

Combining Optical Coherence Tomography, Full-field and Multifocal Visual Evoked Potentials Improves Detection of Asymptomatic Visual Pathway Involvement in Multiple Sclerosis.



Simone Guerrieri¹, Giovanni Di Maggio¹, Marco Pisa¹, Francesco Vitali¹, Roberto Santangelo¹, Stefania Medaglini¹, Lucia Moiola¹, Ubaldo Del Carro¹, Vittorio Martinelli¹, Alexander Klistorner², Giancarlo Comi¹, Letizia Leocani¹

¹ Neurological Dep.t & INSPE - Institute of Experimental Neurology; University Hospital - IRCCS S.Raffaele, Milan – Italy ² Faculty of Medicine and Human Science - Macquarie University; Save Sight Institute - Sydney University, Sydney – Australia

Introduction

In the assessment of visual pathway in Multiple Sclerosis (MS), optical coherence tomography (OCT) is used, especially in the field of research, to measure retinal nerve fiber layer (RNFL) thickness as a marker of axonal loss [1-2] allowing to detect neurodegeneration in vivo and in a non-invasive way. On the other hand full-field visual evoked potentials (ff-VEPs) are commonly performed in neurological clinical practice as an indicator of demyelination [3], especially in the presence of optic neuritis. Multifocal visual evoked potentials (mf-VEPs) allows the electrophysiological assessment of conduction along the central visual pathways for separate portions of the visual field [4]; primarily developed for the assessment of glaucoma [5], this technique has proven to be useful in the investigation of other optic neuropathies and also MS [6]. In this perspective, starting from the experience of our neurophysiology lab, we explored whether a multimodal visual system evaluation, comprehensive of OCT, ff-VEPs and mf-VEPs, could be useful to assess MS patients in everyday clinical practice.

Methods

200 MS patients (16 Clinically Isolated Syndromes-CIS, 126 Relapsing Remitting-RRMS, 38 Secondary Progressive-SPMS, 20 Primary Progressive-PPMS, mean age 40.3 years, mean disease duration 8.19 years, median EDSS 2.0) underwent neurophysiological assessment (OCT, ff-VEPs and mf-VEPs) (*figure 1a-c*). OCT (global and sectoral RNFL thickness) was evaluated considering normative data provided by manufacturer; ff-VEPs and mf-VEPs (latency and amplitude) were interpreted according to our lab data; mf-VEPs cluster analysis was also performed. OCT, ff-VEPs and mf-VEPs sensitivities were analyzed according to ON history and disease course and compared using the McNemar Test.





Figure 1a. OCT acquisition. OCT was performed using a high-resolution spectral-domain device (Heidelberg Spectralis[™]). RNFL thickness was measured on a standard 12° circle scan manually centered around the optic disc by the operator. Inner and outer RNFL boundaries are automatically identified by the software provided by the constructor, global and sectoral RNFL thickness is automatically derived; scans have been also manually checked by the operator to grant a proper image quality. Considering RNFL thickness, exams have been interpreted (normal vs abnormal) according to an age-adjusted normative database provided by the constructor: RNFL thickness values below 1st percentile of normative data in at least one retinal sector have been considered as an indicator of RNFL atrophy.



Figure 1b. ff-VEPs acquisition. ff-VEP were performed using a pattern reversal stimulus on LCD monitor with a single recording channel (2 electrodes at Oz and Cz of the international 10-20 system). Each eye was acquired separately and stimulation was repeated using three different check-size (60', 30' and 15'); for each check-size at least three tracks were acquired in order to grant proper reproducibility of recorded cortical responses. Exams were interpreted (normal vs abnormal) according to our neurophysiology laboratory normative data, focusing in particular on P100 latency and P100-N75 amplitude; for these parameters both absolute values and intereye differences have been taken into account.



Figure 1c. *mf-VEPs acquisition. mf-VEP were performed using a 56-segments dartboard pattern on LCD monitor and 2 recording occipital channels (horizontal and vertical). Each segment gives an independent stimulus controlled by a software performing a Fast Fourier analysis of all raw signals and extracting VEP response from the continuous basal EEG. For each segment latency of the second peak is measured within the complex with the highest peak-to-peak amplitude. Exams were interpreted (normal vs abnormal) considering mean latency and amplitude (both absolute values and intereye asymmetry) compared with our neurophysiology laboratory data; a cluster criteria was also used: according to data obtained from our control group, the exam was considered as pathologic also in the presence of at least 5 contiguous sectors with abnormal latency values.*

Results

Eye-based analysis (figure2): in eyes without Optic Neuritis (**nON**, n=274), OCT, ff-VEPs and mf-VEPs combination was more sensitive than each single technique (75.2% vs 28.8%, 52.2% and 66.1% respectively, p<0.001). The same advantage (91.1% vs 63.3%, 75.6% and 82.2% respectively, p<0.001 for OCT and ff-VEP, p=0.008 for mf-VEP) was found considering eyes with previous ON (>3 months - **cON**, n=90). In eyes with recent ON (<3 months - **aON**, n=36) the combination of the three techniques was superior to OCT only (94.4% vs 58.8%, p<0.001); both ff-VEPs and mf-VEPs showed alone a good diagnostic power (83.3% and 86.1% respectively). When **comparing single techniques** both ff-VEPs and mf-VEPs were superior to OCT in nON eyes (28.8% vs 52.2% and 66.1% respectively, p<0.001), with mf-VEPs more sensitive than ff-VEPs (63.3% vs 75.5%, p=0.071), with mf-VEPs more sensitive than OCT (82.2% vs 63.3%, p=0.002) but not than ff-VEPs. In aON eyes both ff-VEPs and mf-VEPs were superior to OCT (52.8% vs 83.4%, p=0.003 and 86.1%, p=0.008 respectively), with no difference among them. Including **cluster analysis** mf-VEPs were found more sensitive than ff-VEPs also in cON eyes (87.8% vs 75.2%, p=0.013), but not in aON eyes, although reaching 94.4% sensitivity in this category.

Patient-based analysis (figure 3): considering RRMS and CIS patients (**RR+CIS**, n=142) OCT, ff-VEPs and mf-VEPs combination was more sensitive than each single technique (90.1% vs 47.9%, 73.2% and 84.5% respectively, p<0.001 for OCT and ff-VEP, p=0.008 for mf-VEP). When considering progressive patients (**SP+PP**, n=58) the combination of the three techniques was superior to OCT only (96.6% vs 69.0%, p<0.001) but not than ff-VEPs and mf-VEPs (89.7% and 93.1% respectively). When **comparing single techniques** both ff-VEPs and mf-VEPs were superior to OCT in CIS+RR patients (47.9% vs 73.2% and 84.5% respectively, p<0.001), with mf-VEPs more sensitive than ff-VEPs (p=0.005). ff-VEPs and mf-VEPs where found to be more sensitive than OCT also when considering SP+PP patients (69.0% vs 89.7% and 93.1% respectively, p=0.001) with no statistical difference among them also after **cluster analysis** inclusion (98.3% vs 89.7%, p=0.063).









Discussion and Conclusions

The present findings suggest the usefulness of a multimodal approach to the visual system in MS, combining morphological (OCT) with functional information (ff-VEPs and mf-VEPs). The latter techniques seem both useful although providing mutually complementary information. While ff-VEPs provide a global assessment of the visual pathway with robust diagnostic information, mf-VEPs allow to parcel out visual conduction, possibly identifying partial defects which may not influence standard VEPs results, as previously suggested [7] and, when detailed cluster analysis is used as in the present study, may provide higher sensitivity compared with ff-VEPs.

As expected, the advantage of a combined approach seems greater when considering the relatively early phases of relapsing MS, when EPs are less sensitive compared with the progressive phase [8] particularly in eyes without previous ON, where, consistently with what previously reported by our group [9], OCT is less sensitive than VEPs.

Bibliography and Acknowledgements

- 1. Albrecht P et al. Optical coherence tomography measures axonal loss in multiple sclerosis independently of optic neuritis. J Neurol 2007.
- 2. Petzold A et al. Optical coherence tomography in multiple sclerosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Neurol. 2010.
- 3. Comi G et al. Measuring evoked responses in multiple sclerosis. Mult. Scler. 1999.
- 4. Klistorner A et al. Multifocal topographic visual evoked potential: improving objective detection of local visual field defects. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 1998.
- 5. Goldberg I et al. Multifocal objective perimetry in the detection of glaucomatous field loss. Am J Ophthalmol 2002.
- 6. Klistorner A et al. Correlation between full-field and multifocal VEPs in optic neuritis. Doc Ophthalmol. 2008.
- 7. Larissa K et al. A comparison of multifocal and conventional visual evoked potential techniques in patients with optic neuritis / multiple sclerosis. Doc Ophthalmol. 2008.





Disclosures: part of this work was supported by Merck Serono S.A., Geneva, Switzerland. Merck Serono is the biopharmaceutical division of Merck KGaA, Darmstadt, Germany.