Self-compassion and adjustment in epilepsy and psychogenic nonepileptic seizures

Stephanie Clegg [a],[*],[1], Fuschia Sirois [b], Markus Reuber [c]

[a] Clinical Psychology Unit, University of Sheffield, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
[b] Department of Psychology, University of Sheffield, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
[c] Academic Neurology Unit, University of Sheffield, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Self-compassion has been associated with a set of adaptive coping strategies, which in turn explain better adjustment in individuals with chronic illnesses such as inflammatory bowel disease and arthritis. The aim of this study was to investigate whether self-compassion is associated with adjustment in people with epilepsy (PWE) and people with psychogenic nonepileptic seizures (PWPNES). Adjustment was measured via coping efficacy, quality of life (QoL), anxiety, and depression.
Method: A cross-sectional questionnaire design was employed. People with epilepsy ($N = 74$), PWPNES ($N = 46$), and controls ($N = 89$), recruited from outpatient seizure clinics and online, completed questionnaires about their self-compassion, coping efficacy, QoL, anxiety, and depression levels.
Results: Overall, self-compassion was associated with adjustment in PWE and PWPNES. Self-compassion was negatively related to anxiety and depression in PWE, PWPNES, and controls and positively related to coping efficacy in PWE and PWPNES. Self-compassion was also positively related to QoL in PWE and controls; however, this relationship was not significant in PWPNES.
Conclusion: Self-compassion is associated with better adjustment in PWE and PWPNES. Implications of these findings for psychotherapeutic interventions for individuals with seizure disorders and future research are discussed.

© 2019 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Psychogenic nonepileptic seizures (PNES) and epilepsy are chronic conditions characterized by recurrent seizures. Epileptic seizures are characterized by signs and symptoms caused by abnormal electric discharges in the brain whereas seizures in PNES are not associated with abnormal electric activity. Instead, PNES are, in most cases, thought to be an involuntary dissociative response to aversive internal or external stimuli involving a loss of self-control [1].

Epilepsy can be treated effectively with antiepileptic drugs, but about one-third of patients' seizures do not respond to medication [2]. In some patients, medication reduces the number or severity of seizures but does not abolish them altogether. Psychological interventions are sought by some people with epilepsy (PWE) to increase their quality of life (QoL; [3]). However, evidence of the effectiveness of

psychotherapy for epilepsy is still limited [4,5]. Ramaratnam et al. [5] have suggested that psychotherapies for epilepsy have not been more effective because our understanding of the psychological problems faced by PWE is limited. Nevertheless, the National Institution for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines for epilepsy [6] state that adjunctive psychological interventions (cognitive behavioral therapy, relaxation, and biofeedback) should be made available for PWE.

The treatment typically recommended for people with PNES (PWPNES) is psychotherapy [7], although evidence for the effectiveness of psychological interventions for these seizures is also limited [8], and our understanding of the psychological mechanisms underlying PNES remains incomplete [9]. Brown and Reuber [1,9] recently reviewed the literature on psychological and psychiatric factors associated with PNES and suggested an Integrative Cognitive Model of the disorder which can inform psychological formulation and psychotherapeutic intervention on an individual patient level. While there is still a dearth of evidence for the longer-term effectiveness of psychological interventions for PNES [10], it is well documented that long-term seizure and social outcomes are poor if no specific treatment is offered [11].

Although the recommended specific interventions for PWE and PWPNES differ, research shows similarities between the presentations of individuals suffering from both conditions. Anxiety and depression

* Corresponding author at: Bradford District Care NHS Foundation Trust, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
E-mail address: stephanie.clegg@bdct.nhs.uk (S. Clegg).
[1] Postal address: Community Mental Health Team for Older People in Craven, Bradford District Care NHS Foundation Trust, The Craven Centre, Skipton Hospital, Keighley Road, Skipton BD23 2RJ, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

are twice as common in PWE than the general population, and even more prevalent in PWPNES [12,13]. Both seizure disorders have been associated with reduced self-esteem [14]. Depression has been related to poor epileptic seizure control [15], and anxiety in PWPNES has been associated with avoidant behavior tendencies and higher seizure frequency [16,17]. Avoidance can lead to social isolation and loss of self-confidence, which could, in turn, increase psychological distress and decrease QoL [18]. Several studies suggest that an individual's coping resources are not only relevant in patients with PNES but that they are also an important determinant of people's resilience to epileptic seizures. Kemp, Morley, and Anderson [19] linked adjustment difficulties in PWE to avoidance, doubt regarding the diagnosis, and belief in poor containment. Conversely, high resourcefulness has been linked to lower levels of depression and anxiety in PWE [20].

There is growing evidence linking self-compassion to adaptive coping and lower stress in chronic illness populations, including individuals with epilepsy [21]. Self-compassion has been defined by Neff [22] as taking a kind, accepting, and nonjudgmental stance towards oneself in times of failure and difficulty. It comprises three key features that may account for why self-compassionate people are able to cope with stressful life circumstances: (1) self-kindness, (2) common humanity, and (3) mindfulness.

Research has demonstrated that self-compassion is linked to indicators of adjustment in individuals with chronic illness, including well-being and favorable medical outcomes [23] as well as adaptive coping and lower stress [24]. Understanding the potential of self-compassion to facilitate adaptive coping and therefore to reduce stress in individuals with epilepsy and PNES is important as stress and anxiety could be a trigger for both epileptic and PNES and contribute to a reduction of QoL in either disorder [1,25].

The current study aimed to examine the association of self-compassion with adjustment in PWE and PWPNES. Coping efficacy was considered the primary indicator of adaptive coping and adjustment. Adjustment was also assessed through anxiety and depression levels and QoL. A healthy control group was included critically to appraise whether findings are specific to PWE and PWPNES or comparable with the general population. More specifically, the study tested the following hypothesis:

1) Self-compassion levels will be lower in both patient groups (epilepsy and PNES) than in controls. Self-compassion levels with be lower in PWPNES than PWE.
2) Self-compassion will be positively correlated with coping efficacy and QoL in PWE and PWPNES.
3) Levels of self-compassion will be negatively correlated with anxiety and depression in PWE and PWPNES.

2. Method

2.1. Participants and recruitment procedure

The study employed a cross-sectional design. Data were collected from a convenience sample of participants, recruited between July and December 2017.

2.1.1. Groups with epilepsy and PNES

2.1.1.1. Clinic recruitment. Participants with diagnoses of epilepsy or PNES were recruited from a neurology outpatient clinic at the Royal Hallamshire Hospital, Sheffield. Patients were only included if their diagnoses of epilepsy or PNES were confirmed by the Consultant Neurologist who had seen the patient on the day of their study participation and based on all available clinical data (not invariably including video-electroencephalogram (EEG) confirmation of the diagnosis). Patients with a clinically uncertain diagnosis or a diagnosis of mixed epilepsy and PNES were excluded. Inclusion criteria included being over

16 years of age, able to give informed consent, and complete self-report questionnaires independently or with minimal help. Participants completed the questionnaire either via hard copy or were given a link to complete the questionnaire online (see below). Of 128 participants who were approached about the study in clinic, 57 returned a completed paper questionnaire pack.

2.1.1.2. Social media and online recruitment. As well as from clinics, participants were recruited from social media and websites for epilepsy and PNES self-help. Participants recruited in this way were asked to self-screen using the inclusion criteria listed above. Twenty-six participants with PNES and 37 participants with epilepsy were recruited online. General practitioners were contacted to confirm diagnoses of online participants.

2.1.2. Control group

Participants were recruited from a notice posted to a university volunteer's mailing list. Inclusion criteria encompassed adults who self-verified that they were over the age of 16 years, who did not currently experience seizures and self-reported that they had never experienced seizures throughout their lifetime. To take part, participants needed to be able to give informed consent and complete the self-report questionnaires without help.

2.2. Measures

All participants were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire including their age, gender, employment, education, overall current health, diagnosis, and medication. The following measures were also completed:

2.2.1. Self-Compassion Scale — Short Form (SCS-SF) [26]

The SCS-SF is a 12-item inventory designed to measure levels of dispositional self-compassion. Individuals were asked how often they act in self-compassionate ways (e.g., I try to see my failings as part of the human condition) ranging from 1 (*almost never*) to 5 (*almost always*). Six items were reverse scored (e.g., I'm disapproving and judgmental about my own flaws and inadequacies). The short scale has a near perfect correlation with the long scale (26 items) when examining total scores ($r = 0.97$). Reliability of the SCS-SF has been demonstrated previously as Raes et al. [26] report Cronbach's alpha = 0.86. In the current study, the SCS-SF was shown to be reliable with Cronbach's alpha ≥0.80 for all groups.

2.2.2. Coping efficacy scale [27]

The coping efficacy scale is a 3-item instrument that measures the extent to which individuals feel they are coping effectively with 1) emotional aspects, 2) day to day problems, and 3) the symptoms of their illness. Appropriate adaptations were made for the control group to measure how they feel they were coping with different aspects of their life in general e.g., 'I am successfully coping with day to day problems'. A 5-point Likert scale was used to rate responses ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The scale demonstrated good internal consistency previously (Cronbach's alpha = 0.79; [27]) and was shown to be reliable in the current study with Cronbach's alpha >0.80 for all groups.

2.2.3. Generalized Anxiety Disorder-7 (GAD-7) [28]

The GAD-7 is a 7-item measure of anxiety. Individuals were asked to rate how much they had been bothered by seven common anxiety symptoms (e.g., trouble relaxing) in the last two weeks on a 4-point scale ranging from 0 (*not at all*) to 3 (*nearly every day*). Level of severity is classified as minimal (0–4), mild (5–9), moderate (10–14), and severe (15–21) with a recommended clinical cutoff at 10. Participants scoring 10 or above can be considered to be suffering from clinically significant anxiety symptoms [28]. The reliability of the GAD-7 has

previously been demonstrated (Cronbach's alpha = 0.89; [29]), and good reliability was shown in the current study with Cronbach's alpha >0.80 for all groups.

2.2.4. Patient Health-Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) [30]

The PHQ-9 is a 9-item measure of depression. Individuals were asked to rate how much they had been bothered by nine common depressive symptoms in the last two weeks on a four-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 3 (nearly every day). The level of severity is classified as minimal (0–4), mild (5–9), moderate (10–14), moderately severe (15–19), and severe (20–27) [30]. Respondents scoring 10 or above can be considered to be suffering from clinically significant symptoms of depression [31]. The PHQ-9 demonstrated high correlation with another brief depression inventory, high internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha = 0.86) and higher PHQ-9 scores were related to overall decreased functional status [30]. In the current study, the PHQ-9 was shown to have good reliability with Cronbach's alpha >0.80 for all groups.

2.2.5. European Quality of Life — 3 Dimensions Scale (EQ-5D-3L) [32]

The EQ-5D-3L is a standardized, generic measure of QoL. It first presents 5 descriptive items (mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain/discomfort, and anxiety/depression) rated on 3-point scales from 1 (no problems) to 3 (extreme problems). The digits for the five dimensions can be combined into a 5-digit number describing the patient's health state. After considering these areas of their life, a visual analogue scale (VAS) is presented, which records the respondent's global health as a single figure on a vertical 100-point scale. The EQ-5D-3L has been validated by Sanchez-Arenas et al. [32] who reported the general reliability of 0.80 for patients (older adults) and 0.76 for controls (Cronbach's alphas). However, in the current study the EQ-5D-3L did not show high levels (Cronbach's alpha >0.70) of reliability in the PNES or control group. Therefore, the single VAS score is used in the current study.

2.2.6. Liverpool Seizure Severity Scale — Revised (LSSS-3) [33]

The LSSS-3 is a revised version of the LSSS-2 [34]. It is a 12-item inventory designed to quantify the severity of individual's seizures. It provides a single-unit weighted scale (the ictal scale), ranging from 0 to 100, that measures the severity of the most severe seizures the individual has experienced during the past 4 weeks. Reliability of the LSSS-3 has been demonstrated by Cronbach's alpha exceeding 0.7, and validity of the scale is supported by correspondence with physician-rated seizure severity. The LSSS-3 has been used widely among populations with epilepsy and PNES (e.g., [35]), although it was not originally designed or validated to describe PNES. The LSSS-3 was shown to have good reliability in the current study with Cronbach's alpha >0.80 for both groups with epilepsy and PNES.

2.3. Analytic method

Appropriate screens were carried out for assumptions for parametric bivariate correlations and analysis of variance. Where these assumptions were not met, nonparametric equivalents were carried out. To reduce the risk of false positive findings associated with multiple tests, a Bonferroni correction was applied to between-group analysis. Significance level was set at .05 for correlation analysis and correlations were characterized as weak ($p < .05$), moderate ($p < .01$), or strong ($p < .001$) [36].

2.4. Power analysis

A sensitivity power analysis was conducted via G*Power3 [37] to determine the effect size required to obtain a significant result. The sensitivity power calculation was based on conducting a one-way analysis of variance. In order to achieve 80% power with a sample size of 120 (40 epilepsy, 40 PNES, and 40 controls) and an alpha = 0.05, the required effect size was $f = 0.29$ to obtain a significant result. Based on Cohen's [38] recommendations for between subjects ANOVA's, this falls just above a medium effect size for a one-way ANOVA ($f = 0.25$) and was deemed realistic.

Table 1
Statistical demographic, seizure, and psychological comparison between groups.

	Epilepsy (n = 74)	PNES (n = 46)	Controls (n = 89)	p
Demographic characteristics				
Age: median (IQR[a])	35 (17.5)	41 (25.5)	33 (20)	.475
Gender (n, %female)	50, 68.6	35, 76.1	67, 75.3	.461
Years in education:				
median (IQR)	14 (6)	12.5 (4)	17 (4.5)	<.001[**]
Seizure characteristics				
% of individuals experiencing seizures in last 4 weeks				
	55.4	89.1		
No. of seizures per 4 weeks:				
median (IQR)	5 (10.5)	12 (32)		<.001[**]
Seizure severity/ictal scale:				
median (IQR)	61.3 (37.5)	60 (22.5)		.981
Psychological outcomes				
Self-compassion/SCS-SF				
(mean ± SD)	34.5 ± 9.5	31.5 ± 9.3	36.8 ± 9.9	<.001[**]
(min: 12, max: 60)				
Anxiety/GAD-7:				
median (IQR)	7 (11)	11 (11)	3 (6)	<.001[**]
(min: 0, max: 21)				
Depression/PHQ-9:				
median (IQR)	7.5 (10)	15 (12.8)	3 (6)	<.001[**]
(min: 0, max: 27)				
Coping efficacy:	10.1 (5.3)	8 (7)	13 (4)	<.001[**]
median (IQR)				
(min: 3, max: 15)				

[a] IQR = interquartile range.
[**] Significant result ($p < .001$).

2.5. Ethical considerations

Ethical approval for this study was obtained from The Wales Research Ethics Committee 6 Proportionate Review Subcommittee.

3. Results

3.1. Data screening

Missing continuous data from the PNES clinic group ($N = 4$) and epilepsy clinic group ($N = 5$) constituted 0.1% of the total data set and were replaced by mean substitution. No outliers were removed. The main dependent self-compassion variable (SCS-SF) was shown to be normally distributed in each group, and a t-test analysis showed no significant differences between online and clinic recruited participants for both diagnoses. Data were therefore collated to form one overall sample for epilepsy diagnosis and one overall sample for PNES diagnosis.

3.2. Sample characteristics

The complete sample consisted of 209 individuals (74 epilepsy, 46 PNES, 89 control); 152 participants were female.

3.3. Comparison between groups

Statistical comparisons of demographic, seizure, and psychological variables between groups are shown in Table 1.

3.4. Demographics

The Kruskal–Wallis test identified a significant between-group difference ($p < .001$) between at least one pair of groups. Dunn's pairwise tests demonstrated significant differences ($p < .001$, adjusted using Bonferroni correction) in education levels between control and group with epilepsy, as well as between control and group with PNES.

3.5. Seizure characteristics

A Mann–Whitney U test demonstrated a significant difference ($U = 2704.5$, $p < .001$) in seizure frequency in the last four weeks between groups with epilepsy and PNES with more frequent seizures reported by participants with PNES. There was no significant difference in seizure severity between the two groups.

3.6. Coping efficacy

The Kruskal–Wallis test confirmed a significant difference ($p < .001$) in coping efficacy between at least one pair of groups. Dunn's pairwise tests revealed significant differences ($p < .001$, adjusted using Bonferroni correction) between the control and group with epilepsy as well as the control and group with PNES.

3.7. Main analyses

A one-way ANOVA found significant differences in self-compassion scores between groups ($F(2,206) = 8.87$, $p < .001$). A Bonferroni post hoc test revealed that control participants had significantly higher levels of self-compassion ($M = 38.6$, standard deviation = 9.9) than participants with epilepsy ($M = 34.5$, $SD = 9.5$) or participants with PNES ($M = 31.5$, $SD = 9.3$). No difference was found between the groups with epilepsy and PNES. Correlational analysis results are shown in Table 2. Self-compassion was positively correlated with coping efficacy in both the groups with epilepsy and PNES (moderate correlations). No relationship was found between self-compassion and coping efficacy in the control group.

The Kruskal–Wallis test found a significant difference ($p < .001$) in anxiety in at least one pair of groups. Dunn's pairwise tests revealed significant differences ($p < .001$, adjusted using Bonferroni correction) in anxiety levels between controls and both patient groups. No difference was found between the groups with epilepsy and PNES.

The Kruskal–Wallis test demonstrated a significant difference ($p < .001$) in depression in at least one pair of groups. Dunn's pairwise tests revealed significant differences in depression levels ($p < .001$, adjusted using Bonferroni correction) between all three groups.

Large negative correlations were found between self-compassion and anxiety and depression in groups with epilepsy, PNES, and control. There was a moderate positive correlation between self-compassion and QoL in the groups with epilepsy and control. No relationship was found between self-compassion and QoL in the group with PNES.

4. Discussion

The aim of this study was to investigate whether self-compassion is associated with adjustment in PWE and PWPNES. Adjustment was measured via coping efficacy, anxiety, depression, and QoL. Overall, self-compassion was associated with adjustment in PWE and PWPNES. Self-compassion was negatively associated with anxiety and depression in all three groups (PWE, PWPNES, and controls) and positively associated with coping efficacy in PWE and PWPNES. Self-compassion was positively associated with QoL in PWE and controls; however, this relationship was not found in PWPNES. Between-group comparisons found that PWE and PWPNES have lower levels of self-compassion and higher levels of anxiety compared with controls. People with PNES were found to have the highest levels of depression, followed by PWE, and then controls.

The finding that self-compassion was positively associated with coping efficacy in PWE and PWPNES supports the proposition that self-compassion is an important factor in how people with chronic illnesses cope effectively with their condition [24,39]. Interestingly, this relationship was not found in controls and, therefore, may be specific to people with epilepsy, PNES, and/or other chronic illnesses, possibly because such individuals have a greater number of daily stressors to cope with. This provides support for the suggestion that the protective role of self-compassion is explained primarily by the set of coping strategies self-compassionate people use to deal with challenging circumstances [39].

As chronic illnesses present regular unpredictable challenges and stressors, individuals with higher levels of self-compassion have more opportunities to utilize an adaptive set of coping strategies to manage these. Findings from the current study suggest that the unpredictable stressors and challenges presented by chronic seizure disorders may make it difficult for individuals with these disorders to be self-compassionate. Previous research has shown that PWPNES are more likely to engage in experiential avoidance [40] and escape avoidant coping styles [17,41]. The current findings suggest that moving away from

Table 2
Correlational analysis of the study variables across the three groups.

	Coping efficacy	Anxiety	Depression	QoL (VAS)
Epilepsy (n = 74) Self-compassion	0.40[***]	−0.64[***]	−0.57[***]	0.42[***]
PNES (n = 46) Self-compassion	0.37[*]	−0.74[***]	−0.69[***]	0.18
Control (n = 89) Self-compassion	0.19	−0.72[***]	−0.59[***]	0.33[**]

[*] $p < .05$.
[**] $p < .01$.
[***] $p < .001$.

avoidance and becoming more self-compassionate to an individual's seizure experiences may increase coping efficacy.

Our findings match those of previous studies that show that the presence of stress in other chronic illnesses (e.g., arthritis) is associated with low self-compassion [24,39]. Our correlational findings also match those from previous studies in patients with other chronic disorders. For example, coping efficacy has been linked to better adjustment in other populations with chronic illness including arthritis [27] and inflammatory bowel disease [24,42]. Furthermore, the current study found that self-compassion was negatively associated with anxiety and depression and adds to the growing literature that this is a common association in many chronic illnesses, including epilepsy [21,27,43–45].

Findings are in agreement with previous research suggesting that anxiety and depression are more common in PWE and PWPNES than the general population [13], and that depression levels are especially high in PWPNES [46]. The study did not replicate findings that this is also the case for anxiety levels [13,47]. Brown and Reuber [9] recently carried out a systematic review and found that anxiety levels were usually moderately elevated in PWE and PWPNES. Therefore, high anxiety may be associated with living with a seizure disorder per se rather than PNES specifically. Alternatively, increased anxiety levels in PNES may not have been captured well by the self-report instrument used in this study as previous research indicates that levels of alexithymia tend to be higher in PWPNES than those with epilepsy [9]. Therefore, PWPNES may have difficulties recognizing emotional symptoms of anxiety [48].

Although a positive association was found between self-compassion and QoL in PWE and controls, no association was found in PWPNES. This is in contrast with previous research suggesting that high level of self-compassion is linked to QoL in chronic illnesses [45]. It may be noteworthy that QoL is measured broadly in the current study using a global rather than a disease-specific measure, and investigating health-related QoL or subsets of QoL may have produced different results. Investigating specific areas of QoL in this way has developed the understanding of its relationship to personality factors in populations with epilepsy e.g., through its associations with stigma [49].

4.1. Limitations and strengths

Limitations of this study include the cross-sectional design limiting conclusions about the direction of causality. Differences in education levels were found between control and patient groups, as were differences in seizure frequency between patient groups that were not controlled for in the analysis. The study could have also measured levels of alexithymia using a relevant scale (e.g., Toronto Alexithymia Scale; [50]) and controlled for this in analysis. Although a Bonferroni correction was applied for between-group analysis, applying a similar correction for correlational analysis may have further reduced the risk of false positive findings associated with multiple tests. While efforts were made to confirm participant's PNES and epilepsy diagnoses, it was not a requirement that their diagnosis had been proven by video-EEG. Furthermore, diagnoses were not directly verified by the researcher studying medical records. Therefore, some participants may have been misdiagnosed and miscategorized, especially as many PWPNES are initially misdiagnosed as having epilepsy [51]. It is important to acknowledge that the current study did not measure if participants in the control group had any other types of chronic illnesses, as only controls self-reporting seizure disorders were excluded. This may limit the generalizability of our findings to those with or without chronic illnesses. Gathering further demographic information, including ethnicity, may have been beneficial to provide a clearer overview of participants. Furthermore, no data were gathered regarding how long participants had their seizure disorder. Therefore, no investigations were carried out into whether the duration of the disorder and coping efficacy or self-compassion are related.

A strength of the study was the inclusion of a control group to appraise whether findings are specific to PWE and PWPNES or comparable with the general population. The inclusivity of the recruitment method, encompassing both clinic and online epilepsy and samples with PNES, ensured that a wider range of illness experiences was captured than would have been if only one recruitment method used. The sample recruited met the required number of participants calculated by the sensitivity power analysis, and the number of PWPNES recruited exceeded group sizes in similar studies recently published within the PNES literature [52,53].

4.2. Future directions

A number of studies now show that self-compassion can be cultivated (e.g., [54]). Research into the effectiveness of cultivating self-compassion in different ways with PWE and PWPNES, and the effect of this on coping with the disorders should be investigated. Future research may also benefit from comparing individuals with well controlled vs. poorly controlled seizure disorders, and from ascertaining whether the predictability of seizures is associated with adjustment to the condition. As causal inferences cannot be drawn from the cross-sectional design, longitudinal designs to study the course of self-compassion and adjustment in PWE and PWPNES would be beneficial. Investigating health-related QoL or breaking down QoL into subsets and investigating the relationship of these with self-compassion in the PWE and PWPNES may further understanding of this relationship.

4.3. Clinical implications

The findings from this study suggest that self-compassion is associated with QoL, lower anxiety and depression in PWE, and lower anxiety and depression in PWPNES. Incorporating self-compassionate exercises into psychotherapy, e.g., compassionate-based mindfulness [55], or offering specific interventions based on self-compassion i.e., compassion-focussed therapy (CFT; [56]), compassionate mind training [57], and mindful self-compassion program [58], may be beneficial to these populations. Although CFT and other compassionate approaches currently have a plethora of research confirming its effectiveness for anxiety and depression in the general population [59], future research into self-compassionate-based interventions to test acceptability and efficacy in the populations with epilepsy and PNES will be important.

5. Conclusion

The current study is the first to investigate the associations between self-compassion and adjustment in both PWE and PWPNES. Overall, self-compassion was shown to be associated with better adjustment in PWE and PWPNES. Offering psychotherapies focussing on the development of self-compassion may decrease distress and increase an individual's ability to cope with and adjust to their condition. Research into the efficacy of these interventions in PWE and PWEPNES is recommended, as none currently exists.

Declaration of competing interest

None.

References

[1] Brown RJ, Reuber M. Towards an integrative theory of psychogenic non-epileptic seizures (PNES). Clin Psychol Rev 2016;47:55–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr. 2016.06.003.

[2] Duncan JS, Sander JW, Sisodiya SM, Walker MC. Adult epilepsy. Lancet 2006;367: 1087–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(06)68477-8.

[3] Pinikahana J, Dono J. The lived experience of initial symptoms of and factors triggering epileptic seizures. Epilepsy Behav 2009;15:513–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. yebeh.2009.06.004.

[4] Michaelis R, Tang V, Wagner JL, Modi AC, LaFrance Jr WC, Goldstein LH, et al. Psychological treatments for people with epilepsy. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2017;2017 (10):1–77. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD012081.pub2.

[5] Ramaratnam S, Baker G, Goldstein L. Psychological treatments for epilepsy. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2008;2008(3). https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD002029.pub3.

[6] National Institute for Clinical Excellence. Epilepsies: diagnosis and management (CG137). Retrieved 12.5.18 from https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg137/chapter/1-Guidance#psychological-interventions; 2012.

[7] Hingray C, El-Hage W, Duncan R, Gigineishvili D, Kanemoto K, LaFrance Jr WC, et al. Access to diagnostic and therapeutic facilities for psychogenic nonepileptic seizures: an international survey by the ILAE PNES Task Force. Epilepsia 2018;59:203–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/epi.13952 Cited by: 10.

[8] La France W, Reuber M, Goldstein LH. Management of psychogenic non-epileptic seizures. Epilepsia 2013;54:53–67. https://doi.org/10.1111/epi.12106.

[9] Brown RJ, Reuber M. Psychological and psychiatric aspects of psychogenic non-epileptic seizures (PNES): a systematic review. Clin Psychol Rev 2016;45:157–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2016.01.003.

[10] Mayor R, Howlett S, Grunewald R, Reuber M. Long-term outcome of brief augmented psychodynamic interpersonal therapy for psychogenic nonepileptic seizures: seizure control and healthcare utilization. Epilepsia 2010;51:1169–76. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1528-1167.2010.02656.x.

[11] Reuber M, Elger CE. Psychogenic nonepileptic seizures: review and update. Epilepsy Behav 2003;4:205–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1525-5050(03)00104-5.

[12] Diprose W, Sundram F, Menkes D. Psychiatric comorbidity in psychogenic nonepileptic seizures compared with epilepsy. Epilepsy Behav 2016;56:123–30. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2015.12.037.

[13] Kerr MP. The impact of epilepsy on patients' lives. Acta Neurol Scand 2012;126:1–9. https://doi.org/10.1111/ane.12014.

[14] Dimaro L, Roberts N, Moghaddam N, Dawson D, Brown I, Reuber M. Implicit and explicit self-esteem discrepancies in people with psychogenic nonepileptic seizures. Epilepsy Behav 2015;46:109–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2015.03.032.

[15] Margrove K, Mensah S, Thapar A, Kerr M. Depression screening for patients with epilepsy in a primary care setting using the Patient Health Questionnaire-2 and the Neurological Disorders Depression Inventory for Epilepsy. Epilepsy Behav 2011;21:387–90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2011.05.026.

[16] Bakvis P, Spinhoven P, Zitman FG, Roelofs K. Automatic avoidance tendencies in patients with psychogenic non epileptic seizures. Seizure 2011;20:628–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seizure.2011.06.006.

[17] Dimaro L, Dawson D, Roberts N, Brown B, Moghaddam N, Reuber M. Anxiety and avoidance in psychogenic nonepileptic seizures: the role of implicit and explicit anxiety. Epilepsy Behav 2014;33:77–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2014.02.016.

[18] Kerr MP, Mensah S, Besag F, de Toffol B, Ettinger A, Kanemoto K, et al. International consensus clinical practice statements for the treatment of neuropsychiatric conditions associated with epilepsy. Epilepsia 2011;52:2133–8. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1528-1167.2011.03276.x.

[19] Kemp S, Morley S, Anderson E. Coping with epilepsy: do illness representations play a role? Br J Clin Psychol 1999;38:43–58. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466599162656.

[20] Rosenbaum M, Palmon N. Helplessness and resourcefulness in coping with epilepsy. J Consult Clin Psychol 1984;52:244–53 https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.52.2.244.

[21] Baker D, Caswell H, Eccles F. Self-compassion and depression, anxiety, and resilience in adults with epilepsy. Epilepsy Behav 2019;90:154–61. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2018.11.025.

[22] Neff KD. Self-compassion: an alternative conceptualization of a healthy attitude toward oneself. Self Identity 2003;2:85–101. https://doi.org/10.1080/15298860390129863.

[23] Ferrari M, Dal Cin M, Steele M. Self-compassion is associated with optimum self-care behaviour, medical outcomes and psychological well-being in a cross-sectional sample of adults with diabetes. Diabet Med 2017;34:1–8. https://doi.org/10.1111/dme.13451.

[24] Sirois FM, Molnar DS, Hirsch JK. Self-compassion, stress, and coping in the context of chronic illness. Self Identity 2015:1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2014.996249.

[25] Novakova B, Harris PR, Ponnusamy A, Reuber M. The role of stress as a trigger for epileptic seizures: a narrative review of evidence from human and animal studies. Epilepsia 2013;54:1866–76. https://doi.org/10.1111/epi.12377.

[26] Raes F, Pommier E, Neff KD, Van Gucht D. Construction and factorial validation of a short form of the Self-Compassion Scale. Clin Psychol Psychother 2011;18:250–5. https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.702.

[27] Gignac MA, Cott C, Badley EM. Adaptation to chronic illness and disability and its relationship to perceptions of independence and dependence. J Gerontol 2000;55:362–72. https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/55.6.P362.

[28] Spitzer R, Kroenke K, Williams J, Lowe B. A brief measure for assessing general anxiety disorder: the GAD-7. Arch Intern Med 2006;166:1092–7. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092.

[29] Lowe B, Decker O, Müller S, Brähler E, Schellberg D, Herzog W, et al. Validation and standardization of the Generalized Anxiety Disorder Screener (GAD-7) in the general population. Med Care 2008;46:266–74. https://doi.org/10.1097/MLR.0b013e318160d093.

[30] Kroenke K, Spitzer R, Williams J. The PHQ 9: validity of a brief depression severity measure. J Gen Intern Med 2001;16:606–13. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1525-1497.2001.016009606.x.

[31] Gilbody S, Richards D, Barkham M. Diagnosing depression in primary care using self-completed instruments: UK validation of PHQ–9 and CORE–OM. Br J Gen Pract 2007;57:650–2 Available from: http://bjgp.org/content/57/541/650.full.

[32] Sanchez-Arenas R, Vargas-Alarcon G, Sanchez-Garcia S, Garcia-Peña C, Gutierrez-Gutierrez L, Grijalva I, et al. Value of EQ-5D in Mexican city older population with and without dementia (SADEM study). Int J Geriatr Psychiatry 2013;29:478–88. https://doi.org/10.1002/gps.4030.

[33] Scott-Lennox J, Bryant-Comstock L, Lennox R, Baker G. Reliability, validity and responsiveness of a revised scoring system for the Liverpool Seizure Severity Scale. Epilepsy Res 2001;44:53–63. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0920-1211(01)00186-3.

[34] Baker GA, Smith DF, Jacoby A, Hayes JA, Chadwick DW. Liverpool Seizure Severity Scale Revisited. Seizure 1998;7:201–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/0920-1211(91)90071-M.

[35] Novakova B, Harris P, Rawlings G, Reuber M. Coping with stress: a pilot study of a self-help stress management intervention for patients with epileptic or psychogenic non-epileptic seizures. Epilepsy Behav 2019;94:169–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2019.03.002.

[36] Cohen J. Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. . 2nd ed.Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum; 1988.

[37] Faul F, Erdfelder E, Buchner A, Lang AG. Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: tests for correlation and regression analyses. Behav Res Methods 2009;41:1149–60. https://doi.org/10.3758/BRM.41.4.114.

[38] Cohen J. A power primer. Psychol Bull 1992;112:155–9. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033.

[39] Sirois FM, Rowse G. The role of self-compassion in chronic illness care. J Clin Outcomes 2017;23:521–7 Available from: http://www.turner-white.com/pdf/jcom_nov16_compassion.pdf.

[40] Cullingham T, Kirkby A, Sellwood W, Eccles F. Avoidance in nonepileptic attack disorder: a systematic review and meta-analyses. Epilepsy Behav 2019;95:100–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2019.03.004.

[41] Goldstein LH, Drew C, Mellers J, Mitchell-O'Malley S, Oakley D. Dissociation, hypnotizability, coping styles and health locus of control: characteristics of pseudoseizure patients. Seizure 2000;9:314–22. https://doi.org/10.1053/seiz.2000.0421.

[42] Voth J, Sirois FM. The role of self-blame and responsibility in adjustment to inflammatory bowel disease. Rehabil Psychol 2009;54:99–108. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014739.

[43] Brion J, Leary M, Drabkin A. Self-compassion and reactions to serious illness: the case of HIV. J Health Psychol 2014;19:218–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105312467391.

[44] MacBeth A, Gumley A. Exploring compassion: a meta-analysis of the association between self-compassion and psychopathology. Clinical Psychology Review 2012;32:545–52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2012.06.003.

[45] Pino-Gouveia J, Duarte C, Matos M, Fráguas S. The protective role of self-compassion in relation to psychopathology symptoms and quality of life in chronic illness and in cancer patients. Clin Psychol Psychother 2014;21:311–23. https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.1838.

[46] Walsh S, Levita L, Reuber M. Comorbid depression and associated factors in PNES versus epilepsy: systematic review and meta-analysis. Seizure 2018;60:44–56. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seizure.2018.05.014.

[47] Testa SM, Lesser RP, Krauss GL, Brandt J. Personality assessment inventory among patients with psychogenic seizures and those with epilepsy. Eplipsia 2012;52. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1528-1167.2011.03141.x.

[48] Goldstein LH, Mellers JD. Ictal symptoms of anxiety, avoidance behaviour, and dissociation in patients with dissociative seizures. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 2006;77:616–21. https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp.2005.066878.

[49] Margolis S, Nakhutina L, Schaffer S, Grant A, Gonzalez J. Perceived epilepsy stigma mediates relationships between personality and social well-being in a diverse epilepsy population. Epilepsy Behav 2018;78:7–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yebeh.2017.10.023.

[50] Bagby RM, Parker JDA, Taylor GJ. The twenty-item Toronto Alexithymia Scale-I. Item selection and cross-validation of the factor structure. J Psychosom Res 1994;38:23–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-3999(94)90005-1.

[51] Reuber M, Fernandez G, Bauer J, Helmstaedter C, Elger CE. Diagnostic delay in psychogenic nonepileptic seizures. Neurology 2002;58:493–5. https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.58.3.493.

[52] Karakis I, Montouris G, Piperidou C, Luciano M, Meador K, Cole A. Patient and caregiver quality of life in psychogenic non-epileptic seizures compared to epileptic seizures. Seizure 2014;23:47–54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seizure.2013.09.011.

[53] La France W, Alosco M, Davis J, Tremont G, Ryan C, Keitner G, et al. Impact of family functioning on quality of life in patients with psychogenic nonepileptic seizures versus epilepsy. Epilepsia 2011;52:292–300. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.15281167.2010.02765.x.

[54] Boellinghaus I, Jones F, Hutton J. The role of mindfulness and loving-kindness mediation in cultivating self-compassion and other-focused concern in health care professionals. Mindfulness 2014;5:129–38. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-012-0158-6.

[55] Bartels-Velthuis AA, Van Der Ploeg K, Schroevers MJ, Van Den Brink H. The effects of a mindfulness based compassionate living training on anxiety and depression in a heterogeneous sample of psychiatric outpatients: a pilot study. Eur Psychiatry 2015;30:628–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-9338(15)30498-3.

[56] Gilbert P. Introducing compassion focused therapy. BJPsych Adv Psychiatr Treat 2009;15:199–208. https://doi.org/10.1192/apt.bp.107.005264.

[57] Gilbert P, Procter S. Compassionate mind training for people with high shame and self-criticism: overview and pilot study of a group therapy approach. Clin Psychol Psychother 2006;13:353–79 [doi: 1.0002/cpp.507].

[58] Neff KD, Germer CK. A pilot study and randomized controlled trial of the mindful self-compassion program. J Clin Psychol 2013;69:28–44. https://doi.org/10.1002/jclp.21923.

[59] Leaviss J, Uttley L. Psychotherapeutic benefits of compassion-focused therapy: an early systematic review. Psychol Med 2015;45:927–45. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291714002141.