Facial diplegia with paraesthesias: facial nerve enhancement in three dimensional MRI

Facial diplegia (bilateral facial paralysis) is a rare clinical finding that can be the presenting symptom in a wide range of diseases. It occurs in about 50% of patients with Guillain-Barré syndrome (GBS). Guillain-Barré syndrome occurs in about 50% of patients with acute polyneuropathy. Arch Neurol 1994;51:671-5.

The aetiology and pathogenesis of facial diplegia presented in this variant form is still controversial. We experienced a patient who had bilateral facial paralysis, distal limb paraesthesias, and diminished reflexes whose contrast enhanced three dimensional MRI (3-D MRI) showed enhancing lesions in the bilateral facial nerves.

A 27 year old woman had nasal discharge and coughing. One week later she noticed paraesthesias in her fingers and toes. Nine days after the onset of her neurological symptoms, she developed bilateral facial weakness. On admission (day 12) she showed moderate, bilateral facial paralysis that caused her difficulty in moving her forehead, in approximating her eyelids, and in lifting the corners of her mouth. Teasing and taste were preserved.

The other cranial nerves were normal. A motor examination showed normal strength in her limbs. Superficial and deep senses were normal even though she had distal limb paraesthesias. Deep tendon reflexes were absent in all her limbs and her plantar responses were flexor type. Cerebellar ataxia and autonomic nervous dysfunction were excluded. Chest radiography was normal. Laboratory studies of the identifiable causes of facial diplegia (sarcoidosis, Lyme disease, syphilis, infectious mononucleosis, herpes simplex virus, diabetes mellitus, and connective tissue disease) were all negative. On day 12, the CSF examination detected mild increases in protein concentration (57 mg/dl) without pleocytosis. The blink reflex was elicited and both the R1 and R2 components were reduced, but their latencies were not prolonged on day 15. Motor and sensory nerve conduction velocities, and median and tibial nerve sensory responses were normal on day 18. Auditory brainstem responses were normal.

On Day 19, when her facial diplegia was moderate, conventional brain MRI detected no abnormality. A contrast enhanced three dimensional MRI (3-D MRI) showed Gd enhancement of the bilateral facial nerves. The MRI findings indicate the involvement of the peripheral facial nerves in our patient.

Restless legs syndrome associated with spinal cord lesions

Restless legs syndrome may be either a primary or a secondary disorder. The primary form of the syndrome is often familial whereas the secondary form is mainly associated with iron deficiency, or pregnancy. Almost all patients with restless legs syndrome show periodic leg movements during sleep. The pathogenesis of both restless legs syndrome and periodic leg movements is still conjectural. Yokota et al have reported an association of periodic leg movements with spinal cord lesions. However, none of these patients had the typical clinical features of restless legs syndrome. Restless legs syndrome associated with myelopathy is documented in one patient with a Borella induced myelitis. We report three patients who developed a restless legs syndrome in close temporal association with spinal cord lesions.

Case 1 was a 35 year old woman who presented with a 3 week history of painless restlessness of her left lower leg that occurred only at rest, particularly in the evening and at night. The restlessness was partially relieved by walking. With the onset of these symptoms, the patient had noticed a numbness of her left hemibody below the breast. Nine months previously, a numbness of the right leg had subsided spontaneously within 1 week. On examination, the patient had decreased senses for touch, pain, and temperature over the left hemibody below the T6 dermatome. Examination of the urinary tract showed a normal cell count, normal protein content, increased CNS synthesis of IgG, and positive oligoclonal bands. In MRI studies of the spinal cord, no abnormality was documented. MRI was not performed. Transcranial magnetic stimulation showed a slightly prolonged central conduction time of motor evoked potentials recorded over the left abductor hallucis muscle. Otherwise, multimodal evoked potentials were normal. A myelitis due to multiple sclerosis accompanied by a symptomless unilateral restless legs syndrome was diagnosed. The patient was treated with 500 mg prednisolone intravenously over 5 days without any clinical effect. However, a single dose of 100 mg levodopa plus benserazide led to a dramatic improvement of the restless legs syndrome. The levodopa treatment was continued and resulted in complete relief.

Case 2 was a 49 year old man who had a traumatic atlantoaxial dislocation that necessitated operative stabilisation of the cervical spine. Preoperative MRI studies had shown a compression of the medulla and the cervical cord. When we saw the patient 3 years later, he complained of a sensation of cold, pain, and restlessness in both lower legs that was present only at rest, particularly in the
evening, and was relieved by walking around and rubbing the legs with cold water. The onset of these symptoms was only a few weeks after the accident. Clinical examination disclosed a mildly dysarthria and atrophic pareses of the left sternomastoid and the left trapezius muscle. Tendon reflexes were hyperactive and plantar responses were extensor bilaterally. The patient’s gait was spastic, but he was able to walk unassisted. In both legs, pain and temperature sensation were markedly reduced. The diagnosis of a restless legs syndrome secondary to a traumatic lesion of the medulla and the cervical cord was made. Treatment with 100 mg levodopa plus benserazide and 100 mg tramadol resulted in satisfactory relief of the restless legs syndrome.

Case 3 was a 65 year old man who developed slowly progressive spastic tetraparesis and ascending sensory disturbances in both legs. An MRI study showed a cervical spondylotic myelopathy at the level C3-C6 and the patient underwent spinal cord decompression. Five years later, he was referred to our hospital because of an intense sensation of restlessness of both legs located in the feet and calves. The restlessness occurred when sitting and lying for more than 20 minutes. It was pronounced at night and improved when he was walking around. The patient had started simultaneously with the motor and sensory disturbances due to the cervical spondylotic myelopathy and did not improve postoperatively. On examination, the patient was mildly impaired in carrying out motor tasks and his gait was moderately spastic. He had reduced touch and vibration senses in both upper limbs. A restless legs syndrome due to a cervical spondylotic myelopathy was diagnosed. Treatment with pergolide resulted in an excellent control of the restless legs syndrome.

Our patients meet the criteria for the diagnosis of restless legs syndrome.1 Over a follow up period of at least 6 months, restless legs syndrome symptoms were sufficiently relieved by dopaminergic treatment. The association of myelopathy and restless legs syndrome may be merely coincidental. However, the close temporal relation between the onset of myelopathy and restless legs syndrome strongly suggests that restless legs syndrome was secondary to the spinal cord lesions.

In conclusion, our report suggests that restless legs syndrome may occur secondary to spinal cord lesions due to different causative diseases including multiple sclerosis, spinal cord injury, and cervical spondylotic myelopathy. Similar to idiopathic restless legs syndrome and other secondary forms, restless legs syndrome due to myelopathy may respond well to dopaminergic drugs.
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Coma in thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura

Patients with thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura (TTP) can present with devastating neurologic abnormalities.1 Mortality may be as high as 95%, but current treatment has reduced this to about 10% and early treatment improves the rate of recovery.2 We describe two patients who presented with predominantly neurologic symptoms and signs who, because of a delay in making a diagnosis of TTP, were referred for treatment at a late stage. Both patients were reviewed by neurologists and haematologists, who considered that the prognosis was poor.

The first case was a 49 year old woman with a longstanding diagnosis of schizophrenia and a previous left sided cerebrovascular accident. She was admitted to her local hospital with a 3 day history of drowsiness, confusion, epistaxes, and spontaneous bruising, having been noted to be increasingly agitated and disoriented over the preceding 6 weeks. Her only medication was trifluperazin and paroxetine. The second case was a 58 year old man, previously fit and well, who presented to his local hospital with a 3 week history of confusion, drowsiness, jaundice, and right upper quadrant pain. He was taking no medication. The initial findings in both patients are summarised in the table.

In both a diagnosis of TTP was made, although this was not until 5 days after admission in the first case, and both patients were transferred to the intensive care unit for plasma exchange and further management.

Treatment was started in both cases with five cycles of plasmapheresis using 31 cryopelated fresh frozen plasma, and in the first patient this was followed by a course of oral prednisolone and azathioprine. Both made an excellent recovery, with an improvement in conscious level, a rise in platelet count, disappearance of red cell fragments, a fall in LDH and bilirubin concentrations, and normalisation of renal function. The first patient was self ventilating with no neurological deficit at time of transfer back to the referring hospital. The second patient had a Glasgow coma score of 15 by the fifth day of treatment, the only focal neurology being a bilateral internuclear ophthalmoplegia (INO). Three months later the ophthalmoplegia had resolved and the patient was self caring with minimal disability. Both patients were extensively investigated to look for an underlying cause for TTP, but none was found.

Thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura is a syndrome comprising a pentad of features—fever, thrombocytopenia, microangiopathic haemolytic anaemia, neurological abnormalities, and renal dysfunction. Not all five features are required to make the diagnosis of TTP, but if three or more are present, the diagnosis is strongly suspected. Case selection is important since patients with the syndrome may have different clinical presentations. Although TTP is a clinical diagnosis, the presence of specific antibodies directed against LLP, which are found in a subset of patients, is supportive of the diagnosis.1 In our two cases, the diagnosis was made on clinical and laboratory grounds, and the response to haemofiltration proved that a definite diagnosis could be made.

Summary of patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient 1</th>
<th>Patient 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (y)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platelet count ($\times 10^{9} /L$)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral blood film</td>
<td>RBC fragments +++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clotting screen + fibrinogen</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilirubin (µmol/l)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactate dehydrogenase (U/L)</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creatinine (µmol/l)</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow coma score</td>
<td>3/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/5</td>
<td>Pupils equal and reactive, cornalian reflexes intact; bilateral jaw jerk, brisk, gag absent; no motor response to painful stimuli; abdominal reflexes absent; upgoing plantars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>Multiple foci of high intensity on the T2 weighted images in white matter of both cerebral hemispheres and parietal convexity; extension of all four limbs to painful stimuli; plantars equivocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain CT</td>
<td>Raised ICP, nil else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain MRI</td>
<td>Normal, although only a scanning MRI was done. A full MRI would have been required to exclude a midbrain lesion, but was not technically possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
diagnosis—often fewer are present—and there is no pathognomonic test, so diagnosis may be difficult. It is often considered along with haemolytic uraemic syndrome (HUS) to form part of a range of diseases called the thrombotic microangiopathies. In these disorders, intravascular platelet aggregation (there is minimal fibrin deposition) leads to obstruction of arterioles and capillaries, causing local ischaemia. Thus TTP is seen when the cerebral microcirculation is affected, and HUS when the renal microcirculation is affected. An episode of TTP may present as a one off illness, may be recurring,1 or may arise in association with drugs, neoplasia, pregnancy, or HIV infection.

Thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura presents with neurological manifestations in over 50% of episodes, with headache, confusion, and somnolence being most common, leading to focal neurological deficit, convulsions, and eventually coma and death.2 These clinical features are often fleeting and fluctuating and several important points regarding interpretation should be made. Firstly, brain CT may be normal or may show multiple hypodense areas indicative of generalised cerebral oedema.2 Secondly, brain MRI may also be normal, although it is likely to show multiple areas with high intensity on T2 weighted images.3,4 Coma has been shown to be a bad prognostic indicator. Of importance is the finding that despite the presence of subthalamic dysfunction, normal findings on brain CT strongly suggest the potential for full clinical recovery.5,6 Plasmapheresis is now the treatment of choice: plasma infusion alone should not be regarded as an acceptable alternative but as a short term measure only.7 Fresh frozen plasma is the usual replacement fluid, although it remains to be determined whether cryoprecipitate or solvent/detergent fresh frozen plasma is more effective. These plasmas lack von Willebrand factor, and since ultralarge von Willebrand factor multimers have been demonstrated in TTP, it is postulated that additional factor exacerbates the disease. Platelet transfusions should be avoided (unless there is life threatening bleeding) as they may worsen the condition. These two cases illustrate that patients with TTP may present to the intensive care unit with profound coma, such that many clinicians would consider the prognosis so poor that further active management would be inappropriate. In addition, the cases show that patients can survive and even make a full recovery despite a delay in diagnosis and appropriate treatment.

**Anaphylactoid reaction to methyl prednisolone developing after starting treatment with interferon β-1b**

Courses of intravenous methyl prednisolone are a routine feature for disabled relapses in relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. The Interferon β-1b Multiple Sclerosis Study Group’s research published in 1993 showed that interferon β-1b reduces the frequency of relapse in patients with multiple sclerosis.8 We present the case of a 35 year old man with multiple sclerosis who became allergic to intravenous methyl prednisolone after the initiation of treatment with interferon β-1b and discuss what part the drug could have played in this.

A 35 year old man with asthma presented early in 1994 with “dizziness”, double vision, and paraesthesia in the right leg extending into the trunk. He was found to have bilateral pyramidal signs in the legs with extensor plantar responses and gait ataxia. His CSF contained oligoclonal bands. Visual evoked potentials were normal. Brain MRI showed multiple periventricular high density lesions with a similar lesion identified on imaging of the cervical cord, all consistent with demyelination. A 3 day course of intravenous methyl prednisolone in May 1994 was associated with improvement in his initial symptoms. Four months later he presented with a Vth nerve palsy which again responded to a 3 day course of intravenous methyl prednisolone. Between September 1995 and February 1996 he had a further four uneventful 3 day courses of intravenous methyl prednisolone for various symptoms related to his multiple sclerosis. In March 1996 he was started on interferon β-1b (8 MIU subcutaneously on alternate days).

In June 1996 he was admitted with pyramidal weakness of the left limbs, altered sensation in the left leg and urgency of micturition. Soon after starting his first dose of intravenous methyl prednisolone he felt a “jump” in his throat, developed an urticarial rash on his limbs and trunk and began wheezing audibly. Inhaled isoprenal was ineffective. Treatment was stopped and his peak expiratory flow rate (PEFR) measured as 485 l/min. Chlorpheniramine (10 mg) was given intravenously and after 5 minutes his PEFR had returned to normal. He was readmitted with a similar urticarial rash. Again treatment was stopped. Fifteen minutes later the rash had worsened and he felt swelling in his mouth. His symptoms settled after 10 mg intravenous chlorpheniramine. Further methyl prednisolone was not given. After this episode he chose to stop interferon β-1b.

In September 1996 he developed wheeze and a rash after the first dose in a course of intravenous methyl prednisolone. Subsequent doses in that course were preceded by chlorpheniramine. In November 1996 he developed nasal congestion and a rash after 500 mg methyl prednisolone. Again subsequent doses were preceded by a dose of chlorpheniramine. Since then he has been given chlorpheniramine before each dose of intravenous methyl prednisolone, which he has tolerated well.

Allergic reaction to steroids is rare and anaphylactoid reaction to methyl prednisolone is rarer still with only three reports in the literature.9,10 One of these reactions occurred in the course of treatment for multiple sclerosis. The allergic reactions are more likely to be to the carrier than to the steroid itself. Pathology in multiple sclerosis is thought to be due to a delayed type hypersensitivity reaction. The mechanism of action of interferon β-1b and allergic to multiple sclerosis is unknown, although several mechanisms are postulated. There is evidence that, among many of its effects on the immune system, interferon β can increase interleukin-2,11 and that interleukin-2 can stimulate a Th2 response (found in allergic type responses). These effects would explain the sequence of events in this man. However, evidence suggests that interferon β is more likely to suppress both Th1 (found in delayed type hypersensitivity reactions) and Th2 responses.12 It remains uncertain whether the sequence of events here is due to an effect of interferon β-1b or to coinci-

dence. However, clinicians should be aware that the complexity of the effects of interferon β-1b on the immune system may lead to unexpected clinical outcomes.
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A 17 year old girl was referred by her general practitioner due to the sudden onset of numbness on the dorsum of her right foot associated with stamping her foot on walking. She had been well until 6 weeks previously when she developed tonsillitis for which she was treated with oral prednisolone but developed a rash and a mononeuropathy of the right common peroneal nerve with no evidence to suggest a specific infection. As part of her illness she developed a mononeuropathy of the right common peroneal nerve with no evidence to suggest a specific infection. As part of her illness she developed erythema nodosum. There were no skin lesions and her joints were quiescent.

She had an erythrocyte sedimentation rate of 87 mm/h, a C reactive protein concentration of 112 mg/l and an antistreptolysin-O titre (ASOT) of 1600 units/ml. Autoimmune screen apart from the atypical antinuclear antibody (ANA) was normal. There were no skin lesions and her joints were quiescent.

She had an erythrocyte sedimentation rate of 87 mm/h, a C reactive protein concentration of 112 mg/l and an antistreptolysin-O titre (ASOT) of 1600 units/ml. Autoimmune screen, antineuronal antibodies, and cryoglobulins were all negative. ANA was positive. There was no evidence of recent infection. A 17 year old girl was referred by her general practitioner due to the sudden onset of numbness on the dorsum of her right foot associated with stamping her foot on walking. She had been well until 6 weeks previously when she developed tonsillitis for which she was treated with oral prednisolone but developed a rash and a mononeuropathy of the right common peroneal nerve with no evidence to suggest a specific infection. As part of her illness she developed erythema nodosum. There were no skin lesions and her joints were quiescent.

She had an erythrocyte sedimentation rate of 87 mm/h, a C reactive protein concentration of 112 mg/l and an antistreptolysin-O titre (ASOT) of 1600 units/ml. Autoimmune screen, antineuronal antibodies, and cryoglobulins were all negative. ANA was positive. There was no evidence of recent infection.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nerve conduction study results confirming a mainly axonal neuropathy of the right common peroneal nerve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nerve</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right tibial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck of fibula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right peroneal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left peroneal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory conduction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nerve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right sural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left sural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left tibial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CMAP = Compound muscle action potential.
Sudden unexpected death: a rare event in a large community-based prospective cohort with newly diagnosed epilepsy and high remission rates

It is now accepted that mortality in epilepsy is significantly increased, with standard mortality ratios raised twofold. Early deaths are usually attributable to the underlying cause of epilepsy and mortality in chronic cases is commonly due to the epilepsy itself. Of the deaths that are directly related to epilepsy, the commonest category is sudden unexpected death in epilepsy (SUDEP). This is widely defined as a sudden unexpected, non-traumatic and non-drowning death in a person with epilepsy with or without evidence of a seizure and excluding documented status epilepticus in which postmortem examination does not disclose a cause of death. Less common causes are status epilepticus, accidents due to seizures, drowning, and aspiration. Two large community-based prospective studies indicate numbers of up to 1:1100. Patients with chronic epilepsy seem to have a much higher incidence of SUDEP and a tertiary clinic based population with chronic epilepsy in the United Kingdom had an estimated incidence of 1:200 patients. This is in some contrast with the two SUDEP deaths in 5000 patient years reported by the MRC Anti-epileptic Withdrawal Study Group for patients in remission from epilepsy.

We report the first sudden unexpected death in epilepsy in the NGPSE. A 42 year old man known to have poorly controlled idiopathic generalised epilepsy treated with phenytoin and sodium valproate, was found dead in bed, having been well in the hours and days preceding death. He was known to misuse alcohol and was questionably compliant with medication, both factors thought to increase the risk of sudden death. A necropsy did not disclose any relevant pathology—consistent with the definition of SUDEP.

Mortality has been studied in detail in this large cohort and it was only in the 13th year of follow up (8000 patient-years) that the first SUDEP was reported. This could falsely give the impression that SUDEP is a rare occurrence and it must be borne in mind that in large community based cohorts such as the NGPSE, most patients enter remission from seizures and it is the patients who continue to have epilepsy that are most at risk from sudden death. Indeed in this cohort, the number of patients who still have active epilepsy, using International League Against Epilepsy

distribution of the lateral branches of the left posterior inferior cerebellar artery. There was a crescent sign involving the left vertebral artery from the skull base to the basilar artery suggesting vertebral artery dissection (figure).

Four types of lateral medullary infarct are recognised: small midlateral infarct, inferolateral infarct, and a large inferodorsolateral and dorsolateral infarct. The topography of the lesion in our patient corresponds to inferolateral medullary infarct. The patients with inferolateral infarcts and midlateral infarcts in the literature were not recognised to have cerebellar infarct and magnetic resonance angiography in those patients was nor-

The partial lesion of the lateral spinothalamic tract involving only the sacral afferents leading to sparing of the arm and face. The spinal trigeminal nucleus and tract, which contain afferents for the face ipsilateral to the lesion, reside dorsolaterally and the crossed ventral trigeminothalamic tract, which contains afferents for the contralateral face, resides medial to the lateral spinothalamic tract. Lesion of the spinocerebellar tract involving only the sacral fibres explains the presence of severe gait ataxia but no upper limb ataxia. The counterclockwise rotatory nystagmus is likely due to imbalance of projections from the anterior and posterior semicircular canals and the otolith receptor.

A sensory level to the trunk may point to a lateral medullary lesion in the presence of other features suggesting brainstem disease. In our patient these signs were transient and sensory loss predominated. This new pattern of sensory loss should be recognised as symptomatic of lateral medullary infarction in addition to other sensory variants.
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Opportunities for improving the quality of care in malignant cerebral glioma

There is scope for improving the services offered to patients with malignant glioma. Clinical audit has highlighted several important issues including some variation in the management of patients aged over 60, delays in beginning treatment, and problems with communication between different departments involved in patient care. A multidisciplinary Working Group, funded by the NHS Executive, recently developed evidence based guidelines for the management of these patients by surgery, radiotherapy, and chemotherapy. The group also considered the views of patients and their relatives about follow up and psychosocial aspects of care.

We have derived a package of audit measures from these guidelines that allow treatment centres to assess the care that they provide. Proformas within the package cover various topics—for example, technical aspects of treatment, breaking the news of the diagnosis, the support of patients and relatives, and palliative care while in the community. Information is drawn from case records, feedback from patients, relatives and general practitioners. An initial review of the policy a centre has already developed.

We piloted the proforma by reviewing the case records of 60 patients diagnosed at two treatment centres in London between 1992 and 1994. The table shows some results using one proforma which covers breaking the news of the diagnosis. We found, for example, that overall most case records (67%, 40/60) did not record what the patient and their relative had initially been told about the prognosis. However, there did seem to be a difference between centres. At one, clinicians rarely recorded what they had said to patients and relatives whereas at the other this was recorded in just over 50% of cases. Patients at one centre were also more likely to be seen subsequently by counselling or palliative care services.

CORRESPONDENCE

MRI in vertebral artery dissection

In a recent report, Auer et al described the clinical and imaging findings in 19 cases of extracranial vertebral artery dissection retrospectively. We make the following comments.

Firstly, the authors described the "sensitivity" and "specificity" of digital subtraction angiography (DSA), magnetic resonance imaging/angiography (MRI/A), and duplex sonography for diagnosing extracranial vertebral artery dissection. These figures were based on the percentage of probable and definite features among the 19 patients. Nevertheless, sensitivity of a test is the number of cases with true positive results divided by the total number of positive results (including both true and false positives), and specificity is the number of cases with true negative results over the sum of true and false negatives. The authors misquoted the terms "sensitivity" and "specificity" in their report, as the diagnostic criteria of the various tests have not been applied to a control group to disclose the false positive cases and true negative cases. Secondly, the criteria for case inclusion were not defined. Apparently, extracranial vertebral artery dissection was diagnosed by either radiological features on MRI/A (which may be "pathognomonic" or "suggestive") in the appropriate clinical context or confirmatory radiological features on DSA (which may be "specific" or "indirect"). The accuracy and usefulness of DSA, MRI/A, and duplex sonography cannot be compared directly, as no single “gold standard” diagnostic method was used and because results of the present study simply reflected the proportion of cases diagnosed by the authors.

Dissection of neck arteries was thought to be an uncommon cause of ischaemic stroke. The true incidence of this condition remains unknown as angiography is not performed in every patient during the acute or subacute phase. Younger patients are more likely to undergo early angiography when there is a history of recent neck trauma or pain, or when no other causes of stroke are apparent. This selection bias may underestimate the
incidence of stroke due to arterial dissection in older patients and those without neck trauma or pain.
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Auer and Felber reply:

Cheung et al state in their comment, that dissections of the neck arteries are an underestimated cause of stroke, because angiography is not performed in every patient during the acute and subacute phase. This bias is even more important in the case of vertebral artery dissection if the initial symptoms are non-specific. Non-invasive diagnostic methods are likely to be performed earlier in these patients and this was our motivation to report on the neuroradiological features of vertebral artery dissection.

The diagnosis of vertebral artery dissection is often based on the consensus of clinical and neuroradiological features. We agree with Cheung et al that there is no single "gold standard" test for a dissection exists. Imaging procedures more often show indirect signs which have to be interpreted in the appropriate clinical context. Therefore, the "inclusion criterion" we used for this retrospective analysis was the clinical and neuroradiological consensus on the diagnosis of vertebral artery dissection. Moreover, the sensitivity of DSA, ultrasound, and MRI/angiography was estimated from the findings of the affected and the contralateral normal vertebral arteries, there were no false positive results. The term specificity could have been misleading, because it did not refer to the overall specificity of a test but to the frequency of findings that reached a level of specificity sufficient to establish the diagnosis of vertebral artery dissection.

Further prospective studies on the sensitivity and specificity of magnetic resonance imaging for the diagnosis of vertebral artery dissection are certainly necessary, but our retrospective evaluation already showed that MRI and MR angiography will have a major contribution in future.
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Clinical usefulness of MRI in multisystem atrophy.

Schrag et al suggest that certain putaminal and infratentorial changes on MRI are useful in distinguishing between patients with multisystem atrophy (MSA) and patients with idiopathic Parkinson's disease. The specificity and positive predictive value of these changes were both about 90%. However, whether these changes will be useful in clinical practice or epidemiological research is unclear for several reasons.

The number of patients included was small and so the confidence intervals were wide. For example, the specificity of the MRI changes for MSA could be as low as 80%. Moreover, only patients with clinically probable MSA were included. In this group of patients the clinical diagnosis alone had positive predictive value as high as that of MRI and so there would seem to be little added value of MRI (14/15 (93%) patients with probable MSA had the diagnosis confirmed on MRI). A more relevant question is whether the MRI changes are equally specific in those with possible MSA in whom the clinical diagnosis is much less certain. Indeed it is also unclear from this study whether the MRI changes specific to MSA as patients with other conditions that enter into the differential diagnosis were not included. It may therefore be more correct to state that the MRI changes are helpful in excluding Parkinson's disease rather than in confirming MSA.

Finally, the positive predictive value of MRI quoted in this study is likely to be an overestimate compared with its routine use in most movement disorder clinics. Schrag et al included a very high proportion of patients with MSA (nearly 50%) compared with Parkinson's disease. As the positive predictive value is directly related to the prevalence of the disease in a given population, this resulted in a high positive predictive value. In a typical movement disorder clinic, fewer than 10% of patients will have MSA, in which case, even if the sensitivity of MRI is 90%, the positive predictive value would only be about 50%—that is, only half of those with the MRI changes would turn out to have the disease.

It is, therefore, too early to include specific MRI changes as part of the diagnostic criteria for MSA.

CARL COUNSELL ANDREW HUGHES
Department of Neurology, Austin and Repatriation Medical Centre, Bankstown Street, West Heidelberg 3081, Australia
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Schrag and Quinn reply:

Counsell and Hughes raise several potential drawbacks to our study that we willingly acknowledge. Firstly, that the number of patients included was small (about 45 in each group); secondly, that the 1:1 proportion of patients with Parkinson's disease and those with multiple system atrophy (MSA) atrophy is unrepresentative of the real life situation in which the ratio is >10:1. A more ideal study might include 100 patients with MSA (to help counter the criticism of small numbers) and more than 1000 patients with Parkinson's disease, but would be impractical, particularly for the Parkinson's disease group, who, unlike patients with atypical disease, are not usually subjected to MRI. We agree that, as clearly stated in the abstract, our study was restricted to a comparison between multisystem atrophy, Parkinson's disease, and controls, and are currently conducting a further study additionally including patients with other degenerative syndromes. Since the completion of the report, patients with Machado-Joseph disease were identified with similar infratentorial abnormalities. We also agree that in the diagnosis of clinically probable MSA, there is little added value of MRI; involvement of the cerebellum and its pathways is usually already clinically evident before its demonstration by MRI or CT, and even in cases without cerebellar involvement the diagnosis is still a clinical one. Moreover, as we emphasised, a minority of patients with typical multisystem features present to a movement disorder clinic with a diagnosis of MSA. Therefore, unlike others, we have never proposed MRI changes as part of the diagnostic criteria for multisystem atrophy. As discussed, the sensitivity of the MRI may be lower early, and higher late in the disease. However, for the purpose of validation of a proposed diagnostic aid imaging findings need to be related to a clinically probable diagnosis rather than a pathological diagnosis. The “gold standard” is definite, pathologically confirmed disease, but this was achieved in only one patient in our series. In conclusion, we nevertheless think that our, admittedly imperfect, blinded MRI study (the first conducted in MSA) has helped to determine the prevalence of certain MRI abnormalities in patients with clinically probable MSA in comparison to patients with Parkinson's disease and controls. It has also, perhaps more importantly, revealed the limitations of MRI in this context. However, expert clinical evaluation remains the cornerstone of the diagnosis in life, and it is also more cost effective than resorting to expensive imaging techniques.

A SCHRAG N P QUINN
Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Alberta, Queen's Square, London


A dubious therapy for patients with multiple sclerosis.

Plohmawh et al investigated the effects of computer training of attentional deficits in...
patients with multiple sclerosis. They conclude that "significant improvements of performance could almost exclusively be achieved by the specific training programmes". The validity of this conclusion is called into question by severe methodological shortcomings of their study.

Before training, three baseline measurements of attentional functions were administered with 3 week intervals. For evaluation of training effects the median value of the three baseline measurements was compared with the values obtained after training. This statistical approach manifests a curious misunderstanding of the purpose of repeated baseline measurements. They serve to determine a baseline measure at a rate of change during training without any therapy. The critical value is therefore not the mean (or median) of the baseline measures but the difference between them. If therapy is efficient, the difference between pretherapy and post-therapy measurement should be greater than that between two consecutive baseline measurements. This crucial comparison is not presented.

The selection of the median of the three baseline measurements as starting point for calculation of improvements during the first training period poses further problems. If there was any improvement from the first to the third measurement, the median is lower than the third measurement after which training began. This difference inflates apparent improvement in the first training period. It may feign specific training effects if the patients had a steeper baseline than the control group. A possible reason for different baselines are different severities of initial impairment. We (Motz, Grömminger, Göttler, Goldenberg, unpublished data) have administered the PASAT, another test of attentional capacities, four times with weekly intervals to 30 patients with chronic brain damage from different aetiologies. During intervals these patients did not receive any training of attentional functions. Thus, the repeated measurements determined a baseline without therapy. None the less, performance on PASAT improved from test to test. There was a negative correlation between initial performance and improvement. Patients with poor initial performance improved more than those with better performance.

The allocation of patients to treatment groups in the study of Plohmann et al was not randomised. Patients were trained in those two functions that were affected most, and group comparisons were made between patients who had been trained in a function and those who were not. Thus the training group tended to start from a lower level of performance than the control group. Figures 2 and 3 of their paper illustrate this effect improperly. If, as suggested by our results with the PASAT, initial level of impairment has a systematic influence on improvement independently of any therapy, the allegedly specific training effect may be accounted for by influences present in initial level.

Whether or not the results of Plohmann et al. study are reliable has clinical and ethical implications. Multiple sclerosis is one of the most common neurological diseases, and I have the suspicion that no other neurological disease has given rise to a comparable number of scientifically unfounded therapies and advice. The above critique raises the suspicion that no other neurological impairment inflates confidence in results if starting points are not used. The critical value is therefore not the mean (or median) of the baseline measures but the difference between them. If therapy is efficient, the difference between pretherapy and post-therapy measurement should be greater than that between two consecutive baseline measurements. This crucial comparison is not presented.

The selection of the median of the three baseline measurements as starting point for calculation of improvements during the first training period poses further problems. If there was any improvement from the first to the third measurement, the median is lower than the third measurement after which training began. This difference inflates apparent improvement in the first training period. It may feign specific training effects if the patients had a steeper baseline than the control group. A possible reason for different baselines are different severities of initial impairment. We (Motz, Grömminger, Göttler, Goldenberg, unpublished data) have administered the PASAT, another test of attentional capacities, four times with weekly intervals to 30 patients with chronic brain damage from different aetiologies. During intervals these patients did not receive any training of attentional functions. Thus, the repeated measurements determined a baseline without therapy. None the less, performance on PASAT improved from test to test. There was a negative correlation between initial performance and improvement. Patients with poor initial performance improved more than those with better performance.

The allocation of patients to treatment groups in the study of Plohmann et al was not randomised. Patients were trained in those two functions that were affected most, and group comparisons were made between patients who had been trained in a function and those who were not. Thus the training group tended to start from a lower level of performance than the control group. Figures 2 and 3 of their paper illustrate this effect improperly. If, as suggested by our results with the PASAT, initial level of impairment has a systematic influence on improvement independently of any therapy, the allegedly specific training effect may be accounted for by influences present in initial level.

Whether or not the results of Plohmann et al. study are reliable has clinical and ethical implications. Multiple sclerosis is one of the most common neurological diseases, and I have the suspicion that no other neurological disease has given rise to a comparable number of scientifically unfounded therapies and advice. The above critique raises the suspicion that no other neurological impairment inflates confidence in results if starting points are not used. The critical value is therefore not the mean (or median) of the baseline measures but the difference between them. If therapy is efficient, the difference between pretherapy and post-therapy measurement should be greater than that between two consecutive baseline measurements. This crucial comparison is not presented.

The selection of the median of the three baseline measurements as starting point for calculation of improvements during the first training period poses further problems. If there was any improvement from the first to the third measurement, the median is lower than the third measurement after which training began. This difference inflates apparent improvement in the first training period. It may feign specific training effects if the patients had a steeper baseline than the control group. A possible reason for different baselines are different severities of initial impairment. We (Motz, Grömminger, Göttler, Goldenberg, unpublished data) have administered the PASAT, another test of attentional capacities, four times with weekly intervals to 30 patients with chronic brain damage from different aetiologies. During intervals these patients did not receive any training of attentional functions. Thus, the repeated measurements determined a baseline without therapy. None the less, performance on PASAT improved from test to test. There was a negative correlation between initial performance and improvement. Patients with poor initial performance improved more than those with better performance.

The allocation of patients to treatment groups in the study of Plohmann et al was not randomised. Patients were trained in those two functions that were affected most, and group comparisons were made between patients who had been trained in a function and those who were not. Thus the training group tended to start from a lower level of performance than the control group. Figures 2 and 3 of their paper illustrate this effect improperly. If, as suggested by our results with the PASAT, initial level of impairment has a systematic influence on improvement independently of any therapy, the allegedly specific training effect may be accounted for by influences present in initial level.

Whether or not the results of Plohmann et al. study are reliable has clinical and ethical implications. Multiple sclerosis is one of the most common neurological diseases, and I have the suspicion that no other neurological disease has given rise to a comparable number of scientifically unfounded therapies and advice. The above critique raises the suspicion that no other neurological impairment inflates confidence in results if starting points are not used. The critical value is therefore not the mean (or median) of the baseline measures but the difference between them. If therapy is efficient, the difference between pretherapy and post-therapy measurement should be greater than that between two consecutive baseline measurements. This crucial comparison is not presented.

The selection of the median of the three baseline measurements as starting point for calculation of improvements during the first training period poses further problems. If there was any improvement from the first to the third measurement, the median is lower than the third measurement after which training began. This difference inflates apparent improvement in the first training period. It may feign specific training effects if the patients had a steeper baseline than the control group. A possible reason for different baselines are different severities of initial impairment. We (Motz, Grömminger, Göttler, Goldenberg, unpublished data) have administered the PASAT, another test of attentional capacities, four times with weekly intervals to 30 patients with chronic brain damage from different aetiologies. During intervals these patients did not receive any training of attentional functions. Thus, the repeated measurements determined a baseline without therapy. None the less, performance on PASAT improved from test to test. There was a negative correlation between initial performance and improvement. Patients with poor initial performance improved more than those with better performance.

The allocation of patients to treatment groups in the study of Plohmann et al was not randomised. Patients were trained in those two functions that were affected most, and group comparisons were made between patients who had been trained in a function and those who were not. Thus the training group tended to start from a lower level of performance than the control group. Figures 2 and 3 of their paper illustrate this effect improperly. If, as suggested by our results with the PASAT, initial level of impairment has a systematic influence on improvement independently of any therapy, the allegedly specific training effect may be accounted for by influences present in initial level.

Whether or not the results of Plohmann et al. study are reliable has clinical and ethical implications. Multiple sclerosis is one of the most common neurological diseases, and I have the suspicion that no other neurological disease has given rise to a comparable number of scientifically unfounded therapies and advice. The above critique raises the suspicion that no other neurological impairment inflates confidence in results if starting points are not used. The critical value is therefore not the mean (or median) of the baseline measures but the difference between them. If therapy is efficient, the difference between pretherapy and post-therapy measurement should be greater than that between two consecutive baseline measurements. This crucial comparison is not presented.

The selection of the median of the three baseline measurements as starting point for calculation of improvements during the first training period poses further problems. If there was any improvement from the first to the third measurement, the median is lower than the third measurement after which training began. This difference inflates apparent improvement in the first training period. It may feign specific training effects if the patients had a steeper baseline than the control group. A possible reason for different baselines are different severities of initial impairment. We (Motz, Grömminger, Göttler, Goldenberg, unpublished data) have administered the PASAT, another test of attentional capacities, four times with weekly intervals to 30 patients with chronic brain damage from different aetiologies. During intervals these patients did not receive any training of attentional functions. Thus, the repeated measurements determined a baseline without therapy. None the less, performance on PASAT improved from test to test. There was a negative correlation between initial performance and improvement. Patients with poor initial performance improved more than those with better performance.

The allocation of patients to treatment groups in the study of Plohmann et al was not randomised. Patients were trained in those two functions that were affected most, and group comparisons were made between patients who had been trained in a function and those who were not. Thus the training group tended to start from a lower level of performance than the control group. Figures 2 and 3 of their paper illustrate this effect improperly. If, as suggested by our results with the PASAT, initial level of impairment has a systematic influence on improvement independently of any therapy, the allegedly specific training effect may be accounted for by influences present in initial level.

I was very keen to read this book—mainly because I have heard one of the authors state publicly that stroke patients are being transported by air ambulance to emergency rooms in parts of California and I was wondering whether he would advocate this in print. Sadly the nearest he got was “The message to the public is simple: the goal is to take the patient to the emergency room as fast as possible using emergency medical transportation and transfer the patient to a hospital that has brain imaging tests available on a 24 hour a day 7 day a week basis.” Not quite, but the tenor of the book is described—controversial, not overtly dangerous but rather premature, and, for most parts of the United Kingdom, a work of fiction (at least for the moment).

It is one of those slimline varieties meant for the white coat pocket and is obviously aimed at the emergency room doctor eagerly awaiting an acute stroke patient. The call is suddenly in, scanner and thrombolytic infusion ready to go. The relevant chapter is right in the middle of the book and for anyone involved in the day to day care of stroke patients it is fantastic, just like the famous “brain attack!” episode of the television series “ER”. There are tables describing how to monitor patients, how to administer TPA and how to set up tabetalol or sodium nitroprusside infusions for hypertension post thrombolysis. Other chapters between are rather more ordinary notes on prevention, stroke units (one page), transient ischaemic attacks, and diagnosis of the stroke syndromes plus the basic management of subarachnoid haemorrhage and intracranial haemorrhage (with a rather worrying table on the acute management of haemorrhage post-thrombolysis?).

Perhaps the most practical chapter is on the diagnosis and evaluation of patients with stroke which is full of helpful tables but again basically designed as a screening tool for patients suitable for thrombolysis. The text is full of “Americanisms” such as “calm and dry monitory toilet” which I found very amusing and kept me reading in places rather like a Bill Bryson.

The worst chapter is on the imaging of the brain and blood vessels, indeed CT could have been much better. Most of the CT brain images are overexposed and on black and white paper. Although there are arrows indicating to the reader where to look, most of the scans are uninterpretable. Obviously this is a key area in making treatment decisions with thrombolytic drugs and I was disappointed that this was not done better.

Unfortunately the last few chapters are brief add-ons and could have been better or rather impractical section on neuroprotection and a miserly three pages covering rehabilitation and discharge planning.

This book rides on the edge of the evidence and is certainly the “California way”. The authors are to be congratulated for their campaigning zeal for the emergency management of stroke which some of us hope will become more widespread. However, it could be argued that at the present time a more useful practical stroke guide would cover how to set up a
neurovascular clinic and stroke unit, how to overcome resistance to change, how to participate in or set up large multicentre trials etc. Whether you read this book will largely depend on your point of view.

LIZ WARBURTON


In choosing the title for this book, the editors have wisely avoided the use of the term “neuropsychiatry”, which in Britain, at least, implies a primarily psychiatric audience. I think that this book should be read by a much wider audience, including neurologists interested in behaviour and cognition. There are relatively few books available that bridge this important divide. The editors have assembled an impressive international cast who cover most of the hot topics at the interface of neurology and psychiatry.

The first section is dedicated to the frontal lobes with contributions from neuropsychology and frontal lobe abnormalities on structural scanning in schizophrenia. The second section deals with basal ganglia disorders with excellent overviews of neuropsychological findings and behavioural psychopharmacology. The third section is dedicated to memory and its disorders, with extremely readable overviews of advances and controversies in the neuropsychology of memory and clinical disorders. The fourth section deals with psychiatric manifestations of patients with a known brain pathology and structural imaging in the psychoses. Stricter editorial intervention could have avoided some redundancy and overlap with an earlier chapter. Section five covers for what is for many people the central ground of neuropsychiatry—namely, epilepsy—with excellent accounts of the behavioural and psychiatric changes seen in the context of chronic epilepsy. The sixth section takes a developmental perspective, particularly related to schizophrenia, and the final two chapters of the book deal with advances in brain imaging, namely magnetic resonance spectroscopy and imaging of patients with hallucinations.

The editors have deliberately decided not to write a comprehensive textbook, but rather to choose areas of advance and controversy, and in doing so have produced a very readable text. The book is in many ways a celebration of the immense contributions of Professor Alwyn Lishman to the study of the brain and mind. I can thoroughly recommend it to everyone working in this exciting area.

JOHN HODGES