

Title: Serum neurofilament light chain predicts long-term prognosis in Guillain-Barré syndrome patients

Authors: Lorena Martín-Aguilar¹; Pol Camps-Renom², Cinta Lleixà¹, Elba Pascual-Goñi¹, Jordi Diaz-Manera^{1,3}, Ricard Rojas-García^{1,3}, Noemí de Luna^{1,3}, Eduard Gallardo^{1,3}, Elena Cortés-Vicente^{1,3}, Laia Muñoz^{4,5}, Daniel Alcolea^{4,5}, Alberto Lleó^{4,5}, Carlos Casanovas^{3,6-7}, Christian Homedes⁶, Gerardo Gutiérrez-Gutiérrez⁸, María Concepción Jimeno-Montero⁸, José Berciano^{5,9}, Maria José Sedano Tous⁹, Tania Garcia-Sobrino¹⁰, Julio Pardo-Fernandez¹⁰, Celedonio Márquez-Infante¹¹, Iñigo Rojas-Marcos¹², Ivonne Jericó Pascual¹³, Eugenia Martínez-Hernández¹⁴, Germán Morís de la Tassa¹⁵, Cristina Domínguez-González¹⁶, Isabel Illa^{1,3}, Luis Querol^{1,3}.

1. Neuromuscular Diseases Unit, Department of Neurology, Hospital de la Santa Creu i Sant Pau, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain.
2. Department of Neurology, Hospital de la Santa Creu i Sant Pau, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain.
3. Centro para la Investigación Biomédica en Red en Enfermedades Raras (CIBERER).
4. Department of Neurology, Sant Pau Memory Unit, Hospital de la Santa Creu i Sant Pau - IIB Sant Pau, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain.
5. Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red en Enfermedades Neurodegenerativas, CIBERNED, Spain.
6. Neuromuscular Unit, Department of Neurology, Bellvitge University Hospital, Barcelona, Spain
7. Neurometabolic Diseases Group, Bellvitge Biomedical Research Institute (IDIBELL)
8. Hospital Universitario Infanta Sofía, Madrid, Spain
9. Department of Neurology, Hospital Universitario Marqués de Valdecilla (IDIVAL), University of Cantabria, Santander, Spain
10. Hospital Clínico Universitario de Santiago, Santiago de Compostela, Spain.
11. Hospital Universitario Virgen del Rocío, Sevilla, Spain
12. Hospital Universitario Reina Sofía, Córdoba, Spain.
13. Complejo Hospitalario de Navarra, Navarra, Spain
14. Hospital Clínic de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain.
15. Hospital Universitario Central de Asturias, Oviedo, Spain
16. Hospital Universitario 12 de Octubre, Madrid, Spain

Corresponding author:

Luis Querol, Hospital de la Santa Creu I Sant Pau, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Mas Casanovas 90, 08041, Barcelona, Spain.

Email: lquerol@santpau.cat

Funding: This work is supported by Fondo de Investigaciones Sanitarias (FIS), Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Spain and FEDER under grant FIS19/01407, personal grant Rio Hortega CM19/00042, personal grant SLT006/17/00131 of the Pla estratègic de recerca i innovació en salut (PERIS), Departament de Salut, Generalitat de Catalunya, and the ER20P3AC7624 project of the ACCI call of the CIBERER network, Madrid, Spain. Dr. Lleó is supported by Fundació Bancaria La Caixa. Dr. Alcolea is supported by Instituto Carlos III under grants PI18/00435 and INT19/00016 and personal grant SLT006/17/125 of the Pla estratègic de recerca i innovació en salut (PERIS).

Disclosures: Luis Querol has provided expert testimony for Grifols, Sanofi-Genzyme, Novartis, UCB, Roche and CSL Behring and received research funds from Novartis Spain, Sanofi-Genzyme and Grifols. Lorena Martín-Aguilar has received speaking honoraria from Roche. Elba Pascual-Goñi has received speaking honoraria from Roche and Biogen. Jordi Díaz-Manera has provided expert testimony for PTC and Sanofi-Genzyme, has been external advisor for Sanofi, Sarepta and Audentes and received research funds from Sanofi-Genzyme and Boehringer. Daniel Alcolea participated in advisory boards from Fujirebio-Europe and Roche Diagnostics and received speaker honoraria from Fujirebio-Europe, Nutricia and from Krka Farmacéutica S.L. Gerardo Gutiérrez-Gutiérrez has received speaking honoraria from Sanofi-Genzyme, Takeda and has provided expert testimony por Biogen and CSL Behring. The other authors report no disclosures.

ABSTRACT:

Objective: To study baseline serum neurofilament light chain (sNfL) levels as a prognostic biomarker in Guillain-Barré syndrome (GBS).

Methods: We measured NfL using SiMoA in serum (98 samples) and CSF (24 samples) of GBS patients prospectively included in the International GBS Outcome Study (IGOS) in Spain and compared them with controls (HC). We performed multivariable regression to analyze the association between sNfL levels and functional outcome at one year.

Results: GBS patients had higher NfL levels than HC in serum (55.49pg/mL vs 9.13pg/mL, $p < 0.0001$) and CSF (1308.5pg/mL vs 440.24pg/mL, $p = 0.034$). Patients with preceding diarrhea had higher sNfL than patients with respiratory symptoms or no preceding infection (134.90pg/mL vs 47.86pg/mL vs 38.02pg/mL, $p = 0.016$). sNfL levels correlated with GDS and R-ODS scales. Patients with pure motor variant and Miller-Fisher syndrome showed higher sNfL levels than patients with sensory-motor GBS (162.18pg/mL vs 95.50pg/mL vs 38.02pg/mL; $p = 0.025$). AMAN patients had higher sNfL levels than other variants (190.55pg/mL vs 46.79pg/mL, $p = 0.013$). sNfL returned to normal levels at one year. High baseline sNfL levels were associated with inability to run (OR=1.65, 95% CI 1.14-2.40, $p = 0.009$) and lower R-ODS ($\beta -2.60$, 95% $\beta -4.66$ -(-0.54), $p = 0.014$) at one year. Cut-off points predicting clinically relevant outcomes at one year with high specificity were calculated: inability to walk independently (>319 pg/mL), inability to run (>248 pg/mL) and ability to run (<34 pg/mL).

Conclusion: Baseline sNfL levels are increased in patients with GBS, they are associated with disease severity and axonal variants and they have an independent prognostic value in GBS patients.

Keywords: Guillain-Barré syndrome (GBS), neurofilament light chain (NfL), prognosis, axonal damage.

Abbreviations: AIDP: Acute Inflammatory Demyelinating Polyneuropathy; AMAN: Acute Motor Axonal Neuropathy; AMSAN: Acute Motor-Sensory Axonal Neuropathy; CI: Coefficient Interval; CSF: cerebrospinal fluid; GBS: Guillain-Barré syndrome, GeoMean: geometric mean, GDS: GBS Disability Score, HC: Healthy controls; IVIg: Intravenous Immunoglobulin; logNfL: log-transformed neurofilament light chain; MFS: Miller-Fisher Syndrome; MS: Multiple sclerosis, PLEX: Plasma Exchange; sNfL: serum neurofilament light chain; nerve conduction studies (NCS); OR: Odds ratio; R-ODS: Rasch-built Overall Disability Scale.

INTRODUCTION:

Guillain-Barré syndrome (GBS) diagnosis relies on clinical and electrophysiological criteria¹ and albumino-cytological dissociation in CSF, but patients differ considerably in their presentation, clinical course and prognosis. Previous prognostic models, based on clinical and epidemiological features, predict the ability to walk at six months^{2,3} or the probability to develop respiratory insufficiency⁴.

Neurofilament light chain (NfL) is becoming the most important axonal damage biomarker^{5,6} in Neurology after the introduction of ultrasensitive techniques such as the single-molecule array (SiMoA)^{7,8}.

Older studies investigated the role of neurofilament heavy chain (NfH), showing increased CSF NfH levels in GBS patients^{9,10}. CSF NfL levels were also described to associate with outcome in a small study¹¹. A recent study showed increased serum and CSF NfL levels in acquired peripheral neuropathies, including five GBS patients¹² and another study showed increased sNfL levels in various neurodegenerative diseases, including 19 GBS patients, but clinical correlations were not performed¹³. A very recent retrospective study showed that high sNfL were associated with poor short-term prognosis, but prospective or long-term prognosis data and the role of confounding variables were not studied¹⁴. The role of sNfL measured by SiMoA as a long-term prognosis biomarker in GBS has not been investigated so far.

Our study aims to study: (1) the levels of NfL in serum and CSF in GBS patients and its variants; (2) the kinetics of sNfL -at baseline and at one year; and (3) the relationship between baseline sNfL levels and prognosis at one year.

MATERIALS AND METHODS:

Subjects, Standards Protocol Approvals and Patient Consents:

We collected data, involving 98 patients enrolled in the Spanish cohort of the International Guillain-Barré Syndrome Outcome Study (IGOS) study¹⁵. The IGOS is a prospective, observational cohort study including all patients within the GBS diagnostic spectrum. Patients fulfilling diagnostic criteria for GBS or its variants were included within 2 weeks from onset; there were no exclusion criteria. Patients from the Spanish cohort were enrolled between February 2013 and January 2019. Additionally, 16 age-matched healthy controls for sera and 10 age-matched healthy controls for CSF were included. Serum and CSF samples were aliquoted and stored at -80°C until needed. The study was approved by the review boards of Erasmus University Medical Centre, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, the Ethics Committee of the Hospital de la Santa Creu i Sant Pau and the local institutional review boards of participating hospitals or universities. All patients gave written informed consent to participate in the study according to the Declaration of Helsinki.

SiMoA NfL measurements:

Measurement of serum and CSF NfL levels was performed in duplicates in all available samples from GBS patients and healthy controls. The analysis was performed using the reagents by investigators blinded to clinical data using SIMOA Nf-light® kit in SR-X immunoassay analyzer, Simoa™ (Quanterix Corp, Boston, MA, USA), which runs ultrasensitive paramagnetic bead-based enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays. Samples were analyzed following the manufacturer's instructions and standard procedures. To analyze the kinetics of serum NfL in GBS patients, we measured sNfL levels in those patients with available sample at the 52 weeks timepoint (n=33). All NfL values were within the linear ranges of the assays. The intra- and inter-assay coefficients of variation (ICV) at intermediate level (16.15pg/ml) were 7.1% and 6.3%, respectively.

Data collection:

Data were collected prospectively, regarding demography (age and gender), evolution time (days from clinical onset), infectious antecedent event and disability by the GBS disability score¹⁶ (GDS) at study entry. Results of routine CSF examination, nerve conduction studies (NCS) and treatment regimens were collected. We defined an elevated

CSF protein level as higher than 0,45g/L^{15,17}. Clinical variants were defined as sensorimotor, pure motor, pure sensory, Miller-Fisher syndrome (MFS), ataxic and pharyngeal-cervical-brachial variant¹⁸. Patients were classified as acute inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy (AIDP), acute motor axonal neuropathy (AMAN), acute motor-sensory axonal neuropathy (AMSAN), equivocal or normal based on initial NCS. We recorded GBS disability score (GDS) initially, at 4 weeks, at 26 weeks and at 52 weeks and its maximum score during follow-up. Rasch-built Overall Disability Scale (R-ODS, highest score 48, indicating no disability)¹⁹ was assessed at 4 weeks, 26 weeks and 52 weeks. Ability to run was extracted from R-ODS, and ability to walk independently was extracted from GDS.

Statistical analysis:

Descriptive statistics are showed as mean (+/- standard deviation) or median (interquartile range – IQR) in continuous variables and as frequencies (percentages) in categorical variables. sNfL levels were non-normally distributed as tested by the Shapiro-Wilk normality test. Thus, a logarithmic transformation of the variable was performed to approach the normal distribution (logNfL). We summarized NfL levels using geometric means (GeoMeans), GeoMean 95% confidence interval (CI) and coefficient of variation (CV). Comparisons between patients with GBS and healthy controls (HC) were performed by the Wilcoxon rank sum test. Kruskal-Wallis test was used to compare groups at baseline. Wilcoxon matched pairs signed rank test was used to compare baseline sNfL and sNfL at 52 weeks. We used Spearman's coefficient to assess correlation between variables.

To investigate the association between sNfL and prognosis we performed two types of multivariable regression analyses. First, we conducted a multivariable logistic regression analysis to predict the ability to run at 1 year of follow-up. Secondly, we performed a multivariable linear regression analysis to investigate the association between logNfL and R-ODS scale at 1 year. In both analyses we performed a stepwise backward regression modeling to select variables independently associated with the outcome. The variables introduced in our initial multivariable models were selected based on known prognostic factors (age, GDS, diarrhea and AMAN^{20,21}). To perform the multivariable analysis we excluded patients with MFS, because our aim was to predict GBS prognosis and MFS is considered a different disease, including different pathophysiology, clinical presentation

(it does not present with weakness), treatment (often untreated) and outcome (considered self-limiting and benign). The final models were adjusted by potential confounders. A significant confounding effect was defined as an absolute change >10% in the regression coefficients when introducing the variable into the model.

Odds-ratios (OR) for the logistic regression analysis and beta coefficients (β) for the linear regression analysis were reported with 95% confidence intervals and p values.

Additionally, we evaluated the predictive capacity of NfL levels in the acute phase and at one year (residual disability) for 5 different clinically relevant endpoints, established prior to the analysis: (1) Ability to run at 1 year, (2) Inability to run at 1 year, (3) Inability to walk without assistance at 1 year, (4) Ventilation, and (5) Death. First, we performed a univariate logistic regression analysis for each endpoint using NfL levels as the exposure variable. Then, we performed a ROC analysis comparing the predictions against the endpoint and eventually, we selected the cut-off points of NfL levels that better predicted the endpoint aiming for the highest specificity. Finally, we tested the predictive capacity of each cut-point using multivariable logistic regression analyses adjusting for age and AMAN as possible confounders. OR with 95% CI, area under the curve (AUC), sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV) and negative predictive value (NPV) for each cut-point were reported.

Statistical significance for all analyses was set at 0.05 (two-sided). The analysis was carried out in Graphpad Prism v8 and Stata v15® (Texas, USA).

Data availability:

Anonymized data not published within this article will be made available by request from any qualified investigator.

RESULTS:

Baseline characteristics:

We enrolled 98 participants from 11 Spanish centres participating in the IGOS study. GBS patients had an average of 57.4 years and were predominantly men (57%). 68.4% of patients presented an antecedent infectious event, mainly upper respiratory tract infections (43.9%) and diarrhea (24.5%). The median evolution time from onset of

symptoms to inclusion was 4 days (IQR 3-6). Most patients had an initial GDS between 2 and 4 (93.9%), with a median of 3. CSF was examined in 90 (91.8%) patients within a median time of 3 days (IQR 2-6) from onset of neurological symptoms. Elevated CSF protein level was detected in 68.9% of the patients. 18.4% of patients presented with a pure motor GBS variant, 10.2% with MFS, 4.1% with pure sensory variant and 1 patient with ataxic variant; 66.3% presented with the typical sensory-motor variant. Regarding EMG classification, most patients had an AIDP (59.2%), followed by equivocal NCS (14.3%), AMAN (12.2%) and AMSAN (7.1%). Seven patients had normal NCS. Most patients were treated with IVIg (77.6%) or IVIg plus plasma exchange (10.2%). 5% of patients received a second course of IVIg and six patients did not receive treatment.

Association of baseline sNfL with disease characteristics:

GBS patients had significantly higher serum NfL (sNfL) levels (55.49pg/mL) than healthy controls (HC) (9.13pg/mL, $p < 0.0001$, **table 1, figure 1A**). This difference was also observed in CSF (1308.5pg/mL vs 440.24pg/mL, $p = 0.034$, **figure 1B**). We found a correlation between sNfL and CSF NfL ($r = 0.62$, $p < 0.001$, **supplementary figure. 1A**).

We did not find a correlation between sNfL levels and age in GBS patients ($r = 0.18$, $p = 0.07$), although it is clear in HC ($r = 0.65$, $p < 0.001$) (**supplementary figure 1B**). Patients with diarrhea had higher sNfL levels than those patients without any infectious antecedent or with respiratory symptoms (134.9pg/ml vs 38.02pg/mL vs 47.86pg/mL, respectively, $p = 0.016$). CSF protein levels were not correlated with sNfL or CSF NfL. sNfL and CSF NfL levels were not correlated with time since symptom onset.

Regarding GBS variants, sNfL levels were higher in patients with pure motor variant and MFS comparing them with typical GBS (162.18pg/mL vs 95.5pg/mL vs 38.02pg/mL, respectively; $p = 0.025$; **figure 2A**). When we stratified patients according to NCS, patients with AMAN had higher sNfL levels than other patients (199.53pg/mL vs 46.77pg/mL, $p = 0.006$) and patients with equivocal NCS and AMSAN had higher sNfL levels than AIDP (**figure 2B**). The seven patients with normal NCS showed higher sNfL levels than AIDP patients (53.7pg/mL vs 35.48pg/mL, **table 2**). This result can be explained because five of these patients with normal NCS are MFS, who have higher sNfL than AIDP patients. When we stratified these patients according to clinical variants we found five MFS patients, one patient with pure sensory variant and one patient without clinical variant (89.13pg/mL vs 10.47pg/mL vs 23.44pg/mL, respectively). Patients who did not

receive treatment (6.12%) had normal levels of sNfL. Further information about sNfL levels and disease characteristics is detailed in **table 2**.

Association of baseline sNfL with clinical scales:

sNfL is clearly correlated with the GDS and R-ODS scores. sNfL levels tend to be higher with every GDS increase at inclusion time ($r=0.313$, $p=0.002$; **table 2, figure 3**). We also found a correlation with maximum GDS achieved ($r=0.251$, $p=0.013$) and GDS at all timepoints (**table 3**). Baseline sNfL levels also correlated with the R-ODS scale at 4, 26 and 52 weeks with lower R-ODS scores with higher sNfL levels (**table 3**).

Kinetics of sNfL levels:

We analyzed sNfL in 33 patients at baseline and at week 52. At one year, sNfL returned to normal control levels in all patients that had high baseline NfL levels; sNfL levels did not change in patients with normal baseline levels (**supplementary figure 2**).

Association of baseline sNfL and prognosis:

Approximately, 71% and 74.5% of patients could walk independently at 6 months and at 1 year and 60% and 67% of patients could run at 6 months and at 1 year. Ten patients needed ventilation, during a median time of 11 days (IQR 8-33), and 4 patients died. Two patients died due to respiratory insufficiency, one patient due to pneumonia and one patient because of cancer progression. Baseline sNfL levels were associated with the ability to run at 1 year (geomean sNfL levels 33.11pg/mL vs 123.03pg/mL; $p<0.001$). We did not find an association between baseline sNfL and ventilation (geomean sNfL levels 52.48pg/mL vs 83.17pg/mL, $p=0.446$) or between sNfL and death (geomean sNfL levels 53.70pg/mL vs 229.09 pg/mL, $p=0.11$).

In the univariate analysis, logNfL, AMAN, age and initial GDS were associated with the ability to run at 1 year and logNfL, age and initial GDS were associated with the R-ODS at 1 year (**table 4**). In the multivariable logistic regression analysis, which included 4 potential confounder variables in the initial model (age, initial GDS, AMAN and diarrhea), higher baseline NfL levels were independently associated with the inability to run at 1 year after a backward stepwise selection modelling (OR=1.65, 95% CI 1.14-2.40, $p=0.009$; **table 4**). Undoing the log transformation of the variable this increase represents an OR=1.019; 95% CI 1.037-1.002; for each 10pg/mL of sNfL. In the multivariable linear

regression analysis to predict R-ODS, higher baseline NfL levels were also associated with less R-ODS at 1 year ($\beta=-2.60$, 95% CI -4.66-(-0.54); $p=0.014$) (see **table 4**).

We additionally repeated the two multivariable analyses (logistic and linear) with and without MFS patients. We mainly focused in GBS patients only because MFS is considered a different disease and the aim of the study was to assess sNfL to predict GBS outcome. Nonetheless, multivariable analysis including MFS in the models has been also performed with very similar results (**supplementary table 1**).

Predictive capacity of sNfL levels to predict clinically relevant outcomes:

We finally evaluated the ability of baseline sNfL levels to predict the outcome in 5 clinically relevant endpoints: (1) ability to run at 1 year, (2) inability to run at 1 year, (3) inability to walk without assistance at 1 year, (4) ventilation, and (5) death. As described in Methods, we performed a ROC analysis for each endpoint selecting the cut-off points with the highest specificity. We observed that sNfL levels higher than 319pg/mL classified patients unable to walk independently at 1 year (OR=5.20, 95% CI 1.02-26.34, $p=0.047$, specificity 89.4%, sensitivity 33.3%); sNfL levels higher than 248pg/mL classified patients unable to run at 1 year (OR=6.81, 95% CI 1.64-28.21, $p=0.008$, specificity 94.2%, sensitivity 39.3%) and sNfL levels lower than 34pg/mL predicted complete recovery, defined as the ability to run at 1 year (OR=6.59, 95% CI 2.02-21.46, $p=0.002$, specificity 82.1%, sensitivity 69.2%). We were unable to define good prognostic sNfL level cut-off points for ventilation and death due to the low number of patients. AUC, PPV and NPV for each cut-off point are detailed in **supplementary table 2**. The 3 cut-off points values maintain their significance evaluating R-ODS at 1 year by linear regression (**supplementary table 2**).

DISCUSSION:

Our study shows that sNfL levels are a valuable biomarker in GBS patients that correlates with diverse clinical, epidemiological and electrophysiological features and that is associated with clinical outcomes (residual disability) independently of other known prognostic variables: sNfL levels are increased in patients with GBS compared to controls and correlate with disease severity and with pure motor presentation and AMAN electrophysiological variants. This study also shows that sNfL levels tested at admission

can predict prognosis at 1 year and establishes different cut-off points that predict moderate disability (ability to walk independently), mild disability (inability to run) and complete recovery (ability to run) at 1 year in our sample of patients. As expected, due to the monophasic nature of GBS, all patients with high sNfL levels at baseline returned to normal levels at one year.

Baseline characteristics in GBS patients and prognostic values (ability to walk at 6 months and 1 year) in our cohort are similar to other studies and similar to the IGOS global dataset²², except for an increased proportion of AMAN (12.2%) and MFS (10.2%) patients. This could be a selection bias due to the higher severity of AMAN patients or the rarity of MFS variant.

We found a correlation between baseline sNfL levels and disease severity, in agreement with previously reported findings in other peripheral neuropathies; such as chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy (CIDP)²³, Charcot-Marie-Tooth disease²⁴ (CMT) or neuropathy in hereditary transthyretin amyloidosis²⁵. The median levels of sNfL in GBS patients were higher than the sNfL levels reported in other peripheral neuropathies, but there is a high variability among GBS patients, some of them with levels 100-fold higher than HC. This variability is partially explained by the different clinical and EMG variants, being baseline sNfL levels higher in axonal variants (AMAN). Other factors, not considered in this study, could have influenced heterogeneity in sNfL levels (treatment, comorbidities, potential misdiagnosis with GBS mimics...) and will need to be assessed in larger cohorts. We also found elevated sNfL levels in patients with MFS despite their benign prognosis (87.5% were able to run at 6 months and their median R-ODS was 48). When we analyzed the NCS for MFS patients we found five patients with normal NCS, four patients with equivocal NCS and one patient with AMSAN, classified as MFS-overlap syndrome. One possible explanation of the sNfL elevation in MFS patients despite unremarkable peripheral nerve electrophysiological alterations could be that either preganglionic nerve roots (difficult to assess with routine electrophysiology) or cerebellar damage are driving this sNfL increase instead of peripheral nerve damage²⁶⁻²⁸ but larger cohorts with MFS are needed.

Smaller studies have previously studied neurofilament levels⁹⁻¹³ in serum and CSF and some of them found an association of poor outcomes with severity¹⁴. However, we provide the first large prospective study assessing the relationship of sNfL (tested with

SiMoA) with GBS features and long-term prognosis. We found a clear relationship between sNfL and prognosis: high baseline sNfL were associated with inability to run and with R-ODS scores at 1 year in a multiple logistic and linear regression models, adjusted by known prognostic factors. We also aimed to establish cut-off points to predict clinically relevant outcomes with high specificity. These three cut-off points allowed us to predict that in our sample: (1) a patient with baseline sNfL >319 pg/ml is not going to be able to walk independently at 1 year with almost 90% specificity; (2) a patient with baseline sNfL >248pg/ml is not going to be able to run at 1 year with a 94.2% of specificity; and (3) a patient with baseline sNfL < 34pg/ml is going to be able to run at 1 year with a 82.1% of specificity. Considering natural history of GBS, most patients are going to walk independently at 1 year anyway, but early recognition of patients with poor and excellent prognoses could eventually help physicians guide treatment choices in the future and provide better prognostic information for patients in the recovery phase. Incorporating sNfL in the existing prognostic models for GBS²⁻⁴ could be an option to improve the GBS prognosis prediction. Although our study provides one of the largest prognostic studies in GBS, larger studies should confirm our findings and establish optimized sNfL cut-off points for relevant clinical endpoints in more diverse populations and include other important confounders (treatment).

We have not found a strong correlation between the disease characteristics and NfL in CSF, as it happens in other diseases such as multiple sclerosis²⁹. This could be because the immune response in GBS occurs and leads to nerve pathology predominantly in the periphery and not intrathecally. This may also explain why the sNfL and CSF NfL do not correlate with CSF protein levels. Due to the low number of patients in whom we have measured the NfL in CSF, caution should be made in interpreting our data.

An important issue in GBS and other inflammatory neuropathy trials is the lack of biomarkers that could be used as surrogate markers for disease activity and as secondary endpoints in clinical trials. Clinical trials in inflammatory neuropathies and GBS are typically performed using clinical scales as primary and secondary endpoints. Moreover, the traditional primary endpoint (ability to walk unaided at 6 months) may not be sensitive enough to detect GBS natural history modifications by assayed therapies³⁰. The relationship of sNfL levels with disease severity, axonal damage and prognosis suggest that sNfL levels could be an informative secondary endpoint for phase II clinical trials or of treatment response as it happens in other diseases³¹.

One of the limitations of our study is the lack of exclusion criteria in the IGOS study. We did not collect previous neurologic diseases that could raise NfL levels in our patients. In our sample, we have seven patients that have comorbidities affecting mobility, but we did not exclude those patients from multivariable analyses to strictly follow IGOS study inclusion and exclusion criteria. Another point to study would be the time to recovery of patients with high sNfL vs patients with low sNfL. To evaluate this, it would be necessary to perform more frequent or self-registered visits informing about relevant outcomes, since we had no visits scheduled between 6 and 12 months. Furthermore, our established cut-off points are valid only for our sample of patients. Larger studies with repeated sampling and addressing short-term dynamics of the sNfL levels could address the relationship of sNfL levels with treatment response, best time points to test sNfL for prognostic purposes and better representative cut-off points for clinically relevant endpoints, but our study provides the proof of concept to support the use of the sNfL as a prognostic biomarker in GBS in the future.

In summary, our study proves that sNfL are increased in GBS patients, that they correlate with disease severity and axonal damage and that they could be used as an informative prognostic biomarker in GBS patients.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank all our patients for their patience and collaboration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Asbury AK. Cornblath DR. Assessment of current diagnostic criteria for Guillain-Barré syndrome. *Ann Neurol* [online serial]. 1990;27 Suppl:S21-4. Accessed at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2194422>. Accessed January 20, 2019.
2. van Koningsveld R. Steyerberg EW. Hughes RA. Swan A V.. van Doorn PA. Jacobs BC. A clinical prognostic scoring system for Guillain-Barré syndrome. *Lancet Neurol*. 2007;6:589–594.
3. Walgaard C. Lingsma HF. Ruts L. Van Doorn PA. Steyerberg EW. Jacobs BC.


- Early recognition of poor prognosis in Guillain-Barré syndrome. *Neurology*. 2011;76:968–975.
4. Walgaard C. Lingsma HF. Ruts L. et al. Prediction of respiratory insufficiency in Guillain-Barré syndrome. *Ann Neurol*. 2010;67:781–787.
 5. Khalil M. Teunissen CE. Otto M. et al. Neurofilaments as biomarkers in neurological disorders. *Nat Rev Neurol* [online serial]. Springer US; 2018;14:577–589. Accessed at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41582-018-0058-z>.
 6. Gaetani L. Blennow K. Calabresi P. Di Filippo M. Parnetti L. Zetterberg H. Neurofilament light chain as a biomarker in neurological disorders. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. Epub 2019.:1–12.
 7. Kuhle J. Barro C. Andreasson U. et al. Comparison of three analytical platforms for quantification of the neurofilament light chain in blood samples: ELISA, electrochemiluminescence immunoassay and Simoa. *Clin Chem Lab Med*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH; 2016;54:1655–1661.
 8. Disanto G. Barro C. Benkert P. et al. Serum Neurofilament light: A biomarker of neuronal damage in multiple sclerosis. *Ann Neurol*. 2017;81:857–870.
 9. Petzold A. Hinds N. Murray NMF. et al. CSF neurofilament levels: A potential prognostic marker in Guillain-Barré syndrome. *Neurology*. 2006;67:1071–1073.
 10. Petzold A. Brettschneider J. Jin K. et al. CSF protein biomarkers for proximal axonal damage improve prognostic accuracy in the acute phase of Guillain-Barré syndrome. *Muscle and Nerve*. 2009;40:42–49.
 11. Axelsson M. Sjögren M. Andersen O. Blennow K. Zetterberg H. Lycke J. Neurofilament light protein levels in cerebrospinal fluid predict long-term disability of Guillain-Barré syndrome: A pilot study. *Acta Neurol Scand*. 2018;138:143–150.
 12. Mariotto S. Farinazzo A. Magliozzi R. Alberti D. Monaco S. Ferrari S. Serum and cerebrospinal neurofilament light chain levels in patients with acquired peripheral neuropathies. *J Peripher Nerv Syst*. 2018;23:174–177.
 13. Gaiottino J. Norgren N. Dobson R. et al. Increased Neurofilament Light Chain Blood Levels in Neurodegenerative Neurological Diseases. *PLoS One*. 2013;8:1–

- 9.
14. Altmann P. Simoni D De. Kaider A. et al. Increased serum neurofilament light chain concentration indicates poor outcome in Guillain-Barré syndrome. *Journal of Neuroinflammation*; 2020;0:1–10.
15. Jacobs BC. van den Berg B. Verboon C. et al. International Guillain-Barré Syndrome Outcome Study: protocol of a prospective observational cohort study on clinical and biological predictors of disease course and outcome in Guillain-Barré syndrome. *J Peripher Nerv Syst*. Blackwell Publishing Inc.; 2017;22:68–76.
16. Hughes RAC. Newsom-Davis JM. Perkin GD. Pierce JM. Controlled Trial of Prednisolone in Acute Polyneuropathy. *Lancet*. 1978;312:750–753.
17. Hadden RDM. Karch H. Hartung HP. et al. Preceding infections, immune factors, and outcome in Guillain-Barré syndrome. *Neurology*. Lippincott Williams and Wilkins; 2001;56:758–765.
18. Willison HJ. Jacobs BC. van Doorn PA. Guillain-Barré syndrome. *Lancet* [online serial]. 2016;388:717–727. Accessed at: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0140673616003391>. Accessed January 20, 2019.
19. Van Nes SI. Vanhoutte EK. Van Doorn PA. et al. Rasch-built Overall Disability Scale (R-ODS) for immune-mediated peripheral neuropathies. *Neurology*. 2011;76:337–345.
20. Hiraga A. Mori M. Ogawara K. et al. Recovery patterns and long term prognosis for axonal Guillain-Barré syndrome. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2005;76:719–722.
21. Kuwabara S. Mori M. Ogawara K. Hattori T. Yuki N. Indicators of rapid clinical recovery in Guillain-Barré syndrome. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2001;70:560–562.
22. Doets AY. Verboon C. Van Den Berg B. et al. Regional variation of Guillain-Barré syndrome. *Brain*. 2018;141:2866–2877.
23. Lieverloo GGA. Wieske L. Verhamme C. et al. Serum neurofilament light chain

- in chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. *J Peripher Nerv Syst* [online serial]. Epub 2019 Apr 29.:jns.12319. Accessed at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jns.12319>.
24. Sandelius Å, Zetterberg H, Blennow K, et al. Plasma neurofilament light chain concentration in the inherited peripheral neuropathies. *Neurology* [online serial]. 2018;90:e518–e524. Accessed at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29321234>. Accessed December 23, 2019.
 25. Kapoor M, Foiani M, Heslegrave A, et al. Plasma neurofilament light chain concentration is increased and correlates with the severity of neuropathy in hereditary transthyretin amyloidosis. *J Peripher Nerv Syst*. Blackwell Publishing Inc.; Epub 2019.
 26. Berlit P, Rakicky J. The miller fisher syndrome: Review of the literature. *J Clin Neuroophthalmol*. 1992;12:57–63.
 27. Kim YK, Kim JS, Jeong SH, Park KS, Kim SE, Park SH. Cerebral glucose metabolism in Fisher syndrome. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2009;80:512–517.
 28. Sandler RD, Hoggard N, Hadjivassiliou M. Miller-Fisher Syndrome: Is the ataxia central or peripheral? *Cerebellum & Ataxias*. Springer Nature; 2015;2.
 29. Martin SJ, McGlasson S, Hunt D, Overell J. Cerebrospinal fluid neurofilament light chain in multiple sclerosis and its subtypes: A meta-analysis of case-control studies. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2019;90:1059–1067.
 30. Misawa S, Kuwabara S, Sato Y, et al. Articles Safety and efficacy of eculizumab in Guillain-Barré syndrome : a multicentre . double-blind . randomised phase 2 trial. 2018;4422:1–11.
 31. Sormani MP, Haering DA, Kropshofer H, et al. Blood neurofilament light as a potential endpoint in Phase 2 studies in MS. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol* [online serial]. 2019;6:acn3.795. Accessed at: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31211172>. Accessed June 25, 2019.


FIGURES:

Figure 1. Baseline NfL in patients with Guillain-Barré (GBS) vs. healthy controls (HC) in serum (A) and in CSF (B).




The line in the center represents the GeoMean value and the whiskers indicate the 95% confidence interval. GBS = Guillain-Barré Syndrome; HC = Healthy controls; sNfL = serum neurofilament light chain; CSF= cerebrospinal fluid. GeoMean = Geometric mean.

Figure 2. A. sNfL levels in clinical variants. B. sNfL and EMG classification




The line in the center represents the GeoMean value and the whiskers indicate the 95% confidence interval. sNfL= Serum neurofilament light chain; AIDP= Acute Inflammatory Demyelinating Polyneuropathy; AMAN= Acute Motor Axonal Neuropathy; AMSAN= Acute Motor-Sensory Axonal Neuropathy; MFS= Miller-Fisher Syndrome.

Figure 3. Correlation between initial GDS and baseline sNfL levels.




The line in the center represents the GeoMean value and the whiskers indicate the 95% confidence interval. sNfL= Serum neurofilament light chain; GDS= Guillain-Barré Syndrome Disability Score.

Supplementary figure 1. A. Correlation between sNfL and CSF. B. Correlation between sNfL and age.



Dots in red represent Guillain-Barré syndrome patients, dots in blue represent healthy controls. sNfL= serum neurofilament light chain; cNfL= CSF neurofilament light chain

Supplementary figure 2. sNfL Kinetics



TABLES:

Table 1. Baseline serum and CSF NfL in patients with Guillain-Barré (GBS) and healthy controls (HC)

		GBS patients	HC	p
Age	mean +/- SD	57.4 +/- 16.6	51.7 +/- 19.4	0.173
Gender	n. % male	56 (57.1%)	13 (50%)	0.51
Serum NfL (pg/mL)	n	98	16	<0.001
	GeoMean	55.49	9.13	
	Median	40.00	8.22	
	Max	3573.03	22.82	
	Min	4.22	3.29	
CSF NfL (pg/mL)	n	24	10	0.034
	GeoMean	1308.50	440.24	
	Median	883.57	493.79	
	Max	32915.47	1469.97	
	Min	212.74	139.42	

GBS = Guillain-Barré Syndrome; HC = Healthy controls; NfL = neurofilament light chain; CSF= cerebrospinal fluid. GeoMean = Geometric mean; Max = maximum; Min = minimum; SD= Standard Deviation.

Table 2. Relationship between sNfL levels and basal characteristics

BASAL CHARACTERISTICS (n=98)		sNfL (pg/ml; GeoMean. GeoMean 95% CI. CV%)	p
Age (mean +/- SD)	57.35 +/-16.6	-	0.071
Gender (n. %)			
Male	56 (57.1%)	52.48 (31.62; 79.43). 41.5%	0.625
Female	42 (42.9%)	60.26 (39.81; 100). 41.8%	
Infectious antecedent (n. %)			
Diarrhea	24 (24.5%)	134.90 (63.10; 251.19). 36.6%	0.016
Respiratory infection	43 (43.9%)	38.02 (25.12; 63.10). 42.6%	
None	31 (31.6%)	47.86 (28.35; 81.50). 39.3%	
Evolution time (days. median; IQR)	4 (3-6)	-	0.413
Initial GDS (median; IQR)	3 (2-4)		
1 (n. %)	4 (4.1%)	6.17 (3.98; 10). 25.4%	0.005
2 (n. %)	28 (28.6%)	35.48 (19.95; 63.10). 46.1%	
3 (n. %)	19 (19.4%)	64.56 (31.62; 125.89). 36.5%	
4 (n. %)	45 (25.9%)	77.62 (59.12; 125.89). 35.7%	
5 (n. %)	2 (2%)	375.83; 53.5%	
GBS Variants (n. %)			
No	65 (66.3%)	38.02 (25.12; 50.12); 37%	0.009
Pure motor	18 (18.4%)	162.18 (79.43; 398.11); 34.7%	
Pure sensory	4 (4.1%)	26.30 (1.26; 501.19); 91.6%	
MFS	10 (10.2%)	95.50 (31.62; 316.23); 42.3%	
Ataxic	1 (1%)	338.84	
EMG Classification (n. %)			
AIDP	58 (59.2%)	33.88 (25.12; 50.12). 37.7%	0.008
AMAN	12 (12.2%)	199.53 (79.43; 501.19); 28.5%	
AMSAN	7 (7.1%)	107.15 (25.12; 501.19); 44%	
Equivocal	14 (14.3%)	104.7 (39.81; 316.22); 43%	
Normal	7 (7.1%)	53.70 (12.59; 251.19). 50%	
Treatment (n. %)			
No	6 (6.1%)	7.59 (3.98; 12.59); 37.5%	0.009
IVIg	76 (77.6%)	72.44 (50.12; 100.43); 39.1%	
IVIg x2	5 (5.1%)	32.36 (15.85; 79.43); 27%	
IVIg + PLEX	10 (10.2%)	30.90 (12.59; 79.43); 41.8%	
PLEX	1 (1%)	117.49	

sNfL= Serum neurofilament light chain; CI=confidence interval; CV=coefficient of variation. GeoMean=geometric mean; GDS= Guillain-Barré Syndrome Disability Score; AIDP= Acute Inflammatory Demyelinating Polyneuropathy; AMAN= Acute Motor Axonal Neuropathy; AMSAN= Acute Motor-Sensory Axonal Neuropathy; MFS= Miller-Fisher Syndrome; IVIg= Intravenous Immunoglobulin; PLEX= Plasma Exchange.

Table 3. Correlation between GDS and R-ODS at different timepoints and baseline sNFL levels

CLINICAL SCALES		r	p
GDS (median; IQR)			
Initial GDS (n=98)	3 (2-4)	0.313	0.002
Maximum GDS (n=98)	4 (2-4)	0.251	0.013
GDS at 4 weeks (n=96)	2 (1-4)	0.235	0.021
GDS at 26 weeks (n=89)	1 (0-2)	0.341	0.001
GDS at 52 weeks (n=87)	1 (0-2)	0.332	0.002
R-ODS (median; p25. p75)			
At 4 weeks (n=87)	33 (13-45)	-0.342	0.001
At 26 weeks (n=85)	45 (32-48)	-0.362	0.001
At 52 weeks (n=81)	47 (35-48)	-0.344	0.002

sNFL= Serum neurofilament light chain. GDS= Guillain-Barré Syndrome Disability Score; R-ODS= Rasch-built Overall Disability Scale. r= Rho Spearman coefficient

Table 4. Association between baseline NfL levels and prognosis

Univariate analysis for ability to run at 1 year				
Variable	OR	95% CI	p	
logNFL	1.90	1.34-2.69	<0.001	
AMAN	6.53	1.57-27.17	0.010	
Diarrea	2.33	0.83-6.57	0.109	
Age	1.04	1.01-1.07	0.023	
Initial GDS	1.81	1.08-3.04	0.025	
Univariate analysis for R-ODS at 1 year				
Variable	Beta coefficient	95% CI	Std beta	p
logNFL	-3.67	-5.65-(-1.69)	-0.40	<0.001
AMAN	-6.14	-16.48-4.19	-0.14	0.240
Diarrea	-6.03	-14.41-2.34	-0.17	0.155
Age	-0.27	-0.47-(-0.08)	-0.31	0.007
Initial GDS	-5.54	-8.63-(-2.44)	-0.39	0.001
Multivariable logistic analysis for ability to run at 1 year*				
Variable	OR	95% CI	p	
logNFL	1.65	1.14-2.40	0.009	
AMAN	6.19	1.01-38.02	0.049	
Age	1.05	1.01-1.09	0.022	
Multivariable linear analysis for R-ODS at 1 year**				
Variable	Beta	95% CI	Std beta	p
logNFL	-2.60	-4.66-(-0.54)	-0.29	0.014

*Results from the multivariable logistic regression analysis and **results from the multivariable linear regression analysis after a backward stepwise selection modelling. The variables included in the initial model were age, initial GDS, AMAN and diarrhea.

logNFL= log-transformed neurofilament light chain; AMAN=Acute Motor Axonal Neuropathy; GDS= Guillain-Barré Syndrome Disability Score; R-ODS= Rasch-built Overall Disability Scale; Std= Standardized. OR= Odds ratio. CI= Confidence Interval.

Supplementary Table 1. Association between baseline NfL levels and prognosis including MFS patients:

Univariate analysis for ability to run at 1 year				
Variable	OR	95% CI	p	
logNfL	1.67	1.23-2.27	0.001	
AMAN	7.23	1.75-29.89	0.006	
Diarrea	2.34	0.86-6.41	0.097	
Age	1.04	1.01-1.07	0.019	
Initial GDS	1.95	1.17-3.25	0.010	
Univariate analysis for R-ODS at 1 year				
Variable	Beta coefficient	95% CI	Std beta	p
logNfL	-3.27	-5.19-(-1.35)	-0.36	0.001
AMAN	-6.42	-16.17-3.93	-0.14	0.220
Diarrea	-5.25	-13.42-2.92	-0.14	0.205
Age	-0.29	-0.48-(-0.09)	-0.32	0.004
Initial GDS	-5.99	-8.93-(-3.04)	-0.42	<0.001
Multivariable logistic analysis for ability to run at 1 year*				
Variable	OR	95% CI	p	
logNfL	1.49	1.07-2.09	0.019	
AMAN	8.91	1.49-53.14	0.016	
Age	1.05	1.01-1.09	0.010	
Multivariable linear analysis for R-ODS at 1 year**				
Variable	Beta	95% CI	Std beta	p
logNfL	-2.22	-4.12-(-0.33)	-0.24	0.022
Initial GDS	-3.91	-7.06- (-0.76)	-0.27	0.016

*Results from the multivariable logistic regression analysis and **results from the multivariable linear regression analysis after a backward stepwise selection modelling. The variables included in the initial model were age, initial GDS, AMAN and diarrhea.

logNfL= log-transformed neurofilament light chain; AMAN=Acute Motor Axonal Neuropathy; GDS= Guillain-Barré Syndrome Disability Score; R-ODS= Rasch-built Overall Disability Scale; Std= Standardized

Supplementary table 2. Clinically relevant sNfL cut-off points:

		For each clinically relevant endpoint							For evaluating R-ODS at 1 year		
		Multivariable Logistic Regression*			ROC Analysis				Multivariable Linear Regression**		
Endpoint	Cut-off point (pg/ml)	OR (95% CI)	p	AUC	Specificity	Sensitivity	PPV	NPV	β (95% CI)	Std β	p
No ability to walk independently at 1 year	319	5.20 (1.02-26.34)	0.047	0.714	89.4%	33.3%	100%	84.6%	-15.53 (-24.80-(-6.26))	-0.37	0.001
No ability to run at 1 year	248	6.81 (1.64-28.21)	0.008	0.803	94.2%	39.3%	73.3%	73.9%	-12.25 (-21.04-(-3.46))	-0.32	0.007
Ability to run at 1 year	34	6.59 (2.02-21.46)	0.002	0.834	82.1%	69.2%	87.5%	57.5%	11.13 (4.75-17.50)	0.38	0.001

*This model includes logNfL, AMAN and Age. **This model includes logNfL.

OR=Odds ratio. AUC=area under the curve; PPV=Positive Predictive Value. NPV= Negative Predictive Value; R-ODS= Rasch-built Overall Disability Scale; CI=Confidence Interval; Std=Standardized

