Wechsler D. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale--Fourth Edition (WAIS-IV). 22nd ed. San Antonio, Tex.: Pearson; 2008.

28. McKenna P, Warrington EK. The Graded Naming Test. Windsor: NFER-Nelson; 1983.

29. Benton AL, Hamsher KD, Sivan AB. Multilingual Aphasia Examination. 2nd ed. Iowa City, IA: AJA Associates; 1989.

30. Coughlan AK, Hollows SE. The adult memory and information processing battery (AMIPB): test manual. Leeds: A.K. Coughlin, Psychology Dept, St James' Hospital; 1985.

31. Shao Z, Janse E, Visser K, Meyer AS. What do verbal fluency tasks measure? Predictors of verbal fluency performance in older adults. Front Psychol. 2014;5:772. A

32. Li C. Little's Test of Missing Completely at Random. Stata J. 2013;13:795–809.

33. Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. J R Stat Soc Ser B Methodol. 1995;57:289–300.

34. Fonseca Wald ELA, Hendriksen JGM, Drenthen GS, et al. Towards a Better Understanding of Cognitive Deficits in Absence Epilepsy: a Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Neuropsychol Rev. 2019;29:421–449.

35. Hermann BP, Zhao Q, Jackson DC, et al. Cognitive phenotypes in childhood idiopathic epilepsies. Epilepsy Behav. 2016;61:269–274.

36. Abarrategui B, Parejo-Carbonell B, García García ME, Di Capua D, García-Morales I. The cognitive phenotype of idiopathic generalized epilepsy. Epilepsy Behav EB. 2018;89:99–104.

37. Guo JN, Kim R, Chen Y, et al. Impaired consciousness in patients with absence seizures investigated by functional MRI, EEG, and behavioural measures: a cross-sectional study. Lancet Neurol. 2016;15:1336–1345.

38. Killory BD, Bai X, Negishi M, et al. Impaired attention and network connectivity in childhood absence epilepsy. NeuroImage. 2011;56:2209–2217.

39. Smith A, Syvertsen M, Pal DK. Meta-analysis of response inhibition in juvenile myoclonic epilepsy. Epilepsy Behav. 2020;106:107038.

40. Jackson DC, Jones JE, Hsu DA, et al. Language function in childhood idiopathic epilepsy syndromes. Brain Lang. 2019;193:4–9.

41. Tosun D, Siddarth P, Toga AW, Hermann B, Caplan R. Effects of childhood absence epilepsy on associations between regional cortical morphometry and aging and cognitive abilities. Hum Brain Mapp. 2011;32:580–591.

42. Marini C, Scheffer IE, Crossland KM, et al. Genetic architecture of idiopathic generalized epilepsy: clinical genetic analysis of 55 multiplex families. Epilepsia. 2004;45:467–478.

43. Larivière S, Rodríguez-Cruces R, Royer J, et al. Network-based atrophy modeling in the common epilepsies: A worldwide ENIGMA study. Sci Adv. 2020;6:eabc6457.

44. Tondelli M, Vaudano AE, Ruggieri A, Meletti S. Cortical and subcortical brain alterations in Juvenile Absence Epilepsy. NeuroImage Clin. 2016;12:306–311.

45. Drenthen GS, Wald ELAF, Backes WH, et al. Lower myelin-water content of the frontal lobe in childhood absence epilepsy. Epilepsia. 2019;60:1689–1696.

46. Ben-Ari Y, Holmes GL. Effects of seizures on developmental processes in the immature brain. Lancet Neurol. 2006;5:1055–1063.

47. Shaw P, Kabani NJ, Lerch JP, et al. Neurodevelopmental trajectories of the human cerebral cortex. J Neurosci Off J Soc Neurosci. 2008;28:3586–3594.

48. Binnie CD. Cognitive impairment during epileptiform discharges: is it ever justifiable to treat the EEG? Lancet Neurol. 2003;2:725–730.

49. Wandschneider B, Burdett J, Townsend L, et al. Effect of topiramate and zonisamide on fMRI cognitive networks. Neurology. 2017;88:1165–1171.

50. Glauser TA, Cnaan A, Shinnar S, et al. Ethosuximide, Valproic Acid and Lamotrigine in Childhood Absence Epilepsy: Initial Monotherapy Outcomes at 12 months. Epilepsia. 2013;54:141–155.

Figure 1

IQ and linguistic measures

A Plots: IQ, verbal comprehension



B Plots: verbal fluency, naming



C ROC curves



Figure 2

Attention, psychomotor speed, executive function

A Plots: attention and psychomotor speed



B Plots: executive function



C Plots: response inhibition (executive function)



Figure 3

Learning and recall

A Plots: verbal learning and recall



B Plots: visual learning and recall