European Academy of Neurology/Peripheral Nerve Society Guideline on diagnosis and management of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy: Report of a joint task force — Second Revision

Authors: Peter Y. K. Van den Bergh, Pieter A. van Doorn, Robert D.M. Hadden, Bert Avau, Patrik Vankrunkelsven, Jeffrey A. Allen, Shahram Attarian, Patricia H. Blomkwist, David R. Cornblath, Filip Eftimov, H. Stephan Goedee, Thomas Harbo, Satoshi Kuwabara, Richard A. Lewis, Michael P. Lunn, Eduardo Nobile-Orazio, Luis Querol, Yusuf A. Rajabally, Claudia Sommer, Haluk A. Topaloglu

Affiliations:

P.Y.K. Van den Bergh: Neuromuscular Reference Centre, Department of Neurology, University Hospital Saint-Luc, Brussels, Belgium

P.A. van Doorn: Department of Neurology, Erasmus MC, MC University Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

R.D.M. Hadden, Department of Neurology, King's College Hospital, UK

B. Avau: Cochrane Belgium, CEBAM, Leuven, Belgium; CEBaP, Belgian Red Cross, Mechelen, Belgium

P. Vankrunkelsven: Cochrane Belgium, CEBAM, Leuven, Belgium

J.A. Allen: University of Minnesota, Department of Neurology, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA

S. Attarian: Centre de référence des maladies neuromusculaires et de la SLA, APHM, CHU Timone, Marseille, France

P.H. Blomkwist-Markens: GBS/CIDP Foundation International, International Office, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA

D.R. Cornblath: Department of Neurology, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

F. Eftimov: Amsterdam UMC, University of Amsterdam, Department of Neurology, Amsterdam Neuroscience, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

H.S. Goedee: Neuromusculaire Ziekten, Medisch Universitair Medisch Centrum Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands

T. Harbo: Department of Neurology, Århus University Hospital, Århus, Denmark

S. Kuwabara: Department of Neurology, Chiba University Hospital, Chiba, Japan

R.A. Lewis: Department of Neurology, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, California, USA

M.P. Lunn: Department of Neurology and MRC Centre for Neuromuscular Diseases, National Hospital for Neurology and Neurosurgery, Queen Square, London, UK

E. Nobile-Orazio: Neuromuscular and Neuroimmunology Service, IRCCS Humanitas Clinical and Research Center, Department of Medical Biotechnology and Translational Medicine, University of Milan, Milan, Italy

L. Querol: Neuromuscular Diseases Unit – Neurology Department, Hospital de la Santa Creu I Sant Pau, Barcelona, Spain

Y.A. Rajabally: Regional Neuromuscular Service, Neurology, Queen Elizabeth Hospital Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, UK

C. Sommer: Neurologische Klinik, Universitätsklinikum Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany

H.A. Topaloglu: Yeditepe University Department of Pediatrics, İstanbul, Turkey

Abstract

Background: A first revision of the consensus guideline on the definition, investigation, and treatment of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy (CIDP) was published in 2010.

Objective: To develop a second revision of this guideline, using GRADE (Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation) methodology.

Methods: A Task Force of 20 disease experts, a patient representative, and two Cochrane methodologists constructed 12 questions regarding diagnosis (7 questions) and treatment (5 questions) of CIDP using the Population/Intervention/ Comparison/Outcome (PICO) format to guide the literature search. The following databases were searched for identification of eligible studies for each PICO question: Medline, Embase, the Cochrane Library. Data were extracted and summarized in GRADE evidence profiles (for treatment PICOs) or evidence tables (for diagnostic PICOs) and presented to the Task Force. Statements were prepared according to the GRADE Evidence-to-Decision frameworks and were agreed upon in an iterative fashion.

Results and Recommendations: The Task Force distinguished typical CIDP and CIDP variants. The previously used term 'atypical CIDP' was replaced by 'CIDP variants' because these are well characterized entities, each presenting with a specific clinical and electrodiagnostic phenotype (multifocal, focal, distal, motor, or sensory CIDP). The Task Force reduced the levels of diagnostic certainty from three (definite, probable, possible CIDP) to only two (CIDP and possible CIDP), because the sensitivity and specificity of criteria for probable and definite CIDP did not significantly differ. Since there is no gold standard for the diagnosis of CIDP, the Task Force decided to avoid the label 'definite CIDP'. For the electrodiagnostic criteria, the Task Force decided to require sensory in addition to motor conduction studies in the electrodiagnostic criteria. The Task Force agreed on Good Practice Points to define clinical, electrodiagnostic, and supportive criteria and on the investigations to be considered to diagnose CIDP. The principal treatment recommendations are: (a) intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIg) or corticosteroids are strongly recommended as initial treatment in typical CIDP and CIDP variants; (b) plasma exchange is strongly recommended if IVIg and corticosteroids are ineffective; (c) IVIg should be considered as the first-line treatment in motor CIDP (Good Practice Point); (d) if maintenance treatment is needed, IVIg or subcutaneous immunoglobulin (SCIg) are strongly recommended; (e) if the maintenance dose of one of these treatments is high, consider either combination treatments or adding an immunosuppressant or immunomodulatory drug (Good Practice Point); (f) if pain is present, consider drugs against neuropathic pain and multidisciplinary management (Good Practice Point).

Keywords

Chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy, CIDP, definition, diagnosis, treatment, guidelines, GRADE

Objectives

The EFNS/PNS consensus guideline on the diagnosis and management of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy (CIDP) was published first in 2005 (1,2) and revised in 2010 (3,4). The aim of this second revision is to update the 2010 guideline according to the GRADE (Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation) methodology (5) and to formulate evidence-based recommendations and consensus-based Good Practice Points for clinical practice.

Background

The diagnosis of CIDP rests upon a combination of clinical, electrodiagnostic and laboratory features with exclusions to eliminate other disorders that may mimic CIDP. Criteria for CIDP have been most closely linked to electrodiagnostic criteria for detection of peripheral nerve demyelination. Comparison of different published diagnostic criteria sets for CIDP showed that the 2010 EFNS/PNS guideline criteria (3,4) have very good diagnostic accuracy (6-8). World-wide acceptance and use of these criteria in CIDP research have been documented (9). Nevertheless, misdiagnosis commonly occurs, particularly in those classified as CIDP variants (10-12). Although this may be related to errors in the interpretation of diagnostic test results (11,13) and to non-compliance or lack of awareness of guidelines (14), some patients fulfilling diagnostic criteria based on correctly interpreted test results do not have CIDP (10,13). The current guideline revision attempts to improve specificity of the criteria. The evidence from randomized clinical therapeutic trials has significantly increased since 2010 and allows evidence-based recommendations about treatments according to GRADE.

Methods

The methodology for the development of this guideline followed the frameworks provided by AGREE II (15) and GRADE (5), and the recommendations of the EAN on the development of a neurological management guideline (16). Twelve research questions were constructed in the PICO Population/Intervention/ Comparison/Outcome (PICO) format during a kick-off meeting in March 2018 (Box). The following databases were searched for identification of eligible studies for each PICO question, according to predefined selection criteria: Medline, via the PubMed interface; Embase, via the embase.com interface; the Cochrane Library, consisting of the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews; the Database of Abstracts of Reviews (DARE); and the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Clinical Trials (CENTRAL). The literature search for each PICO was conducted between June 2018 and July 2019 without restrictions regarding publication date. The Task Force additionally included relevant papers published during the preparation of this Guideline. Unpublished data known to the Task Force was not used. Data were extracted and summarized in GRADE evidence profiles (treatment PICOs) or evidence tables (diagnostic PICOs). To reach consensus, the guideline Task Force members prepared draft statements about definition, diagnosis, and treatment, according to the GRADE Evidence-to-Decision frameworks (17,18). Evidence and recommendations were classified using the EAN guideline recommendations (16). The Task Force made a strong recommendation (for or against an intervention or test) when

it judged that almost all informed people would make the recommended choice (19). A weak recommendation was made when it judged that most informed people would choose the recommended course of action, but a substantial number would not, either because it was applicable (or available) only to a subgroup, or the evidence had low certainty, or the risk/benefit ratio might not be favourable for all patients. When no or only very low certainty 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 by the Task Force until consensus was reached. A detailed protocol of the guideline development can be found in supplementary material online.

Results

I - Diagnostic criteria for CIDP

1 - Clinical criteria (Table 1, Flowchart 1)

The Task Force refined the clinical criteria for defining CIDP into 'typical CIDP' and 'CIDP variants'. Since they are more a matter of definition than research questions, these criteria are formulated as consensus expert opinion. The Task Force replaced the label 'atypical CIDP', used in the 2010 EFNS/PNS guideline (3,4), by 'CIDP variants' because these are now well characterized entities, each presenting with a specific clinical and electrodiagnostic phenotype.

Typical CIDP

Most commonly, the disease begins with paraesthesiae and weakness in the distal limbs as well as difficulty walking. The clinical examination shows progressive symmetric proximal and distal muscle weakness, sensory loss, and decreased or absent deep tendon reflexes. The disease course is steadily progressive for more than 8 weeks, but can be relapsing-remitting. In contrast with Guillain–Barré syndrome (GBS), cranial nerves are less frequently affected and respiratory (20,21) or autonomic involvement is exceptional (22-25). Typical CIDP is more common in males and can occur at any age, but most commonly between 40 and 60 years. Onset during infancy and childhood can occur (26-29). Typical CIDP may present acutely (acute-onset CIDP, A-CIDP) in up to 13% of patients, who rapidly progress within 4 weeks and initially may be diagnosed with Guillain-Barré syndrome (30,31). Therefore, distinguishing A-CIDP from GBS can be challenging as 5% of patients initially diagnosed with GBS are later reclassified as A-CIDP (31). In contrast with GBS patients, A-CIDP patients continue to deteriorate more than 8 weeks after onset or may relapse at least three times after initial improvement. Often, A-CIDP patients remain able to walk independently, are less likely to have facial weakness, respiratory or autonomic nervous system involvement, and are more likely to have sensory signs (31,32). Although these features may favour the diagnosis of A-CIDP, there are no specific clinical features or laboratory tests that can distinguish GBS from A-CIDP in the acute stage of the disease.

CIDP variants

Clinical presentations different from typical CIDP are considered CIDP variants because they share the common features of demyelination and response to immune therapy. Whether their pathogenic mechanisms are different is not clear since there are indications that CIDP variants may evolve over time into typical CIDP (33-35). Recognition of the clinical phenotype of the variants is crucial since the diagnostic workflow and the differential diagnosis may differ compared to typical CIDP.

- Distal CIDP, also known as distal acquired demyelinating symmetric neuropathy (DADS) (36), presents with sensory loss in the distal upper and lower limbs as well as gait instability. Weakness may occur and is usually distally accentuated in lower more than upper limbs. Approximately two thirds of patients with this phenotype have IgM paraproteinaemic neuropathy, often with antibodies against myelin-associated glycoprotein (MAG). Distal neuropathy with an IgM paraprotein and anti-MAG antibodies, anti-MAG neuropathy, is considered outside the scope of CIDP as the majority of patients have specific electrodiagnostic and pathologic findings and do not respond to intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIg) or corticosteroids (37-39).
- Multifocal CIDP (synonyms: multifocal demyelinating neuropathy with persistent conduction block, Lewis-Sumner syndrome - LSS (40); multifocal acquired demyelinating sensory and motor neuropathy – MADSAM (41); multifocal inflammatory demyelinating neuropathy – MIDN (42)) usually affects the upper limbs first. Lower limbs may become involved later or sometimes are affected from the onset (41,42). Cranial nerves, including oculomotor, trigeminal, facial, vagal, and hypoglossal nerves, are probably more frequently involved than in other CIDP forms (37,44-48).
- Focal CIDP is rare and usually affects the brachial or lumbosacral plexus, but can affect individual peripheral nerves as well (49,50).
- Motor CIDP presents as relatively symmetric proximal and distal weakness but with normal sensation clinically and electrodiagnostically (51,52). This is in contrast to both typical CIDP, where sensation is abnormal, and multifocal motor neuropathy (MMN), where the pattern of weakness is asymmetric and mainly affecting the upper limbs (53). If sensory nerve conduction is abnormal in clinically motor CIDP (54), the diagnosis is motor-predominant CIDP. Patients with motor CIDP may deteriorate after corticosteroids (PICO 8) (35,51,54,55).
- Sensory CIDP is usually characterized by gait ataxia and impairment of vibration and position sense (56,34,57). By definition, muscle weakness is not present. If motor nerve conduction slowing or motor conduction block are present (56,58,59), the diagnosis is sensory-predominant CIDP. Long-term follow-up studies have shown that sensory CIDP is often a transient clinical stage that precedes the appearance of weakness in about 70% of patients (60,35).

Disorders not classified as CIDP

Chronic immune sensory polyradiculopathy (CISP). Patients suspected to have clinically sensory CIDP, but with normal motor and sensory nerve conduction studies may have CISP (61-63). Somatosensory evoked potentials may be absent or show very proximal slowing in CISP because sensory axons proximal to the dorsal root ganglia are

affected. Because the sensory neurons in the dorsal root ganglia remain intact, standard sensory nerve conduction studies are normal. Although most likely immune-mediated and responding to immune treatment, there is not enough evidence to determine if CISP is demyelinating or related to sensory CIDP, and has therefore not been included in the CIDP variant classification (see Flowchart 2).

Autoimmune nodopathies. Antibodies against nodal-paranodal cell-adhesion molecules (contactin-1 (CNTN1), neurofascin-155 (NF155), contactin-associated protein 1 (Caspr1), and neurofascin isoforms NF140/186) have been discovered in a small subset of patients fulfilling 2010 EFNS/PNS criteria for CIDP (3,4) (PICO 5, Flowchart 1). Patients with these antibodies often have specific clinical characteristics (64,65). Antibodies against CNTN1 were reported in patients diagnosed with CIDP, who presented with acute or subacute disease onset, motor or ataxic features, and had no or poor response to IVIg treatment (66,68). Antibodies against NF155 were observed in patients diagnosed with CIDP who were younger at onset, and had a subacute or chronic disease course, distal weakness, ataxia, tremor, and no or poor response to IVIg treatment (69-71). Antibodies against Caspr1 present as an acute/subacute neuropathy frequently associated with ataxia, neuropathic pain, cranial nerve involvement and poor response to IVIg (72-74). Antibodies to all neurofascin isoforms lead to a severe phenotype, in particular when of the IgG3 isotype (75,76). The Task Force proposed to name these conditions 'autoimmune nodopathies' and not to regard them as CIDP variants because they have distinct clinical features, no overt inflammation or macrophage-mediated demyelination (77-79) and do poorly respond to CIDP treatment, IVIg in particular. Rituximab, however, may be effective (72,75,80,81).

Numerous conditions (e.g., diabetes mellitus, IgG or IgA monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS), lymphoma, vasculitis, IgM monoclonal gammopathy without antibodies to MAG) have been associated with CIDP. There is insufficient evidence to consider CIDP associated with these diseases different from idiopathic CIDP. In some cases, CIDP may occur as an immune-related adverse event induced by drugs or biologics (82-84). In those cases, most physicians would stop the drug/biologic but this decision should be based on the individual clinical situation. In most published reports, treatment has not differed from that used in idiopathic CIDP. The differential diagnosis of typical CIDP and CIDP variants is extensive and needs to be carefully addressed by appropriate investigations (Tables 4 and 5, Flowchart 2).

2 - Electrodiagnostic criteria (PICO 1) (Tables 2 and 3)

The Task Force **strongly recommended electrodiagnosis (nerve conduction studies)** to support the clinical diagnosis of typical CIDP and CIDP variants. The Task Force decided to reduce the levels of electrodiagnostic certainty, used in the 2010 EFNS/PNS guideline (3,4), from three (definite, probable, possible CIDP) to only two (CIDP and possible CIDP), based on fulfilment of electrodiagnostic criteria strongly or weakly supportive of demyelination, because of empirical evidence showing that the sensitivity and specificity of electrodiagnostic criteria for probable and definite CIDP do not significantly differ (85,8). Since there is no gold standard for the diagnosis of CIDP, the Task Force

decided to avoid the label 'definite CIDP'. The Task Force decided to require not only motor but also sensory conduction studies to define the diagnostic categories of typical CIDP and CIDP variants (Table 6, Flowchart 1).

Good Practice Point 1 – Typical CIDP

- To confirm the clinical diagnosis of typical CIDP, at least 2 motor nerves must have abnormalities which fulfil the motor nerve conduction criteria. If criteria are fulfilled in only 1 nerve, the diagnosis is possible typical CIDP.
- Sensory nerve conduction abnormalities must be present in at least 2 nerves.
- In patients suspected of having typical CIDP because they fulfil clinical criteria but not minimal electrodiagnostic criteria, the diagnosis of possible typical CIDP may be made if there is objective improvement following treatment with IVIg, corticosteroids or plasma exchange and if at least 1 additional supportive criterion (PICO 2-4, 6) is fulfilled.

Good Practice Point 2 – Distal CIDP

- Motor nerve conduction criteria fulfilment is required in at least 2 upper limb nerves to confirm the clinical diagnosis of distal CIDP. The distal CMAP amplitude should be at least 1 mV. When criteria are fulfilled in lower limb but not upper limb nerves or if criteria are fulfilled in only 1 upper limb nerve, the maximum diagnostic certainty is possible distal CIDP.
- Sensory nerve conduction abnormalities must be present in at least 2 nerves.

Good Practice Point 3 – Multifocal and focal CIDP

- Motor nerve conduction criteria fulfilment is required in at least 2 nerves in total in more than 1 limb to confirm the clinical diagnosis of multifocal CIDP and in at least 2 nerves in 1 limb for the diagnosis of focal CIDP. When criteria are fulfilled in only 1 nerve, the maximum diagnostic certainty is possible multifocal or possible focal CIDP.
- Sensory nerve conduction abnormalities must be present in at least 2 nerves of the affected limbs for the diagnosis of multifocal CIDP and in 1 nerve of the affected limb for the diagnosis of possible focal CIDP.

Good Practice Point 4 – Motor CIDP (and motor-predominant CIDP)

- Motor CIDP must fulfil motor nerve conduction criteria in at least 2 nerves and sensory nerve conduction must be normal in all of at least 4 nerves (median, ulnar, radial, and sural) to confirm the clinical diagnosis. If criteria are fulfilled in only 1 nerve, the clinical diagnosis is possible motor CIDP.
- Clinically motor CIDP with sensory nerve conduction abnormalities is diagnosed as motor-predominant CIDP.

Good Practice Point 5 – Sensory CIDP (and sensory-predominant CIDP)

- Sensory CIDP must fulfil sensory nerve conduction criteria and motor nerve conduction must be normal in all of at least 4 nerves (median, ulnar, peroneal, and tibial) to confirm the clinical diagnosis The maximum diagnostic certainty is possible sensory CIDP.

- Clinically sensory CIDP with motor nerve conduction abnormalities is diagnosed as possible sensory-predominant CIDP. If motor conduction criteria are fulfilled in at least 2 nerves, the diagnostic certainty increases to sensory-predominant CIDP.

Considerations supporting the Good Practice Points (supplementary material online)

Evidence summary: Data extracted from 38 cohort studies assessing the usefulness of a total of 27 electrodiagnostic parameters or criteria sets were subjected to GRADE analysis. The certainty of the evidence of effect estimates was low to very low for all outcomes.

Rationale: The recommendation of the Task Force for electrodiagnostic testing in patients with clinically suspected CIDP is based on the very good diagnostic accuracy of 2010 EFNS/PNS electrodiagnostic criteria (3,4) with high sensitivity/specificity for CIDP of 95%/96% (6), 81%/96% (7), and 73%/91% (8) reported in different patient populations. The advantages of electrodiagnostic testing include the long history of clinical experience, availability, inexpensiveness, and low burden for the patient. The Task Force expanded the 2010 EFNS/PNS electrodiagnostic criteria (3,4) by including sensory nerve conduction studies and by defining criteria specific for CIDP variants (Tables 2 and 3). Since up to 20% of patients with typical CIDP fulfil clinical criteria but not minimal electrodiagnostic criteria, the Task Force considered that in such patients the possibility of typical CIDP as proposed by Koski et al. (86) may justify a trial with any of the three proven CIDP treatments (PICO 1), provided that at least one other supportive criterion is fulfilled. An objective response to treatment (PICO 2) would then support a diagnosis of possible typical CIDP.

3 - Supportive criteria

Response to treatment (PICO 2), imaging (PICO 3), cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) (PICO 4), or nerve biopsy (PICO 6) may support the diagnosis of CIDP in patients who fulfil clinical criteria for CIDP, but whose electrodiagnostic criteria only allow for possible CIDP. Since sensory nerve conduction studies are now part of the electrodiagnostic criteria set, they have been removed as general supportive criterion, except for diagnosing patients with sensory CIDP without motor nerve conduction abnormalities, in whom fulfilment of the sensory conduction criteria is required.

3a - Response to treatment (PICO 2)

Good Practice Points

- The Task Force **weakly recommended an objective positive response to treatment with immunomodulatory agents (IVIg, plasma exchange, corticosteroids)** to support the clinical diagnosis of CIDP in patients in whom clinical, electrodiagnostic and other supportive criteria allow only a diagnosis of possible CIDP.

- Objective response to treatment requires improvement on at least 1 disability and 1 impairment scale. Lack of improvement following treatment does not exclude CIDP and a positive response is not specific for CIDP. There are many outcome scales. Some examples of disability and impairment scales are given:
    - Disability can be assessed by the Inflammatory Rasch-built Overall Disability Scale (I-RODS) (87-89) and the Inflammatory Neuropathy Cause and Treatment (INCAT) disability scale (90,91).
    - Impairment can be assessed by the MRC sum score (92,91,89), the Modified INCAT Sensory Sum scale (mISS) (93,91), the Neuropathy Impairment Score (NIS) (94), and by measuring grip strength using handheld dynamometry (95,91,96,97).
- The changes required to define improvement have not been adequately validated. The following which have been used in research trials can serve as a guide:
    - I-RODS: + ≥ 4 centile points
    - INCAT disability scale: - ≥ 1 point
    - mISS: - ≥ 2points
    - MRC sum score (0-60): + ≥ 2-4 points*
    - Grip strength:
        - Martin Vigorimeter: + ≥ 8 -14 kPa*
        - Jamar Hand Grip Dynamometer: + ≥ 10%**

    * higher values may improve diagnostic specificity

    ** values averaged over 3 consecutive days improve diagnostic specificity

Considerations supporting the Good Practice Point (supplementary material online)

Evidence summary: Data from 6 cohort studies assessing response to treatment with IVIg, plasma exchange, or corticosteroids were extracted and analysed in evidence tables. There is moderate certainty evidence that corticosteroids and plasma exchange and high certainty evidence that IVIg improves impairment (98) (PICO 8-10). Uncontrolled studies report a positive response to IVIg, plasma exchange, or corticosteroids in variable proportions of patients (68-99%) (34,48,99-101). Reasons for therapeutic failure likely include inadequate treatment dosing or duration (12). Misdiagnosis is also an important consideration for patients who do not respond to first line CIDP treatment (10-12).

Rationale: Current immunomodulatory treatments are not specific for CIDP, since other autoimmune conditions may also respond to these. Treatment response therefore needs to be carefully considered in the clinical and electrophysiological context to avoid overdiagnosis. If patients have an objective response to treatment, the probability of the diagnosis of CIDP increases. A minority of non-responders to at least one of the three proven effective treatments (PICO 8-10) still may have CIDP. These patients would require additional testing to rule out other disorders which mimic CIDP before considering other immunosuppressive treatment strategies.

3b - Imaging (PICO 3)

Ultrasound

Good Practice Points

- the Task Force **weakly recommended using ultrasound in adult patients** to diagnose CIDP in patients fulfilling diagnostic criteria for possible CIDP but not for CIDP. The diagnosis of CIDP may be more likely if there is nerve enlargement* of at least 2 sites in proximal median nerve segments and/or the brachial plexus (see note on excluding mimics).

  *cross-sectional area median nerve >10mm^2 at forearm, >13mm^2 upper arm, >9mm^2 interscalene (trunks) or >12mm^2 for nerve roots.
- There is currently no evidence to support ultrasound in paediatric patients.

Considerations supporting the Good Practice Points (supplementary material online)

Evidence summary: Data extracted from 12 cohort studies assessing the usefulness of ultrasound were analysed. Enlargement mainly of proximal nerve segments in arm nerves and spinal nerve roots are the most characteristic feature in CIDP (102-105). The yield of stringent cut-off values using a practical sonographic protocol (brachial plexus and proximal median nerve segments bilaterally) has been validated in a prospective cohort of patients with suspected chronic inflammatory neuropathies (106,107). In contrast to the adult population, systematic studies on yield of ultrasound in children with suspected CIDP are lacking. Only a few smaller studies reported on reference values for sonographic nerve sizes in different age categories (108-110), but stringent cut-off values based on disease controls are lacking.

Rationale: Since in children inherited demyelinating neuropathies are much more prevalent than CIDP and since rater experience on nerve ultrasound in children is limited, the Task Force did not recommend ultrasound to support the diagnosis in children. Ultrasound is a low-cost, widely available, non-invasive procedure with moderate diagnostic accuracy.

MRI

Good Practice Points

- task Force **weakly recommended against using MRI in adult patients** to diagnose CIDP except in patients fulfilling diagnostic criteria for possible CIDP but not for CIDP. CIDP may be more likely if there is enlargement

and/or increased signal intensity of nerve root(s) on T2 weighted MRI sequences (DIXON/STIR, coronal + sagittal planes)* (see note on excluding mimics).

*preferably quantitative assessment of the spinal nerve root sizes (nerve root diameter right next to the ganglion, measured as height in coronal plane with cut-off value >5mm), or semi-quantitative scoring of abnormalities of the spinal nerve roots and trunks using the following categories: normal, possibly abnormal, clearly abnormal.

- There is currently no evidence to support MRI in paediatric patients.

Considerations supporting the Good Practice Points (supplementary material online)

Evidence summary: Data from 18 studies assessing the usefulness of MRI were extracted and analysed. MRI of the brachial and lumbosacral plexus may aid in the diagnosis of CIDP by showing nerve root hypertrophy, increased signal intensity or contrast enhancement (102,111-114). Advanced MRI sequences have improved tissue discriminating properties (115). Most MRI studies only evaluated patients with established CIDP, using different study designs (with/without control group), whereas only a few investigated its added diagnostic value that would approach a more routine clinical setting (116,117). An important limitation is the lack of objective cut-off values for abnormality. Two studies found low reproducibility of results in patients with chronic inflammatory neuropathies and disease controls, even among experienced raters (118-120). Only a few studies used objective cut-offs for abnormal nerve root sizes (>5mm) to improve performance and consistency of plexus MRI (116,121).

Rationale: Conditions under which MRI may be considered in patients fulfilling only possible electrodiagnostic criteria include unavailability of ultrasound or when ultrasound results are non-contributory. In children with suspected CIDP, systematic studies on MRI are lacking, inherited demyelinating neuropathies are more prevalent than CIDP, and rater experience in children is limited. The low interrater reliability, lack of objective cut-off values and high cost of MRI contribute to the recommendation against using MRI.

NOTE: Before concluding that ultrasound or MRI abnormalities are supportive of CIDP, there should be no laboratory/clinical features that suggest other diseases such as multifocal motor neuropathy (MMN), demyelinating Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease (CMT), IgM paraproteinaemic neuropathy (especially with anti-MAG antibodies), polyneuropathy-organomegaly-endocrinopathy-M-protein-skin changes (POEMS) syndrome, diabetic radiculoplexus neuropathy, amyloid neuropathy, neuralgic amyotrophy, leprosy, neurofibromatosis or neurolymphomatosis.

3c - Cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) analysis (PICO 4)

Good Practice Points

- The Task Force **weakly recommended against CSF analysis if diagnostic criteria are already met**.
- CSF analysis should be considered to exclude other diagnoses or to support the diagnosis of CIDP in the following circumstances:
  - Patients fulfilling diagnostic criteria for possible CIDP but not CIDP.
  - In cases of acute or subacute onset.
  - When an infectious or malignant aetiology is suspected or possible.
  - CSF protein elevation should be interpreted cautiously in the presence of diabetes.
  - In view of higher normative values for CSF protein in individuals older than 50 years, higher levels are required to support a diagnosis of CIDP; there is insufficient research to date to establish rigorous cut-offs.

Considerations supporting the Good Practice Point (supplementary material online)

Evidence: From 42 clinical cohort studies identified, 9 were included for data extraction and analysis. CSF protein is often increased in CIDP patients (sensitivity of 42% - 77%), but with unknown specificity to discern CIDP from CIDP mimics (7,46). In suspected CIDP with unusual features or in the presence of systemic symptoms and signs, CSF analysis is recommended to exclude an underlying malignancy or infection (122). There is a risk of misdiagnosis in cases where electrodiagnosis is non-confirmatory and only CSF protein is increased (11). Specificity for CIDP is uncertain using newly established higher normative cutoff values for CSF protein elevation in older subjects (> 0.6 g/L above age 50) (123). Liberatore et al. (124) found that, using cut-offs of $\geq$ 0.5 g/L under the age of 50 years and > 0.6 g/L over the age of 60 years, sensitivity of CSF protein elevation for CIDP was 68%. In children, the interpretation of CSF protein levels is complex and validated reference values for different ages categories are lacking.

Rationale: The independent diagnostic value of CSF testing remains unproven. When CSF protein levels are normal, doubt may unnecessarily be cast upon the diagnosis. In selected cases, where the clinical diagnosis and electrodiagnostic results are not fully confirmatory, CSF analysis could either support the diagnosis or exclude alternative diagnoses. The sensitivity of CSF in CIDP variants is uncertain. It may be advisable to consider more extensive electrodiagnostic testing prior to performing a lumbar puncture.

3d - Nerve biopsy (PICO 6)

Good Practice Points

The Task Force did not recommend nerve biopsy as a routine procedure to diagnose CIDP and **weakly recommended performing a nerve biopsy only in specific circumstances:**

- In cases where CIDP is suspected but cannot be confirmed with the clinical, laboratory, imaging and electrodiagnostic studies.

- In cases where CIDP is suspected, but there is little or no response to treatment, such that an alternative diagnosis such as CMT, amyloidosis, sarcoidosis, or nerve sheath tumours/neurofibromatosis might be considered.
- Nerve biopsies should be considered only when:
    - skilled (neuro)surgeons and neuropathologists and specialized and experienced pathology laboratory facilities are available.
    - symptoms are severe enough to justify the potential morbidity associated with a nerve biopsy.
    - the low accuracy of the test is fully understood by the patient before undergoing the biopsy.
- When a nerve biopsy is taken:
    - current expert consensus on minimal standards for processing and evaluating nerve biopsies should be observed (125).
    - most often the sural or the superficial peroneal nerve is biopsied but biopsy of a clinically affected nerve is more likely to provide useful information.
    - factors probably supporting the diagnosis of CIDP may be:
        - thinly myelinated axons and small onion bulbs (126)
        - thinly myelinated or demyelinated internodes in teased fibers (127)
        - perivascular macrophage clusters (128)
        - supportive features of demyelination on electron microscopy (129).

Considerations supporting the Good Practice Points (supplementary material online):

Evidence summary: Data from 26 studies identified for assessing the usefulness of nerve biopsy were extracted and analysed to reach consensus. Several studies tried to estimate nerve biopsy accuracy in diagnosing CIDP, but the variability between them was huge and they could not be combined because of the wide range of outcomes used. Even when using the same parameters, there is an important level of heterogeneity in the sensitivity for findings suggestive of CIDP, which can be due to the subjectivity in studying the biopsies, the timing of the biopsy in the disease course, and comorbidities (130). Several studies assessed the clinical outcomes when initiating treatment after a nerve biopsy. Clinical outcomes in patients with suspected CIDP, treated with immunomodulating agents after a biopsy-guided diagnosis of CIDP, have been successful (130-132). However, lacking a control group, these data could not be used for analysis. Since nerve biopsy can reveal findings suggestive of a different or differential diagnosis, a biopsy may save patients from the unnecessary complications of immune treatment and lead to appropriate therapy. Nerve biopsies have poor sensitivity and specificity, and their contribution to the diagnosis is limited by these inaccuracies.

Rationale: The weak recommendation of the Task Force for nerve biopsy is intended to reduce the number of unnecessary biopsies for suspected CIDP, given the low diagnostic accuracy and invasive nature. The Task Force expects that only a small number of carefully selected nerve biopsies will contribute to a more accurate diagnosis of CIDP and to a lower probability of misdiagnosis, especially in unusual cases when all other investigations are non-

diagnostic, including some patients considered to have CIDP who have not responded to treatment. Sural nerve biopsy is associated with numbness in the area of innervation (133-135). Other complications include acute pain (136), chronic pain (135), allodynia (137), dysesthesia (138), neuroma formation (136), infections and wound dehiscence (137).

4 - Criteria for immunological testing

4a – Monoclonal gammopathy testing (PICO 7)

Good Practice Points

- The Task Force **strongly recommended testing for serum monoclonal proteins in adult patients** with a clinical suspicion of CIDP.
- Testing should include serum protein electrophoresis and immunofixation (to increase sensitivity to detect relevant low level paraproteins and identify paraprotein class and light chain), spot urine immunofixation for light chains (Bence Jones protein). Measurement of serum free light chains (SFLC) may detect an abnormality not otherwise detected. Note that relevant monoclonal proteins may still have normal light chain and ratio measurements in SFLC assays. If a gammopathy is found, further evaluation may be required and haematology-oncology consultation should be strongly considered.
- In patients with distal CIDP, if no IgM paraprotein is found or anti-MAG antibody testing is negative, repeat testing should be considered.
- Testing of vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) serum levels is recommended in patients with a distal and painful CIDP phenotype, in whom a lambda light chain associated IgA or IgG paraprotein is found, when POEMS syndrome is suspected.

Considerations supporting the Good Practice Points (supplementary material online)

Evidence: Data from 35 observational studies assessing the presence and significance of monoclonal proteins and anti-MAG antibodies were extracted and summarized in evidence tables. Neuropathies with monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS) may behave like typical CIDP (139-141). However, monoclonal gammopathies may be associated with neuropathies mimicking CIDP, such as anti-MAG IgM neuropathy (36,142), POEMS syndrome (143-145), multiple myeloma or AL-amyloidosis (144).

Rationale: In patients with suspected CIDP and a monoclonal gammopathy, correct diagnosis of both the neurological and oncological condition is of paramount importance because of the implications for management and treatment. Patient burden is negligible. These tests are low cost and are available in most hospitals.

4b - Antibody testing (PICO 5)

Good Practice Points

The Task Force **weakly recommended testing for nodal and paranodal antibodies in patients fulfilling clinical and electrodiagnostic criteria for CIDP, except in those who have particular features suggestive of autoimmune nodopathy, and for anti-MAG antibodies, except in those with an IgM paraprotein.**

- Nodal and paranodal autoantibody testing should be considered in patients with clinical suspicion of CIDP:
  - nodal and paranodal (anti-NF155, anti-CNTN1, anti-Caspr1) and possibly anti-NF140/186 antibody testing is recommended when available and meeting quality standards.
  - testing of nodal and paranodal antibodies is strongly recommended in certain CIDP populations:
    - patients resistant to standard therapy with IVIg and corticosteroids.
    - patients with acute or subacute aggressive onset, previous diagnosis of Guillain-Barré syndrome or acute-onset CIDP.
    - patients with low-frequency tremor, ataxia disproportionate to the sensory involvement or other cerebellar features or predominantly distal weakness.
    - Patients with respiratory failure and cranial nerve involvement.
    - Patients with associated nephrotic syndrome.
    - Patients with very high CSF protein levels.

- The Task Force recommended using for nodal and paranodal autoantibody testing:
  - a cell-based assay using mammalian expression vectors encoding human NF155, CNTN1, NF186/NF140 and Caspr1. Expression vectors should avoid the use any protein tag at the N-terminal site, any protein tag at the C terminal site for CNTN1 and avoid the use, in general, of GFP-tagged expression vectors.
  - a confirmatory test with ELISA (using human recombinant proteins) or teased-nerve immunohistochemistry. The order of assays can be interchanged. This is strongly recommended for low titer sera or dubious staining on the cell-based assay to avoid false positives.

- Anti-MAG antibody testing is strongly recommended in all patients fulfilling CIDP diagnostic criteria with an IgM paraprotein because a high titre of anti-MAG antibodies (> 7,000 Bühlmann Titre Units, BTU) (146) would strongly suggest a different diagnosis than CIDP.

- The Task Force recommends for anti-MAG antibody testing:
  - Bühlmann test ELISA, or
  - Locally validated ELISA, Western blot or immunohistochemistry assays.

Considerations supporting the Good Practice Points (supplementary material online)

Evidence: Data from 16 cohort studies assessing the presence of nodal-paranodal and anti-MAG antibodies were extracted and analysed. Diagnostic utility seems strong for anti-NF155 and anti-CNTN1 IgG (66,68,71), and anti-Caspr1 IgG (72-74). More evidence is needed for anti-NF155 IgM (147), anti-nodal NF140/186 IgG (75,76), and anti-MAG without an apparent paraprotein (148). For autoantibodies against CNTN1 and NF155, replication studies and a systematic review (149) are available with clear associations to clinically relevant features and a high diagnostic specificity. For autoantibodies against Caspr1, nodal NF, and MAG, only small case series or anecdotal cases have been reported. Evidence that autoantibody detection may inform treatment remains anecdotal. Several case reports and case series associate the detection of nodal-paranodal antibodies, especially anti-NF155 and anti-CNTN1 with poorer responses to conventional therapies (65,149). There is anecdotal evidence that these patients may respond well to rituximab (80,150). Although the evidence is weak due to the low numbers of patients, the response to rituximab has been replicated in independent cohorts and the magnitude of the effect is, at least for a subset of patients, very significant.

Rationale: Nodal-paranodal or MAG antibody testing should be considered in patients who fulfil criteria for CIDP, when they present with particular characteristics (Flowchart 1) and when they do not respond well to proven effective treatments for CIDP. Anti-MAG antibodies are relevant, if associated with a distal CIDP phenotype and an IgM paraprotein. The antibody testing has a low cost and positive results have significant implications for diagnosis and treatment. Access to antibody testing requires specialized laboratory procedures that are not available worldwide and standardization of the assays through interlaboratory validation needs to be performed. Patient burden is negligible.

5 - Recommended strategy for the diagnosis of CIDP (Flowcharts 1 and 2, Table 6)

CIDP should be considered in any patient with a progressive symmetric or multifocal polyradiculoneuropathy in whom the clinical course is relapsing and remitting or progresses for more than 8 weeks, especially if there are sensory symptoms, proximal weakness, areflexia without wasting, or preferential loss of vibration or joint position sense. Electrodiagnostic tests are mandatory and the major features suggesting a diagnosis of CIDP are listed in Tables 1-3 and Flowchart 1. The sensitivity of electrodiagnostic criteria for motor nerves may be improved by examining more than four nerves, by including proximal stimulation in the upper limbs. If electrodiagnostic criteria for CIDP are not met initially, a repeat study at a later date should be considered. Supportive criteria (PICOs 2-4, 6) can be used to confirm the diagnosis of CIDP in patients with a possible diagnosis as based on clinical and electrodiagnostic criteria. CSF examination, ultrasound of proximal median nerve segments, cervical spinal roots, and the brachial plexus or MRI of spinal roots, brachial or lumbar plexus, and a trial of immunotherapy with objective assessment of endpoints may assist the diagnosis. Biopsy of the sural nerve, but occasionally the superficial peroneal nerve, can provide supportive evidence for the diagnosis of CIDP, but positive findings are not specific and negative findings do not exclude the diagnosis. Monoclonal gammopathy testing should be performed in all patients with suspected CIDP (PICO 7). If an IgM paraprotein is present, anti-MAG antibodies should be tested (PICO 5). When specific clinical features are present, testing of nodal-paranodal antibodies may be indicated to diagnose

autoimmune neuropathies (PICO 5, Flowchart 1). There is only low certainty evidence concerning all these matters. Since other conditions may mimic CIDP, investigations to discover possible other diseases should be considered (Tables 4-5, Flowchart 2). The diagnostic categories for typical CIDP and CIDP variants are defined by mandatory clinical and electrodiagnostic criteria, and if these give a diagnosis of only possible CIDP then 2 additional supportive criteria are required (Flowchart 1, Table 6).

II – Treatment of CIDP

1 – Corticosteroids (PICO 8)

Recommendation

- The Task Force **strongly recommended treatment with corticosteroids**.
- The best corticosteroid regimen is not known.
- Pulsed high-dose corticosteroid treatment with oral dexamethasone or IV methylprednisolone may be considered as an alternative to daily oral prednisone/prednisolone or dexamethasone treatment.
- Long-term corticosteroid treatment may induce significant-side effects.
- Since patients with motor CIDP may deteriorate after corticosteroids, IVIg should be considered as the first-line treatment in motor CIDP (Good Practice Point).

Considerations supporting the recommendation (supplementary material online)

Evidence: Although it is uncertain (very low certainty evidence with 1 trial, 28 participants) (151) whether daily oral prednisone (120 mg daily slowly tapered over 4 months) improved impairment compared with no treatment, observational studies and the abundant clinical practice experience strongly suggest that corticosteroids are effective in CIDP. Daily oral corticosteroid doses commonly used are prednisone or prednisolone 60 mg equivalent to methylprednisolone 48 mg, slowly tapered over 6-8 months, depending on clinical response and possible side-effects. Although some centres prefer to start with a daily dose of 1-2 mg/kg of prednisolone, there is no evidence that this is superior. An alternative to daily corticosteroid regimens could be pulsed treatment with oral or IV corticosteroids. There is moderate certainty evidence (1 trial, 41 participants) (152), that 6 months' treatment with pulsed high-dose oral dexamethasone (4 days 40 mg monthly) did not improve disability more than daily oral prednisolone (60 mg, slowly tapered over 8 months). There is very low certainty evidence from open follow-up studies or randomized controlled trials that pulsed corticosteroid treatment (40 mg/day for 4 days per month) gave similar improvement in disability to daily oral prednisolone (60 mg, slowly tapering over 8 months). There is very low certainty evidence from open follow-up studies or randomized controlled trials that pulsed corticosteroid treatment (40 mg/day oral dexamethasone or 500 mg/day IV methylprednisolone, each daily for 4 days per month for 6 months) may induce more frequent and longer remission than daily oral corticosteroid treatment (153,154). Low to

moderate certainty evidence suggests that there are fewer side-effects and a faster response with pulsed high-dose corticosteroid compared with daily oral corticosteroid treatment. Some patients with CIDP may deteriorate after corticosteroid treatment, especially those with typical CIDP with focal demyelination (conduction block without significant motor conduction slowing elsewhere) or motor CIDP (35, 51, 54). Therefore, corticosteroids are not recommended as first-line treatment in these patients (98).

Rationale: Because of abundant clinical practice experience, corticosteroid treatment can be used as first-line treatment. However, in patients with (relative) contra-indications for long-term high-dose corticosteroid treatment, IVIg (or subcutaneous immunoglobulin (SCIg)) may be the preferred treatment. Patients should be carefully monitored for treatment response, which usually starts after several weeks or months. Reduction of the corticosteroid dose should be attempted regularly to investigate whether the current high dose is still required or whether the patient is in remission. Addition of calcium and bisphosphonate treatment should be considered. Potential side-effects of corticosteroids (e.g., osteoporosis, gastric ulceration, diabetes, cataracts, avascular necrosis of long bones, arterial hypertension) may outweigh the benefit from treatment in low disability disease.

2 – Immunoglobulin (PICO 9)

Recommendations and supporting considerations (supplementary material online)

2a – IVIg versus placebo

- The Task Force **strongly recommended treatment with IVIg**.
- Induction treatment: The usual total IVIg dose is 2 g/kg, divided over 2-5 days. Since not all patients respond to this first course, 2-5 repeated doses of 1g/kg IVIg every 3 weeks may be required before either the patient improves or it can be decided that IVIg is ineffective. Alternatively, clinical experience indicates that a second course of 2g/kg a few weeks after the first course may be sufficient to decide whether IVIg is ineffective.
- Maintenance treatment: Most patients require IVIg maintenance treatment. The best IVIg maintenance dose and schedule are not known.
- Objective end-of-dose deterioration before the next IVIg infusion should be minimised. If it occurs, the IVIg dose may be increased or the infusion interval shortened.
- If the patient is clinically stable, it is recommended to check periodically whether the IVIg dose can be reduced (e.g., by 25% per infusion), the treatment interval lengthened, or the treatment discontinued. Based on clinical experience, this could be done once every 6-12 months for the first 2-3 years of treatment, then less frequently (e.g., every 1-2 years).

Evidence: According to high certainty evidence (5 trials, 269 participants) (98), induction treatment with IVIg produced more short-term improvement than placebo. Adverse events were more common with IVIg than placebo (high certainty evidence), but serious adverse events were not observed (moderate certainty evidence, 3 trials, 315 participants) (98). The ICE randomized controlled trial showed that 94% of patients responded to 2g/kg induction treatment and two subsequent treatments of 1g/kg at 3 weeks intervals (157). The open PRIMA and PRISM studies indicated that a treatment response sometimes may only be observed after 3-5 infusions of 1g/kg every 3 weeks (155,156). Alternatively, clinical experience indicates that most patients respond objectively to no more than two initial courses of 2 g/kg (39). It is not well known whether an objective response following only after several treatments is due to a delayed treatment response or to the requirement of a different treatment regimen. The 1g/kg every 3 weeks regimen used in the ICE trial for 6 months is often considered as a standard maintenance treatment (157,158), although the IMC trial comparing IVIg with corticosteroids used an IVIg maintenance dose of 2 g/kg every 4 weeks (159). Experience from clinical practice indicates that the IVIg maintenance dose can be lower (0.4 – 1g/kg every 2-6 weeks), but this should be individually adjusted (39,160-162). There is no evidence of a difference in efficacy between different IVIg preparations for treating CIDP. A randomized controlled trial in 27 patients with CIDP comparing 5% freeze-dried and 10% liquid IVIg preparations showed no difference in treatment efficacy (163). Clinical experience indicates that a switch to another preparation may be helpful to relieve side-effects.

Rationale: The Task Force considered that the demonstrated efficacy of IVIg in trials, together with extensive practical experience of effectiveness, outweigh the frequent minor and the rare but more serious side-effects. IVIg treatment is acceptable and feasible. The major barriers are the high cost, the inconvenience for the patients, and the need for venous access. The initial IVIg treatment course is usually given in a hospital or day care facility. Maintenance IVIg infusions usually can be administered at a day care facility, infusion centre, or in some countries at home with proper monitoring. Potential burden of repeated infusions and high health care costs of IVIg may outweigh the benefit from treatment in low disability disease.

2b – IVIg versus corticosteroids

- Both IVIg and oral or IV corticosteroids are first-line treatments for CIDP. Based on the level of evidence, the Task Force did not recommend an overall preference for either treatment modality and **weakly recommended either IVIg or corticosteroid treatment.**
- Both short- and long-term effectiveness, risks, ease of implementation, and cost should be considered:
    - IVIg may be preferable when it comes to short-term treatment effectiveness, or when (relative) contra-indications for corticosteroids exist.
    - There is some indication that pulsed corticosteroids may be preferable for long-term treatment effectiveness, because of a possible higher rate and longer duration of remission, or when IVIg is unaffordable or unavailable.

Evidence: There is little or no difference in short-term improvement of disability with IVIg in comparison with oral prednisolone (moderate certainty evidence; 1 trial, 29 participants) or long-term improvement after IV methylprednisolone (high-certainty evidence; 1 trial, 45 participants) (98). Clinical improvement after IVIg however may be faster and the adherence to the treatment seems to be better after IVIg than after IV methylprednisolone (159). Side-effects of long-term treatment are probably in favour of IVIg (real-life experience). Pulsed IV corticosteroid treatment, however, may increase the rate and duration of remission after 6 months as compared with IVIg based on one small study (low certainty evidence) (154). A trial comparing standard oral prednisolone versus pulsed dexamethasone treatment did not show a difference in remission rate (152).

Rationale: The reason for selecting either IVIg or corticosteroid treatment is based on a series of patient-oriented considerations. Chronic high-dose oral corticosteroid treatment probably has a higher chance of side-effects compared with IVIg, but data on long-term (> 6 months) corticosteroid treatment in CIDP are not available. IVIg is considerably more costly than corticosteroids. Co-morbidity may be important for the choice of treatment. IVIg is preferable when there is an increased risk of developing osteoporosis or diabetes. In children, tablets are better tolerated than regular IV treatments but an effect on growth should be considered.

2c – IVIg versus plasma exchange

- Although the evidence from studies is limited, the Task Force **weakly recommended treatment with IVIg compared with plasma exchange,** mainly based on the ease of administration of IVIg.
- In some patients with good vascular access, plasma exchange may be an acceptable option for chronic treatment.

Evidence: Both treatments are considered effective, although the research evidence based on comparative studies is sparse (very low certainty evidence). For induction treatment, plasma exchange and IVIg seem equally effective (98,164,165). Doses used in comparative studies are for IVIg: 0.4 g/kg weekly for 3 weeks, then 0.2 g/kg weekly for the next 3 weeks, and for plasma exchange: 2x/week for 3 weeks, then 1x/week for 3 weeks. For maintenance treatment, no proper studies on long-term efficacy and safety of plasma exchange exist. Long-term treatment effects of IVIg are much better known. Especially in small children, IVIg is preferred over plasma exchange, mainly for practical reasons. Non-controlled studies indicated that plasma exchange can still be effective if treatment with IVIg or corticosteroids fails (166).

Rationale: The main advantage of IVIg is the relative ease of administration (although plasma exchange often can be delivered through peripheral vein access if using a centrifugal machine). IVIg infusion does not require special equipment. If plasma exchange can be delivered through a peripheral vein, the side-effect profile is usually good. Both treatments are expensive, but IVIg is usually even more expensive than plasma exchange. The cost of plasma

exchange is dependent not only on the costs of the equipment, but also on the costs of replacement fluids such as albumin or fresh frozen plasma. These costs may vary in different countries. In children, IVIg is preferred over plasma exchange, mainly for practical reasons.

2d – SCIg

- The Task Force **strongly recommended using SCIg for maintenance treatment** in CIDP.
- The Task Force **recommended no preference for either IVIg or SCIg for maintenance treatment** in CIDP**.**
- During follow-up, the dose should be tailored according to individual treatment response.
- The Task Force **weakly recommended against using SCIg for induction treatment** in CIDP.

Evidence: Efficacy of SCIg, compared with placebo, has been demonstrated in two randomized controlled trials with high certainty evidence (PATH trial in 172 patients (168) and another randomized controlled trial in 30 patients (169) in CIDP patients previously responsive to IVIg. There is insufficient evidence that a higher dose (0.4 g/kg weekly) is superior to a lower dose (0.2 g/kg weekly) for maintenance treatment (88). However, a 24-week open-label extension study indicated that there were lower relapse rates in the higher dose group (168). Therefore, long-term dosing should be individualized and tailored to find the most appropriate dose. There are frequent minor side-effects (mainly skin reactions). Limited available information indicates that patients with CIDP might in some cases require higher mean doses of SCIg compared with their previous IVIg dose. There is only very low certainty evidence for using SCIg as induction treatment (one randomized controlled cross-over trial in 20 patients) (169).

Rationale: When CIDP patients switch from IVIg to SCIg, it is reasonable to start using the same mean dose (1:1) per week. If the treatment effect is insufficient, the dose should be adjusted using reliable outcome measures. If the dose is high (> 20-30 g/infusion), an option is to split doses, increase frequency or to use multiple injection sites for subcutaneous infusions. Patients' personal preferences should be considered in choosing SCIg or IVIg. Arguments favouring SCIg include the autonomy and convenience of self-treatment at home, avoiding intravenous cannulation, and possibly fewer systemic side-effects. Disadvantages of SCIg include local side-effects (subcutaneous swelling and pain) and more frequent infusions. Maintenance treatment with SCIg is acceptable and usually feasible.

3 – Plasma exchange (PICO 10)

Recommendation

- The Task Force **strongly recommended treatment with plasma exchange**.
- The initial treatment may start with 5 exchanges over 2 weeks, thereafter the plasma exchange interval should be individually adapted. If possible, peripheral veins should be used.

Considerations supporting the recommendation (supplementary material online)

Evidence: According to moderate certainty evidence (2 trials, 59 participants), twice-weekly plasma exchange produced more short-term (at 3 or 4 weeks) improvement in disability than sham exchange (98,170-172). In the largest observational study, 3.9% of plasma exchange procedures had complications (173).

Rationale: Plasma exchange requires good vascular access and specialized equipment. In patients with difficult vascular access, who require multiple exchanges in a short period of time, a catheter inserted in a non-peripheral vein can be used. For single exchanges during long-term maintenance treatment, tunneled catheters may be used. These drawbacks make plasma exchange, despite its effectiveness and relative safety, the third option for chronic treatment after corticosteroids and IVIg.

4 – Other treatments (PICO 11)

Recommendations and supporting considerations (supplementary material online)

4a – Methotrexate

- The Task Force **weakly recommended against using methotrexate**.

Evidence: According to low certainty evidence (1 randomised parallel-group trial, 60 participants) (174), increasing methotrexate doses to 15 mg weekly for 32 weeks did not allow more participants to reduce corticosteroid or IVIg doses by more than 20% (primary outcome). Serious adverse events were no more common with methotrexate (3 cases) than with placebo (1 case).

Rationale: In making this recommendation, the lack of efficacy in one trial was crucial (174). However, it is acknowledged that the patient selection (insufficient assessment of active disease prior to enrollment) and the relatively low 15mg weekly methotrexate dose used in this trial may have led to an underestimation of the potential efficacy of methotrexate. Observational data that suggests methotrexate might work in some cases (175-178). Nevertheless, given the current lack of demonstrated efficacy and the potential side-effects such as teratogenicity, abnormal liver function, and pulmonary fibrosis (98), methotrexate is not recommended in patients with CIDP.

4b - Interferon beta 1a

- The Task Force **strongly recommended against using interferon beta-1a**.

Evidence: According to moderate certainty evidence (2 trials, 87 participants), interferon beta-1a (IFN beta-1a), in comparison with placebo, did not allow more patients with CIDP to withdraw from IVIg (179,180). A possible increase in serious adverse events could not be confirmed (low certainty evidence). The drug may have serious adverse events (none in the cross-over trial with 20 participants, but 4 in the IFN beta 1a and none in the placebo group in the randomized controlled trial with 67 participants).

Rationale: In making this recommendation, the Task Force judged the demonstrated lack of efficacy from two randomized controlled trials to be crucial (179,180). The drug may have serious side-effects.

4c – Fingolimod

- The Task Force **weakly recommended against using fingolimod**.

Evidence: This recommendation is based on the lack of efficacy of fingolimod (0.5 mg once daily) in a randomized controlled trial in 106 patients who were previously treated with IVIg or corticosteroids, providing moderate certainty evidence (181). However, the study design may have led to an underestimation of the potential efficacy, because IVIg was stopped abruptly in all 41 patients who had been receiving IVIg and who were randomized to fingolimod. Therefore, some patients might have relapsed shortly after the start of the trial even before fingolimod had the time to show efficacy. Due to the trial design, some patients may not have had active disease when randomized. Adverse events occurred in 76% of participants receiving fingolimod and 85% on placebo, and serious adverse events such as headache, hypertension, and extremity pain, occurred in 17% and 8% of the patients, respectively.

Rationale: The Task Force did not favour the use of fingolimod to treat CIDP given the current lack of demonstrated efficacy and the associated safety profile of fingolimod.

4d - Other immunosuppressive drugs

- Although there is only very low certainty evidence, the Task Force **weakly recommended for using azathioprine, cyclophosphamide, ciclosporin, mycophenolate mofetil and rituximab** (after failure of proven effective treatments or as add-on medication).
- The Task Force **weakly recommended against using alemtuzumab, bortezomib, etanercept, fampridine, fludarabine, immunoadsorption, interferon alpha, abatacept, natalizumab, and tacrolimus**.

Good Practice Points

- Azathioprine, mycophenolate mofetil, and ciclosporin may be considered as immunoglobulin or corticosteroid-sparing agents in CIDP patients treated with either immunoglobulin or corticosteroids as maintenance treatment.
- Cyclophosphamide, ciclosporin and rituximab may be considered in patients who are refractory to the proven effective treatments (IVIg, corticosteroids and plasma exchange).

Evidence: Azathioprine and mycophenolate mofetil are frequently used in CIDP as immunoglobulin- or corticosteroid-sparing agents, although their effectiveness to lower immunoglobulin or corticosteroid dose is uncertain (182-189). Although there is only very limited evidence from case series, cyclophosphamide (190-195), ciclosporin (196-199), and rituximab (200-202) may be considered in patients insufficiently responding or refractory to conventional treatment. The Task Force suggested that rituximab may be tried in children after failure of proven effective treatments, instead of cyclophosphamide because of a better side-effect profile. The Task Force considered the available evidence on effectiveness too limited, and potential harms too great, to support the use of alemtuzumab (203), bortezomib (204), etanercept (205), fampridine (206), fludarabine (207), immunoadsorption (208,209), interferon alpha (210), abatacept (211), natalizumab (212), tacrolimus (213). The Task Force noted that there is insufficient evidence for a positive effect of haematopoietic stem cell transplantation (HSCT).Since there are significant morbidities and a mortalilty risk with HSCT, this treatment should only be considered as a last resort option in specialised CIDP centres (214,215).

5 – Pharmacological treatment of pain (PICO 12)

Good Practice Points

The Task Force **strongly recommended assessment and treatment of pain** when present in CIDP.

In patients with CIDP and pain:

- Assess the cause(s) of the pain, whether neuropathic or nociceptive (especially musculoskeletal) pain. Either might be a consequence of CIDP or unrelated to CIDP. Consider alternative diagnoses mimicking CIDP (such as POEMS, vasculitis, diabetes, amyloidosis, CMT1B) in which neuropathic pain may be even more prevalent.
- For neuropathic pain or dysaesthesia, consider treating according to published guidelines (216,217). These recommend tricyclic antidepressants, pregabalin, gabapentin or serotonin-noradrenaline reuptake inhibitors (duloxetine or venlafaxine) as first line treatments.

Considerations supporting the Good Practice Points (supplementary material online)

Evidence: The prevalence of pain (of any type, but with no alternative cause other than CIDP) at any time during the course of CIDP was estimated as 46% in a systematic review (218) and varied between 7 - 72% in different studies,

reviewed by Thakur et al. (219). Neuropathic pain was present in 20% of 79 CIDP patients in the study by Bjelica et al (220), and an additional 20% had previously taken medication for neuropathic pain. The quality of pain encompassed many different typical symptoms of neuropathic pain such as burning, dysaesthesiae and others. Non-neuropathic pain in CIDP has not been specifically studied but nociceptive/mechanical pain may be secondary to degenerative changes related to muscle weakness, altered gait and muscle usage patterns, and foot collapse. Radicular pain due to compression of hypertrophic spinal roots has been reported rarely in CIDP (221). There is low certainty evidence for treatment of pain in CIDP. The use of anti-neuropathic pain drugs in CIDP is described in only a few small uncontrolled series (218,220). This limited evidence does not suggest that treatment of neuropathic pain in CIDP should differ from other neuropathic pain conditions. Immune treatment (mostly steroids and/or IVIg), although primarily given to treat motor and sensory deficit, also improved pain in 89% of 46 patients with painful CIDP in pooled uncontrolled small series reviewed by Michaelides et al. (218). However, this evidence is very low certainty, and pain has not been investigated as an outcome in controlled trials demonstrating efficacy of immune treatments. The Task Force does not recommend using immune treatment primarily for treating pain. There are no reports on treatment of nociceptive/mechanical pain in CIDP.

Rationale: Despite the absence of evidence of efficacy of pharmacological treatments for neuropathic pain in CIDP, its widespread use in practice in patients with neuropathic pain and CIDP, and their proven efficacy in other neuropathic pain disorders justifies its use in CIDP patients with pain. Drugs for neuropathic pain often cause side-effects, but in patients with severe pain the potential gains were judged to outweigh these. Pain treatment is feasible, acceptable and reasonably affordable.

Recommendations and Good Practice Points

Good Practice Points for defining diagnostic criteria for CIDP (Flowchart 1):

1. Clinical: typical CIDP and CIDP variants (Table 1)
2. Electrodiagnostic: CIDP and possible CIDP (Tables 2 and 3)
3. Supportive: CSF, imaging (ultrasound, MRI), nerve biopsy and treatment response (PICO 2-4, 6)
4. Categories: CIDP and possible CIDP (Table 6)

Recommendations and Good Practice Points for treatment of CIDP (Flowchart 3)**:**

For induction treatment

1. IVIg or corticosteroids should be considered in typical CIDP and CIDP variants in the presence of disabling symptoms (strong recommendation). Plasma exchange is similarly effective but may be less well tolerated and more difficult to administer (strong recommendation). The presence of relative contraindications to any of these treatments may influence the choice (weak recommendation). The advantages and disadvantages should be explained to the patient who should be involved in the decision making (Good Practice Point).

2. If the objective response is inadequate or the maintenance doses of the initial treatment (IVIg, corticosteroids, or plasma exchange) result in significant side-effects, the other first-line treatment alternatives should be tried before considering combination treatments (strong recommendation). Adding an immunosuppressant or immunomodulatory drug may be considered, but there is no sufficient evidence to recommend any particular drug (Good Practice Point).

3. In motor CIDP, IVIg should be considered as the initial treatment (Good Practice Point).

For maintenance treatment

1. If the first-line treatment is effective, continuation should be considered until the maximum benefit has been achieved (strong recommendation) and then the dose reduced or the interval increased to find the lowest effective maintenance dose (Good Practice Point).

2. Subcutaneous immunoglobulin (SCIg) and IVIg can both be considered as maintenance treatment in IVIg-responsive patients with active disease (strong recommendation).

3. Neuropathic pain should be treated with drugs according to published guidelines on treatment of neuropathic pain (Good Practice Point).

4. Advice about foot care, exercise, diet, driving, and life style management should be considered. Depending on the needs of the patient, orthoses, physiotherapy, occupational therapy, psychological support and referral to a rehabilitation specialist should be considered (Good Practice Points). Information about patient support groups should be offered (Good Practice Point).

Box - Population/Intervention/Comparison/Outcome (PICO) questions

DIAGNOSTIC PICOS (systematic literature search and consensus)

PICO 1. Electrodiagnosis - In patients with suspected CIDP, does the use of electrophysiology/electrodiagnosis (motor and sensory nerve conduction studies, somatosensory evoked potentials, root stimulation, triple stimulation technique, nerve excitability studies, and electromyography), compared to not using electrodiagnosis, influence diagnostic accuracy and patient outcome?

PICO 2. Response to treatment as diagnostic criterion - In patients with suspected CIDP, does the use of patients' response to treatment (subjective vs objective), compared to not considering response to treatment, influence diagnostic accuracy and patient outcome?

PICO 3. MRI or ultrasound - In patients with suspected CIDP, does the use of imaging - MRI (thickening or abnormal enhancement of cervical/lumbar nerve roots or brachial/lumbar plexus) or nerve ultrasound (increased cross-sectional area of peripheral nerves or roots compared with normal values), compared to no imaging, influence diagnostic accuracy and patient outcome (treatment response and clinical course)?

PICO 4. CSF - In patients with suspected CIDP, does the use of CSF examination compared to not using CSF examination, influence diagnostic accuracy and patient outcome? Are thresholds for raised protein different in children < 16 years old or in any patient, or in subgroups with diabetes, or previous spinal surgery?

PICO 5. Antibodies - In patient with suspected CIDP, does testing for the presence of serum auto-antibodies, including anti-nodal and paranodal antibodies (contactin1, contactin1/contactin-associated protein1 complex, neurofascin155, neurofascin140/neurofascin186, contactin-associated protein1), anti-ganglioside antibodies, and anti-MAG antibodies, compared to not testing for antibodies, influence diagnostic accuracy and patient outcome?

PICO 6. Nerve biopsy - In patients with suspected CIDP, does nerve biopsy (looking for macrophage-associated demyelination, onion bulb formation, demyelinated and to a lesser extent remyelinated nerve fibres, endoneurial oedema, endoneurial mononuclear cell infiltration, loss of transverse bands or paranodal loop detachment, teased fibre analysis), compared to no nerve biopsy, influence diagnostic accuracy and patient outcome?

PICO 7. Monoclonal gammopathies - In patient with suspected CIDP, does testing for the presence of IgG, IgA, IgM or light chain monoclonal gammopathies, compared with not testing for monoclonal s influence diagnostic accuracy and patient outcome?

TREATMENT PICOS (systematic literature search and GRADE)

PICO 8. Corticosteroids - In patients with CIDP, does treatment with corticosteroids, compared to no treatment with corticosteroids or corticosteroids in a different dose/timing influence impairment, disability, and quality of life? Are treatment effects different in CIDP variants and in children (< 16 years)?

PICO 9. Immunoglobulin - In patients with CIDP, does treatment with IV or SC immunoglobulins, compared to no treatment with immunoglobulins or immunoglobulins in a different dose/timing, influence impairment, disability, and quality of life? Are treatment effects different in CIDP variants and in children (< 16 years)?

PICO 10. Plasma exchange - In patients with CIDP, does treatment with plasma exchange, compared to no treatment with plasma exchange or plasma exchange in a different dose/timing, influence impairment, disability, and quality of life? Are treatment effects different in children (< 16 years)?

PICO 11. Other immune treatments - In patients with CIDP, does treatment with immunomodulatory drugs other than corticosteroids, immunoglobulins and plasma exchange, compared to no treatment with immunomodulatory drugs or immunomodulatory drugs in a different dose/timing, influence impairment, disability, and quality of life? Are treatment effects different in children (< 16 years)?

PICO 12. Pain treatment - In patients with CIDP, do drugs for pain relief (anti-epileptic, antidepressant, opiates or opiate analogues, cannabinoids, acetaminophen, NSAIDs or other typical or atypical analgesia), compared to no pain relief or other analgesia influence pain, fatigue, and quality of life?

Table 1. Clinical criteria for CIDP

Typical CIDP

All the following:

- Progressive or relapsing, symmetric, proximal and distal muscle weakness of upper and lower limbs, and sensory involvement of at least 2 limbs
- Developing over at least 8 weeks
- Absent or reduced tendon reflexes in all limbs

CIDP variants

One of the following, but otherwise as in typical CIDP (tendon reflexes may be normal in unaffected limbs):

- Distal CIDP: distal sensory loss and muscle weakness predominantly in lower limbs
- Multifocal CIDP: sensory loss and muscle weakness in a multifocal pattern, usually asymmetric, upper limb predominant, in more than 1 limb
- Focal CIDP: sensory loss and muscle weakness in only 1 limb
- Motor CIDP: motor symptoms and signs without sensory involvement
- Sensory CIDP: sensory symptoms and signs without motor involvement

Table 2. Motor nerve conduction criteria

(1) Strongly supportive of demyelination: at least one of the following:

(a) Motor distal latency prolongation ≥ 50% above ULN in 2 nerves (excluding median neuropathy at the wrist from carpal tunnel syndrome), or

(b) Reduction of motor conduction velocity ≥ 30% below LLN in 2 nerves, or

(c) Prolongation of F-wave latency ≥ 20% above ULN in 2 nerves (≥ 50% if amplitude of distal negative peak CMAP < 80% of LLN values), or

(d) Absence of F-waves in 2 nerves if these nerves have distal negative peak CMAP amplitudes ≥ 20% of LLN, + ≥ 1 other demyelinating parameter[a] in ≥ 1 other nerve, or

(e) Motor conduction block: ≥ 30% reduction of the proximal relative to distal negative peak CMAP amplitude, excluding the tibial nerve, and distal negative peak CMAP amplitude ≥ 20% of LLN, in 2 nerves; or in 1 nerve + ≥ 1 other demyelinating parameter[a] except absence of F-waves in ≥ 1 other nerve, or

(f) Abnormal temporal dispersion: > 30% duration increase between the proximal and distal negative peak CMAP (at least 100% in the tibial nerve) in ≥ 2 nerves, or

(g) Distal CMAP duration (interval between onset of the first negative peak and return to baseline of the last negative peak) prolongation in ≥ 1 nerve[b] + ≥ 1 other demyelinating parameter[a] in ≥ 1 other nerve

- (LFF 2 Hz) median > 8.4 ms, ulnar > 9.6 ms, peroneal > 8.8 ms, tibial > 9.2 ms
- (LFF 5 Hz) median > 8.0 ms, ulnar > 8.6 ms, peroneal > 8.5 ms, tibial > 8.3 ms
- (LFF 10 Hz) median > 7.8 ms, ulnar > 8.5 ms, peroneal > 8.3 ms, tibial > 9.2 ms
- (LFF 20 Hz) median > 7.4 ms, ulnar > 7.8 ms, peroneal > 8.1 ms, tibial > 8.0 ms

(2) Weakly supportive of demyelination
As in (1) but in only one nerve.

CMAP, compound muscle action potential; ULN, upper limit of normal values; LLN, lower limit of normal values. [a] Any nerve meeting any of the criteria (a–g). [b] Mitsuma et al. (222). LLF, low frequency filter.

NOTE 1. These criteria have been established by using a frequency filter bandpass of 2 Hz – 10kHz for all parameters, except for distal CMAP duration prolongation where separate criteria were defined for 4 different low frequency

filters (LFF) of 2, 5, 10, and 20 Hz. Skin temperature should be maintained to at least 33°C at the palm and 30°C at the external malleolus.

NOTE 2. Extensiveness of motor nerve conduction studies (number of nerves to be studied and proximal studies):

- To apply motor nerve conduction criteria, the median, ulnar (stimulated below the elbow), peroneal (stimulated below the fibular head), and tibial nerves on one side are tested.
- If criteria are not fulfilled, the same nerves are tested at the other side, and/or the ulnar and median nerves are stimulated at the axilla and at Erb's point.
- Motor conduction block or slowing is not considered in the ulnar nerve across the elbow or the peroneal nerve across the knee. Between Erb's point and the wrist, at least 50% CMAP amplitude reduction is required for probable conduction block in the ulnar and median nerves. Proximal studies of the median nerve may require collision techniques to avoid ulnar nerve components in the median nerve CMAP when recorded from the *abductor pollicis brevis* muscle (but not when recorded from the *flexor carpi radialis* muscle) (3,4,48,223,224).
- For ulnar motor conduction block in the forearm, a Martin-Gruber anastomosis should be ruled out with stimulation of the median nerve at the elbow recording over the *abductor digiti minimi* muscle.
- For median motor conduction block in the forearm, co-stimulation of the ulnar nerve at the wrist must be ruled out. Stimulation of the median nerve at the wrist while simultaneously recording over the *abductor pollicis brevis* muscle and the *abductor digiti minimi* muscle can detect ulnar nerve co-stimulation; stimulation should be adapted so that no CMAP is recorded from the ulnar nerve-innervated *abductor digiti minimi* muscle.
- If distal CMAP amplitudes are severely reduced (< 1mV), recording from more proximal muscles innervated by the peroneal, median, or radial nerve, may be attempted to demonstrate motor nerve conduction slowing meeting electrodiagnostic criteria.

Table 3. Sensory nerve conduction criteria

(1) CIDP

- Sensory conduction abnormalities (prolonged distal latency, or reduced SNAP amplitude, or slowed conduction velocity outside of normal limits) in 2 nerves.

(2) Possible CIDP

- As in (1) but in only one nerve.
- Sensory CIDP with normal motor nerve conduction studies:
  - sensory nerve conduction velocity < 80% of LLN (for SNAP amplitude > 80% of LLN) or < 70% of LLN (or SNAP amplitude < 80% of LLN) (225) in at least 2 nerves (median, ulnar, radial, sural nerve), or
  - sural sparing pattern (abnormal median or radial sensory nerve action potential (SNAP) with normal sural nerve SNAP) (excluding carpal tunnel syndrome) (225-227).

SNAP, sensory nerve action potential; LLN, lower limit of normal. Skin temperature should be maintained to at least 33°C at the palm and 30°C at the external malleolus.

NOTE 1. Since these criteria do not permit to identify normal reference values compatible with sensory nerve demyelination, sensory CIDP cannot be more than a possible diagnosis as based on clinical and electrophysiological criteria.

NOTE 2. Decline in sural nerve action potential amplitude occurs with age and use of age-dependent reference values after age 60 are recommended (228).

Table 4. Differential diagnosis (see Flowchart 2)*

Typical CIDP

- AL amyloidosis, hATTR polyneuropathy
- Chronic ataxic neuropathy ophthalmoplegia M-protein agglutination disialosyl antibodies (CANOMAD)
- Guillain-Barré syndrome
- Hepatic neuropathy
- HIV-related neuropathy
- Multiple myeloma
- Osteosclerotic myeloma
- POEMS syndrome
- Uremic neuropathy
- Vitamin B12 deficiency – actual or functional (e.g., nitrous oxide poisoning)

Distal CIDP

- Diabetic neuropathy
- Hereditary neuropathies (CMT1, CMTX1, CMT4, metachromatic leukodystrophy, Refsum disease, adrenomyeloneuropathy, hATTR polyneuropathy)
- Anti-MAG IgM neuropathy
- POEMS syndrome
- Vasculitic neuropathy

Multifocal and focal CIDP

- Diabetic radiculopathy/plexopathy
- Entrapment neuropathies
- Hereditary neuropathy with liability to pressure palsies (HNPP)
- Multifocal motor neuropathy (MMN)
- Neuralgic amyotrophy
- Peripheral nerve tumours (such as lymphoma, perineurioma, schwannoma, neurofibroma)
- Vasculitic neuropathy (mononeuritis multiplex)

Motor CIDP

- Hereditary motor neuropathies (such as distal hereditary motor neuropathies, spinal muscular atrophy, porphyria)
- Inflammatory myopathies

- Motor neurone disease
- Neuromuscular junction disorders (such as myasthenia gravis, Lambert-Eaton syndrome)

Sensory CIDP

- Cerebellar ataxia, neuropathy, vestibular areflexia syndrome (CANVAS)
- Chronic immune sensory polyradiculopathy (CISP)
- Dorsal column lesions (such as syphilis, paraneoplastic, copper deficiency, vitamin B12 deficiency)
- Hereditary sensory neuropathies
- Idiopathic sensory neuropathy
- Sensory neuronopathy
- Toxic neuropathies (such as chemotherapy and vitamin B6 toxicity)

*The differential diagnosis includes the disorders listed but is not limited to these.

Table 5. Investigations to be considered

Studies strongly recommended in typical CIDP and in CIDP variants:

- Electrodiagnosis including motor and sensory nerve conduction studies
- Serum and urine monoclonal protein detection by immunofixation
- Fasting blood glucose
- Complete blood count
- Renal function
- Liver function

Studies to be performed if indicated in typical CIDP and in CIDP variants:

- Ultrasound of the brachial plexus and cervical nerve roots in adult patients
- MRI of cervical and lumbosacral nerve roots in adult patients
- Cerebrospinal fluid examination including cells and protein
- Nerve biopsy
- Glycosylated hemoglobin (HbA1c)
- Borrelia burgdorferi serology
- C reactive protein
- Antinuclear antibody antibodies (ANA)
- HIV serology
- Serum vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF)
- Anti-MAG antibodies (when IgM monoclonal gammopathy present)
- Nodal-paranodal protein antibodies
- Skeletal survey
- Chest X ray
- Genetic testing for hereditary neuropathy

Additional studies if indicated in CIDP variants:

<u>Distal CIDP</u>

- Anti-MAG antibodies when IgM monoclonal gammopathy present

<u>Multifocal and focal CIDP</u>

- Antinuclear antibodies (ANA) and antineutrophil cytoplasmic antibodies (ANCA)

- Anti-GM1 IgM antibodies

Motor CIDP

- Creatine kinase level
- Muscle biopsy
- Neuromuscular junction evaluation (repetitive stimulation, antibodies against acetylcholine receptors, MuSK, or presynaptic voltage-gated calcium channels)

Sensory CIDP

- IgM paraproteinaemic neuropathy with anti-MAG antibodies (anti-MAG neuropathy)
- Antiganglioside antibodies
- Vitamin B12 and B6
- Somatosensory evoked potentials when nerve conduction studies are normal

Table 6. Diagnostic categories (Flowchart 1)

Typical CIDP

Typical CIDP

- Clinical criteria + motor nerve conduction criteria in 2 nerves + sensory nerve conduction abnormalities in 2 nerves; or
- Possible typical CIDP + at least 2 supportive criteria

Possible typical CIDP

- Clinical criteria + motor nerve conduction criteria in 1 nerve + sensory nerve conduction abnormalities in 1 nerve; or
- Clinical criteria + nerve conduction abnormalities not fulfilling CIDP motor nerve conduction criteria in 1 nerve + sensory nerve conduction abnormalities in 2 nerves + objective response to treatment + 1 other supportive criterion

Multifocal or focal CIDP

Multifocal or focal CIDP

- Clinical criteria + motor nerve conduction criteria in 2 nerves + sensory nerve conduction abnormalities in 2 nerves; or
- Possible multifocal and focal CIDP + at least 2 supportive criteria

Possible multifocal or focal CIDP

- Clinical criteria + motor nerve conduction criteria in 1 nerve + sensory nerve conduction abnormalities in 1 nerve
- Focal CIDP fulfilling clinical criteria + motor nerve conduction criteria 1 nerve + sensory nerve conduction abnormalities in 1 nerve (possible focal CIDP only, cannot be upgraded by supportive criteria)

Distal CIDP

Distal CIDP

- Clinical criteria + motor nerve conduction criteria in 2 upper limb nerves + sensory nerve conduction abnormalities in 2 nerves; or
- Possible distal CIDP + at least 2 supportive criteria

Possible distal CIDP

- Clinical criteria + motor nerve conduction criteria in 1 upper limb nerve + sensory nerve conduction abnormalities in 1 nerve; or
- Clinical criteria + motor nerve conduction criteria in 2 lower limbs nerves only + sensory nerve conduction abnormalities in 2 nerves (possible distal CIDP only, cannot be upgraded by supportive criteria)

Motor CIDP

Motor CIDP

- Clinical criteria + Motor nerve conduction criteria in 2 nerves + normal sensory nerve conduction in 4 nerves: or Possible motor CIDP + at least 2 supportive criteria

Possible motor CIDP

- Clinical criteria + Motor nerve conduction criteria in 1 nerve + normal sensory nerve conduction in 4 nerves

Motor-predominant CIDP

As in motor CIDP but with sensory nerve conduction abnormalities in 2 nerves

Sensory CIDP

Possible sensory CIDP

- Clinical criteria + sensory nerve conduction criteria (possible distal CIDP only, cannot be upgraded by supportive criteria)

Sensory-predominant CIDP

As in sensory CIDP but with motor nerve conduction abnormalities in 2 nerves. If motor conduction criteria are fulfilled in 2 nerves, possible sensory-predominant CIDP becomes sensory-predominant CIDP.

Flowchart legends

Flowchart 1. Diagnostic criteria and categories of CIDP and CIDP variants (PICOs 1-4, 6).

Flowchart 2. Red flags that suggest another diagnosis than CIDP and CIDP variants (Table 4).

Flowchart 3. Induction and maintenance treatment of CIDP (PICOs 8-11).

References

1. European Federation of Neurological Societies/Peripheral Nerve Society Guideline on management of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. Report of a joint task force of the European Federation of Neurological Societies and the Peripheral Nerve Society. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2005; **10**: 220-228.
2. Hughes RA, Bouche P, Cornblath DR, Evers E, Hadden RD, Hahn A, Illa I, Koski CL, Léger JM, Nobile-Orazio E, Pollard J, Sommer C, Van den Bergh P, van Doorn PA, van Schaik IN. European Federation of Neurological Societies/Peripheral Nerve Society guideline on management of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy: report of a joint task force of the European Federation of Neurological Societies and the Peripheral Nerve Society. *Eur J Neurol* 2006; **13**: 326-332.
3. European Federation of Neurological Societies/Peripheral Nerve Society Guideline on management of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy: report of a joint task force of the European Federation of Neurological Societies and the Peripheral Nerve Society--First Revision. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2010; **15**: 1-9.
4. Van den Bergh PYK, Hadden RDM, Bouche P, Cornblath DR, Hahn A, Illa I, Koski CL, Léger JM, Nobile-Orazio E, Pollard J, Sommer C, van Doorn PA, van Schaik IN; European Federation of Neurological Societies; Peripheral Nerve Society. European Federation of Neurological Societies/Peripheral Nerve Society Guideline on management of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy: report of a joint task force of the European Federation of Neurological Societies and the Peripheral Nerve Society – First revision. *Eur J Neurol* 2010; **17**: 356-363.
5. Schünemann HJ, Guyatt G, Oxman A, editors. GRADE handbook for grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. Updated October 2013. ed: The GRADE Working Group; 2013.
6. Tackenberg B, Lünemann JD, Steinbrecher A, Rothenfusser-Korber E, Sailer M, Brück W, Schock S, Zschenderlein R, Zipp F, Sommer N. Classifications and treatment responses in chronic immune-mediated demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Neurology* 2007; **68**: 1622–1629.
7. Rajabally YA, Nicolas G, Pieret F, Bouche P, Van den Bergh PY. Validity of diagnostic criteria for chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy: a multicentre European study. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2009; **80**: 1364-1368.
8. Breiner A, Brannagan 3rd TH. Comparison of sensitivity and specificity among 15 criteria for chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Muscle Nerve* 2014; **50**: 40-46.
9. Rajabally YA, Fowle AJ, Van den Bergh PY. Which criteria for research in CIDP? An analysis of current practice. *Muscle Nerve* 2015; **51**: 932-933.
10. Eftimov F, Vermeulen M, van Doorn PA, Brusse E, van Schaik IN; PREDICT. Long-term remission of CIDP after pulsed dexamethasone or short-term prednisolone treatment. *Neurology* 2012; **78**: 1079-1084.
11. Allen JA, Lewis RA. CIDP diagnostic pitfalls and perception of treatment benefit. *Neurology* 2015; **85**: 498–504.

12. Kaplan A, Brannagan TH. Evaluation of patients with refractory chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Muscle Nerve* 2017; **55**: 476–482.
13. Allen JA, Ney J, Lewis RA. Electrodiagnostic errors contribute to chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy misdiagnosis. *Muscle Nerve* 2018; **57**: 542–549.
14. Rajabally YA, Van den Bergh P. Compliance with international guidelines for chronic inflammatory neuropathies. *Eur J Neurol* 2019; **8**: 285-288.
15. Brouwers MC, Kho ME, Browman GP, Burgers JS, Cluzeau F, Feder G, Fervers B, Graham ID, Grimshaw J, Hanna SE, Littlejohns P, Makarski J, Zitzelsberger L; AGREE Next Steps Consortium. AGREE II: advancing guideline development, reporting and evaluation in health care. *CMAJ* 2010; **182**: E839-842.
16. Leone MA, Keindl M, Schapira AH, Deuschl G, Federico A. Practical recommendations for the process of proposing, planning and writing a neurological management guideline by EAN task forces. *Eur J Neurol* 2015;**22**:1505-1510.
17. Alonso-Coello P, Oxman AD, Moberg J, Brignardello-Petersen R, Akl EA, Davoli M, Treweek S, Mustafa RA, Vandvik PO, Meerpohl J, Guyatt GH, Schünemann HJ; GRADE Working Group. GRADE Evidence to Decision (EtD) frameworks: a systematic and transparent approach to making well informed healthcare choices. 2: Clinical practice guidelines. *BMJ* 2016; **353**: i2089.
18. Schünemann HJ, Mustafa R, Brozek J, Santesso N, Alonso-Coello P, Guyatt G, Scholten R, Langendam M, Leeflang MM, Akl EA, Singh JA, Meerpohl J, Hultcrantz M, Bossuyt P, Oxman AD; GRADE Working Group. GRADE Guidelines: 16. GRADE evidence to decision frameworks for tests in clinical practice and public health. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2016;**76**:89-98.
19. Andrews JC, Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, Pottie K, Meerpohl JJ, Coello PA, Rind D, Montori VM, Brito JP, Norris S, Elbarbary M, Post P, Nasser M, Shukla V, Jaeschke R, Brozek J, Djulbegovic B, Guyatt G. GRADE guidelines: 15. Going from evidence to recommendation-determinants of a recommendation's direction and strength. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2013; **66**:726-735.
20. Stojkovic T, De Seze J, Hurtevent JF, Fourrier F, Vermersch P. Phrenic nerve palsy as a feature of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Muscle Nerve* 2003; **27**: 497-499.
21. Henderson RD, Sandroni P, Wijdicks EF. Chronic inflammatory demyelinating poly- neuropathy and respiratory failure. *J Neurol* 2005; **252**: 1235-1237.
22. Sakakibara R, Hattori T, Kuwabara S, Yamanishi T, Yasuda K. Micturitional disturbance in patients with chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Neurology* 1998; **50**: 1179-1182.
23. Yamamoto K, Watarai M, Hashimoto T, Ikeda S. Chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy with autonomic involvement. *Muscle Nerve* 2005; **31**: 108-112.
24. Boukhris S, Magy L, Li Y, Debras C, Vallat JM. Autonomic nervous system involvement in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Rev Neurol (Paris)* 2005; **161**: 1228-1231.
25. Stamboulis E, Katsaros N, Koutsis G, Iakovidou H, Giannakopoulou A, Simintzi I. Clinical and subclinical autonomic dysfunction in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *Muscle Nerve* 2006; **33**: 78-84.

26. Nevo Y, Pestronk A, Kornberg AJ, Connolly AM, Yee WC, Iqbal I, Connolly AM, Yee WC, Iqbal I, Shield LK. Childhood chronic inflammatory demyelinating neuropathies: clinical course and long-term follow-up. *Neurology* 1996; **47**: 98-102.
27. Simmons Z, Wald JJ, Albers JW. Chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy in children: II. Long-term follow-up, with comparison to adults. *Muscle Nerve* 1997; **20**: 1569-1575.
28. Ryan MM, Grattan-Smith PJ, Procopis PG, Morgan G, Ouvrier RA. Childhood chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy: clinical course and long-term outcome. *Neuromuscul Disord* 2000; **10**: 398-406.
29. Hattori N, Misu K, Koike H, Ichimura M, Nagamatsu M, Hirayama M, Ichimura M, Nagamatsu M, Hirayama M, Sobue G. Age of onset influences clinical features of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *J Neurol Sci* 2001; **184**: 57-63.
30. Ruts et al., 2005 Ruts L, van Koningsveld R, van Doorn PA. Distinguishing acute-onset CIDP from Guillain-Barré syndrome with treatment related fluctuations. *Neurology* 2005; **65**: 138-140.
31. Ruts L, Drenthen J, Jacobs BC, van Doorn PA, Dutch GBS Study Group. Distinguishing acute-onset CIDP from fluctuating Guillain- Barré syndrome. *Neurology* 2010; **74**: 1680-1686.
32. Dionne A, Nicolle MW, Hahn AF. Clinical and electrophysiological parameters distinguishing acute-onset chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy from acute inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Muscle Nerve* 2010; **41**: 202-207.
33. Verma A, Tandan R, Adesina AM, Pendlebury WW, Fries TJ, Bradley WG. Focal neuropathy preceding chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy by several years. *Acta Neurol Scand* 1990; **81**: 516-521.
34. Viala K, Maisonobe T, Stojkovic T, Koutlidis R, Ayrignac X, Musset L, Fournier E, Léger JM, Bouche P. A current view of the diagnosis, clinical variants, response to treatment and prognosis of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *J Periph Nerv Syst* 2010; **15**: 50-56.
35. Doneddu PE, Cocito D, Manganelli F, Fazio R, Briani C, Filosto M, Benedetti L, Mazzeo A, Marfia GA, Cortese A, Fierro B, Jann S, Beghi E, Clerici AM, Carpo M, Schenone A, Luigetti M, Lauria G, Antonini G, Rosso T, Siciliano G, Cavaletti G, Liberatore G, Santoro L, Peci E, Tronci S, Ruiz M, Cotti Piccinelli S, Toscano A, Mataluni G, Piccolo L, Cosentino G, Sabatelli M, Nobile-Orazio E; Italian CIDP Database study group. Atypical CIDP: diagnostic criteria, progression and treatment response. Data from the Italian CIDP Database. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2019; **90**: 125–132.
36. Katz JS, Saperstein DS, Gronseth G, Amato AA, Barohn RJ. Distal acquired demyelinating symmetric neuropathy. *Neurology* 2000; **54**: 615-620.
37. Maisonobe T, Chassande B, Verin M, Jouni M, Léger JM, Bouche P. Chronic dysimmune demyelinating polyneuropathy: a clinical and electrophysiological study of 93 patients. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 1996; **61**: 36-42.
38. Larue S, Bombelli F, Viala K, Neil K, Maisonobe T, Bouche P, Musset L, Fournier E, Léger JM. Non-anti- MAG DADS neuropathy as a variant of CIDP: clinical, electrophysiological, laboratory features and response to treatment in 10 cases. *Eur J Neurol* 2011; **18**: 899-905.

39. Lunn MP, Nobile-Orazio E. Immunotherapy for IgM anti-myelin-associated glycoprotein paraprotein-associated peripheral neuropathies. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2016; **10**: CD002827.
40. Lewis RA, Sumner AJ, Brown MJ, Asbury AK. Multifocal demyelinating neuropathy with persistent conduction block. *Neurology* 1982; **32**: 958-964.
41. Saperstein DS, Amato AA, Wolfe GI, Katz JS, Nations SP, Jackson CE, Bryan WW, Burns DK, Barohn RJ.. Multifocal acquired demyelinating sensory and motor neuropathy: the Lewis-Sumner syndrome. *Muscle Nerve* 1999; **22**: 560-566.
42. Van den Berg-Vos RM, Van den Berg LH, Franssen H, Vermeulen M, Witkamp TD, Jansen GH, van Es HW, Kerkhoff H, Wokke JH. Multifocal inflammatory demyelinating neuropathy: a distinct clinical entity? *Neurology* 2000; **54**: 26-32.
43. Oh SJ, Claussen GC, Kim DS. 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* 1997; **2**: 362-369.
44. Jeanjean AP, Duprez T, Van den Bergh PY. Massive peripheral nerve hypertrophy in a patient with multifocal upper limb demyelinating neuropathy (Lewis-Sumner syndrome). *Acta Neurol Belg* 2001; **101**: 234-238.
45. Weiss MD, Oakley JC, Meekins GD. Hypoglossal neuropathy in Lewis-Sumner syndrome masquerading as motor neuron disease. *Neurology* 2006; **67**: 175-176.
46. Rajabally YA, Chavada G. Lewis-Sumner syndrome of pure upper-limb onset: diagnostic, prognostic, and therapeutic features. *Muscle Nerve* 2009; **39**: 206-220.
47. Rabin M, Mutlu G, Stojkovic T, Maisonobe, Lenglet T, Fournier E, Bouche P, Léger JM, Viala K. Chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy: search for factors associated with treatment dependence or successful withdrawal. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2014; **85**: 901-906.
48. Lucke IM, Wieske L, van der Kooi AJ, van Schaik IN, Eftimov F, Verhamme C. Diagnosis and treatment response in the asymmetric variant of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2019; **24**: 174-179.
49. Thomas PK, Claus D, Jaspert A, Workman JM, King RH, Larner AJ, Anderson M, Emerson JA, Ferguson IT. Focal upper limb demyelinating neuropathy. *Brain* 1996**; 119**: 765-774.
50. Van den Bergh PY, Thonnard JL, Duprez T, Laterre EC. Chronic demyelinating hypertrophic brachial plexus neuropathy. *Muscle Nerve* 2000; **23**: 283-288.
51. Donaghy M, Mills KR, Boniface SJ, Simmons J, Wright I, Gregson N, Jacobs J. Pure motor demyelinating neuropathy: deterioration after steroid treatment and improvement with intravenous immunoglobulin. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 1994; **57**: 778-783.
52. Sabatelli M, Madia F, Mignogna T, Lippi L, Quaranta L, Tonali P. Pure motor chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *J Neurol* 2001; **248**: 772-777.
53. Joint Task Force of the EFNS and the PNS. 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--first revision. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2010; **15**: 295-301.

54. Pegat A, Boisseau W, Maisonobe T, Debs R, Lenglet T, Psimaras D, Azoulay-Cayla A, Fournier E, Viala K. Motor chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy (CIDP) in 17 patients: Clinical characteristics, electrophysiological study, and response to treatment. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2020; **25**: 162-170.
55. Eftimov F, Liesdek MH, Verhamme C, van Schaik IN; PREDICT study group. Deterioration after corticosteroids in CIDP may be associated with pure focal demyelination pattern. *BMC Neurol* 2014; **14**: 72. doi: 10.1186/1471-2377-14-72.
56. Oh SJ, Joy JL, Kuruoglu R. Chronic sensory demyelinating neuropathy: chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy presenting as a pure sensory neuropathy. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 1992; **55**: 677-680.
57. Ayrignac X, Viala K, Koutlidis RM, Taïeb G, Stojkovic T, Musset L, Léger JM, Fournier E, Maisonobe T, Bouche P. Sensory chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy: an under-recognized entity? *Muscle Nerve* 2013; **48**: 727–732.
58. Berger AR, Herskovitz S, Kaplan J. Late motor involvement in cases presenting as ''chronic sensory demyelinating polyneuropathy''. *Muscle Nerve* 1995; **8**: 440-444.
59. Thonnard JL, Detrembleur C, Van den Bergh PYK. Assessment of hand function in a patient with chronic sensory demyelinating neuropathy. *Neurology* 1997; **49**: 253-257.
60. van Dijk GW, Notermans NC, Franssen H, Wokke JH. Development of weakness in patients with chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy and only sensory symptoms at presentation: a long-term follow-up study. *J Neurol* 1999; **246**: 1134-1139.
61. Sinnreich M, Klein CJ, Daube JR, Engelstad J, Spinner RJ, Dyck PJB. Chronic immune sensory polyradiculoneuropathy: a possibly treatable sensory ataxia. *Neurology* 2004; **63**: 1662–1669.
62. Rajabally YA, Wong SL. Chronic inflammatory pure sensory polyradiculoneuropathy: a rare CIDP variant with unusual electrophysiology. *J Clin Neuromuscul Dis* 2012; **13**: 149-152.
63. Clerici AM, Nobile-Orazio E, Mauri M, Squellati FS, Bono GG. Utility of somatosensory evoked potentials in the assessment of response to IVIG in a long-lasting case of chronic immune sensory polyradiculopathy. *BMC Neurol* 2017; **17**: 127.
64. Querol L, Devaux J, Rojas-Garcia R, Illa I. Autoantibodies in chronic inflammatory neuropathies: Diagnostic and therapeutic implications. *Nat Rev Neurol* 2017; **13**: 533-547.
65. Vural A, Doppler K, Meinl E. Autoantibodies against the node of Ranvier in seropositive chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy: diagnostic, pathogenic, and therapeutic relevance. *Front Immunol* 2018; **9**: 1-14.
66. Querol L, Nogales-Gadea G, Rojas-Garcia R, Martinez-Hernandez E, Diaz-Manera J, Suárez-Calvet X, Navas M, Araque J, Gallardo E, Illa I. Antibodies to contactin-1 in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Ann Neurol* 2013; **73**: 370-380.
67. Doppler K, Appeltshauser L, Wilhelmi K, Villmann C, Dib-Hajj SD, Waxman SG, Mäurer M, Weishaupt A, Sommer C. Destruction of paranodal architecture in inflammatory neuropathy with anti-contactin-1 autoantibodies. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2015; **86**: 720-728.

68. Miura Y, Devaux JJ, Fukami Y, Manso C, Belghazi M, Wong AH, Yuki N; CNTN1-CIDP Study Group. Contactin 1 IgG4 associates to chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy with sensory ataxia. *Brain* 2015; **138**: 1484-1491.
69. Querol L, Nogales-Gadea G, Rojas-Garcia R, Diaz-Manera J, Pardo J, Ortega-Moreno A, Sedano MJ, Gallardo E, Berciano J, Blesa R, Dalmau J, Illa I. Neurofascin IgG4 antibodies in CIDP associate with disabling tremor and poor response to IVIg. *Neurology* 2014; **82**: 879-886.
70. Ogata H, Yamasaki R, Hiwatashi A, Oka N, Kawamura N, Matsuse D, Kuwahara M, Suzuki H, Kusunoki S, Fujimoto Y, Ikezoe K, Kishida H, Tanaka F, Matsushita T, Murai H, Kira J. Characterization of IgG4 anti-neurofascin 155 antibody-positive polyneuropathy. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol* 2015; **2**: 960-971.
71. Devaux JJ, Miura Y, Fukami Y, Inoue T, Manso C, Belghazi M, Sekiguchi K, Kokubun N, Ichikawa H, Wong AH, Yuki N. Neurofascin-155 IgG4 in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Neurology* 2016; **86**: 800-807.
72. Doppler K, Appeltshauser L, Villmann C, Martin C, Peles E, Krämer HH, Haarmann A, Buttmann M, Sommer C.. Auto-antibodies to contactin-associated protein 1 (Caspr) in two patients with painful inflammatory neuropathy. *Brain* 2016; **139**: 2617-2630.
73. Cortese A, Lombardi R, Briani C, Callegari I, Benedetti L, Manganelli F, Luigetti M, Ferrari S, Clerici AM, Marfia GA, Rigamonti A, Carpo M, Fazio R, Corbo M, Mazzeo A, Giannini F, Cosentino G, Zardini E, Currò R, Gastaldi M, Vegezzi E, Alfonsi E, Berardinelli A, Kouton L, Manso C, Giannotta C, Doneddu P, Dacci P, Piccolo L, Ruiz M, Salvalaggio A, De Michelis C, Spina E, Topa A, Bisogni G, Romano A, Mariotto S, Mataluni G, Cerri F, Stancanelli C, Sabatelli M, Schenone A, Marchioni E, Lauria G, Nobile-Orazio E, Devaux J, Franciotta D. Antibodies to neurofascin, contactin-1, and contactin-associated protein 1 in CIDP: Clinical relevance of IgG isotype. *Neurol Neuroimmunol Neuroinflamm* 2020; **7**: e639.
74. Pascual-Goñi E, Fehmi J, Lleixà C, Martín-Aguilar L, Devaux J, Höftberger R, Delmont E, Doppler K, Sommer C, Radunovic A, Carvajal A, Smyth S, Williams L, Mazanec R, Potočková V, Hinds N, Cassereau J, Viala K, Lefilliatre M, Nicolas G, Foley P, Leypoldt F, Keddie S, Lunn MP, Zimprich F, Nunkoo VS, Löscher WN, Martínez-Martínez L, Díaz-Manera J, Rojas-Garcia R, Illa I, Rinaldi S, Querol L. Antibodies to the Caspr1/contactin-1 complex in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Brain* 2021 (in press).
75. Delmont E, Manso C, Querol L, Cortese A, Berardinelli A, Lozza A, Belghazi M, Malissart P, Labauge P, Taieb G, Yuki N, Illa I, Attarian S, Devaux JJ. Autoantibodies to nodal isoforms of neurofascin in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Brain* 2017; **140**: 1851-1858.
76. Stengel H, Vural A, Brunder A-M, Heinius A, Appeltshauser L, Fiebig B, Giese F, Dresel C, Papagianni A, Birklein F, Weis J, Huchtemann T, Schmidt C, Körtvelyessy P, Villmann C, Meinl E, Sommer C, Leypoldt F, Doppler K. Anti–pan-neurofascin IgG3 as a marker of fulminant autoimmune neuropathy. *Neurol Neuroimmunol Neuroinflamm* 2019; **6**: e603.
77. Doppler K, Appeltshauser L, Wilhelmi K, Villmann C, Dib-Hajj SD, Waxman SG, Mäurer M, Weishaupt A, Sommer C. Destruction of paranodal architecture in inflammatory neuropathy with anti-contactin-1 autoantibodies. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2015; **86**: 720-728.

78. Vallat JM, Yuki N, Sekiguchi K, Kokubun N, Oka N, Mathis S, Magy L, Sherman DL, Brophy PJ, Devaux JJ. Paranodal lesions in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy associated with anti-neurofascin 155 antibodies. *Neuromuscul Disord* 2017; **27**: 290-293.
79. Koike H, Nishi R, Ikeda S, Kawagashira Y, Iijima M, Katsuno M, Sobue G. Ultrastructural mechanisms of macrophage-induced demyelination in CIDP. *Neurology* 2018**; 4**: 1051-1060.
80. Querol L, Rojas-Garcia R, Diaz-Manera J, Barcena J, Pardo J, Ortega-Moreno A, Sedano MJ, Seró-Ballesteros L, Carvajal A, Ortiz N, Gallardo E, Illa I. Rituximab in treatment-resistant CIDP with antibodies against paranodal proteins. *Neurol Neuroimmunol Neuroinflamm* 2015; **2**: e149.
81. Doppler K, Schuster Y, Appeltshauser L, Biko L, Villmann C, Weishaupt A, Werner C, Sommer C. Anti-CNTN1 IgG3 induces acute conduction block and motor deficits in a passive transfer rat model. *J Neuroinflammation* 2019; **16**: 73.
82. Tsouni, P., et al., Anti-TNF alpha medications and neuropathy. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2015; 20: 397-402.
83. Psimaras, D., et al., Immune checkpoint inhibitors-induced neuromuscular toxicity: From pathogenesis to treatment. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2019; **24** Suppl 2: S74-S85.
84. Velasco R, Alberti P, Bruna J, Psimaras D, Argyriou AA. Bortezomib and other proteosome inhibitors-induced peripheral neurotoxicity: From pathogenesis to treatment. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2019; **24** Suppl 2: S52-S62.
85. Van den Bergh PY, Piéret F. Electrodiagnostic criteria for acute and chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *Muscle Nerve* 2004; **29**: 565-574.
86. Koski CL, Baumgarten M, Magder LS, Barohn RJ, Goldstein J, Graves M, Gorson K, Hahn AF, Hughes RA, Katz J, Lewis RA, Parry GJ, van Doorn P, Cornblath DR. Derivation and validation of diagnostic criteria for chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *J Neurol Sci* 2009; **277**: 1-8.
87. van Nes SI, Vanhoutte EK, van Doorn PA, Hermans M, Bakkers M, Kuitwaard K, Faber CG, Merkies IS. Rasch-built Overall Disability Scale (R-ODS) for immune-mediated peripheral neuropathies. *Neurology* 2011; **76**: 337-345.
88. van Schaik IN, Bril V, van Geloven N, Hartung HP, Lewis RA, Sobue G, Lawo JP, Praus M, Mielke O, Durn BL, Cornblath DR, Merkies ISJ; PATH study group. Subcutaneous immunoglobulin for maintenance treatment in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy (PATH): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Neurol* 2018; **17**: 35-46.
89. Rajabally YR and Gashemi M. Comparative value and determinants of suitability of outcome measures in treated chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Muscle Nerve* 2019; **61**: 182–186.
90. Merkies IS, Schmitz PI, van der Meché FG, Samijn JP, van Doorn PA; Inflammatory Neuropathy Cause and Treatment (INCAT) group. Clinimetric evaluation of a new overall disability scale in immune mediated polyneuropathies. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2002; **72**: 596-601.
91. Merkies IS, van Nes SI, Hanna K, Hughes RA, Deng C. Confirming the efficacy of intravenous immunoglobulin in CIDP through minimum clinically important differences: shifting from statistical significance to clinical relevance. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2010; **81**: 1194-1199.

92. Medical Research Council. Aids to the investigation of the peripheral nervous system. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office; 1943.
93. Merkies IS, Schmitz PI, van der Meché FG, van Doorn PA. Psychometric evaluation of a new sensory scale in immune-mediated polyneuropathies. Inflammatory Neuropathy Cause and Treatment (INCAT) Group. *Neurology* 2000; **54**: 943-949.
94. Dyck PJ, Boes CJ, Mulder D, Millikan C, Windebank AJ, Dyck PJ, Espinosa R. History of standard scoring, notation, and summation of neuromuscular signs. A current survey and recommendation. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2005; **10**: 158-173.
95. Vanhoutte EK, Latov N, Deng C, Hanna K, Hughes RA, Bril V, Dalakas MC, Donofrio P, van Doorn PA, Hartung HP, Merkies IS. Vigorimeter grip strength in CIDP: a responsive tool that rapidly measures the effect of IVIG—the ICE study. *Eur J Neurol* 2013; **20**: 748–755.
96. Doneddu PE, Mandia D, Gentile F, Gallia F, Liberatore G, Terenghi F, Ruiz M, Nobile-Orazio E. Home monitoring of maintenance intravenous immunoglobulin therapy in patients with chronic inflammatory neuropathy. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2020; **25**: 238-246.
97. Allen JA, Pasnoor M, Dimachkie MM, Ajroud-Driss S, Brannagan TH, Cook AA, Walton T, Fiecas MB, Kissel J, Merkies I, Gorson KC, Lewis RA. Quantifying Treatment-related Fluctuations in CIDP: Results of the GRIPPER study. *Neurology* 2021 (accepted).
98. Oaklander AL, Lunn MP, Hughes RA, van Schaik IN, Frost C, Chalk CH. Treatments for chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy (CIDP): an overview of systematic reviews. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2017; **1**: CD010369.
99. Kuitwaard K, Hahn AF, Vermeulen M, Venance SL, van Doorn PA. Intravenous immunoglobulin response in treatment-naïve chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2015; **86**: 1331–1336.
100. Cocito D, Paolasso I, Antonini G, Benedetti L, Briani C, Comi C, Fazio R, Jann S, Matà S, Mazzeo A, Sabatelli M, Nobile-Orazio E; Italian Network for CIDP. A nationwide retrospective analysis on the effect of immune therapies in patients with chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *Eur J Neurol* 2010; **17**: 289-294.
101. Chan Y-C, Allen DC, Fialho D, Mills KR, Hughes RAC. Predicting response to treatment in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2006; **77**: 114-116.
102. Goedee HS, Jongbloed BA, van Asseldonk JH, Hendrikse J, Vrancken AFJE, Franssen H, Nikolakopoulos S, Visser LH, van der Pol WL, van den Berg LH. A comparative study of brachial plexus sonography and magnetic resonance imaging in chronic inflammatory demyelinating neuropathy and multifocal motor neuropathy. *Eur J Neurol* 2017; **24**: 1307-1313.
103. Goedee, HS, van der Pol WL, van Asseldonk JH, Franssen H, Notermans NC, Vrancken AJ, van Es MA, Nikolakopoulos S, Visser LH, van den Berg LH. Diagnostic value of sonography in treatment-naive chronic inflammatory neuropathies. *Neurology* 2017; **88**: 143-151.
104. Grimm A, Rattay TW, Winter N, Axer H. Peripheral nerve ultrasound scoring systems: benchmarking and comparative analysis. *J Neurol* 2017; **264**: 243-253.

105. Zaidman CM, Harms MB, Pestronk A. Ultrasound of inherited vs. acquired demyelinating polyneuropathies. *J Neurol* 2013; **260**: 3115-3121.

106. Herraets IJT, Goedee HS, Telleman JA, van Eijk RPA, van Asseldonk JT, Visser LH, van den Berg LH, van der Pol WL. Nerve ultrasound improves detection of treatment-responsive chronic inflammatory neuropathies. *Neurology* 2020; **94**: e1470-e1479.

107. Herraets, IJT, Goedee HS, Telleman JA, van Eijk RPA, Verhamme C, Saris CGJ, Eftimov F, van Alfen N, van Asseldonk JT, Visser LH, van den Berg LH, van der Pol LW. Nerve ultrasound for diagnosing chronic inflammatory neuropathy: a multicenter validation study. *Neurology* 2020; **95**: e1745-e1753.

108. Druzhinin D, Naumova C, Nikitin S. Nerve ultrasound normal values in children and young adults. *Muscle Nerve* 2019; **60**: 757-761.

109. Schubert C, Grimm AS, Stahl JH, Küpper H, Kegele J, Wittlinger J, Serna-Higuita L, Winter N, Groeschel S, Grimm A. Nerve ultrasound reference data in children from two to seven years. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2020; **131**: 859-865.

110. Wang, W, Wang Q. Sonographic measurements of normal C5-C8 nerve roots in children. *Muscle Nerve* 2020; **61**: 649-653.

111. Kuwabara S, Nakajima M, Matsuda S, Hattori T. Magnetic resonance imaging at the demyelinative foci in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Neurology* 1997; **48**: 874-877.

112. Duggins AJ, JMcLeod JG, Pollard JD, Davies L, Yang F, Thompson EO, Soper JR. Spinal root and plexus hypertrophy in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Brain* 1999; **122**: 1383-1390.

113. Rajabally YA, Knopp MJ, Martin-Lamb D, Morlese J. Diagnostic value of MR imaging in the Lewis-Sumner syndrome: a case series. *J Neurol Sci* 2014; **342**: 182-185.

114. Goedee HS, van der Pol WL, Hendrikse J, van den Berg LH.. Nerve ultrasound and magnetic resonance imaging in the diagnosis of neuropathy. *Curr Opin Neurol* 2018; **31**: 526-533.

115. Shibuya K, Sugiyama A, Ito S, Misawa S, Sekiguchi Y, Mitsuma S, Iwai Y, Watanabe K, Shimada H, Kawaguchi H, Suhara T, Yokota H, Matsumoto H, Kuwabara S.. Reconstruction magnetic resonance neurography in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Ann Neurol* 2015; **77**: 333-337.

116. Lozeron P, Lacour MC, Vandendries C, Théaudin M, Cauquil C, Denier C, Lacroix C, Adams D. Contribution of plexus MRI in the diagnosis of atypical chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathies. *J Neurol Sci* 2016; **360**: 170-175.

117. Jomier F, Bousson V, Viala K, Péréon Y, Magot A, Cauquil C, Bouhour F, Vial C, Bedat-Millet A-L, Taithe F, Bresch S, Siri A, Kubis N, Lozeron P. Prospective study of the additional benefit of plexus magnetic resonance imaging in the diagnosis of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Eur J Neurol* 2020; **27**: 181-187.

118. Oudeman J, Eftimov F, Strijkers GJ, Schneiders JJ, Roosendaal SD, Engbersen MP, Froeling M, Goedee HS, van Doorn PA, Caan MWA, van Schaik IN, Maas M, Nederveen AJ, de Visser M, Verhamme C. Diagnostic accuracy of MRI and ultrasound in chronic immune-mediated neuropathies. *Neurology* 2020; **94**: e62-e74.

119. van Rosmalen MHJ, Goedee HS, van der Gijp A, Witkamp TD, Froeling M, Hendrikse J, van der Pol WL. Low interrater reliability of brachial plexus MRI in chronic inflammatory neuropathies. *Muscle Nerve* 2020; **61**:779-783.

120. van Rosmalen MHJ, Goedee HS, van der Gijp A, Witkamp TD, van Eijk RPA, Asselman FL, van den Berg LH, Mandija S, Froeling M, Hendrikse J, van der Pol WL. Quantitative assessment of brachial plexus MRI for the diagnosis of chronic inflammatory neuropathies. *J Neurol* 2020; Sep 23. doi: 10.1007/s00415-020-10232-8.

121. Tanaka K, Mori N, Yokota Y, Suenaga T. MRI of the cervical nerve roots in the diagnosis of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy: a single-institution, retrospective case-control study. *BMJ Open* 2013; **3**: p.e003443.

122. Rajabally YA, Attarian S. Chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy and malignancy: A systematic review. *Muscle Nerve* 2018; **57**:875-883.

123. Breiner A, Bourque PR, Allen JA. Updated cerebrospinal fluid total protein reference values improve chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy diagnosis. *Muscle Nerve* 2019; **60**: 180-183.

124. Liberatore L, Manganelli F, Cocito D, Fazio R, Briani C, Filosto F, Benedetti L, Antonini G, Cosentino G, Jann S, Mazzeo A, Cortese A, Marfia GA, Clerici AM, Siciliano G, Carpo C, Sabatelli M, Lauria G, Rosso T, Nobile Orazio E, on the behalf of the Italian CIDP Database Study Group. Relevance of diagnostic investigations in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy: Data from the Italian CIDP database. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2020 April 28. doi: 10.1111/jns.12378.

125. Sommer CL, Brandner S, Dyck PJ, Harati Y, Lacroix C, Lammens M, Magy L, Mellgren SI, Morbin M, Navarro C, Powell HC, Schenone AE, Tan E, Urtizberea A, Weis J. Peripheral Nerve Society Guideline on processing and evaluation of nerve biopsies. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2010; **15**: 164-175.

126. Garces-Sanchez M, Laughlin RS, Dyck PJ, Engelstad JK, Norell JE, Dyck PJ. Painless diabetic motor neuropathy: a variant of diabetic lumbosacral radiculoplexus neuropathy? *Ann Neurol* 2011; **69**: 1043-1054.

127. Xu M, Pinto M, Sun C, Engelstad JK, James Dyck P, Dyck PJ, Klein CJ. Expanded teased nerve fibre pathological conditions in disease association. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2019; **90**: 138-140.

128. Sommer C, Koch S, Lammens M, Gabreels-Festen A, Stoll G, Toyka KV. Macrophage clustering as a diagnostic marker in sural nerve biopsies of patients with CIDP. *Neurology* 2005; **65**: 1924-1929.

129. Vallat JM, Tabaraud F, Magy L, Torny F, Bernet-Bernady P, Macian F, Couratier P. Diagnostic value of nerve biopsy for atypical chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy: evaluation of eight cases. *Muscle Nerve* 2003; **27**: 478-485.

130. Kulkarni GB, Mahadevan A, Taly AB, Nalini A, Shankar SK. Sural nerve biopsy in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy: are supportive pathologic criteria useful in diagnosis? *Neurol India* 2010; **58**: 542-548.

131. Haq RU, Fries TJ, Pendlebury WW, Kenny MJ, Badger GJ, Tandan R. Chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy: a study of proposed electrodiagnostic and histologic criteria. *Arch Neurol* 2000; **57**: 1745-1750.

132. Molenaar DS, Vermeulen M, de Haan R. Diagnostic value of sural nerve biopsy in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 1998; **64**: 84-89.

133. Ducic I, West J. A modified approach to sural nerve biopsy: minimizing complications. *Ann Plast Surg* 2009; **62**: 220-222.

134. IJpma FF, Nicolai JP, Meek MF. Sural nerve donor-site morbidity: thirty-four years of follow-up. *Ann Plast Surg* 2006; **57**: 391-395.

135. Dahlin LB, Eriksson KF, Sundkvist G. Persistent postoperative complaints after whole sural nerve biopsies in diabetic and non-diabetic subjects. *Diabet Med* 1997; **14**: 353-356.

136. Hilton DA, Jacob J, Househam L, Tengah C. Complications following sural and peroneal nerve biopsies. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2007; **78**: 1271-1272.

137. Theriault M, Dort J, Sutherland G, Zochodne DW. A prospective quantitative study of sensory deficits after whole sural nerve biopsies in diabetic and nondiabetic patients. Surgical approach and the role of collateral sprouting. *Neurology* 1998; **50**: 480-484.

138. Flachenecker P, Janka M, Goldbrunner R, Toyka KV. Clinical outcome of sural nerve biopsy: a retrospective study. *J Neurol* 1999; **246**: 93-96.

139. Alkhawajah NM, Dunnigan SK, Bril V. Comparison of monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance-associated neuropathy and chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy patients. *J Neurol* 2014; **261**: 1485-1491.

140. Notermans NC, Franssen H, Eurelings M, Van der Graaf Y, Wokke JH. Diagnostic criteria for demyelinating polyneuropathy associated with monoclonal gammopathy. *Muscle Nerve* 2000; **23**: 73-79.

141. Simmons Z, Albers JW, Bromberg MB, Feldman EL. Presentation and initial clinical course in patients with chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy: comparison of patients without and with monoclonal gammopathy. *Neurology* 1993; **43**: 2202-2209.

142. Sakamoto Y, Shimizu T, Tobisawa S, Isozaki E. Chronic demyelinating neuropathy with anti-myelin-associated glycoprotein antibody without any detectable M-protein. *Neurol Sci* 2017; **38**: 2165-2169.

143. Nasu S, Koga S, Kuwabara S. Different neurological and physiological profiles in POEMS syndrome and chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2012; **83**: 476-479.

144. Neligan A, Reilly MM, Lunn MP. CIDP: mimics and chameleons. *Pract Neurol* 2014; 14: 399-408.

145. Marsh ES, Keddie S, D'Sa S, Terris-Presthot F, Lunn MP. Early VEGF testing in inflammatory neuropathy avoids POEMS syndrome misdiagnosis and associated costs. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2021; 92: 172–176.

146. Liberatore G, Giannotta C, Sajeev BP, Morenghi E, Terenghi F, Gallia F, Doneddu PE, Manganelli F, Cocito D, Filosto M, Antonini G, Cosentino G, Marfia GA, Clerici AM, Lauria G, Rosso T, Cavaletti G, Nobile-Orazio E. Sensitivity and specificity of a commercial ELISA test for anti-MAG antibodies in patients with neuropathy. *J Neuroimmunol* 2020; **345**: 577288.

147. Doppler K, Stengel H, Appeltshauser L, Grosskreutz J, Ng JKM, Meinl E, Sommer C. Neurofascin-155 IgM autoantibodies in patients with inflammatory neuropathies. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2018; **89**: 1145–1151.

148. Pascual-Goñi E, Martín-Aguilar L, Lleixà C, Martínez-Martínez L, Simón-Talero MJ, Díaz-Manera J, Cortés-Vicente E, Rojas-García R, Moga E, Juárez C, Illa I, Querol L. Clinical and laboratory features of anti-MAG neuropathy without monoclonal gammopathy. *Sci. Rep* 2019; **9**: 6155. Available from: http://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-019-42545-8.

149. Hu W, Xin Y, He Z, Zhao Y. Association of neurofascin IgG4 and atypical chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brain Behav* 2018; **8**: e01115. doi: 10.1002/brb3.1115. Epub 2018 Sep 21.

150. Painous C, López-Pérez MÁ, Illa I, Querol L. Head and voice tremor improving with immunotherapy in an anti-NF155 positive CIDP patient. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol* 2018; **5**: 499–501. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29687027.

151. Dyck PJ, O'Brien PC, Oviatt KF, Dinapoli RP, Daube JR, Bartleson JD, Mokri B, Swift T, Low PA, Windebank AJ. Prednisone improves chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy more than no treatment. *Ann Neurol* 1982; **11**: 136-141.

152. van Schaik IN, Eftimov F, van Doorn PA, Brusse E, van den Berg LH, van der Pol WL, Faber CG, van Oostrom JC, Vogels OJ, Hadden RD, Kleine BU, van Norden AG, Verschuuren JJ, Dijkgraaf MG, Vermeulen M. Pulsed high-dose dexamethasone versus standard prednisolone treatment for chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy (PREDICT study): a double-blind, randomised, controlled trial. *Lancet Neurol* 2010; **9**: 245-253.

153. Eftimov F, Vermeulen M, van Doorn PA, Brusse E, van Schaik IN, Predict. Long-term remission of CIDP after pulsed dexamethasone or short-term prednisolone treatment. *Neurology* 2012; **78**: 1079-1084.

154. Nobile-Orazio E, Cocito D, Jann S, Uncini A, Messina P, Antonini G, Fazio R, Gallia F, Schenone A, Francia A, Pareyson D, Santoro L, Tamburin S, Cavaletti G, Giannini F, Sabatelli M, Beghi E; IMC Trial Group. Frequency and time to relapse after discontinuing 6-month therapy with IVIg or pulsed methylprednisolone in CIDP. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2015; **86**: 729-734.

155. Léger JM, De Bleecker JL, Sommer C, Robberecht W, Saarela M, Kamienowski J, Stelmasiak Z, Mielke O, Tackenberg B, Shebl A, Bauhofer A, Zenker O, Merkies IS; PRIMA study investigators. Efficacy and safety of Privigen(®) in patients with chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy: results of a prospective, single-arm, open-label Phase III study (the PRIMA study). *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2013; **18**: 130-140.

156. Nobile-Orazio E, Pujol S, Kasiborski F, Ouaja R, Corte GD, Bonek R, Cocito D, Schenone A. An international multicenter efficacy and safety study of IqYmune in initial and maintenance treatment of patients with chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy: PRISM study. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2020; **25**: 356-365. Lunn MP, Ellis L, Hadden RD, Rajabally YA, Winer JB, Reilly MM. A proposed dosing algorithm for the individualized dosing of human immunoglobulin in chronic inflammatory neuropathies. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2016; **21**: 33-37.

157. Hughes RA, Donofrio P, Bril V, Dalakas MC, Deng C, Hanna K, Hartung HP, Latov N, Merkies IS, van Doorn PA; ICE Study Group.. Intravenous immune globulin (10% caprylate-chromatography purified) for the treatment of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy (ICE study): a randomised placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet Neurol* 2008; **7**: 136-144.

158. Latov N, Deng C, Dalakas MC, Bril V, Donofrio P, Hanna K, Hartung HP, Hughes RA, Merkies IS, van Doorn PA; IGIV-C CIDP Efficacy (ICE) Study Group. Timing and course of clinical response to intravenous immunoglobulin in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *Arch Neurol* 2010; **67**: 802-807.

159. Nobile-Orazio E, Cocito D, Jann S, Uncini A, Beghi E, Messina P, Antonini G, Fazio R, Gallia F, Schenone A, Francia A, Pareyson D, Santoro L, Tamburin S, Macchia R, Cavaletti G, Giannini F, Sabatelli M; IMC Trial Group. Intravenous immunoglobulin versus intravenous methylprednisolone for chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Neurol* 2012; **11**: 493-502.

160. Kuitwaard K, Fokkink WR, Brusse E, Vrancken AFJE, Eftimov F, Notermans NC, van der Kooi AJ, Merkies ISJ, Jacobs BC, van Doorn PA. Maintenance IV immunoglobulin treatment in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2017; **22**: 425-432.

161. Rajabally YA, Wong SL, Kearney DA. Immunoglobulin G level variations in treated chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy: clues for future treatment regimens? *J Neurol* 2013; **260**: 2052-2056.

162. Rajabally YA, Afzal S. Clinical and economic comparison of an individualised immunoglobulin protocol vs. standard dosing for chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *J Neurol* 2019; **266**: 461-467.

163. Kuitwaard K, van den Berg LH, Vermeulen M, Brusse E, Cats EA, van der Kooi AJ, Notermans NC, van der Pol WL, van Schaik IN, van Nes SI, Hop WC, van Doorn PA. Randomised controlled trial comparing two different intravenous immunoglobulins in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2010; **81**: 1374-1379.

164. Dyck PJ, Litchy WJ, Kratz KM, Suarez GA, Low PA, Pineda AA, Windebank AJ, Karnes JL, O'Brien PC. A plasma exchange versus immune globulin infusion trial in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *Ann Neurol* 1994; **36**: 838-845.

165. Eftimov F, Winer JB, Vermeulen M, de Haan R, van Schaik IN. Intravenous immunoglobulin for chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2013; CD001797.

166. Kuitwaard K, Hahn AF, Vermeulen M, Venance SL, van Doorn PA. Intravenous immunoglobulin response in treatment-naïve chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2015; **86**: 1331-1336.

167. Markvardsen LH, Debost JC, Harbo T, Sindrup SH, Andersen H, Christiansen I, Otto M, Olsen NK, Lassen LL, Jakobsen J; Danish CIDP and MMN Study Group. Subcutaneous immunoglobulin in responders to intravenous therapy with chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *Eur J Neurol* 2013; **20**: 836-842.

168. van Schaik IN, Mielke O, Bril V, van Geloven N, Hartung HP, Lewis RA, Sobue G, Lawo JP, Praus M, Durn BL, Cornblath DR, Merkies ISJ; PATH study group. Long-term safety and efficacy of subcutaneous immunoglobulin IgPro20 in CIDP: PATH extension study. *Neurol Neuroimmunol Neuroinflamm* 2019; **6**: e590.

169. Markvardsen LH, Sindrup SH, Christiansen I, Olsen NK, Jakobsen J, Andersen H; Danish CIDP and MMN Study Group. Subcutaneous immunoglobulin as first-line therapy in treatment-naive patients with chronic

inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy: randomized controlled trial study. *Eur J Neurol* 2017; **24**: 412-418.

170. Dyck PJ, Daube J, O'Brien P, Pineda A, Low PA, Windebank AJ, Swanson C. Plasma exchange in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *N Engl J Med* 1986; **314**: 461-465.
171. Hahn AF, Bolton CF, Pillay N, Chalk C, Benstead T, Bril V, Shumak K, Vandervoort MK, Feasby TE. Plasma-exchange therapy in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. A double-blind, sham-controlled, cross-over study. *Brain* 1996; **119**: 1055-1066.
172. Mehndiratta MM, Hughes RA, Pritchard J. Plasma exchange for chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015: CD003906.
173. Mörtzell Henriksson M, Newman E, Witt V, Derfler K, Leitner G, Eloot S, Dhondt A, Deeren D, Rock G7, Ptak J, Blaha M, Lanska M, Gasova Z, Hrdlickova R, Ramlow W, Prophet H, Liumbruno G, Mori E, Griskevicius A, Audzijoniene J, Vrielink H, Rombout S, Aandahl A, Sikole A, Tomaz J, Lalic K, Mazic S, Strineholm V, Brink B, Berlin G, Dykes J, Toss F, Axelsson CG, Stegmayr B, Nilsson T, Norda R, Knutson F, Ramsauer B, Wahlström A. Adverse events in apheresis: An update of the WAA registry data. *Transfus Apher Sci* 2016; **54**: 2-15.
174. RMC Trial Group. Randomised controlled trial of methotrexate for chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy (RMC trial): a pilot, multicentre study. *Lancet Neurol* 2009; **8**: 158-164.
175. Cocito D, Grimaldi S, Paolasso I, Falcone Y, Antonini G, Benedetti L, Briani C, Fazio R, Jann S, Matà S, Sabatelli M, Nobile-Orazio E; Italian Network for CIDP Register. Immunosuppressive treatment in refractory chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. A nationwide retrospective analysis. *Eur J Neurol* 2011; **18**: 1417-1421.
176. Díaz-Manera J, Rojas-García R, Gallardo E, Illa I. Response to methotrexate in a chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy patient. *Muscle Nerve* 2009; **39**: 386-388.
177. Fialho D, Chan YC, Allen DC, Reilly MM, Hughes RA. Treatment of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy with methotrexate. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2006; **77**: 544-547.
178. Ryan MM, Grattan-Smith PJ, Procopis PG, Morgan G, Ouvrier RA. Childhood chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy: clinical course and long-term outcome. *Neuromuscul Disord* 2000; **10**: 398-406.
179. Hadden RD, Sharrack B, Bensa S, Soudain SE, Hughes RA. Randomized trial of interferon beta-1a in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *Neurology* 1999; **53**: 57-61.
180. Hughes RA, Gorson KC, Cros D, Griffin J, Pollard J, Vallat JM, Maurer SL, Riester K, Davar G, Dawson K, Sandrock A; Avonex CIDP Study Group. Intramuscular interferon beta-1a in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *Neurology* 2010; **74**: 651-657.
181. Hughes RAC, Dalakas MC, Merkies I, Latov N, Léger JM, Nobile-Orazio E, Sobue G, Genge A, Cornblath D, Merschhemke M, Ervin CM, Agoropoulou C, Hartung HP; FORCIDP Trial Investigators. Oral fingolimod for chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy (FORCIDP Trial): a double-blind, multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Neurol* 2018; **17**: 689-698.
182. Bedi G, Brown A, Tong T, Sharma KR. Chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy responsive to mycophenolate mofetil therapy. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2010; **81**: 634-636.

183. Benedetti L, Grandis M, Nobbio L, Beronio A, Ghiglione E, Manzino M, Primavera A, Mancardi G, Schenone A. Mycophenolate mofetil in dysimmune neuropathies: a preliminary study. *Muscle Nerve* 2004; **29**: 748-749.

184. Chaudhry V, Cornblath DR, Griffin JW, O'Brien R, Drachman DB. Mycophenolate mofetil: a safe and promising immunosuppressant in neuromuscular diseases. *Neurology* 2001; **56**: 94-96.

185. Dyck PJ, O'Brien P, Swanson C, Low P, Daube J. Combined azathioprine and prednisone in chronic inflammatory-demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Neurology* 1985; **35**: 1173-1176.

186. Gorson KC, Amato AA, Ropper AH. Efficacy of mycophenolate mofetil in patients with chronic immune demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Neurology* 2004; **63**: 715-717.

187. Mowzoon N, Sussman A, Bradley WG. Mycophenolate (CellCept) treatment of myasthenia gravis, chronic inflammatory polyneuropathy and inclusion body myositis. *J Neurol Sci* 2001; **185**: 119-122.

188. Radziwill AJ, Schweikert K, Kuntzer T, Fuhr P, Steck AJ. Mycophenolate mofetil for chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy: An open-label study. *Eur Neurol* 2006; **56**: 37-38.

189. Umapathi T, Hughes R. Mycophenolate in treatment-resistant inflammatory neuropathies. *Eur J Neurol* 2002; **9:** 683-685.

190. Bouchard C, Lacroix C, Planté V, Adams D, Chedru F, Guglielmi JM, Said G. Clinicopathologic findings and prognosis of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Neurology* 1999; **52**: 498-503.

191. Brannagan TH 3rd, Pradhan A, Heiman-Patterson T, Winkelman AC, Styler MJ, Topolsky DL, Crilley PA, Schwartzman RJ, Brodsky I, Gladstone DE. High-dose cyclophosphamide without stem-cell rescue for refractory CIDP. *Neurology* 2002; **58**: 1856-1858.

192. Gladstone DE, Prestrud AA, Brannagan TH 3rd. High-dose cyclophosphamide results in long-term disease remission with restoration of a normal quality of life in patients with severe refractory chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2005; **10**: 11-16.

193. Gladstone DE, Golightly MG, Brannagan TH 3rd. High dose cyclophosphamide preferentially targets naïve T (CD45/CD4/RA+) cells in CIDP and MS patients. *J Neuroimmunol* 2007; **190**: 121-126.

194. Good JL, Chehrenama M, Mayer RF, Koski CL. Pulse cyclophosphamide therapy in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Neurology* 1998; **51**: 1735-1738.

195. Prineas JW, McLeod JG. Chronic relapsing polyneuritis. *J Neurol Sci* 1976; **27**: 427-458.

196. Barnett MH, Pollard JD, Davies L, McLeod JG. Cyclosporin A in resistant chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *Muscle Nerve* 1998; **21**: 454-460.

197. Mahattanakul W, Crawford TO, Griffin JW, Goldstein JM, Cornblath DR. Treatment of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy with cyclosporin-A. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 1996; **60**: 185-187.

198. Matsuda M, Hoshi K, Gono T, Morita H, Ikeda S. Cyclosporin A in treatment of refractory patients with chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *J Neurol Sci* 2004; **224**: 29-35.

199. Odaka M, Tatsumoto M, Susuki K, Hirata K, Yuki N. Intractable chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy treated successfully with ciclosporin. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2005; **76**: 1115-1120.

200. Benedetti L, Briani C, Franciotta D, Fazio R, Paolasso I, Comi C, Luigetti M, Sabatelli M, Giannini F, Mancardi GL, Schenone A, Nobile-Orazio E, Cocito D. Rituximab in patients with chronic inflammatory demyelinating

polyradiculoneuropathy: a report of 13 cases and review of the literature. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2011; **82**: 306-308.

201. Gorson KC, Natarajan N, Ropper AH, Weinstein R. Rituximab treatment in patients with IVIg-dependent immune polyneuropathy: a prospective pilot trial. *Muscle Nerve* 2007; **35**: 66-69.
202. Velardo D, Riva N, Del Carro U, Bianchi F, Comi G, Fazio R. Rituximab in refractory chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy: report of four cases. *J Neurol* 2017; **264**: 1011-1014.
203. Marsh EA, Hirst CL, Llewelyn JG, Cossburn MD, Reilly MM, Krishnan A, Doran M, Ryan AM, Coles AJ, Jones JL, Robertson NP. Alemtuzumab in the treatment of IVIG-dependent chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *J Neurol* 2010; **257**: 913-919.
204. Pitarokoili K, Yoon MS, Kröger I, Reinacher-Schick A, Gold R, Schneider-Gold C. Severe refractory CIDP: a case series of 10 patients treated with bortezomib. *J Neurol* 2017; **264**: 2010-2020.
205. Chin RL, Sherman WH, Sander HW, Hays AP, Latov N. Etanercept (Enbrel) therapy for chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *J Neurol Sci* 2003; **210**: 19-21.
206. Leussink VI, Stettner M, Warnke C, Hartung HP. Fampridine-PR (prolonged released 4-aminopyridine) is not effective in patients with inflammatory demyelination of the peripheral nervous system. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2016; 21: 85-87.
207. Leitch MM, Sherman WH, Brannagan TH 3rd. Fludarabine in the Treatment of Refractory Chronic Inflammatory Demyelinating Neuropathies. *J Clin Neuromuscul Dis* 2015; **17**: 1-5.
208. Lieker I, Slowinski T, Harms L, Hahn K, Klehmet J. A prospective study comparing tryptophan immunoadsorption with therapeutic plasma exchange for the treatment of chronic inflammatory demyelinatingpolyneuropathy. *J Clin Apher* 2017; **32**: 486-493.
209. Zinman LH, Sutton D, Ng E, Nwe P, Ngo M, Bril V. A pilot study to compare the use of the Excorim staphylococcal protein immunoadsorption system and IVIG in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Transfus Apher Sc*i 2005; **33**: 317-324.
210. Gorson KC, Ropper AH, Clark BD, Dew RB 3rd, Simovic D, Allam G. Treatment of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy with interferon-alpha 2a. *Neurology* 1998; **50**: 84-87.
211. Desai J, Ramos-Platt L, Mitchell WG. Treatment of pediatric chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy: Challenges, controversies and questions. *Ann Indian Acad Neurol* 2015; **18**: 327-330.
212. Vallat JM, Mathis S, Ghorab K, Milor MA, Richard L, Magy L. Natalizumab as a Disease-Modifying Therapy in Chronic Inflammatory Demyelinating Polyneuropathy - A Report of Three Cases. *Eur Neurol* 2015; **73**: 294-302.
213. Ahlmén 1, Andersen O, Hallgren G, Peilot B. Positive effects of tacrolimus in a case of CIDP. *Transplant Proc* 1998; **30**: 4194.
214. Mahdi-Rogers M, Kazmi M, Ferner R, Hughes RA, Renaud S, Steck AJ, Fuhr P, Halter J, Gratwohl A, Tyndall A. Autologous peripheral blood stem cell transplantation for chronic acquired demyelinating neuropathy. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2009; **14**: 118-124.

215. Press R, Askmark H, Svenningsson A, Andersen O, Axelson HW, Strömberg U, Wahlin A, Isaksson C, Johansson JE, Hägglund H. Autologous haematopoietic stem cell transplantation: a viable treatment option for CIDP. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2014; **85**: 618-624.

216. Finnerup NB, Attal N, Haroutounian S, McNicol E, Baron R, Dworkin RH, Gilron I, Haanpää M, Hansson P, Jensen TS, Kamerman PR, Lund K, Moore A, Raja SN, Rice AS, Rowbotham M, Sena E, Siddall P, Smith BH, Wallace M. Pharmacotherapy for neuropathic pain in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Neurol* 2015; **14**: 162-173.

217. Attal N, Cruccu G, Baron R, Haanpaa M, Hansson P, Jensen TS, Nurmikko T; European Federation of Neurological Societies. EFNS guidelines on the pharmacological treatment of neuropathic pain: 2010 revision. *Eur J Neurol* 2010; **17**: 1113-e88.

218. Michaelides A, Hadden RDM, Sarrigiannis PG, Hadjivassiliou M, Zis P. Pain in Chronic Inflammatory Demyelinating Polyradiculoneuropathy: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Pain Ther* 2019; **8**: 177-185.

219. Thakur S, Dworkin RH, Freeman R, Gorson KC, Herrmann DN. Pain in acquired inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathies. *Pain* 2016; **157**: 1887-1894.

220. Bjelica B, Peric S, Bozovic I, Kacar A, Cobeljic M, Dejanovic I, Stevic Z, Basta I. One-year follow-up study of neuropathic pain in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2019; **24**: 180-186.

221. Kitakule MM, McNeal A. Massive nerve root hypertrophy in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy. *J Assoc Acad Minor Phys* 1997; **8**: 55-57.

222. Mitsuma S, Van den Bergh P, Rajabally YA, Van Parijs V, Martin-Lamb D, Sonoo M, Inaba A, Shimizu T, Isose S, Sato Y, Komori T, Misawa S, Kuwabara S; Tokyo Metropolitan Neuromuscular Electrodiagnosis Study Group. Effects of low frequency filtering on distal compound muscle action potential duration for diagnosis of CIDP: A Japanese-European multicenter prospective study. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2015; **126**: 1805-1810.

223. Rajabally YA, Jacob S, Hbahbih M. Optimizing the use of electrophysiology in the diagnosis of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy: a study of 20 cases. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* 2005; **10**: 282–292.

224. Vo ML, Hanineva A, Chin RL, Carey BT, Latov N, Langsdorf JA. Comparison of 2-limb versus 3-limb electrodiagnostic studies in the evaluation of chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Muscle Nerve* 2015; **51**: 549-553. 2005.

225. Bragg JA, Benatar MG. Sensory nerve conduction slowing is a specific marker for CIDP. *Muscle Nerve* 2008; **38**:1599-1603.

226. Bromberg MB, Albers JW. Patterns of sensory nerve conduction abnormalities in demyelinating and axonal peripheral nerve disorders. *Muscle Nerve* 1993; **16**: 262-266.

227. Rajabally YA, Narasimhan M. The value of sensory electrophysiology in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *Clin Neurophysiol* 2007; **118**: 1999-2004.

228. Esper GJ, Nardin RA, Benatar M, Sax TW, Acosta JA, Raynor EM. Sural and radial sensory responses in healthy adults: diagnostic implications for polyneuropathy. *Muscle Nerve* 2005; **31**: 628-632.