



## Complete Summary

---

### GUIDELINE TITLE

Guidelines on routine cerebrospinal fluid analysis. Report from an EFNS task force.

### BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)

Deisenhammer F, Bartos A, Egg R, Gilhus NE, Giovannoni G, Rauer S, Sellebjerg F, EFNS Task Force. Guidelines on routine cerebrospinal fluid analysis. Report from an EFNS task force. Eur J Neurol 2006 Sep;13(9):913-22. [66 references]  
[PubMed](#)

### GUIDELINE STATUS

This is the current release of the guideline.

## COMPLETE SUMMARY CONTENT

SCOPE  
METHODOLOGY - including Rating Scheme and Cost Analysis  
RECOMMENDATIONS  
EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS  
BENEFITS/HARMS OF IMPLEMENTING THE GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS  
QUALIFYING STATEMENTS  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINE  
INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE (IOM) NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY REPORT  
CATEGORIES  
IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND AVAILABILITY  
DISCLAIMER

## SCOPE

### DISEASE/CONDITION(S)

Neurological diseases requiring cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) analysis

### GUIDELINE CATEGORY

Diagnosis

### CLINICAL SPECIALTY

Internal Medicine  
Neurology  
Pathology  
Psychiatry

## **INTENDED USERS**

Clinical Laboratory Personnel  
Physicians

## **GUIDELINE OBJECTIVE(S)**

To produce recommendations on how to use a set of cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) parameters including protein, albumin, immunoglobulin, glucose, lactate and cellular changes, as well as specific antigen and antibody testing for infectious agents in different clinical settings and to show how different constellations of these variables correlate with diseases of the nervous system

## **TARGET POPULATION**

Patients with neurological diseases requiring investigation of cerebrospinal fluid (CSF)

## **INTERVENTIONS AND PRACTICES CONSIDERED**

Routine cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) analysis including total protein, albumin, immunoglobulins, glucose, lactate, cell count, cytological staining, and investigation of infectious CSF

## **MAJOR OUTCOMES CONSIDERED**

Sensitivity and specificity of cerebrospinal fluid analysis

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **METHODS USED TO COLLECT/SELECT EVIDENCE**

Hand-searches of Published Literature (Secondary Sources)  
Searches of Electronic Databases

### **DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO COLLECT/SELECT THE EVIDENCE**

A Medline search using the search terms cerebrospinal fluid (CSF), immunoglobulin G (IgG), immunoglobulin M (IgM), immunoglobulin A (IgA), and albumin was conducted. Also, the key words 'cerebrospinal fluid' or 'CSF' were cross-referenced with 'glucose', 'lactate', 'cytology', 'cell\* in title' excluding 'child\*'. Furthermore, a search for 'cerebrospinal fluid' and 'immunoglobulin' and 'diagnosis' and 'electrophoresis' or 'isoelectric focusing' was performed limited to the time between 1 January 1980 and 1 January 2005, only items with abstracts, and English language (274 references). A search for 'cerebrospinal fluid' and 'infectious' limited for time (1 January 1980 until now) returned 560 abstracts. Abstracts which primarily did not deal with diagnostic issues and infectious CSF (e.g. non-infectious inflammatory diseases, vaccination, general CSF parameters, pathophysiology, cytokines and therapy) were excluded resulting in 60 abstracts. Searching the items 'cerebrospinal fluid' and 'serology' limited for time (1 January

1980 until now) and excluding abstracts not directly related to the topic returned 35 abstracts and a search for 'cerebrospinal fluid' and 'bacterial culture' limited for time (1 January 1980 until now) resulted in 28 abstracts.

The abstracts were selected by the author who was in charge of the respective topic. In addition, text books and articles identified in reference lists of individual papers were selected if considered appropriate.

## **NUMBER OF SOURCE DOCUMENTS**

Not stated

## **METHODS USED TO ASSESS THE QUALITY AND STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE**

Weighting According to a Rating Scheme (Scheme Given)

## **RATING SCHEME FOR THE STRENGTH OF THE EVIDENCE**

### **Evidence Classification Scheme for a Diagnostic Measure**

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

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

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

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

## **METHODS USED TO ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE**

Systematic Review

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE METHODS USED TO ANALYZE THE EVIDENCE**

Not stated

## **METHODS USED TO FORMULATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Expert Consensus

## **DESCRIPTION OF METHODS USED TO FORMULATE THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Individual task force members prepared draft statements for various parts of the manuscript. Evidence was classified as class I–IV and recommendations as level A–C according to the scheme agreed for European Federation of Neurological Societies (EFNS) guidelines (see "Availability of Companion Documents" field in this summary). When only class IV evidence was available but consensus could be reached, the task force has offered advice as good practice points. The statements were revised and adapted into a single document which was then revised until consensus was reached.

## **RATING SCHEME FOR THE STRENGTH OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Rating of Recommendations**

**Level A rating** (established as useful/predictive or not useful/predictive) requires at least one convincing class I study or at least two consistent, convincing class II studies.

**Level B rating** (established as probably useful/predictive or not useful/predictive) requires at least one convincing class II study or overwhelming class III evidence.

**Level C rating** (established as possibly useful/predictive or not useful/predictive) requires at least two convincing class III studies.

**Good practice point** When only class IV evidence was available but consensus could be reached, the task force has offered advice as good practice points.

## **COST ANALYSIS**

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

## **METHOD OF GUIDELINE VALIDATION**

Peer Review

## **DESCRIPTION OF METHOD OF GUIDELINE VALIDATION**

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

# **RECOMMENDATIONS**

## **MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

Cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) should be immediately (i.e. <1 h) analysed after collection. If storage is required for later investigation this can be done at 4–8 degrees C (short term) or at –20 degrees C (long term). Only protein components and ribonucleic acid (RNA) (after appropriate preparation) can be analysed from stored CSF (**good practice point**).

The **level B recommendation** regarding CSF partitioning and storage states that 12 mL of CSF should be partitioned into three to four sterile tubes. It is important that the CSF is not allowed to sediment before partitioning. Store 3–4 mL at 4 degrees C for general investigations, cultivation and microscopic investigation of bacteria and fungi, antibody testing, polymerase chain reaction (PCR) and antigen detection. Bigger volumes (10–15 mL) are necessary for certain pathogens like *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*, fungi or parasites.

Normal CSF protein concentration should be related to the patient's age (higher in the neonate period and after age of 60 years) and the site of CSF collection (**level B recommendation**). Exact upper normal limits of protein concentration differ according to technique and examining laboratory.

The CSF to serum albumin concentration quotient ( $Q_{alb}$ ) should be preferred to total protein concentrations, partly because reference levels are more clearly defined and partly because it is not confounded by changes in other CSF proteins (**level B recommendation**).

The glucose concentration in CSF should be related to the blood concentration. Therefore, CSF glucose/serum ratio is preferable. Pathological changes in this ratio or in lactate concentration support bacterial or fungal meningitis or leptomeningeal metastases (**level B recommendation**).

Intrathecal immunoglobulin G (IgG) synthesis can be measured by various quantitative methods, but at least for the diagnosis of multiple sclerosis the detection of oligoclonal bands by appropriate methods is superior to any existing formula (**level A recommendation**). Patients with other diseases associated with intrathecal inflammation (e.g. patients with central nervous system (CNS) infections, may also have intrathecal IgA and IgM synthesis as assessed by non-linear formulae [Reiber hyperbolic formulae or extended indices], which should be preferred to the linear IgA and IgM indices) (**level B recommendation**).

Cellular morphology (cytological staining) should be evaluated whenever pleocytosis is found or leptomeningeal metastases or pathological bleeding is suspected (**level B recommendation**). If cytology is inconclusive in case of query CSF bleeding, measurement of bilirubin is recommended for up to 2 weeks after the clinical event.

For standard microbiological examination sedimentation at 3000 x g for 10 min is recommended (**level B recommendation**). Microscopy should be performed using Gram or methylene blue, Auramin O or Ziehl-Nielsen (*Mycobacterium tuberculosis*), or Indian ink stain (*Cryptococcus*). Depending on clinical

presentation incubation with bacterial and fungal culture media can be useful. Anaerobic culture media are only recommended if there is suspicion of brain abscess. A viral culture is generally not recommended. A list of infectious agents and their association with different diseases as well as the recommended method of detection is provided in Table 4 of the original guideline document. The results of bacterial antigen detection have to be interpreted with respect to the microscopical CSF investigation and culture results. It is not routinely recommended in cases of negative microscopy. A diagnosis of bacterial nervous system infection based on antigen detection alone is not recommended (risk of contamination).

### **Definitions:**

#### **Evidence Classification Scheme for a Diagnostic Measure:**

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

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

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

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

#### **Rating of Recommendations**

**Level A rating** (established as useful/predictive or not useful/predictive) requires at least one convincing class I study or at least two consistent, convincing class II studies.

**Level B rating** (established as probably useful/predictive or not useful/predictive) requires at least one convincing class II study or overwhelming class III evidence.

**Level C rating** (established as possibly useful/predictive or not useful/predictive) requires at least two convincing class III studies.

**Good practice point** When only class IV evidence was available but consensus could be reached, the task force has offered advice as good practice points.

#### **CLINICAL ALGORITHM(S)**

None provided

## EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

### TYPE OF EVIDENCE SUPPORTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS

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

## BENEFITS/HARMS OF IMPLEMENTING THE GUIDELINE RECOMMENDATIONS

### POTENTIAL BENEFITS

Appropriate analysis of cerebrospinal fluid (CSF)

### POTENTIAL HARMS

- Cytologic examination of cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) can render false-positive and false-negative results
- Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) of CSF can render a false-negative result (most likely in the first 3 days after the illness or 10 days and more after the onset of the disease.)

## QUALIFYING STATEMENTS

### QUALIFYING STATEMENTS

This guideline provides the view of an expert task force appointed by the Scientific Committee of the European Federation of Neurological Societies (EFNS). It represents a peer-reviewed statement of minimum desirable standards for the guidance of practice based on the best available evidence. It is not intended to have legally binding implications in individual cases.

## IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GUIDELINE

### DESCRIPTION OF IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

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

## INSTITUTE OF MEDICINE (IOM) NATIONAL HEALTHCARE QUALITY REPORT CATEGORIES

### IOM CARE NEED

Getting Better  
Living with Illness

## **IOM DOMAIN**

Effectiveness

## **IDENTIFYING INFORMATION AND AVAILABILITY**

### **BIBLIOGRAPHIC SOURCE(S)**

Deisenhammer F, Bartos A, Egg R, Gilhus NE, Giovannoni G, Rauer S, Sellebjerg F, EFNS Task Force. Guidelines on routine cerebrospinal fluid analysis. Report from an EFNS task force. *Eur J Neurol* 2006 Sep;13(9):913-22. [66 references]  
[PubMed](#)

### **ADAPTATION**

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

### **DATE RELEASED**

2006 Sep

### **GUIDELINE DEVELOPER(S)**

European Federation of Neurological Societies - Medical Specialty Society

### **SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING**

European Federation of Neurological Societies

### **GUIDELINE COMMITTEE**

European Federation of Neurological Societies Task Force on Routine Cerebrospinal Fluid Analysis

### **COMPOSITION OF GROUP THAT AUTHORED THE GUIDELINE**

*Task Force Members:* F. Deisenhammer, Department of Neurology, Innsbruck Medical University, Innsbruck, Austria; A. Bartos, Department of Neurology, 3rd Faculty of Medicine, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic; R. Egg, Department of Neurology, Innsbruck Medical University, Innsbruck, Austria; N. E. Gilhus, Department of Clinical Medicine, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway, and Department of Neurology, Haukeland University Hospital, Bergen, Norway; G. Giovannoni, Department of Neuroinflammation, Institute of Neurology, University College London, London, UK; S. Rauer, Department of Neurology and Clinical Neurophysiology, Albert-Ludwigs University, Freiburg, Germany; F. Sellebjerg, Department of Neurology, Copenhagen University Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark

## **FINANCIAL DISCLOSURES/CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

The authors reportedly have no conflicts of interest.

## **GUIDELINE STATUS**

This is the current release of the guideline.

## **GUIDELINE AVAILABILITY**

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

Print copies: Available from Dr Florian Deisenhammer, Department of Neurology, Innsbruck Medical University, Anichstrasse 35, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria; Phone: +43 512 504 24264; Fax: +43 512 504 6724231; E-mail: [florian.deisenhammer@uibk.ac.at](mailto:florian.deisenhammer@uibk.ac.at)

## **AVAILABILITY OF COMPANION DOCUMENTS**

The following are available:

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

## **PATIENT RESOURCES**

None available

## **NGC STATUS**

This NGC summary was completed by ECRI on April 9, 2007. The information was verified by the guideline developer on May 15, 2007.

## **COPYRIGHT STATEMENT**

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

## **DISCLAIMER**

### **NGC DISCLAIMER**

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

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

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

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

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

© 1998-2008 National Guideline Clearinghouse

Date Modified: 11/3/2008

