

Pakistan Journal of Neurological Sciences (PJNS)

Volume 12 | Issue 4

Article 4

12-2017

Early electrophysiological findings in guillain barre syndrome

Hazim brohi *LNH Karachi*

Rajesh kumar *LNH Karachi*

Sadia Mubarak *LNH Karachi*

Muhammmad Anees Mumtaz LNH Karachi

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.aku.edu/pjns Part of the <u>Neurology Commons</u>

Recommended Citation

brohi, Hazim; kumar, Rajesh; Mubarak, Sadia; and Mumtaz, Muhammmad Anees (2017) "Early electrophysiological findings in guillain barre syndrome," *Pakistan Journal of Neurological Sciences (PJNS)*: Vol. 12 : Iss. 4, Article 4. Available at: https://ecommons.aku.edu/pjns/vol12/iss4/4

Early Electrophysiological findings in Guillain Barre Syndrome:

Hazim brohi¹, Rajesh kumar², Sadia Mubarak³, Muhammmad Anees Mumtaz⁴ ¹Associate Professor Neurology Department LNH Karachi, ²Senior Registrar Neurology Department LNH Karachi ³FCPS Neurology, ⁴MBBS Graduate of LNMC

Corresponding to: Hazim brohi (Associate Professor Neurology Department LNH Karachi) Email: hazimbrohi@yahoo.com

Date of submission: April 05, 2017 Date of revision: August 22, 2017 Date of acceptance: September 11, 2017

ABSTRACT:

Early electrophysiological testing is more important as early abnormalities can be obtained even in the first week. However the electrical abnormalities may not be that prominently evident for definitive diagnosis in the first 2 weeks.

However at times the decision of treatment has to be taken early. Research is required to look at different electrophysiological parameter which could give clue for an earlier diagnosis. The aim of our study is to determine early electrophysiological parameters with in first week to identify GBS at earliest.

KEY WORDS:

Electrophysiological testing, GBS, Cerebrospinal fluid protein

INTRODUCTION

GBS is an acquired autoimmune polyradiculoneuropathy. As polio is being eradicated from the world it is the most common cause of acute flaccid paralysis worldwide¹. It affects equally males and females with an annual incidence rate of 1-2/100000². Clinically it presents with progressive symmetrical ascending muscle weakness of more than two limbs, areflexia with or without sensory, autonomic and brainstem abnormalities lasting less than four weeks^{3,4}. Due to involvement of cranial and phrenic nerve approximately 1/3 of hospitalized patients require mechanical ventilation because of diaphragmatic and oropharangeal muscle weakness². Early detection and appropriate treatment can save the patient from the need of mechanical ventilation and enhances early recovery.^{5,6,7} Electro diagnostic studies play very vital role for the diagnosis of GBS⁵⁻⁸. It is also useful to differentiate between different subtypes of GBS to assess the prognosis as axonal As compare to Electro diagnostic studies the other vital tool for detection is CSF. It usually has elevated proteins. But

cerebrospinal fluid protein is frequently normal in the earlier course of the disease (although this can vary in some patients during the course of illness or even characteristic abnormality may not evolve for several days or week).¹⁴ Early electrophysiological testing is more important as early abnormalities can be obtained even in the first week. However the electrical abnormalities may not be that prominently evident for definite diagnosis in the first 2 weeks,¹⁵ Literature search shows various studies regarding the earliest signs seen electro diagnostically .These studies included patients up to 7 days. However at times the decision of treatment has to be taken early. Research is required to look at different electrophysiological parameters which could give clue for an earlier diagnosis. The aim of our study is to determine early electrophysiological parameters with in first week to identify GBS at earliest.

METHODOLOGY

The study was analytical cross sectional. The data was collected from the records of all patients with the clinical diagnosis of GBS presenting in the neurophysiology lab at Liaquat National Hospital Karachi from Jan 2016 to Dec 2017. The diagnostic criteria were in accordance with the electrophysiological findings using Dutch Guillain Barre Electro Diagnostic criteria¹⁶. The data was analyzed on SPSS version 19. As the aim of study was to highlight the earliest electrophysiological findings the data was divided in to three sub categories according to durations of less that is less than 3days, 3 to 5 days and 5-7 days were studied. The results were than compared with each other.

ELECTROPHYSIOLOGICAL CRITERIA FOR DIAGNOSIS OF GBS

According to the Dutch Guillain Barre study group criteria only one of the following abnormalities in at least two nerves should be considered¹⁶.

- 1. Increased distal motor latency>150% of upper limit of normal
- 2. Decreased conduction velocity<70% of lower limit of normal
- 3. Increased F wave latency>150 of upper limit of normal
- 4. Decreased CMAP (compound muscle action potential) amplitude > upper limit of normal.

INCLUSION CRITERIA:

- Patients with provisional clinical diagnosis of GBS referred for NCS
- · Duration of symptoms is up to one week.

EXCLUSION CRITERIA:

- Patients with duration of symptoms for more than one week
- Patients with history of any other illness which may cause motor weakness other than GBS such as Diabetes, Alcoholism, Renal failure, inherited disease of peripheral nerves, anterior horn cells disease, myopathy, and other systemic diseases that may affect nerves.

NCS PARAMETERS

For the motor nerves, we obtained the latency and amplitude by stimulating at both the proximal sites (elbow for the median and ulnar nerves, popliteal fossa for the tibial nerve, and fibular head for the peroneal nerve) and distal sites (wrist for the median and ulnar nerves, and ankle for the tibial and peroneal nerves). The conduction velocity was calculated for the segment between the proximal and distal stimulation sites. The CMAP amplitude was measured from baseline to the negative peak. We also obtained Fwave latencies from these motor nerves. For Sensory nerves we obtained peak latencyconduction velocity and sensory nerve action potential (SNAP) amplitude by stimulating at distal sites (wrist for median and ulnar sensory nerves and ankle for sural nerves). We also measured the Hreflex.

RESULTS

Total of 60 patient records were reviewed. Only 31 patients were found to be within the duration of 7 days. Out of these 31 patients, 7 patients lie in the group of less than 3 days, 12 in 5 days group and 12 in 1 week group. Out of 31, 21 were males and 10 were females' patients. Age range was 6 years to 62 years, mean age was 36.58 years. Type of GBS was inconclusive (only absent H reflex) in 8 patients while 13 patients found to have AMAN and 10 patients had AIDP. The data was stratified into three categories, depending upon time of arrival from onset of symptoms. The following results were obtained:

Table 01:

| Bara | motoro | Duratio | n of symptom | IS | Total | p-value |
|------------|---------------------|---|--|--------------|--------------|---------|
| Para | meters | less than 3days | 5days | 1week | Iotai | |
| NCS | Normal | 2 28.6% | 3 25% | 1 8.34% | 6 19.35% | 0.42 |
| | Abnormal | 5 71.4% | 9 75% | 11 91.67% | 25 80.64% | 0.42 |
| | Normal | 2 28.57% | 5 16.67% | 3 25% | 10 32.25% | 0.66 |
| WI Waves | Abnormal | 5 71.42 | 7 58.34% | 9 75% | 21 67.74% | |
| latonovM | Normal | 3 42.85% | 7 58.34% | 3 25% | 13 41.94% | 0.246 |
| atencym | Abnormal | 4 57.14% | Duration of symptomsthan 3days5days1week 2 3 1 28.6% 25% 8.34% 5 911 71.4% 75% 91.67% 2 5 3 28.57% 16.67% 25% 5 7 9 71.42 58.34% 75% 3 7 3 42.85% 58.34% 25% 4 5 9 57.14% 41.67% 75% 4 5 9 57.14% 41.67% 16.67% 4 7 10 57.14% 58.34% 83.34% 2 5 1 4 7 10 57.14% 58.34% 83.34% 2 5 1 4 7 10 57.14% 8.34% 91.67% 1 1 0 14.28% 8.34% 0.00% 1 2 0 14.28% 16.67% 00.00% 1 2 0 14.28% 16.67% 00.00% 2 6 3 28.57% 50% 25% 4 4 9 57.14% 33.34% 75% | 18 58.06% | | |
| Motor CV | Normal | 3 42.85% | 5 41.67% | 2 16.67% | 10 32.25% | 0.31 |
| | Abnormal | less than 3days5days1weekT2311928.6%25%8.34%1959118059118025328.57%16.67%25%328.57%16.67%25%57971.4258.34%75%67971.4258.34%25%42.85%58.34%25%41.67%75%5835242.85%41.67%16.67%35242.85%41.67%16.67%3235242.85%41.67%335242.85%41.67%83.34%6725128.6%41.67%8.34%251128.6%41.67%8.34%58.34%91.67%741114.28%8.34%0.00%61114.28%16.67%91.67%100%9328.57%50%25%3544957.14%33.34%75%54 | 21 67.74% | 1 | | |
| amplitudeM | Normal | 2 28.6% | 5 41.67% | 1 8.34% | 8 25.81% | 0.146 |
| ampiltudei | Abnormal | 5 71.4% | 7 58.34% | 11 91.67% | 23 74.19% | 0.140 |
| H_roflex | Normal | 1 14.28% | 1 8.34% | 0 0.00% | 2 6.45% | 0.22 |
| II-IEIIEX | Abnormal | 6 85.71% | 11 91.67% | 12 100% | 29 93.55% | 0.55 |
| H-reflex | Normal | 1 14.28% | 2 16.67% | 0 00.00% | 3 9.68% | |
| value | Poorly modulated | 2 28.57% | 6 50% | 3 25% | 11 35.48% | 0.19 |
| | Absent | 4 57.14% | 4 33.34% | 9 75% | 17 54.84% | |

Showing electrophysiological findings with the duration of GBS symptoms

Table 02:

Showing type of GBS and of symptoms of GBS. **typeofGBS * durationofsymptoms Crosstabulation**

| | | Duration of symptoms | | | Total | |
|----------------|---------------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------|
| | | less than 3days | 5days | 1week | TOLAI | p-value |
| Type of GBS | Not known | 2 28.57% | 5 41.67% | 1 8.34% | 8 25.81% | |
| | axonal | 3 42.86% | 4 33.34% | 6 50% | 13 41.64% | 0.42 |
| | demyelinating | 2 28.57% | 3 25% | 5 41.67% | 10 32.36% | |
| Total | | 07 100% | 12 100% | 12 100% | 31 100% | |

Table 03:

| | | Duration of symptoms | | | | |
|------------|----------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------|
| | | less than 3days | 5days | 1week | Total | p-value |
| suralnerve | normal | 6 85.71% | 7 58.34% | 5 41.67% | 18 58.06% | |
| | abnormal | 1 14.29% | 4 33.34% | 7 58.34% | 12 38.71% | 0.209 |
| | not done | 0 00.00% | 1 8.34% | 0 00.00% | 1 3.23% | |
| Total | | 7 100% | 12 100% | 12 100% | 31 100% | |

Showing sural nerve involvement with the duration of GBS symptoms: suralnerve * durationofsymptoms Crosstabulation

 Table 04:

 Sural nerve involvement with type of GBS

 Sural nerve * type of GBS Cross tabulation

| | | Type of GBS | | | | |
|-------------|----------|-------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|---------|
| | | Not known | axonal | demyelinating | Iotal | p-value |
| | normal | 7 87.5% | 8 61.54% | 3 30% | 18 58.06% | |
| Sural nerve | abnormal | 1 12.5% | 5 38.46% | 6 60% | 12 38.71% | 0.95 |
| | not done | 0 00.00% | 0 00.00% | 1 10% | 01 3.23% | 0.95 |
| Total | | 8 | 13 100% | 10 100% | 31 100% | |

DISCUSSION

There have been various studies on early electro diagnostic findings in patients with GBS. According to the study of Geetanjali on Early Electro Diagnostic Findings of GuillainBarre Syndrome³, hallmarks of early demyelinating polyneuropathy are slow motor conduction velocities (MCV) prolonged distal motor latency (MDL), prolonged/absent F wave latencies mainly in the lower limbs, and conduction block with

absent F wave.

For early diagnosis of AIDP variant of GBS, ChansonJB¹⁷ study proposed new diagnostic criteria with sensitivity of 81% within 7 days. According to the study, if electro diagnostic parameters like H-reflex, CV (conduction velocity) and DML (distal motor latency) were abnormal, patient can be diagnosed with AIDP. Their study showed abnormalities in the Hreflexes (97%), motor conduction velocity (78%), and prolonged distal latency in motor nerves (78%). Comparing this with our study H reflex was abnormal in 93.55% of cases (p value0.33), F wave was prolonged in 67.74% (p value 0.66), motor latency were abnormal in 58.06% (p value 0.246) and slowing of motor conduction velocity were abnormal in 67.74% (p value 0.31).

As the main aim of the study was that which parameters could be further indicative of the disease earlier than 7 days. Although the stratified data did not show significance on statistical analysis the percentile results were indicative of certain considerable potential parameters.

Considering about these parameters, as we had stratified our data in to earliest by 3days, 5 days and 7 days from onset to see most early electrophysiological changes. We found abnormal H-reflex to be earliest involved in 85.71% of patients (within 3days) which increase up to 91.67% by 5 days and was abnormal in all cases by day 7. As compare to H reflex, MCV was abnormal in approximately 55% (details- 57.14% by day 3 and 58.34% by day 5, 83 % by day 7). While DML (latency) was 57.14% by day 3, 41.67% by day 5 and 75% by 7 days thus clearly indicating the H-reflex was the earliest abnormality to be noted.

F wave is most sensitive diagnostic test for early GBS it shows early predilection for involvement of proximal spinal roots, According to Gordon PH¹⁹ study, f-wave latency is abnormal in 84% by 7 days. In our study, it was 75% by 7 days as with rest of world literature. However, in earliest group (3 days) it was 71.42%, 58.34% in 5days and 75% by 7 days. When comparing with H-reflex it was noted that F wave were abnormal by 71.42% in 3 days (H reflex 85.71%), 58.34% by day 5 (H reflex 91.67%) and 75% by 7 day (H reflex 100%). Again indicating that H reflex is the relatively more sensitive earliest indicator of GBS.

Our study was limited by the smallness of the sample, which hindered the ability to draw definitive conclusions. However the potential considerable parameters like H reflex and f waves are consistent with world literature.

CONCLUSION

The electro diagnostic parameters are sensitive indicators of early GBS, H reflex followed by F reflex can be abnormal as earliest by 3days.

REFERENCES

1. Jasem at al, Guillain-Barré syndrome as a cause of acute flaccid paralysis in Iraqi children: a result of 15 years of nation-wide study. BMC

neurology 2013 13:195.

- 2. Burns TM, Guillain-Barre' Syndrome. SeminNeurol 2008 April;28(2):152-167
- Geetanjali et al. Early Electrodiagnostic Findings of GuillainBarre Syndrome. J NeurolNeurophysiol 2013, 4:1
- 4. Kuwabara S. Guillain-Barre syndrome: epidemiology, pathophysiology and management. Drugs 2004;64:597-610
- 5. The Guillain-Barré Syndrome Study Group Plasmapheresis and acute Guillain-Barré syndrome. *Neurology*.1985;35:1096-1104.<u>Google Scholar</u>
- 6. van der Meche FGSchmitz PIMfor the Dutch Guillain-Barré Study Group A randomized trial comparing intravenous immune globulin and plasma exchange in Guillain-Barré syndrome. *N Engl J Med*.1992;326:1123-1129.<u>Google</u> <u>Scholar</u>
- 7. Burns TM. Guillain-Barre syndrome. SeminNeurol 2008; 28(2): 152-67
- Albers JW, Kelly JJ Jr. Acquired inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathies: clinical and electrodiagnostigfeatures. Muscle Nerve 1989;12:435-51.
- 9. Corn blath DR. Electrophysiology in Guillain-Barrésyndrome. Ann Neurol 1990;27:17-20.
- 10. M EULST EE J, van der MECHE FG. Electrodiagnosticcriteria for polyneuropathy and demyelination: applicationin 135 patients with Guillain-Barre syndrome. JNeurolNeurosurg Psychiatry 1995;59:482-6.
- 11. WEIN BERG DH. AAEM case report 4: Guillain-Barré syndrome. Muscle Nerve 1999;22:271-81.
- The Italian GuillainBarré Study Group. The prognosis and main prognostic indicators of GuillainBarré syndrome: A multicentre prospective study of 297 patients. Brain 1996;119:2053-61
- Netto BA et al, Prognosis of patients with
 Guillain-Barré syndrome requiring mechanical ventilation.Neurol India 2011;59:707-11

- Albers JW, Donofrio PD, McGonagITK. Sequential electrodiagnosticabnormalities in acute inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. Muscle Nerve 1985;8:528-39.
- 15. Albers JWKelly JJ Acquired inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathies: clinical and electrodiagnostic features. Muscle Nerve.1989;12:435-451.<u>Google Scholar</u>
- 16. Meulstee J, Van Der Meche FG.

Electrodiagnostic criteria for polyneuropathy and demyelination: application in 135 patients with Guillain- Barré syndrome. Dutch Guillain-B a r r é S t u d y G r o u p . J NeurolNeuroSurgPsychiat 1995;59: 482-486.

17. Chanson JB, Echaniz-Laguna A. Early electrodiagnostic abnormalities in acute inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy: a retrospective study of 58 patients. Clin Neurophysiol 2014;125:1900-1905.

Conflict of interest: Author declares no conflict of interest. Funding disclosure: Nil

Author's contribution: Hazim Brohi; concept, data collection, data analysis, manuscript writing, manuscript review

Rajesh Kumar; data collection, data analysis, manuscript writing, manuscript review Sadia Mubarak; data analysis, manuscript writing, manuscript review Muhammad Anees Mumtaz; data analysis, manuscript writing, manuscript review