

Nerve conduction studies in experimental models of autoimmune neuritis: A meta-analysis and guideline

Felix Kohle¹, Alina Sprenger¹, Ines Muke¹, Gereon R Fink^{1,2} and Helmar C Lehmann¹

¹Department of Neurology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Cologne and University Hospital Cologne, Cologne, Germany

²Cognitive Neuroscience, Research Center Juelich, Institute of Neuroscience and Medicine (INM-3), Juelich, Germany

Corresponding author:

Felix Kohle, Department of Neurology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Cologne and University Hospital Cologne, Kerpener Strasse, 62 50937, Cologne, Germany.

Email: felix.kohle@uk-koeln.de

or

Helmar C. Lehmann, Department of Neurology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Cologne and University Hospital Cologne, Kerpener Strasse, 62 50937, Cologne, Germany.

Email: helmar.lehmann@uk-koeln.de

21 **List of abbreviations**

22 CI = confidence interval

23 CMAP = compound muscle action potential

24 CV = conduction velocity

25 EAN = experimental autoimmune neuritis

26 MeSH = Medical Subject Headings

27 NCS = nerve conduction studies

28 NCV = nerve conduction velocity

29 SD = standard deviation

30 SE = standard error

31 SNAP = sensory nerve action potential

32

1. Introduction

Nerve conduction studies (NCS) are standard measures in experimental autoimmune neuritis (EAN), the most common experimental model of Guillain-Barré syndrome (GBS). There is consensus that NCS need standardization to produce high-quality results and to minimize inter- and intraobserver variability (Dillingham et al. , 2016, Dyck et al. , 2013, Litchy et al. , 2014). However, in contrast to human studies, experimental NCS in EAN lack standardization in terms of (i) normative reference values, (ii) technical performance, and (iii) criteria for reporting relevant information in scientific publications. These issues are at odds with the principles of replacement, reduction, and refinement (3R) in animal research. For instance, establishing individual NCS reference values for a specific experiment requires additional animals, which contradicts the principle of minimizing the number and exposure of test animals to this invasive and potentially painful procedure.

To provide a set of reference metrics and criteria for technical performance and reporting of NCS, we performed a systematic review and meta-analysis of NCS for the last 30 years of healthy Lewis rat breed, the most commonly used strain in autoimmune neuritis.

2. Methods

2.1 Literature search strategy

This meta-analysis follows the proposed Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guideline (Moher et al. , 2009) (**Additional file 1**). A systematic literature review of the database Medline (via pubmed) was performed on the 30th of November 2019. We used the MeSH- and search terms [experimental autoimmune neuritis], neurophysiology, [neural conduction], [electromyography], and neurophysio* and combined them with the term [rat, inbred Lew] (**Table 1**). We only included publications in English.

“[insert Table 1]”

We exported the studies to Endnote X9 (Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA) to find any possible duplications of studies due to indexing under more than one of the five search or MeSH-terms. We further defined a timeline of 30 years, between the 1st of January 1990 and the 30th of November 2019, to limit differences in technological advances (Dillingham, Chen, 2016).

2.2. Data collection

Exclusion criteria were papers written in other languages than English, number of examined animals <4 (to reduce bias), studies performed on dead rats, NCS after model induction, intraoperative electrodiagnostic studies (e.g., surgical exposure of the sciatic

nerve followed by NCS), NCS of non-immune mediated neuritis (e.g., reconstructive nerve lesions), and papers that reported only percentages and ratios but no numeric values. Inclusion criteria were papers written in English, NCS performed on healthy living rats (≥ 4 per study) before any intervention or any surgical procedure, graphically or numerically reported statistical values like mean, SD, or SE of NCS in immune-mediated neuritis models. Title, abstract, and whenever necessary, the entire publication of 468 studies were read and screened for exclusion criteria by two independent researchers (HL and FK). Rare discrepancies in study selection (overall five studies) were resolved by mutual discussion. For each study, we pooled all experimental groups, in which NCS was performed on fit rats and **before** an intervention. We converted the means, standard deviations (SD), and standard errors (SE) in any paper with more than one group to a pooled mean, SD, and SE of the mean using the method described in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins JPT, 2019). In 17 studies, results were only presented graphically. We used ImageJ software (ImageJ 1x- software, open-source) to measure and extract the data of interest (Schneider, 2012).

2.3 Statistical analysis

All analyses were performed using Stata 16 (StataCorp, College Station, Texas, USA). Descriptive statistics are reported as means and 95 % confidence intervals (CI). A meta-

analysis of the parameters was performed using Stata's metan command. The metan command pools studies to produce an overall effect estimate using inverse variance-weighted meta-analysis. The meta-analysis was performed using a random-effects model (to account for the heterogeneity between studies), specifying each study-specific parameter as effect size and a 95 % CI, based on the reported SE. An overall summary and study-specific effect sizes and 95% CIs are reported in forest plots for parameters NCV and CMAP. We report heterogeneity via between-study variance (τ^2), percentage of variability in the effect sizes, which is not caused by sampling error (I^2), and the total amount of variability of heterogeneity plus sampling variance (H^2). We used a restricted maximum likelihood (REML) function for unbiased estimates of variances. To address the risk of bias across the studies, we used the Systematic Review Center for Laboratory animal Experimentation (SYRCLE) tool for the risk of bias assessment (Hooijmans et al. , 2014). Further subgroup analyses for gender, animals' age, and animals' weight (in a range of 150-220g) were performed, as well as stratification for the anesthetics used and pulse amplitude. The sample sizes of studies reporting CMAP after stimulation at the ankle or hip were too small for further subgroup analysis.

3. Results

3.1 Literature search

The search led to 616 publications of interest, 58 of which were duplicates captured by more than one search term. Further, ninety studies had been published before 1990. Thus, 468 studies were eligible for further review, of which 412 were excluded after abstract and title screening. Fifty-six publications were accessed for full-text analysis, of which 28 were excluded because they met exclusion criteria (**Additional file 2**). Twenty-eight studies were left for qualitative assessment. Three studies (of which two exclusively) reported motor NCS of the tail nerve (Kafri et al. , 2002, Usuki et al. , 2010, Usuki et al. , 2006). Due to this low number of studies, no further analysis was performed concerning this nerve. Overall, 26 studies reporting NCV or/and CMAP of the sciatic nerve and its muscles, were included in the qualitative analysis (**Figure 1**).

“[insert Figure 1]”

Figure 1. Study flow-chart based on the PRISMA guidelines. PRISMA = Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses, n= number of studies.

3.2 Data characteristics

Overall, the studies included a total of 735 Lewis-rats (mean $28.27 \pm$ SD of 19.12 per study). Twenty-two of the 26 studies reported NCV, 13 the CMAP recorded from the dorsal foot muscles after stimulation at the sciatic notch, and 15 the CMAP recorded from the dorsal foot muscles after stimulation at the ankle or popliteal fossa. Six studies did not describe the animals' age, two studies did not report the gender distribution of

the animals included (**Table 2 and 3**). Reported methods differed widely regarding anesthesia, positioning, pulse duration, pulse amplitude, temperature monitoring, and technical devices (**Table 3**). The most frequently used anesthetics were xylazine and ketamine, followed by pentobarbital, halothane, fentanyl/fluanisone, and isoflurane. The drugs had been administered via intravenous, intraperitoneal, subcutaneous injection, or inhalation and differed remarkably in the used concentrations (**Table 3**). Two studies did not specify the used narcotics, and 12 studies did not report the used concentration. Also, the reported technical procedures were often incomplete and varied considerably. Only six studies reported pulse amplitude (between 1 and 30 mA), 23 studies a pulse duration (50 – 200 ms). Seven studies did not report temperature monitoring. The positioning of electrodes was described in 25 studies (**Table 3**).

“[insert Table 2]”

“[insert Table 3]”

3.3. Quality appraisal

The SYRCLE’s “risk of bias tool” assesses the bias of preclinical intervention studies (Hooijmans, Rovers, 2014). Some of these biases were not considered relevant for our purpose since we only included healthy rats in our analysis. We, therefore, decided to exclude whether allocation concealment was performed and whether animals were randomly assessed for outcome measurement. Random intervention group allocation

for, e.g., medication application should not bias baseline NCS, nor should allocation for outcome measurement (outcome NCS was not of interest in this analysis). Converting graphical data could introduce another bias, which we added to the assessment. The risk of bias assessment for the 26 studies, only regarding baseline NCS, is depicted in

Figure 2.

“[insert Figure 2]”

Figure 2. Risk of bias assessment. Study quality is assessed by eight items using the SYRCLE risk of bias tool. Studies were allocated to 3 different categories: high risk for bias (orange), low risk for bias (grey), and unclear risk of bias (blue).

Poor reporting regarding experimental details led to an overall unclear risk of bias. Selection bias assessment showed that none of the studies described how group allocation had been performed. Fortunately, only 23% of the studies showed a high risk of bias regarding baseline characteristics. Performance bias was not further detailed in any of the studies as no references to random housing or caregiver/investigator blinding was made. Only 27% of the studies stated investigators’ blindness, with the remaining studies not addressing possible detection bias. Attrition bias via incomplete outcome reporting was a concern in 37% of the studies, and selective outcome reporting was a low risk (12%). 65% of the included reports depicted their data graphically.

3.4 Study findings

We performed a meta-analysis of motor NCS data (NCV/CMAP) for the sciatic nerve based on the extracted data. The reported mean values for NCV (**Figure 3**) and CMAP after stimulation at the notch (**Figure 4**) or the ankle (**Figure 5**) were dispersed with considerable heterogeneity between the studies (reported $I^2 > 99\%$). This heterogeneity was accessed with further subgroup analyses of NCV stratified for gender and age, which did not reveal any significant impact of this parameter for NCV (**Figure 6 and Additional file 3**). To assess the impact of weight, we analyzed the NCV of studies that reported the animals' weight within a range of 150-220 g. Despite comparable mean weights, considerably different NCVs were found (**Additional file 4**). Methodical differences of the studies were further analyzed with subgroup analyses for used temperature monitoring, anesthetics, and pulse duration (**Additional files 5 to 7**). In all cases, considerably variable NCV were found. A meta-analysis for pooled mean NCV and CMAP was conducted, but the observed variability was too substantial and could not be explained by any meaningful factor. We reported the values as ranges in **Table 4**.

“[insert **Figure 3**]”

Figure 3. Meta-analysis with a random-effects model of the reported NCV. NCV values are in (m/s). Heterogeneity was considerable with a reported I^2 of 99.75%. The NCV with a 95% CI are reported with their percentual weight in generating the overall NCV (see Table 4).

190 “[insert Figure 4]”

191 **Figure 4.** Meta-analysis with a random-effects model of reported CMAP after
192 stimulation at the notch and recording in dorsal foot (plantar) muscles. Heterogeneity
193 was considerable with $I^2 = 99.77\%$. The mean CMAP of each study with a 95% CI is
194 reported and their percentual weight in generating the overall CMAP (see Table 4).

195 “[insert Figure 5]”

196 **Figure 5.** Meta-analysis with a random-effects model of reported pooled CMAP after
197 stimulation at the ankle and recording in dorsal foot muscles. Heterogeneity was
198 considerable with $I^2 = 100\%$. The mean CMAP of each study with a 95% CI is reported
199 and their percentual weight in generating the overall CMAP (see Table 4).

200 “[insert Figure 6]”

201 **Figure 6.** Impact of gender on NCV. Meta-analysis with a random-effects model of
202 reported NCV values stratified by gender (f = female, m = male, u = unknown).
203 Heterogeneity is considerable for all conditions ($I^2 = 99.63\%$ for f, $I^2 = 98.90\%$ for m).
204 The mean NCV in (m/s) of each study with a 95% CI is reported and their percentual
205 weight in generating the overall NCV (overall NCV not shown due to heterogeneity).

207 4. Discussion

208 4.1 Summary of evidence

209 This is the first meta-analysis of NCS in EAN. All eligible studies reported NCS data
210 from the sciatic nerve's motor fibers, except for two studies reporting NCS data only of
211 the tail nerve. Three studies also reported data on sensory nerve conduction and sensory
212 nerve action potential using the H-reflex of the sural nerve (Niknami et al. , 2013,
213 Taylor and Pollard, 2001, 2003).

214 The preference for using the sciatic nerve for NCS in EAN can be explained by the fact
215 that it is the largest peripheral nerve. It is relatively easy to access, and its anatomical
216 hallmarks for stimulation are comparable to those of humans. The neglect of NCS of
217 sensory fibers probably reflects the technical difficulties of accessing and recording
218 sensory nerves. Sensory amplitudes are much smaller and require an experienced
219 examiner, particularly when small rodents are used. NCS of sensory fibers are often
220 contaminated by accidentally stimulated motor fibers and altered by artifacts, pressure,
221 and positioning, even though some studies argue that sensory NCS offer a reliable
222 assessment of nerve function in rats (Apfel et al. , 1992, Kurokawa et al. , 2004,
223 Stanley, 1981).

224 The extracted data showed considerable heterogeneity in all our analyses, with I^2 values
225 >99%. Potential explanations for this heterogeneity include the experience of the
226 conducting researcher. Dyck et al. (Dyck, Albers, 2013) reported a high interrater
227 variability even between experienced physicians for human nerve conduction studies,
228 while intraobserver variability was not reported.

Furthermore, significant variations in technical procedures were noted. These differences comprised anesthesia, stimulating device, stimulation, positioning, and temperature monitoring. It is conceivable that these inequalities also contribute to the observed variability of reported NCS data.

For instance, Oh et al. (Oh et al. , 2010) observed a significant, dose-dependent reduction of NCV following pentobarbital and ketamine/xylazine -induced anesthesia in mice with fewer effects of isoflurane. In contrast, volatile agents as isoflurane or halothane seem to suppress F-waves in a dose-dependent fashion, whereas ketamine/xylazine did not affect F-waves (Nowicki et al. , 2014). Although only rarely performed and therefore not included in our meta-analysis, F-waves may indicate radiculopathy and can be useful as an outcome measure for EAN.

Temperature is also well known to bias NCS, as reduced temperatures may cause slower NCV. NCS in humans are normally conducted within a temperature range of 32-36°C measured by surface thermometers. Limbs should be warmed up to this range, if necessary. In rodents, even the accurate measurement itself can be challenging. Most studies that reported temperature control used heat lamps and thermostats for maintaining the temperature between 34-37°C. According to Allen's rule, smaller animals have a higher surface/volume ratio leading to a faster cooldown of limbs during NCS without heating lamps. Consequences on NCV and CMAP are immense: different studies reported a CV reduction of 1.5-2 m/s per 1°C degree surface temperature

reduction for sensory and motor nerve velocity in humans (Halar et al. , 1981, Halar et al. , 1983, Rutkove, 2001). Effects on CMAP are, however, conflicting with a reported increase but also decrease of amplitude and duration (Rutkove, 2001).

Basic procedural steps of NCS are another pitfall. Anatomical knowledge of the investigated nerve is essential for the correct placement of the needle electrodes.

Technical issues can also occur during stimulation of the nerve. For NCS, all axons within the nerve must be depolarized sufficiently. Submaximal stimulation of the axons can occur with suboptimal placement of the electrodes, or submaximal stimulation pulse and duration.

The exact measurement of the distances between the electrodes is elementary to calculate NCV. Variations of a few millimeters can increase or decrease NCV significantly. Absolute changes in the distance in small rodents compared to human NCS have a higher relative impact. For example, in humans, for distances less than 10 cm, the error in NCV was reported greater than 20 - 25% for a CV greater than 40 m/s (Landau et al. , 2003, Maynard and Stolov, 1972). In human NCS, 3-4 cm between the stimulating and recording electrodes is recommended as minimal distance (Landau, Diaz, 2003). The hindlimb of a rat, depending on its age, has a length of 5-10 mm, so that the stimulation electrode at the ankle has a distance to the dorsal foot muscles of 1 mm. Other variables that significantly influence nerve distances in rats is weight and age. Therefore, these parameters should be assessed for each animal.

CMAP reflects the number and integrity of functioning axons of the nerve. During submaximal stimulation, the CMAP can be falsely low. Most of the studies used the sciatic notch and ankle as the two sites for the stimulation electrodes to evaluate conduction blocks and the proximal and distal integrity of the nerve. Pitarokoili and colleagues, on the other hand, reported insertion of the electrode at the popliteal fossa for distal stimulation (not included in the current meta-analysis due to exclusion criteria). The reports about the effect of the distances between stimulating and recording electrodes on CMAP amplitude are conflicting (Johnsen et al. , 2006, Li et al. , 2014, Mizuta et al. , 2008). Most human studies show an amplitude decay with proximal stimulation due to differences in CV and desynchronization (Johnsen, Fuglsang-Frederiksen, 2006, Olney et al. , 1987). These results were not confirmed in our meta-analysis. The mean reported CMAP amplitude of all 7 studies, which reported measurements after notch and ankle stimulation, were proximally higher than distally (**Figure 4 and 5**).

4.2.Limitations

Limitations of this review, as in many other reviews of animal studies, are the poorly reported methods and the variable methods applied by the researchers. The substantial heterogeneity of the studies could not be resolved by addressing methodical issues via subgroup analyses. Further bias assessment was hampered by incomplete method

reporting, and systematic errors cannot be excluded. As has been stated by other reviews of animal studies, detailed and standardized reporting of animal study methods is mandatory.

Further, potentially relevant studies could have been missed in our review, as our literature search was restricted to one database. Finally, no study protocol was published.

5. Conclusion

Our meta-analysis emphasizes the need for standardization concerning conducting and reporting NCS in EAN. We propose the use of a checklist of seven items, describing essential information (**Table 5**). Adhering to this protocol will help to improve the quality of the studies and reduce intra- and interobserver variability. It will refine the methodology and minimize the number of animals needed in adherence to the 3 R's principles of (Russell and Burch, 1959).

"[insert Table 4]"

"[insert Table 5]"

We also calculated normative values for NCS in Lewis rats' sciatic nerve of (**Table 4**), based on our meta-analytic data. These metrics may serve as a blueprint for the design (e.g., enabling a power analysis to estimate the number of animals needed in

309 applications to institutional animal welfare committees) and interpretation of collected
310 data studying EAN. Nevertheless, given the considerable heterogeneity of the data
311 analyzed we still advise collecting a core set of normal values from a control group for
312 each experiment.

313

Declarations

Availability of data and materials

All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article and its supplementary information files.

Competing Interest

FK contributed to one study included in this review. The authors declared no further potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Acknowledgments

We thank Bert Avau and Christina Samel for their thoughtful insights and comments on this manuscript.

References

- Ambrosius B, Pitarokoili K, Schrewe L, Pedreiturria X, Motte J, Gold R. Fingolimod attenuates experimental autoimmune neuritis and contributes to Schwann cell-mediated axonal protection. *Journal of neuroinflammation*. 2017;14:92.
- Apfel SC, Arezzo JC, Lipson L, Kessler JA. Nerve growth factor prevents experimental cisplatin neuropathy. *Annals of neurology*. 1992;31:76-80.
- Calik MW, Shankarappa SA, Stubbs EB, Jr. Forced-exercise attenuates experimental autoimmune neuritis. *Neurochemistry international*. 2012;61:141-5.
- Cavaletti G, Mata S, Fasano A, Lolli F, Riccio P, Celon S, et al. Lipid-free versus lipid-bound P2 protein-induced experimental allergic neuritis: clinicopathological, neurophysiological, and immunological study. *Journal of neuroscience research*. 2000;62:709-16.
- Dillingham T, Chen S, Andary M, Buschbacher R, Del Toro D, Smith B, et al. Establishing high-quality reference values for nerve conduction studies: A report from the normative data task force of the American Association Of Neuromuscular & Electrodiagnostic Medicine. 2016;54:366-70.
- Dyck PJ, Albers JW, Wolfe J, Bolton CF, Walsh N, Klein CJ, et al. A trial of proficiency of nerve conduction: greater standardization still needed. *Muscle & nerve*. 2013;48:369-74.

351 Halar EM, DeLisa JA, Brozovich FV. Peroneal nerve conduction velocity: the
 352 importance of temperature correction. Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation.
 353 1981;62:439-43.

354 Halar EM, DeLisa JA, Soine TL. Nerve conduction studies in upper extremities: skin
 355 temperature corrections. Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation. 1983;64:412-
 356 6.

357 Hartung HP, Schafer B, van der Meide PH, Fierz W, Heininger K, Toyka KV. The role
 358 of interferon-gamma in the pathogenesis of experimental autoimmune disease of the
 359 peripheral nervous system. Annals of neurology. 1990;27:247-57.

360 Harvey GK, Pollard JD. Patterns of conduction impairment in experimental allergic
 361 neuritis. An electrophysiological and histological study. Journal of neurology,
 362 neurosurgery, and psychiatry. 1992;55:909-15.

363 Harvey GK, Toyka KV, Hartung HP. Effects of mast cell degranulation on blood-nerve
 364 barrier permeability and nerve conduction in vivo. J Neurol Sci. 1994;125:102-9.

365 Higgins JPT TJ, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic
 366 Reviews of Interventions version 6.0. (updated July 2019). Cochrane, 2019. Available
 367 from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook. Accessed 20 March 2020.

368 Hooijmans CR, Rovers MM, de Vries RB, Leenaars M, Ritskes-Hoitinga M,
 369 Langendam MW. SYRCLE's risk of bias tool for animal studies. BMC medical research
 370 methodology. 2014;14:43.

371 Johnsen B, Fuglsang-Frederiksen A, de Carvalho M, Labarre-Vila A, Nix W, Schofield
 372 I. Amplitude, area and duration of the compound muscle action potential change in
 373 different ways over the length of the ulnar nerve. *Clinical neurophysiology : official*
 374 *journal of the International Federation of Clinical Neurophysiology.* 2006;117:2085-92.
 375 Jung S, Huitinga I, Schmidt B, Zielasek J, Dijkstra CD, Toyka KV, et al. Selective
 376 elimination of macrophages by dichlormethylene diphosphonate-containing liposomes
 377 suppresses experimental autoimmune neuritis. *J Neurol Sci.* 1993;119:195-202.
 378 Jung S, Kramer S, Schluesener HJ, Hunig T, Toyka K, Hartung HP. Prevention and
 379 therapy of experimental autoimmune neuritis by an antibody against T cell receptors-
 380 alpha/beta. *Journal of immunology (Baltimore, Md : 1950).* 1992;148:3768-75.
 381 Jung S, Toyka KV, Hartung HP. Soluble complement receptor type 1 inhibits
 382 experimental autoimmune neuritis in Lewis rats. *Neuroscience letters.* 1995;200:167-70.
 383 Kafri M, Drory VE, Wang N, Rabinowitz R, Korczyn AD, Chapman J. Assessment of
 384 experimental autoimmune neuritis in the rat by electrophysiology of the tail nerve.
 385 *Muscle & nerve.* 2002;25:51-7.
 386 Kurokawa K, de Almeida DF, Zhang Y, Hebert CD, Page JG, Schweikart KM, et al.
 387 Sensory nerve conduction of the plantar nerve compared with other nerve conduction
 388 tests in rats. *Clinical neurophysiology : official journal of the International Federation of*
 389 *Clinical Neurophysiology.* 2004;115:1677-82.

390 Landau ME, Diaz MI, Barner KC, Campbell WW. Optimal distance for segmental
 391 nerve conduction studies revisited. 2003;27:367-9.
 392 Lawlor MW, Richards MP, Fisher MA, Stubbs Jr. EB. Sensory nerve conduction deficit
 393 in experimental monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS)
 394 neuropathy. 2001;24:809-16.
 395 Li Y, Lao J, Zhao X, Tian D, Zhu Y, Wei X. The optimal distance between two
 396 electrode tips during recording of compound nerve action potentials in the rat median
 397 nerve. Neural regeneration research. 2014;9:171-8.
 398 Lin HH, Spies JM, Lu JL, Pollard JD. Effective treatment of experimental autoimmune
 399 neuritis with human immunoglobulin. J Neurol Sci. 2007a;256:61-7.
 400 Lin HH, Wang MX, Spies JM, Pollard JD. Effective treatment of experimental
 401 autoimmune neuritis with Fc fragment of human immunoglobulin. Journal of
 402 neuroimmunology. 2007b;186:133-40.
 403 Litchy WJ, Albers JW, Wolfe J, Bolton CF, Walsh N, Klein CJ, et al. Proficiency of
 404 nerve conduction using standard methods and reference values (Cl. NPhys Trial 4).
 405 Muscle & nerve. 2014;50:900-8.
 406 Maynard FM, Stolov WC. Experimental error in determination of nerve conduction
 407 velocity. Archives of physical medicine and rehabilitation. 1972;53:362-72.

408 Mizuta K, Fujita T, Nakatsuka T, Kumamoto E. Inhibitory effects of opioids on
 409 compound action potentials in frog sciatic nerves and their chemical structures. *Life*
 410 *sciences*. 2008;83:198-207.

411 Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic
 412 reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS medicine*. 2009;6:e1000097.

413 Moriguchi K, Miyamoto K, Kusunoki S. 4-Aminopyridine ameliorates experimental
 414 autoimmune neuritis in Lewis rats. *Journal of neuroimmunology*. 2017;305:72-4.

415 Motte J, Ambrosius B, Gruter T, Bachir H, Sgodzai M, Pedreiturria X, et al. Capsaicin-
 416 enriched diet ameliorates autoimmune neuritis in rats. *Journal of neuroinflammation*.
 417 2018;15:122.

418 Niknami M, Wang MX, Nguyen T, Pollard JD. Beneficial effect of a multimerized
 419 immunoglobulin Fc in an animal model of inflammatory neuropathy (experimental
 420 autoimmune neuritis). *J Peripher Nerv Syst*. 2013;18:141-52.

421 Nowicki M, Baum P, Kosacka J, Stockinger M, Kloting N, Bluher M, et al. Effects of
 422 isoflurane anesthesia on F-waves in the sciatic nerve of the adult rat. *Muscle & nerve*.
 423 2014;50:257-61.

424 Oh SS, Hayes JM, Sims-Robinson C, Sullivan KA, Feldman EL. The effects of
 425 anesthesia on measures of nerve conduction velocity in male C57Bl6/J mice.
 426 *Neuroscience letters*. 2010;483:127-31.

427 Olney RK, Budingen HJ, Miller RG. The effect of temporal dispersion on compound
 428 action potential area in human peripheral nerve. *Muscle & nerve*. 1987;10:728-33.
 429 Pitarokoili K, Ambrosius B, Meyer D, Schrewe L, Gold R. Dimethyl Fumarate
 430 Ameliorates Lewis Rat Experimental Autoimmune Neuritis and Mediates Axonal
 431 Protection. *PloS one*. 2015;10:e0143416.
 432 Pitarokoili K, Ambrosius B, Schrewe L, Hayardeny L, Hayden M, Gold R. Laquinimod
 433 exerts strong clinical and immunomodulatory effects in Lewis rat experimental
 434 autoimmune neuritis. *Journal of neuroimmunology*. 2014;274:38-45.
 435 Pitarokoili K, Bachir H, Sgodzai M, Gruter T, Haupteltshofer S, Duscha A, et al.
 436 Induction of Regulatory Properties in the Intestinal Immune System by Dimethyl
 437 Fumarate in Lewis Rat Experimental Autoimmune Neuritis. *Frontiers in immunology*.
 438 2019;10:2132.
 439 Pitarokoili K, Kohle F, Motte J, Fatoba O, Pedreiturria X, Gold R, et al. Anti-
 440 inflammatory and immunomodulatory potential of human immunoglobulin applied
 441 intrathecally in Lewis rat experimental autoimmune neuritis. *Journal of*
 442 *neuroimmunology*. 2017;309:58-67.
 443 Russell WMS, Burch RL. The principles of humane experimental technique: Methuen;
 444 1959.
 445 Rutkove SB. Effects of temperature on neuromuscular electrophysiology. *Muscle &*
 446 *nerve*. 2001;24:867-82.

447 Sarkey JP, Richards MP, Stubbs EB, Jr. Lovastatin attenuates nerve injury in an animal
 448 model of Guillain-Barre syndrome. *Journal of neurochemistry*. 2007;100:1265-77.
 449 Schneider CA, Rasband, W. S., Eliceiri, K. W. NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of image
 450 analysis. *Nature methods* 2012. p. 671-5.
 451 Stanley EF. Sensory and motor nerve conduction velocities and the latency of the H
 452 reflex during growth of the rat. *Experimental neurology*. 1981;71:497-506.
 453 Stevens A, Schabet M, Wietholter H, Schott K. Prednisolone therapy of experimental
 454 allergic neuritis in Lewis rats does not induce relapsing or chronic disease. *Journal of*
 455 *neuroimmunology*. 1990;28:141-51.
 456 Taylor JM, Pollard JD. Dominance of autoreactive T cell-mediated delayed-type
 457 hypersensitivity or antibody-mediated demyelination results in distinct forms of
 458 experimental autoimmune neuritis in the Lewis rat. *Journal of neuropathology and*
 459 *experimental neurology*. 2001;60:637-46.
 460 Taylor JM, Pollard JD. Neurophysiological changes in demyelinating and axonal forms
 461 of acute experimental autoimmune neuritis in the Lewis rat. *Muscle & nerve*.
 462 2003;28:344-52.
 463 Usuki S, Taguchi K, Gu YH, Thompson SA, Yu RK. Development of a novel therapy
 464 for Lipo-oligosaccharide-induced experimental neuritis: use of peptide glycomimics.
 465 *Journal of neurochemistry*. 2010;113:351-62.

466 Usuki S, Thompson SA, Rivner MH, Taguchi K, Shibata K, Ariga T, et al. Molecular
467 mimicry: sensitization of Lewis rats with *Campylobacter jejuni* lipopolysaccharides
468 induces formation of antibody toward GD3 ganglioside. *Journal of neuroscience*
469 *research*. 2006;83:274-84.

470 Watson SL, Westland K, Pollard JD. An electrophysiological and histological study of
471 trypsin induced demyelination. *J Neurol Sci*. 1994;126:116-25.

472 Yamawaki M, Vasquez A, Ben Younes A, Yoshino H, Kanda T, Ariga T, et al.
473 Sensitization of Lewis rats with sulfoglucuronosyl paragloboside: electrophysiological
474 and immunological studies of an animal model of peripheral neuropathy. *Journal of*
475 *neuroscience research*. 1996;44:58-65.

476

Tables

Table 1. Study design.

Search or [MeSH] term	Number of papers
1. [neurophysiology]	6,585
2. [neural conduction]	31,727
3. [electromyography]	78,387
4. [Neuritis, Autoimmune, Experimental]	584
5. neurophysio*	115,977
6. [rats, inbred Lew]	22,832
Combination	Number of papers
1. AND 6.	0
2. AND 6.	113
3. AND 6.	79
4. AND 6.	349
5. AND 6.	75
6. AND 1. OR 2. OR 3. OR 4. OR 5.	616

The number of papers for each search and [MeSH]-Term are shown. The combination of the terms reduced the number and left 616 studies for further review.

482 **Table 2.** Characteristics of the used rats.

author	experimental groups	n total	gender	age (weeks)	body weight (g)
Ambrosius et al. , 2017	4	16	f	6-8	160-180
Calik et al. , 2012	1	18	m	a	200-240
Cavaletti et al. , 2000	3	54	u	u	180-200
Hartung et al. , 1990	3	36	f	8-12	180-220
Harvey and Pollard, 1992	2	48	m	u	250-320
Harvey et al. , 1994	3	18	f	11-12	175-205
Jung et al. , 1992	4	27	f	6-8	130-180
Jung et al. , 1993	4	26	f	6-8	160-190
Jung et al. , 1995	2	10	f	u	135-160
Kafri, Drory, 2002	1	5	f	8	175-210
Lawlor et al. , 2001	1	10	m	a	240-300
Lin et al. , 2007a	2	24	m	a	300-400
Lin et al. , 2007b	4	33	f	a	150-200
Moriguchi et al. , 2017	2	9	m	8-10	u
Motte et al. , 2018	2	23	f	6-8	160-180
Niknami, Wang, 2013	6	74	f	8-10	150-200
Pitarokoili et al. , 2014	4	11	f	6-8	160-180
Pitarokoili et al. , 2015	4	40	f	6-8	160-180

Pitarokoili et al. , 2017	8	80	f	6-8	160-180
Pitarokoili et al. , 2019	3	30	f	6-8	160-180
Sarkey et al. , 2007	3	12	m	a	300
Stevens et al. , 1990	3	24	f	u	160-200
Taylor and Pollard, 2001	2	40	b	u	190-400
Taylor and Pollard, 2003	3	43	m/f	u	190-400
Watson et al. , 1994	2	10	u	a	300-400
Yamawaki et al. , 1996	2	14	f	10-12	210-260

Numbers of rats in experimental group, total number (n) of rats used in the study,
gender, age (in weeks) and body weight in (g) (m: male, f: female, u: unknown, a:
adult).

487 **Table 3:** Technical characteristics of the studies.

author	device	anesthesia	concentration	temperature	pulse amplitude (mA)	pulse duration (ms)	positioning
Ambrosius et al. , 2017	Keypoint, Dantec	Xylazine/ketamine	10/50 mg/kg i.p.	yes	u	50	yes
Calik et al. , 2012	Teca Synergy, Care-Fusion	Xylazine/ketamine	u	yes	25	50	yes
Cavaletti et al. , 2000	u	u	u	yes	u	u	yes
Hartung et al. , 1990	Medelec MS 91B	Fentanyl/fluanisone	1 ml/kg s.c.	yes	30-40	50	yes
Harvey and Pollard, 1992	Devices Mk IV	Halothane/O2	u	no	u	50	yes
Harvey et al. , 1994	Medelec MS 91	Fentanyl/fluanisone	0.5ml/kg s.c.	yes	u	50	yes
Jung et al. , 1992	Medelec MS 91A	Fentanyl/fluanisone	u	yes	30-40	50	yes
Jung et al. , 1993	Medelec MS 91A	Fentanyl/fluanisone	u	yes	30-40	50	yes
Jung et al. , 1995	91	Fentanyl/fluanisone	u	yes	u	u	u
Kafri, Drory, 2002	Teca Modell Mno	Pentobarbital	30 (mg/kg) i.p.	no	u	200	yes
Lawlor et al. , 2001	Medical System	Xylazine/ketamine	u	7-30	50	yes	u
Lin et al. , 2007a	Neuromax	Pentobarbital	60 mg/kg i.p.	u	u	100	yes
Lin et al. , 2007b	Neuromax	Pentobarbital	60 mg/kg i.p.	u	u	100	yes

Moriguchi et al.

, 2017 Neuropack y Isoflurane u no u u yes

Motte et al. , Keypoint, 10/50 mg/kg

2018 Dantec Xylazine/ketamine i.p. yes u 50 yes

Niknami, Wang,

2013 Neuromax Halothane/O2 u yes u 100 yes

Pitarokoili et al. Keypoint, 10/50 mg/kg

, 2014 Dantec Xylazine/ketamine i.p. yes u 50 yes

Pitarokoili et al. Keypoint, 10/50 mg/kg

, 2015 Dantec Xylazine/ketamine i.p. yes u 50 yes

Pitarokoili et al. Keypoint, 10/50 mg/kg

, 2017 Dantec Xylazine/ketamine i.p. yes u 50 yes

Pitarokoili et al. Keypoint, 10/50 mg/kg

, 2019 Dantec Xylazine/ketamine i.p. yes u 50 yes

Sarkey et al. ,

2007 u Xylazine/ketamine u yes 25 50 yes

Stevens et al. , Toennies DA-

1990 IIR Xylazine/ketamine 3/63 mg/kg i.p. no u 50 yes

Taylor and Medelec 30/60 mg/kg

Pollard, 2001 MS92b Pentobarbital f/m i.p. no u 50 yes

Taylor and Medelec 30/60 mg/kg

Pollard, 2003 MS92b Pentobarbital f/m i.p. no u 50 yes

Watson et al. , Devices Mark

1994 IV u u yes u 50 yes

Yamawaki et al.

, 1996 u Pentobarbital u yes u 50 yes

488 Technical device, anesthesia, concentration, temperature, pulse amplitude, pulse

489 duration, and positioning of the rat are shown. U stands for unknown, f for female, m

for male. Anesthesia concentration is given in (mg/kg) or (ml/kg) and application route is described if possible (s.c.: subcutaneous, i.p.: intraperitoneal).

Table 4. Proposed normative values of motor NCS of the sciatic nerve in Lewis rats.

NCS	Mean values with 95% CI
NCV	47.24 m/s [43.65 – 50.84]
CMAP sciatic notch	12.16 mV [9.72 – 14.60]
CMAP ankle	17.41 mV [11.87 – 22.95]

As results of the meta-analyses, the mean values of NCV, CMAP of the sciatic notch and the ankle with a 95% confidence interval are shown.

497 **Table 5.** Checklist for performance and reporting NCS in rats

Number	Item	Recommendation for reporting
1	Animals	Species, strain, gender, mean age + range, mean weight + range
2	Anesthesia	Used drug, route of administration, concentration per (kg) bodyweight
3	Temperature	Should be controlled with heat lamp or pad, Monitoring with infrared skin thermometer or rectal probe
4	Electrode Type	Needle electrodes for sciatic nerve Needle or ring electrodes for tail nerve
5	Placement / Positioning	Standardized distances in (mm), rather than anatomical landmarks, for sciatic nerve: stimulation at sciatic notch and ankle, recording at dorsal foot (plantar) muscles
6	Pulse amplitude / duration	Supramaximal amplitude 7-30 (mA), duration 50 (ms)
7	Data reporting	Mean values, Standard Error of the Mean or Standard Deviation

498 The proposed seven items should be addressed when NCS are conducted in rats.

499 **Additional files**

500 **Additional file 1. PRISMA-Checklist.**

Section/topic		Checklist item	Reported on page
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	2,3
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	4
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	4
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	16
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	5,6
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	5
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	5,6

Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	6
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	5,6
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	5,6
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	6,7
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	6,7
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I^2) for each meta-analysis.	6,7
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	7
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	6,7
RESULTS			
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	7,8
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	8,9
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	6,7
Results of individual	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each	8-12

studies		intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	8,9
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	9,10
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	11,12
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	12-16
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	16
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	17
FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	19,20

502 **Additional file 2.** Table of excluded studies (n = 28) with corresponding exclusion
 503 criteria.

author	reason for exclusion
Aronovich 2012 et al.	NCS after EAN induction
Bechtold 2005 et al.	intraoperative, terminal NCS
Doppler 2019 et al.	display of ratio only, for SNAP only mean without SD/SE
Gabriel 1997 et al.	terminal NCS
Gabriel 1998 et al.	terminal NCS
Hadden 2001 et al.	NCS after EAN induction
Han (1) 2016 et al.	NCS after EAN induction
Han (2) 2016 et al.	NCS after EAN induction
Harvey 1992 et al.	display of ratio only
Kafri 2005 et al.	NCS after EAN induction
Kajii 2014 et al.	NCS after EAN induction
Kim 1994 et al.	NCS after experimental injections
Kremer 2019 et al.	NCS after EAN induction
Lawlor 2002 et al.	display of ratio only
Lonigro 2009 et al.	intraoperative, terminal NCS
Mix 1992 et al.	terminal NCS
Pollard 1995 et al.	display of ratio only

Redford (1) 1997 et al.	NCS after EAN induction
Redford (2) 1997 et al.	intraoperative, terminal NCS
Schmidt 2003 et al.	data not shown
Spies 1995 et al.	data not shown
Stanley 1992 et al.	intraoperative NCS
Taylor 2017 et al.	display of ratio only
Wiethölter 1992 et al.	NCS after EAN induction
Yan 2000 et al.	display of ratio only
Yan 2014 et al.	display of ratio only
Zhang 2014 et al.	NCS after EAN induction
Zielasek 1993 et al.	data not shown

504

505 **Additional file 3.** pdf. Stratification of NCV for age in weeks. A stands for adult rats, u
506 for unknow (age not documented in the studies). Heterogeneity was considerable
507 throughout all groups. Most studies (n= 8) reported rats with an age of 6-8 weeks
508 (Heterogeneity of $I^2 = 99.69\%$). Mean NCV with a 95% CI of each study is displayed
509 with the percentual weight in the overall analysis.

510

Additional file 4.pdf. Impact of weight on NCV. This meta-analysis with a random-effects model of reported NCV values only included studies that reported animals' weight within a range of 150-220 g. Heterogeneity was considerable with $I^2 = 99.84\%$. The mean NCS in (m/s) of each study with a 95% confidence interval and their percentual in generating the overall NCS is reported (overall NCV not shown due to heterogeneity).

Additional file 5. pdf. Subgroup analysis of studies reporting temperature monitoring for NCV. Heterogeneity was considerable with $I^2 = 99.71\%$. Mean NCV with a 95% CI of each study is displayed with the percentual weight in the overall analysis.

Additional file 6.pdf. Subgroup analysis of NCV after stratification for anesthetics used. Heterogeneity was considerable throughout all groups. Mean NCV with a 95% CI of each study is displayed with the percentual weight in the overall analysis.

Additional file 7.pdf. Subgroup analysis of reported NCV after stratification for pulse duration. Pulse duration is displayed in (ms). Heterogeneity was considerable throughout all groups. Mean NCV with a 95% CI of each study is displayed with the percentual weight in the overall analysis.