



Complete Summary

GUIDELINE TITLE

Management of paraneoplastic neurological syndromes: report of an EFNS Task Force.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)

Vedeler CA, Antoine JC, Giometto B, Graus F, Grisold W, Hart IK, Honnorat J, Sillevs Smitt PA, Verschuuren JJ, Voltz R, Paraneoplastic Neurological Syndrome Euronetwork. Management of paraneoplastic neurological syndromes: report of an EFNS Task Force. Eur J Neurol 2006 Jul;13(7):682-90. [73 references] [PubMed](#)

GUIDELINE STATUS

This is the current release of the guideline.

COMPLETE SUMMARY CONTENT

SCOPE

METHODOLOGY - including Rating Scheme and Cost Analysis

RECOMMENDATIONS

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

BENEFITS/HARMS OF IMPLEMENTING THE GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS

QUALIFYING STATEMENTS

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINE

INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE (IOM) NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY REPORT

CATEGORIES

IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND AVAILABILITY

DISCLAIMER

SCOPE

DISEASE/CONDITION(S)

Paraneoplastic neurological syndromes:

- Limbic encephalitis
- Subacute sensory neuronopathy
- Cerebellar degeneration
- Opsoclonus-myoclonus
- Lambert-Eaton myasthenic syndrome
- Peripheral nerve hyperexcitability

Note: Myasthenia gravis, paraproteinemic neuropathies, paraneoplastic retinopathy and dermatomyositis have not been included in this report.

GUIDELINE CATEGORY

Diagnosis
Evaluation
Management
Treatment

CLINICAL SPECIALTY

Family Practice
Internal Medicine
Neurology
Oncology
Pediatrics

INTENDED USERS

Physicians

GUIDELINE OBJECTIVE(S)

To outline guidelines for the management of classical paraneoplastic neurological syndrome (PNS)

TARGET POPULATION

Patients with paraneoplastic neurological syndrome (PNS)

INTERVENTIONS AND PRACTICES CONSIDERED

Diagnosis/Evaluation

1. Assessment of onconeural antibodies
2. High resolution computed tomography (CT) and Fluorodeoxyglucose positron-emission tomography (FDG PET)
3. Follow-up at regular intervals to search for tumors

Management/Treatment

1. Treatment of underlying tumor
2. Specialist consultation
3. Immune therapy (steroids, plasma exchange, or intravenous immunoglobulin) for children with paraneoplastic opsoclonus myoclonus (POM) or adults with Lambert-Eaton myasthenic syndrome (LEMS) or peripheral nerve hyperexcitability (PPNH)
4. Symptomatic therapy

MAJOR OUTCOMES CONSIDERED

- Sensitivity and specificity of diagnostic tests

- Effectiveness of treatment

METHODOLOGY

METHODS USED TO COLLECT/SELECT EVIDENCE

Searches of Electronic Databases

DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO COLLECT/SELECT THE EVIDENCE

Search strategies have included English literature from the following databases: Cochrane Library, MedLine, PubMed (last search 15 December 2004). The key words used for the search included 'limbic encephalitis', 'sensory neuronopathy', 'cerebellar ataxia', 'opsoclonus-myoclonus', 'Lambert-Eaton myasthenic syndrome', 'neuromyotonia' in combination with 'investigation' and 'therapy'.

NUMBER OF SOURCE DOCUMENTS

Not stated

METHODS USED TO ASSESS THE QUALITY AND STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE

Weighting According to a Rating Scheme (Scheme Given)

RATING SCHEME FOR THE STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE

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 to 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)

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

METHODS USED TO ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE

Systematic Review

DESCRIPTION OF THE METHODS USED TO ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE

Not stated

METHODS USED TO FORMULATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Expert Consensus

DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO FORMULATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS

All evidence available was evaluated as class IV – case reports, case series and expert opinion. Thus no recommendations reach level A, B or C. Good practice points were agreed by consensus.

RATING SCHEME FOR THE STRENGTH OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Rating of Recommendations for a Diagnostic Measure

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.

Rating of Recommendations for a Therapeutic Intervention

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) requires at least two convincing class III studies.

Good Practice Points Where there was lack of evidence but consensus was clear the Task Force members have stated their opinion as good practice points.

COST ANALYSIS

A formal cost analysis was not performed and published cost analyses were not reviewed.

METHOD OF GUIDELINE VALIDATION

Peer Review

DESCRIPTION OF METHOD OF GUIDELINE VALIDATION

The guidelines were validated according to the European Federation of Neurological Societies (EFNS) criteria (see "Availability of Companion Documents").

RECOMMENDATIONS

MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The levels of evidence (class I-IV) supporting the recommendations and ratings of recommendations (A-C, Good Practice Points) are defined at the end of the "Major Recommendations" field.

Good Practice Points

- Patients with paraneoplastic neurological syndrome (PNS) most often present with neurological symptoms before an underlying tumour is detected. Onconeural antibodies should be sought in sera from patients with suspected PNS. The antibodies are important for diagnosis and tumour search.
- Radiological investigations for tumours, such as high resolution CT for the detection of small cell lung cancer (SCLC), are important, but should be followed by fluorodeoxyglucose positron-emission tomography (FDG PET) if no tumour is found.
- Patients should also be followed at regular intervals, for example every 6 months for up to 4 years, to search for tumour in cases where the initial tumour screen was negative.
- Early detection and treatment of the tumour is the approach that seems to offer the greatest chance for PNS stabilization. This is carried out in cooperation with the oncologist, pulmonologist, gynaecologist or paediatrician depending on the associated tumour.
- Immune therapy (steroids, plasma exchange or intravenous immunoglobulin) usually has no or modest effect on paraneoplastic limbic encephalitis (PLE), subacute sensory neuropathy (SSN) or paraneoplastic cerebellar degeneration (PCD).
- Children with paraneoplastic opsoclonus-myoclonus (POM) may respond to immune therapy, whereas no clear evidence of such therapy has been shown in adults with POM.
- Patients with Lambert-Eaton myasthenic syndrome (LEMS) or paraneoplastic peripheral nerve hyperexcitability (PPNH) usually improve with immune therapy.
- Symptomatic therapy should be offered to all patients with PNS.

Definitions:

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 to 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)

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 for a Diagnostic Measure

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.

Rating of Recommendations for a Therapeutic Intervention

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) requires at least two convincing class III studies.

Good Practice Points Where there was lack of evidence but consensus was clear the Task Force members have stated their opinion as good practice points.

CLINICAL ALGORITHM(S)

None provided

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

TYPE OF EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

The type of supporting evidence is identified and graded for selected recommendations (see "Major Recommendations").

BENEFITS/HARMS OF IMPLEMENTING THE GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS

POTENTIAL BENEFITS

Appropriate management of paraneoplastic neurological syndromes

POTENTIAL HARMS

Not stated

QUALIFYING STATEMENTS

QUALIFYING STATEMENTS

This guideline provides the view of an expert task force appointed by the Scientific Committee of the European Federation of Neurological Societies (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.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINE

DESCRIPTION OF IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

The European Federation of Neurological Societies has a mailing list and all guideline papers go to national societies, national ministries of health, World Health Organisation, European Union, and a number of other destinations. Corporate support is recruited to buy large numbers of reprints of the guideline papers and permission is given to sponsoring companies to distribute the guideline papers from their commercial channels, provided there is no advertising attached.

INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE (IOM) NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY REPORT CATEGORIES

IOM CARE NEED

Getting Better

IOM DOMAIN

Effectiveness

IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND AVAILABILITY

BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)

Vedeler CA, Antoine JC, Giometto B, Graus F, Grisold W, Hart IK, Honnorat J, Sillevs Smitt PA, Verschuuren JJ, Voltz R, Paraneoplastic Neurological Syndrome Euronetwork. Management of paraneoplastic neurological syndromes: report of an EFNS Task Force. Eur J Neurol 2006 Jul;13(7):682-90. [73 references] [PubMed](#)

ADAPTATION

Not applicable: The guideline was not adapted from another source.

DATE RELEASED

2006 Jul

GUIDELINE DEVELOPER(S)

European Federation of Neurological Societies - Medical Specialty Society

SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING

European Federation of Neurological Societies

GUIDELINE COMMITTEE

European Federation of Neurological Societies Task Force on the Management of Paraneoplastic Neurological Syndromes

COMPOSITION OF GROUP THAT AUTHORED THE GUIDELINE

Task Force Members: C. A. Vedeler, Department of Neurology, Haukeland University Hospital, Bergen, Norway; Department of Clinical Medicine, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway; J. C. Antoine, Department of Neurology, Hopital Bellevue, Saint Etienne, France; B. Giometto, Department of Neurology and Psychiatry (Neurologic Clinic) University of Padua, Padua, Italy; F. Graus, Service of Neurology, Institut d'Investigacio Biomedica August Pi i Sunyer (IDIBAPS), Hospital Clinic, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain; W. Grisold, Ludwig Boltzmann Institut fur Neuroonkologie, Vienna, Linz, Austria; I. K. Hart, Neuroimmunology Group, Department of Neurological Science, Liverpool, UK; J. Honnorat, Ataxia Research Center, Neurology B, Hospital Neurologique, Lyon, France; P. A. E. Sillevs Smitt, Department of Neurology, Erasmus University Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands; J. J. G. M. Verschuuren, Department

of Neurology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands; R. Voltz, Department of Palliative Medicine, University of Cologne, Cologne, Germany for the Paraneoplastic Neurological Syndrome Euronetwork

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURES/CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Not stated

GUIDELINE STATUS

This is the current release of the guideline.

GUIDELINE AVAILABILITY

Electronic copies: Available to registered users from the [European Federation of Neurological Societies Web site](#).

Print copies: Available from Christian A. Vedeler, Department of Neurology, Haukeland University Hospital, Bergen, Norway; Phone: 47 55 97 5044; Fax: 47 55 97 5164; E-mail: christian.vedeler@helse-bergen.no

AVAILABILITY OF COMPANION DOCUMENTS

The following are available:

- Brainin M, Barnes M, Baron JC, Gilhus NE, Hughes R, Selmaj K, Waldemar G; Guideline Standards Subcommittee of the EFNS Scientific Committee. Guidance for the preparation of neurological management guidelines by EFNS scientific task forces – revised recommendations 2004. Eur J Neurol. 2004 Sep;11(9):577-81. Electronic copies: Available in Portable Document Format (PDF) from the [European Federation of Neurological Societies Web site](#).
- Guideline papers. European Federation of Neurological Societies. Electronic copies: Available from the [European Federation of Neurological Societies Web site](#).

PATIENT RESOURCES

None available

NGC STATUS

This NGC summary was completed by ECRI on April 6, 2007. The information was verified by the guideline developer on May 15, 2007.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT

This NGC summary is based on the original guideline, which is subject to the Blackwell-Synergy copyright restrictions.

DISCLAIMER

NGC DISCLAIMER

The National Guideline Clearinghouse™ (NGC) does not develop, produce, approve, or endorse the guidelines represented on this site.

All guidelines summarized by NGC and hosted on our site are produced under the auspices of medical specialty societies, relevant professional associations, public or private organizations, other government agencies, health care organizations or plans, and similar entities.

Guidelines represented on the NGC Web site are submitted by guideline developers, and are screened solely to determine that they meet the NGC Inclusion Criteria which may be found at <http://www.guideline.gov/about/inclusion.aspx>.

NGC, AHRQ, and its contractor ECRI Institute make no warranties concerning the content or clinical efficacy or effectiveness of the clinical practice guidelines and related materials represented on this site. Moreover, the views and opinions of developers or authors of guidelines represented on this site do not necessarily state or reflect those of NGC, AHRQ, or its contractor ECRI Institute, and inclusion or hosting of guidelines in NGC may not be used for advertising or commercial endorsement purposes.

Readers with questions regarding guideline content are directed to contact the guideline developer.

© 1998-2008 National Guideline Clearinghouse

Date Modified: 10/13/2008

