

EFNS/PNS MMN GUIDELINES

European Federation of Neurological Societies/Peripheral Nerve Society Guideline* on management of multifocal motor neuropathy. Report of a joint task force of the European Federation of Neurological Societies and the Peripheral Nerve Society

Joint Task Force of the EFNS and the PNS†

Abstract Background: Several diagnostic criteria for multifocal motor neuropathy (MMN) have been proposed in recent years, and a beneficial effect of intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIg) and various other immunomodulatory drugs has been suggested in several trials and uncontrolled studies. Objectives: The aim of this guideline was to prepare consensus guidelines on the definition, investigation, and treatment of MMN. Methods: Disease experts and a representative of patients considered references retrieved from MEDLINE and the Cochrane Library in July 2004 and prepared statements that were agreed in an iterative fashion. Recommendations: The Task Force agreed on good practice points to define clinical and electrophysiological diagnostic criteria for MMN and investigations to be considered. The principal recommendations and good practice points were as follows: (1) IVIg (2 g/kg given over 2–5 days) should be considered as the first line of treatment (level A recommendation) when disability is sufficiently severe to warrant treatment; (2) corticosteroids are not recommended (good practice point); (3) if initial treatment with IVIg is effective, repeated IVIg treatment should be considered (level C recommendation). The frequency of IVIg maintenance therapy should be guided by the individual response (good practice point). Typical treatment regimens are 1 g/kg every 2–4 weeks or 2 g/kg every 4–8 weeks (good practice point); (4) if IVIg is not (or not sufficiently) effective, then immunosuppressive treatment may be considered. Cyclophosphamide, cyclosporine, azathioprine, interferon- β 1a, or rituximab are possible agents (good practice point); and (5) toxicity makes cyclophosphamide a less desirable option (good practice point).

Key words: definition, diagnosis, guidelines, multifocal motor neuropathy, treatment

Address correspondence to: Richard A. C. Hughes, Department of Clinical Neuroscience, King's College London School of Medicine, Guy's Hospital, London SE1 1UL, UK. E-mail: richard.a.hughes@kcl.ac.uk

**Anticipated date for updating this guideline: Not later than October 2008.*

†Membership of Task Force: Richard A. C. Hughes (Chair), UK; Pierre Bouche, France; David R. Cornblath, USA; Eileen Evers, UK; Robert D. Hadden, UK; Isabel Illa, Spain; Carol L. Koski, USA; Jean-Marc Léger, France; Eduardo Nobile-Orazio, Italy; John D. Pollard, Australia; Claudia Sommer, Germany; Peter Van den Bergh, Belgium; Pieter A. van Doorn, Netherlands; Ivo N. van Schaik, Netherlands.

Objectives

The aim of this guideline was to construct guidelines for the definition, diagnosis, and treatment of multifocal motor neuropathy (MMN) based on the available evidence and, where adequate evidence was not available, consensus.

Background

Patients with a pure motor, asymmetric neuropathy with multifocal conduction blocks (CBs) have been

reported from 1986 onwards (*Chad et al., 1986; Roth et al., 1986; Parry and Clarke, 1988*). Pestronk and colleagues first introduced the term 'multifocal motor neuropathy' and highlighted the association with immunoglobulin M anti-ganglioside GM1 antibodies and the response to immune-modulating therapies (*Pestronk et al., 1988*). The diagnosis of MMN is based on clinical, laboratory, and electrophysiological characteristics (*Parry and Sumner, 1992; Van den Berg-Vos et al., 2000a; Nobile-Orazio, 2001; Nobile-Orazio et al., 2005*). Several diagnostic criteria for this neuropathy have been proposed (*Van den Berg-Vos et al., 2000c; Hughes, 2001; Olney et al., 2003*). These criteria share the following clinical features: slowly progressive, asymmetric, predominantly distal weakness without objective loss of sensation in the distribution of two or more individual peripheral nerves, and absence of upper motor neuron signs. The hallmark of the disease is the presence of multifocal CB on electrophysiological testing outside the usual sites of nerve compression (*Cornblath et al., 1991; Kaji and Kimura, 1991; Parry and Sumner, 1992; Parry, 1993; Van Asseldonk et al., 2003*). CB is a reduction in the amplitude or area (or both) of the compound muscle action potential (CMAP) obtained by proximal vs. distal stimulation of motor nerves in the absence of or with only focal abnormal temporal dispersion (*Cornblath et al., 1991; Nobile-Orazio, 2001; Kaji, 2003*). The extent of reduction of the CMAP amplitude and/or area necessary for CB are still matters of debate. For this guideline, we present clinical and electrophysiological diagnostic criteria based on published criteria and consensus agreed upon by the task force.

MMN is a treatable disorder. A beneficial effect of various immunomodulatory drugs has been suggested in several uncontrolled studies (*Pestronk et al., 1988; Krarup et al., 1990; Feldman et al., 1991; Hausmanowa-Petrusewicz et al., 1991; Chaudhry et al., 1993; Meucci et al., 1997; Van Es et al., 1997; Martina et al., 1999; Van den Berg-Vos et al., 2000b; Léger et al., 2005*) and were reviewed in a Cochrane systematic review (*Umaphathi et al., 2003*). Four trials have shown high-dose intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIg) therapy to be effective in MMN, and this treatment currently is considered the standard treatment for MMN (*Azulay et al., 1994; Van den Berg et al., 1995; Federico et al., 2000; Léger et al., 2001*). These trials have also been reviewed in a Cochrane systematic review (*Van Schaik et al., 2004*). This small body of evidence allowed some evidence-based statements about treatment.

Search Strategy

We searched MEDLINE from 1980 onwards to July 24, 2004 for articles on MMN and 'diagnosis' or

'treatment' or 'guideline' but found that the personal databases of Task Force members were more useful. We also searched the Cochrane Library in September 2004.

Methods for Reaching Consensus

Pairs of Task Force members prepared draft statements about definition, diagnosis, and treatment, which were considered at a meeting in September 2004. Evidence was classified as class I–IV and recommendations as level A–C according to the scheme agreed for EFNS guidelines (*Brainin et al., 2004*). When only class IV evidence was available but consensus could be reached, the Task Force offered advice as good practice points. The statements were revised and collated into a single document, which was then revised iteratively until consensus was reached.

Results

Diagnostic criteria for MMN

The Task Force developed their own diagnostic criteria based on the published criteria (*Parry and Sumner, 1992; Van den Berg-Vos et al., 2000a; 2000c; Hughes, 2001; Nobile-Orazio, 2001; Olney et al., 2003; Nobile-Orazio et al., 2005*). The clinical criteria are listed in Table 1. The main clinical features are weakness without objective sensory loss, slowly progressive or stepwise progressive course, asymmetric involvement of two or more nerves, and absence of upper motor neuron signs. Additional clinical criteria have also been proposed: not more than seven of eight affected limb regions, predominance of weakness in the upper limbs, decreased or absent tendon reflexes, and age of onset between 20 and 65 years (*Van den Berg-Vos et al., 2000a*). These additional features were associated with a more frequent response to immunoglobulin therapy, but it was unclear how they influenced diagnostic accuracy, and the absence of some of these features is not uncommon in patients with otherwise typical MMN (*Nobile-Orazio et al., 2005*). The Task Force decided not to include an age limit in the criteria.

The presence of CB in motor nerve fibers is the hallmark of the disease.

The first papers defined CB as a 20–30% amplitude or area reduction if the distal CMAP duration did not exceed 15% greater than normal. In one of the main papers concerning the diagnostic criteria of MMN, grading of CB was defined as definite or probable and in the other as definite, probable, and possible (*Van den Berg-Vos et al., 2000c; Hughes, 2001; Olney et al., 2003*).

Table 1. Clinical criteria for multifocal motor neuropathy (MMN).

Core criteria (both must be present)

- (1) Slowly progressive or stepwise progressive, asymmetric limb weakness, or motor involvement having a motor nerve distribution in at least two nerves, for more than 1 month*
- (2) No objective sensory abnormalities except for minor vibration sense abnormalities in the lower limbs

Supportive clinical criteria

- (3) Predominant upper limb involvement†
- (4) Decreased or absent tendon reflexes in the affected limb‡
- (5) Absence of cranial nerve involvement§
- (6) Cramps and fasciculations in the affected limb

Exclusion criteria

- (7) Upper motor neuron signs
- (8) Marked bulbar involvement
- (9) Sensory impairment more marked than minor vibration loss in the lower limbs
- (10) Diffuse symmetric weakness during the initial weeks
- (11) Laboratory: cerebrospinal fluid protein >1 g/L

*Usually more than 6 months.

†At onset, predominant lower limb involvement accounts for nearly 10% of the cases.

‡Slightly increased tendon reflexes, in particular in the affected arm, have been reported and do not exclude the diagnosis of MMN provided criterion 7 is met.

§12th nerve palsy has been reported.

There is only class IV evidence concerning all these matters. Nevertheless, the Task Force agreed on good practice points to define clinical and electrophysiological diagnostic criteria for MMN (Tables 1 and 2).

Investigation of MMN

On the basis of consensus expert opinion, consideration of MMN should enter the differential diagnosis of any patient with a slowly or stepwise progressive asymmetrical limb weakness without objective sensory abnormalities, and upper motor neuron or bulbar signs or symptoms.

MMN should be differentiated from motor neuron disease, entrapment neuropathies, hereditary neuropathy with liability to pressure palsy, Lewis–Sumner syndrome, and chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy (CIDP), in particular its purely motor variant (Chad *et al.*, 1986; Parry and Clarke, 1988; Pestronk *et al.*, 1990; Veugelers *et al.*, 1996; Oh *et al.*, 1997; Beydoun, 1998; Ellis *et al.*, 1999; Lewis, 1999; Mezaki *et al.*, 1999; Molinuevo *et al.*, 1999; Parry, 1999;

Saperstein *et al.*, 1999; Van den Berg-Vos *et al.*, 2000c; Visser *et al.*, 2002).

Clinical examination and electrodiagnostic tests are mandatory, and the features suggesting a diagnosis of MMN are listed under diagnostic criteria. A family history should be obtained. Other tests that can support the diagnosis of MMN are cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) protein <1 g/L, anti-ganglioside GM1 antibody testing (Van Schaik *et al.*, 1995; Taylor *et al.*, 1996; Willison and Yuki, 2002), and increased signal intensity on T2-weighted magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scans of the brachial plexus (Van Es *et al.*, 1997; Van den Berg-Vos *et al.*, 2000a; 2000c). CSF examination, anti-ganglioside GM1 antibody testing, and MRI scans of the brachial plexus are not normally needed for patients fulfilling the clinical and electrodiagnostic criteria of MMN. Nerve biopsies are not routinely performed in MMN but can be useful in detecting an alternative cause (Bouche *et al.*, 1995; Corse *et al.*, 1996). Needle electromyogram, serum and urine paraprotein detection by immunofixation (Noguchi *et al.*, 2003), thyroid function test (Toscano *et al.*, 2002),

Table 2. Electrophysiological criteria for conduction block (CB)*.

- (1) Definite motor CB*
Negative CMAP area reduction on proximal vs. distal stimulation of at least 50% whatever the nerve segment length (median, ulnar, and peroneal). Negative CMAP amplitude on stimulation of the distal part of the segment with motor CB must be >20% of the lower limit of normal and >1 mV (baseline negative peak) and an increase of proximal negative peak CMAP duration must be ≤30%
- (2) Probable motor CB*
Negative CMAP area reduction of at least 30% over a long segment of an upper limb nerve with an increase of proximal negative peak CMAP duration ≤30%, or
Negative CMAP area reduction of at least 50% (same as definite) with an increase of proximal negative peak CMAP duration >30%
- (3) Normal sensory nerve conduction in upper limb segments with CB and normal SNAP amplitudes (see exclusion criteria)

CMAP, compound muscle action potential; SNAP, sensory nerve action potential.

*Evidence for CB must be found at sites distinct from common entrapment or compression syndromes.

creatine kinase test (Chaudhry et al., 1993; Van den Berg-Vos et al., 2000a), and measurement of CSF cell count and protein level (Taylor et al., 2000; Van den Berg-Vos et al., 2000a) are investigations which can be helpful to discover concomitant disease or exclude other possible causes. This list is not complete and additional investigations should be guided by the clinical findings.

Treatment of MMN

The treatment options for people with MMN are sparse. In contrast to the response in CIDP, MMN does not usually respond to steroids or plasma exchange, and patients' condition may worsen when they receive these treatments (Van den Berg et al., 1997; Carpo et al., 1998; Claus et al., 2000; Nobile-Orazio, 2001).

The efficacy of IVIg has been suggested by many open, uncontrolled studies. Four randomized, controlled, double-blind trials (RCTs) of IVIg for treating MMN have been completed (Azulay et al., 1994; Van den Berg et al., 1995; Federico et al., 2000; Léger et al., 2001). These four RCTs included a total of 45 patients with MMN and have been summarized in a Cochrane systematic review (Van Schaik et al., 2004). IVIg treatment is superior to placebo in inducing an improvement in muscle strength in patients with MMN (numbers needed to treat = 1.4, 95% CI 1.1–1.8). As weakness is the only determinant of disability in patients with MMN, it is to be expected that in patients whose muscle strength improves after IVIg treatment, disability will improve as well. In a large retrospective study, elevated anti-ganglioside GM1 antibodies and definite CB were significantly correlated with a favorable response to IVIg (Van den Berg-Vos et al., 2000a). In approximately a third of patients, prolonged remission (>12 months) was established with IVIg alone; approximately half of patients need repeated IVIg infusions, and of them, half need additional immunosuppressive treatment (Léger et al., 2005). Effectiveness declines during prolonged treatment, even when dosage is increased, probably due to ongoing axonal degeneration (Van den Berg et al., 1998; Terenghi et al., 2004). However, in one retrospective study, treatment with higher than normal maintenance doses of IVIg (1.6–2.0 g/kg given over 4–5 days) promoted reinnervation, decreased the

number of CBs, and prevented axonal degeneration in 10 MMN patients for up to 12 years (Vucic et al., 2004).

Uncontrolled studies suggest a beneficial effect of cyclophosphamide (Pestronk et al., 1988; Krarup et al., 1990; Feldman et al., 1991; Chaudhry et al., 1993; Meucci et al., 1997; Van Es et al., 1997), interferon (IFN)- β 1a (Martina et al., 1999; Van den Berg-Vos et al., 2000b), and azathioprine (Hausmanowa-Petrusewicz et al., 1991; Léger et al., 2005). There is conflicting evidence for rituximab (Rojas-Garcia et al., 2003; Rüegg et al., 2004). Cyclophosphamide was not recommended by one group of experts because concern exists about its toxicity and lack of evidence of efficacy in MMN (Hughes, 2001).

Recommendations and Good Practice Points

Diagnostic criteria (good practice points)

1. Clinical: the two core criteria and all exclusion criteria should be met (Table 1);
2. Electrodiagnostic: definite or probable CB in at least two nerves (Table 2);
3. Supportive: anti-GM1 antibody testing, MRI, CSF examination, and treatment response (Table 3);
4. Categories: definite and probable MMN (Table 4).

Diagnostic tests (good practice points)

1. Clinical examination and electrodiagnostic tests should be considered in all patients;
2. Anti-ganglioside GM1 antibody testing, MRI of the brachial plexus, and CSF examination should be considered in selected patients;
3. Investigations to discover concomitant disease or exclude other possible causes should be considered, but the choice of tests will depend on the individual circumstances.

Treatment

1. IVIg (2 g/kg given over 2–5 days) should be considered as the first line of treatment (level A recommendation) when disability is sufficiently severe to warrant treatment;
2. Corticosteroids are not recommended (good practice point);

Table 3. Supportive criteria.

-
- (1) Elevated immunoglobulin M anti-ganglioside GM1 antibodies (level A recommendation)
 - (2) Magnetic resonance imaging showing gadolinium enhancement and/or hypertrophy of the brachial plexuses (good practice point)
 - (3) Clinical improvement following intravenous immunoglobulin treatment (good practice point)
-

Table 4. Diagnostic categories.**Definite MMN**

Clinical criteria 1, 2, and 7–11 and electrophysiological criteria 1 and 3 in one nerve

Probable MMN

Clinical criteria 1, 2, and 7–11 and electrophysiological criteria 2 and 3 in two nerves

Clinical criteria 1, 2, and 7–11 and electrophysiological criteria 2 and 3 in one nerve and at least one supportive criteria 1–3 (Table 3)

MMN, multifocal motor neuropathy.

3. If an initial treatment with IVIg is effective, repeated IVIg treatment should be considered in selected patients (level C recommendation). The frequency of IVIg maintenance therapy should be guided by the response (good practice point). Typical treatment regimen is 1 g/kg every 2–4 weeks or 2 g/kg every 1–2 months (good practice point);
4. If IVIg is not (or not sufficiently) effective, then immunosuppressive treatment may be considered. Cyclophosphamide, cyclosporine, azathioprine, IFN- β 1a, or rituximab are possible agents (good practice point);
5. Toxicity makes cyclophosphamide a less desirable option (good practice point).

Conflicts of Interest

The following authors have reported conflicts of interest: R. Hughes, personal none, departmental research grants or honoraria from Bayer, Biogen-Idec, Schering-Laboratoire Français du Biofractionnement (LFB), and Kedrion; D. Cornblath, personal honoraria from Aventis Behring and Baxter; C. Koski, personal honoraria from American Red Cross, Baxter, Bayer, and ZLB-Behring; J. M. Léger, personal none, departmental research grants or honoraria from Biogen-Idec, Baxter, LFB, and Octapharma; E. Nobile-Orazio, personal honoraria from Kedrion, Grifols, Baxter, and LFB (and he has been commissioned by Kedrion and Baxter to give expert opinions to the Italian Ministry of Health on the use of IVIg in dysimmune neuropathies); J. Pollard, personal none, departmental research grants from Biogen-Idec and Schering; P. van Doorn, personal none, departmental research grants or honoraria from Baxter and Bayer. The other authors have nothing to declare.

References

- Azulay JP, Blin O, Pouget J, Boucraut J, Billé-Turc F, Carles G, Serratrice G (1994). Intravenous immunoglobulin treatment in patients with motor neuron syndromes associated with anti-GM1 antibodies: a double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Neurology* 44:429–432.
- Beydoun SR (1998). Multifocal motor neuropathy with conduction block misdiagnosed as multiple entrapment neuropathies. *Muscle Nerve* 21:813–815.
- Bouche P, Moulouguet A, Younes-Chennoufi AB, Adams D, Baumann N, Meininger V, Léger JM, Said G (1995). Multifocal motor neuropathy with conduction block: a study of 24 patients. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 59:38–44.
- Brainin M, Barnes M, Baron JC, Gilhus NE, Hughes R, Selmaj K, Waldemar G; Guideline Standards Subcommittee of the EFNS Scientific Committee (2004). Guidance for the preparation of neurological management guidelines by EFNS scientific task forces – revised recommendations 2004. *Eur J Neurol* 11:577–581.
- Carpo M, Cappellari A, Mora G, Pedotti R, Barbieri S, Scarlato G, Nobile-Orazio E (1998). Deterioration of multifocal motor neuropathy after plasma exchange. *Neurology* 50:1480–1482.
- Chad DA, Hammer K, Sargent J (1986). Slow resolution of multifocal weakness and fasciculation: a reversible motor neuron syndrome. *Neurology* 36:1260–1263.
- Chaudhry V, Corse AM, Cornblath DR, Kuncel RW, Drachman DB, Freimer ML, Miller RG, Griffin JW (1993). Multifocal motor neuropathy: response to human immune globulin. *Ann Neurol* 33:237–242.
- Claus D, Specht S, Zieschang M (2000). Plasmapheresis in multifocal motor neuropathy: a case report. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 68:533–535.
- Cornblath DR, Sumner AJ, Daube J, Gilliat RW, Brown WF, Parry GJ, Albers JW, Miller RG, Petajan J (1991). Conduction block in clinical practice. *Muscle Nerve* 14:869–871.
- Corse AM, Chaudhry V, Crawford TO, Cornblath DR, Kuncel RW, Griffin JW (1996). Sensory nerve pathology in multifocal motor neuropathy. *Ann Neurol* 39:319–325.
- Ellis CM, Leary S, Payan J, Shaw C, Hu M, O'Brien M, Leigh PN (1999). Use of human intravenous immunoglobulin in lower motor neuron syndromes. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 67:15–19.
- Federico P, Zochodne DW, Hahn AF, Brown WF, Feasby TE (2000). Multifocal motor neuropathy improved by IVIg: randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Neurology* 55:1256–1262.
- Feldman EL, Bromberg MB, Albers JW, Pestronk A (1991). Immunosuppressive treatment in multifocal motor neuropathy. *Ann Neurol* 30:397–401.
- Hausmanowa-Petrusewicz I, Rowinska-Marcinska K, Kopec A (1991). Chronic acquired demyelinating motor neuropathy. *Acta Neurol Scand* 84:40–45.
- Hughes RA (2001). 79th ENMC International Workshop: multifocal motor neuropathy 14–15 April 2000, Hilversum, The Netherlands. *Neuromuscul Disord* 11:309–314.
- Kaji R (2003). Physiology of conduction block in multifocal motor neuropathy and other demyelinating neuropathies. *Muscle Nerve* 27:285–296.

- Kaji R, Kimura J (1991). Nerve conduction block. *Curr Opin Neurol Neurosurg* 4:744–748.
- Krarup C, Stewart JD, Sumner AJ, Pestronk A, Lipton SA (1990). A syndrome of asymmetric limb weakness with motor conduction block. *Neurology* 40:118–127.
- Léger JM, Chassande B, Musset L, Meininger V, Bouche P, Baumann N (2001). Intravenous immunoglobulin therapy in multifocal motor neuropathy: a double-blind, placebo-controlled study. *Brain* 124:145–153.
- Léger JM, Viala K, Cancalon F, Maisonobe T, Gruwez B, Waegemans T, Bouche P (2005). Are intravenous immunoglobulins a long-term therapy of multifocal motor neuropathy? A retrospective study of response to IVIg and of its predictive criteria in 40 patients. *Neurology* 64:A412.
- Lewis RA (1999). Multifocal motor neuropathy and Lewis Sumner syndrome: two distinct entities. *Muscle Nerve* 22:1738–1739.
- Martina IS, van Doorn PA, Schmitz PI, Meulstee J, van der Meché FG (1999). Chronic motor neuropathies: response to interferon- β 1a after failure of conventional therapies. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 66:197–201.
- Meucci N, Cappellari A, Barbieri S, Scarlato G, Nobile-Orazio E (1997). Long term effect of intravenous immunoglobulins and oral cyclophosphamide in multifocal motor neuropathy. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 63:765–769.
- Mezaki T, Kaji R, Kimura J (1999). Multifocal motor neuropathy and Lewis Sumner syndrome: a clinical spectrum. *Muscle Nerve* 22:1739–1740.
- Molinuevo JL, Cruz-Martinez A, Graus F, Serra J, Ribalta T, Valls-Sole J (1999). Central motor conduction time in patients with multifocal motor conduction block. *Muscle Nerve* 22:926–932.
- Nobile-Orazio E (2001). Multifocal motor neuropathy. *J Neuroimmunol* 115:4–18.
- Nobile-Orazio E, Cappellari A, Priori A (2005). Multifocal motor neuropathy: current concepts and controversies. *Muscle Nerve* 31:663–680.
- Noguchi M, Mori K, Yamazaki S, Suda K, Sato N, Oshimi K (2003). Multifocal motor neuropathy caused by a B-cell lymphoma producing a monoclonal IgM autoantibody against peripheral nerve myelin glycolipids GM1 and GD1b. *Br J Haematol* 123:600–605.
- Oh SJ, Claussen GC, Kim DS (1997). Motor and sensory demyelinating mononeuropathy multiplex (multifocal motor and sensory demyelinating neuropathy): a separate entity or a variant of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy? *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2:362–369.
- Olney RK, Lewis RA, Putnam TD, Campellone JV Jr; American Association of Electrodiagnostic Medicine (2003). Consensus criteria for the diagnosis of multifocal motor neuropathy. *Muscle Nerve* 27:117–121.
- Parry GJ (1993). Motor neuropathy with multifocal conduction block. *Semin Neurol* 13:269–275.
- Parry GJ (1999). Are multifocal motor neuropathy and Lewis–Sumner syndrome distinct nosologic entities? *Muscle Nerve* 22:557–559.
- Parry GJ, Clarke S (1988). Multifocal acquired demyelinating neuropathy masquerading as motor neuron disease. *Muscle Nerve* 11:103–107.
- Parry GJ, Sumner AJ (1992). Multifocal motor neuropathy. In: *Peripheral Neuropathy*. Dyck PJ, Thomas PK, Griffin JW (Eds). W.B. Saunders Company, Philadelphia, pp 671–684.
- Pestronk A, Chaudhry V, Feldman EL, Griffin JW, Cornblath DR, Denys EH, Glasberg M, Kuncl RW, Olney RK, Yee WC (1990). Lower motor neuron syndromes defined by patterns of weakness, nerve conduction abnormalities, and high titers of anti-glycolipid antibodies. *Ann Neurol* 27:316–326.
- Pestronk A, Cornblath DR, Ilyas AA, Baba H, Quarles RH, Griffin JW, Alderson K, Adams RN (1988). A treatable multifocal motor neuropathy with antibodies to GM1 ganglioside. *Ann Neurol* 24:73–78.
- Rojas-Garcia R, Gallardo E, de Andres I, de Luna N, Juarez C, Sanchez P, Illa I (2003). Chronic neuropathy with IgM anti-ganglioside antibodies: lack of long term response to rituximab. *Neurology* 61:1814–1816.
- Roth G, Rohr J, Magistris MR, Ochsner F (1986). Motor neuropathy with proximal multifocal persistent conduction block, fasciculations and myokymia. Evolution to tetraplegia. *Eur Neurol* 25:416–423.
- Rüegg SJ, Fuhr P, Steck AJ (2004). Rituximab stabilizes multifocal motor neuropathy increasingly less responsive to IVIg. *Neurology* 63:2178–2179.
- Saperstein DS, Amato AA, Wolfe GI, Katz JS, Nations SP, Jackson CE, Bryan WW, Burns DK, Barohn RJ (1999). Multifocal acquired demyelinating sensory and motor neuropathy: the Lewis–Sumner syndrome. *Muscle Nerve* 22:560–566.
- Taylor BV, Gross L, Windebank AJ (1996). The sensitivity and specificity of anti-GM1 antibody testing. *Neurology* 47:951–955.
- Taylor BV, Wright RA, Harper CM, Dyck PJ (2000). Natural history of 46 patients with multifocal motor neuropathy with conduction block. *Muscle Nerve* 23:900–908.
- Terenghi F, Cappellari A, Bersano A, Carpo M, Barbieri S, Nobile-Orazio E (2004). How long is IVIg effective in multifocal motor neuropathy? *Neurology* 62:666–668.
- Toscano A, Rodolico C, Benvenga S, Girlanda P, Laura M, Mazzeo A, Nobile-Orazio E, Trimarchi F, Vita G, Messina C (2002). Multifocal motor neuropathy and asymptomatic Hashimoto's thyroiditis: first report of an association. *Neuromuscul Disord* 12:566–568.
- Umaphathi T, Hughes RAC, Nobile-Orazio E, Léger JM (2005). Immunosuppressant and immunomodulatory treatments for multifocal motor neuropathy. *The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, Issue 3. Art. No.CD003217. DOI: 10.1002-14651858.CD003217.pub 2.
- Van Asseldonk JT, Van den Berg LH, Van den Berg-Vos RM, Wieneke GH, Wokke JH, Franssen H (2003). Demyelination and axonal loss in multifocal motor neuropathy: distribution and relation to weakness. *Brain* 126:186–198.
- Van den Berg LH, Franssen H, Wokke JH (1998). The long-term effect of intravenous immunoglobulin treatment in multifocal motor neuropathy. *Brain* 121:421–428.
- Van den Berg LH, Kerkhoff H, Oey PL, Franssen H, Mollee I, Vermeulen M, Jennekens FG, Wokke JH (1995). Treatment of multifocal motor neuropathy with high dose intravenous immunoglobulins: a double blind, placebo-controlled study. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 59:248–252.
- Van den Berg LH, Lokhorst H, Wokke JH (1997). Pulsed high-dose dexamethasone is not effective in patients with multifocal motor neuropathy. *Neurology* 48:1135.
- Van den Berg-Vos RM, Franssen H, Wokke JH, Van Es HW, Van den Berg LH (2000a). Multifocal motor neuropathy: diagnostic criteria that predict the response to immunoglobulin treatment. *Ann Neurol* 48:919–926.
- Van den Berg-Vos RM, Van den Berg LH, Franssen H, Van Doorn PA, Merkies IS, Wokke JH (2000b). Treatment of multifocal motor neuropathy with interferon-beta1A. *Neurology* 54:1518–1521.

- Van den Berg-Vos RM, Van den Berg LH, Franssen H, Vermeulen M, Witkamp TD, Jansen GH, Van Es HW, Kerckhoff H, Wokke JH (2000c). Multifocal inflammatory demyelinating neuropathy: a distinct clinical entity? *Neurology* 54:26–32.
- Van Es HW, Van den Berg LH, Franssen H, Witkamp TD, Ramos LM, Notermans NC, Feldberg MA, Wokke JH (1997). Magnetic resonance imaging of the brachial plexus in patients with multifocal motor neuropathy. *Neurology* 48:1218–1224.
- Van Schaik IN, Bossuyt PM, Brand A, Vermeulen M (1995). Diagnostic value of GM1 antibodies in motor neuron disorders and neuropathies: a meta-analysis. *Neurology* 45:1570–1577.
- Van Schaik IN, Van den Berg LH, de Haan R, Vermeulen M (2005). Intravenous immunoglobuline for multifocal motor neuropathy. *The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, Issue 2. Art. No. CD00429. DOI: 10.1002-14651858.CD00429.pub 2.
- Veugelers B, Theys P, Lammens M, Van Hees J, Robberecht W (1996). Pathological findings in a patient with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis and multifocal motor neuropathy with conduction block. *J Neurol Sci* 136:64–70.
- Visser J, van den Berg-Vos RM, Franssen H, van den Berg LH, Vogels OJ, Wokke JH, de Jong JM, de Visser M (2002). Mimic syndromes in sporadic cases of progressive spinal muscular atrophy. *Neurology* 58:1593–1596.
- Vucic S, Black KR, Chong PS, Cros D (2004). Multifocal motor neuropathy: decrease in conduction blocks and reinnervation with long-term IVIg. *Neurology* 63: 1264–1269.
- Willison HJ, Yuki N (2002). Peripheral neuropathies and anti-glycolipid antibodies. *Brain* 125:2591–2625.

Appendix: Guidelines

Aim of guidelines

This guideline has been produced by the Task Force members of the European Federation of Neurological Societies (EFNS) who are also members of the Peripheral Nerve Society (PNS). Additional non-European members of the Task Force were appointed on the recommendation of the Board of Directors of the PNS. The Task Force adopted the methods and classification scheme of the EFNS (see Appendix Tables 1 and 2). Where only class IV evidence existed, a consensus opinion was expressed as a good practice point (*Brainin et al., 2004*). "The aim of an EFNS neurological management guideline is to provide evidence-based guidance for clinical neurologists, other health care professionals and health care providers about important aspects of management of neurological disease. It provides the view of an expert task force appointed by the Scientific Committee of the EFNS. It represents a peer-reviewed statement of minimum desirable standards for the guidance of practice based on the best available evidence. It is not intended to have legally binding implications in individual cases" (*Brainin et al., 2004*). This guideline is not intended to have implications regarding reimbursement.

Appendix Table 1. Evidence classification scheme for a therapeutic intervention.

Class I: An adequately powered prospective, randomized, controlled clinical trial with masked outcome assessment in a representative population or an adequately powered systematic review of prospective randomized controlled clinical trials with masked outcome assessment in representative populations. The following are required:

- (a) randomization concealment;
- (b) primary outcome(s) is/are clearly defined;
- (c) exclusion/inclusion criteria are clearly defined;
- (d) adequate accounting for dropouts and crossovers with numbers sufficiently low to have minimal potential for bias;
- (e) relevant baseline characteristics are presented and substantially equivalent among treatment groups or there is appropriate statistical adjustment for differences.

Class II: Prospective matched-group cohort study in a representative population with masked outcome assessment that meets (a)–(e) above or a randomized, controlled trial in a representative population that lacks one criteria (a–e)

Class III: All other controlled trials (including well-defined natural history controls or patients serving as own controls) in a representative population, where outcome assessment is independent of patient treatment

Class IV: Evidence from uncontrolled studies, case series, case reports, or expert opinion

Rating of recommendations

- Level A rating (established as effective, ineffective, or harmful) requires at least one convincing class I study or at least two consistent, convincing class II studies
- Level B rating (probably effective, ineffective, or harmful) requires at least one convincing class II study or overwhelming class III evidence
- Level C rating (possibly effective, ineffective, or harmful) rating requires at least two convincing class III studies

Appendix Table 2. Evidence classification scheme for a diagnostic measure.

Class I: A prospective study in a broad spectrum of persons with the suspected condition, using a 'gold standard' for case definition, where the test is applied in a blinded evaluation, and enabling the assessment of appropriate tests of diagnostic accuracy

Class II: A prospective study of a narrow spectrum of persons with the suspected condition, or a well-designed retrospective study of a broad spectrum of persons with an established condition (by gold standard) compared with a broad spectrum of controls, where test is applied in a blinded evaluation, and enabling the assessment of appropriate tests of diagnostic accuracy

Class III: Evidence provided by a retrospective study where either persons with the established condition or controls are of a narrow spectrum, and where test is applied in a blinded evaluation

Class IV: Any design where test is not applied in blinded evaluation OR evidence provided by expert opinion alone or in descriptive case series (without controls)

Rating of recommendations

- Level A rating (established as useful/predictive or not useful/predictive) requires at least one convincing class I study or at least two consistent, convincing class II studies
- Level B rating (established as probably useful/predictive or not useful/predictive) requires at least one convincing class II study or overwhelming class III evidence
- Level C rating (established as possibly useful/predictive or not useful/predictive) requires at least two convincing class III studies
