IJPPR
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PHARMACY & PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH
An official Publication of Human Journals
ISSN 2349-7203
HUMAN

Human Journals
Review Article
April 2020 Vol.:18, Issue:1

An Overview on Guillain Barre Syndrome: A Threatening Neurological Disorder

IJPPR
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PHARMACY & PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH
An official Publication of Human Journals
ISSN 2349-7203
HUMAN

SALMAN KAPADIA[1]

[1]*Dept. of Pharmacology, Oriental College of Pharmacy, Sanpada, Navi Mumbai-400705, India.*

Submission: 22 March 2020

Accepted: 30 March 2020

Published: 30 April 2020

www.ijppr.humanjournals.com

Keywords: Guillain-Barre syndrome, Neurological disorder, Biological drug, Therapy, Autoimmune disease, Treatment, IVIG, Autonomic dysfunction

ABSTRACT

The syndrome of Guillain-Barre is an autoimmune disorder that includes a heterogeneous group of pathological and clinical entities. Guillain-Barre syndrome (GBS) is an acute flaccid limb weakness and is considered a monophasic disease. But there have been reports of recurrences. Published case studies suggest that 1-5% of patients with GBS will experience recurrent attacks. Because weakness can affect the diaphragm and cause breathing distress, mechanical ventilation is required by 10 percent to 30 percent of patients. Symptoms advance and peak 4 weeks after onset. For respiratory and cardiac monitoring, as well as supporting care and treatment, patients generally require hospitalization. It has been found that treatment with both intravenous immunoglobulin and plasma exchange are equally beneficial. In predicting the outcome of these patients, several factors are useful.

INTRODUCTION

Guillain Barré syndrome (GBS) is an acute, often serious, and autoimmune fulminant polyradiculoneuropathy in nature. GBS is the most frequent cause of generalized acute or sub acute paralysis that rivaled polio in frequency at one moment.[1] GBS is also referred to as Landry-Guillain-Barre-Strohl syndrome and severe inflammatory polyneuropathy demyelinating. It is recorded that the global annual incidence is 0.6–2.4 instances per 100,000 per annum. [2,3,4]

Men are affected about 1.5 times more frequently than women.[5] The most frequently occurring subtype in North America and Europe is acute inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy (AIDP), accounting for about 90 percent of all instances. However, axonal variants of GBS i.e. acute motor axonopathy (AMAN) and acute motor sensory axonopathy (AMSAN) are discovered in other areas of the globe (Asia, Central and South America).[6,7,8] Our knowledge of the Guillain-Barr'e syndrome has significantly enhanced over the past century with a much clearer concept of the syndrome's clinical subtypes and some of the rarer variants pathogenesis. 2016 marks the centenary of Guillain, Barr'e and Strohl's initial description.[9] In the lack of the anticipated pleocytosis of cerebrospinal fluid (CSF), which characterized poliomyelitis, they defined a quickly progressive motor disorder associated with missing reflexes and a raised CSF protein. Over the years that followed, it became apparent that the syndrome varied in severity so that it could lead to respiratory paralysis and death in its most severe form.[10]

Acute inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy (AIDP) is the Western world's most common subtype with a primarily demyelinating pathology and varying degrees of secondary axonal harm. The next most common is acute motor axonal neuropathy (AMAN), which appears to be a main axonal disease influencing motor nerves only. There are much rarer axonal variations involving sensory and motor nerves. Acute Axonal Neuropathy Motor and Sensory. Miller Fisher syndrome is usually regarded to be associated with GBS although it is associated with anti-GQ1b antibodies in a unique narrow manner.[11] Although GBS etiology is not obviously recognized, surveys have discovered that approximately 70 percent of instances are preceded by acute, mostly bacterial, cardiovascular or gastrointestinal procedures 1 to 3 weeks before the start of symptoms. Typically, the velocity of nerve conduction is conducted to verify the diagnosis. Acute motor axonal neuropathy characterizes

electro-physiologically GBS. Immunoglobulin and plasmapheresis has produced an important shift during the course of the disease.[12,13]

In Landry's 1859 report on 10 patients with "ascending paralysis," one of the earliest descriptions of what we know today as Guillain-Barre syndrome is discovered.[14] In 1916, two French soldiers with motor weakness, reflexia and "albuminocytological dissociation" in the cerebrospinal fluid were described by Guillain, Barre, and Strohl. Subsequently, several similar manifestations were reported, and this clinical entity was named after Guillain and Barre. Later, Schizophrenia like syndrome were identified with distinctive clinical characteristics. On the grounds of clinical characteristics, aetiology and electrophysiological characteristics, this difference is feasible today.[15,16] GBS is now regarded the most prevalent universal cause of acute flaccid paralysis due to near eradication of poliomyelitis.[17] It starts predominantly with a progressive bilateral weakness in lower limb muscles, which is quickly ascending and spreading to the upper body, upper limbs and face muscles. This dysfunction of the engine is often connected with a loss or attenuation of profound body-wide tendon reflexes.[18]

GBS pathogenesis has gained tremendous attention since the implementation of GBS in 1859. Initially, GBS pathogenesis was thought to be mostly dependent on the immune system mediated by T cell. Also contributing to this concept was EAN (Experimental Allergic Neuritis), which is an animal model of GBS. EAN may be caused by either PNS myelin protein immunization (e.g. P0, P2, and PMP22) or animal transmission of sensitized T cells. It was widely regarded as an equivalent GBS AIDP variant model. Since EAN has persisted over more than two decades in GBS preclinical studies, it has led to several research assessing the T-cell mechanism in eliciting the inflammatory response observed in GBS and potential therapeutic objectives in pathogenesis. However, in GBS and other peripheral neuropathies, EAN has been widely criticized for its failure to introduce particular antigenic objectives for T-cell autoreactivity. Furthermore, EAN is insufficient to describe other GBS spectrum variations other than AIDP, namely AMAN.[19,20]

Guillain-Barré syndrome (GBS) is a life-threatening polyradiculoneuropathy with a reported mortality rate of 3% to 13%. Respiratory failure, pneumonia, cardiac arrest and autonomic dysfunction are the most commonly mentioned causes of death in GBS. Previous trials recognized different risk factors for deadly GBS, including era and severity of disease, but most clinical mortality surveys concentrated on selective patient subgroups or were

performed before plasma exchange and IV immunoglobulin (IVIg) were introduced.[21-26] Guillain-Barré syndrome (GBS) is an acute generalized polyneuropathy that affects 1 to 2 out of 100,000 individuals per year. More males than females are impacted (1.25:1), and the syndrome can happen in patients of any era, typically affecting patients between the ages of 40 and 50 years, although the incidence is increased by 20 percent per 10-year age rise.[27,28]

Epidemiology

According to epidemiological studies from Europe, the United States and Australia, the annual incidence of Guillain-Barré syndrome is around 1–3/100 000 inhabitants.[29-36] It can happen in any age group. There seems to be a bimodal distribution of the age-specific curve with peaks in young adults and elderly people. Some studies indicate a rise in age-related occurrence, particularly in the elderly age group. There are no coherent differences in geography. In a cohort study, age-adjusted relative risks indicate that the risk of Guillain-Barré syndrome during childbirth is smaller and rises after delivery.[37,38] Several infections were involved in GBS growth. In the three weeks prior to the start of GBS symptoms, about two-thirds of patients with the disease report respiratory or gastrointestinal symptoms.[39] The strongest proof involves infection with Campylobacter jejuni, but after infection with Mycoplasma pneumoniae, Haemophilus influenzae, cytomegalovirus and Epstein-Barr virus, GBS has also been reported.[40]

Etiology and Pathophysiology

GBS mechanism is thought to be an inflammatory neuropathy owing to cross-reactivity between neural antigens and particular infection-induced antibodies. Organisms that are infectious, like C. Jejuni, convey lipooligosaccharides in a ganglioside-like bacterial wall. This molecular mimicry produces nerve-attacking antiganglioside antibodies. The particular stimulated antibody and its nerve target region may explain the distinct GBS subtypes. Less than one patient per 1,000 C patients. GBS grows in jejuni infection, indicating that host factors play a major part in the pathological process. Research, however, has not yet recognized factors that increase the risk of creating GBS for an individual. It has been demonstrated that GBS causes symptoms in peripheral nerves through multifocal regions of mononuclear cell infiltration. The clinical manifestations correspond to the place and severity of the inflammation. The myelin is predominantly damaged in AIDP, whereas Ranvier's nodes are targeted in acute motor axonal neuropathy. [41,42]

Causes of GBS

GBS usually develops after a triggering event.

Infections: One of the most prevalent causes of gastroenteritis globally, Campylobacter jejuni leads 30% to 35% of GBS instances. Cytomegalovirus, Mycoplasma pneumoniae, Haemophilus influenzae, Epstein-Barr virus, and HIV are other infectious causes. In patients with lymphoma, Hodgkin disease, and systemic lupus erythematosus, GBS also happens; these instances happen more frequently than opportunity alone can attribute.[43]

Other causes: After another triggering case like immunization, surgery, trauma, or bone marrow transplantation, a tiny proportion of patients develop GBS. One research based on a vaccine used in the 1970s discovered that in 2 per 1 million individuals vaccinated, the H1N1 influenza vaccine increased the risk of creating GBS.[44,45]

Pathology

The studies of Asbury and colleagues[46] suggested that the earliest hallmark of Guillain Barré syndrome was the presence in endoneurium and perineurium of perifascicular lymphocytic cuvs of tiny vessels. This seems to be associated with demyelination, typically associated with macrophage[47] In this regard, the pathology has many similarities with the animal model, experimental allergic neuritis (EAN).[48] Recent pathological studies have shown that there are several pathological subtypes of Guillain Barré syndrome, although the disease's demyelinating type is the most prevalent, and is likely to represent at least 75 percent of instances.[49] Some cases of Guillain Barré syndrome are connected with a mainly axonal mechanism where macrophages can be discovered near the axon, with myelin sparing.[50] In demyelinating types of the disease, this histological finding was interpreted as indicating an immunological assault on antigens of axonal origin rather than a myelin antigen.

Other disease instances seem to involve both sensory and motor axons such instances are called acute motor neuropathy and sensory axonal neuropathy (AMSAN). This illness version appears to be the most rare and may represent only 5% of the clinical syndrome.

Neurophysiology

In the diagnosis and definition of the GBS subtype, neurophysiology is highly helpful. Early assessment of the syndrome often demonstrates low potential for action, extended distal

engine latency, delayed F waves, and conductive block. [51] Occasionally the first research is normal and the documentation of a peripheral nerve disease requires a repeat survey. After the acute phase of the disease is over, axonal disease types are characterized by decreased motor and/or sensory action potentials with denervation potential. Neurophysiological trials conducted as part of the European IvIg and steroid research discovered that 69% of studies were compatible with AIDP, with only 3% suggesting axonal pathology in research conducted within 3 weeks of initiation. At this early point, 23% of research were equivocal and could have continued to be predominantly axonal. [52]

Immunology

Guillain Barré syndrome's earliest immunological studies were restricted to crude fixation tests for nerve antigens. Such studies in only a tiny percentage of instances proposed minor abnormalities.[53] Nevertheless, Guillain Barré syndrome's drastic reaction to plasma exchange therapy reinforced the opinion that a plasma derived factor must play a part in the syndrome's aetiology. In the mid-1980s, Koski et al described a technique of C1 esterase that appeared in most patients with Guillain Barré syndrome to detect subtle additional fixation.[54] An enormous proliferation of publications has sparked the discovery of antiganglioside antibodies in the serum of patients with Guillain Barré syndrome. The frequency of these antibodies ranges from as small as 29% to 27% to almost 70%,28 although the average is likely around 30%.[55,56]

Patients with Miller Fisher syndrome have significantly greater frequency detectable anti-GQ1b antibodies, likely around 95%. In the nervous system, gangliosides are commonly dispersed and can have a range of functional positions. Ganglioside structure includes multiple repeating subunits that may be antigenic. Antiganglioside antibodies therefore have distinct specificities and can overlap.[57,58] The presence of antiganglioside antibody in a percentage of Guillain Barré syndrome patients does not indicate pathogenetic antibodies. However, there seems to be a growing body of evidence in favor of the hypothesis that the fine specificity of antiganglioside antibodies determines the pattern of clinical and pathological involvement in at least a proportion of patients with Guillain Barré syndrome. Patients with axonal forms of Guillain Barré syndrome are more likely to have antiganglioside antibodies that recognize the GD1a ganglioside in support of this hypothesis.[59,60]

Diagnosis

GBS differential diagnosis involves acute myelopathy, arsenic poisoning, botulism, cytomegalovirus, neuropathy or myopathy of critical disease, diphtheria, Lyme polyradiculitis, myasthenia gravis, organophosphate and shellfish poisoning, poliomyelitis, porphyria, serious hypophosphatemia, thallium poisoning, vasculitis neuropathy, and West Nile virus.

Classically, patients with GBS have elevated protein concentrations (up to 1,800 mg / dL compared to standard 15 to 45 mg / dL) and ordinary white blood cell counts in cerebrospinal fluid (CSF), known as albuminocytological dissociation.[61] Protein concentrations in the CSF may be normal in early GBS; however, protein concentrations in the CSF will rise in 90 percent of patients by the end of the second week of symptoms.[62] One research of 474 patients discovered higher than normal levels of CSF protein in 49 percent of first day patients and 53 percent of first 3 days patients.[63] Typically, this percentage rises as the syndrome progresses, so clinicians should not depend exclusively on high concentrations of protein in the CSF for diagnosis, particularly early in GBS. Interestingly, lumbosacral spine MRI, which can be used to rule out other diagnoses, may show lumbosacral nerve root improvement gadolinium, helping to diagnose GBS.[64,65]

Diagnostic criteria for GBS

Required:

- Progressive weakness in both arms and legs
- Areflexia

Strongly support:

- Symptom progression over days and for up to 4 weeks
- Relative symmetry of symptoms
- Mild sensory symptoms or signs
- Recovery beginning 2 to 4 weeks after symptom progression ceases
- Autonomic dysfunction

- Absence of fever at onset
- High concentration of protein in CSF
- Typical electrodiagnostic features

Rule out GBS:

- Treatment of botulism, myasthenia gravis, poliomyelitis, or toxic neuropathy
- Abnormal porphyrin metabolism
- Recent diphtheria
- Purely sensory syndrome.

Differential diagnosis

The differential diagnosis in the syndrome is comparatively broad early, with the original focus on placing the pathology in the nerve roots and peripheral nerves rather than anywhere else in the nervous system. When a neuropathy diagnosis has been made, the differential diagnosis includes:

- infection (Lyme, diphtheria)
- inflammatory (neurosarcoid)
- paraneoplastic (owing to nerve roots infiltration)
- vasculitic
- metabolic (beri-beri owing to vitamin B1 deficiency)
- postinfectious / autoimmune origin (GBS).[66]

Prognosis

Approximately 85 percent of GBS patients attain complete recovery within months to a year. Following therapy, fatigue is the most prevalent and persistent symptom. Other less common residual challenges include reduced leg muscle weakness, fingers and toes numbness, and mild bifacial weakness.[67] Within 3 days to 3 weeks after completion of therapy, 5% to 10%

of patients who have improved with therapy will have a relapse. If the patient replied to the original therapy, the same therapy can be used or an alternative therapy can be attempted; either effective (e.g. PLEX or IVIG). However, even with therapy, 3% to 5% of GBS patients die mostly from autonomous dysfunction, acute respiratory distress syndrome, lung embolism, or infection-related cardiac arrest.[68] Unfortunately, these persistent deficit have not been significantly altered by the introduction of plasma exchange and intravenous immunoglobulin, which primarily reduces the time taken to recover and not the percentage of patients making a good recovery. It seems likely that the proportion of patients with comprehensive axonal damage following the acute stage of the illness is not changed by current types of treatment. The use of nerve growth factors is of concern. Trials are underway to investigate the combined role of steroids and intravenous immunoglobulin, â-interferon therapy, and frequent immunoglobulin intravenous course. There are also those who favor immune absorption instead of simply exchanging plasma. All these types of therapy are currently experimental.[69]

Pain in GBS

Although in several retrospective studies on Guillain-Barre syndrome (GBS), pain is recognized as a prevalent symptom,[70-76] the different syndromes of pain seen in GBS are often unrecognized and can be under-treated. Uncontrolled pain may happen in spite of compassionate and supportive measures such as the use of air mattresses, cautious turning of patients and placement of limbs, and the use of elbow and knee padding to avoid pressure palsies.[77]

In 29 successive patients, detailed clinical characteristics and pain issues. In 55 percent of their patients, they portrayed low back and proximal leg pain of muscular origin early in the disease and in 72 percent at some point during the first month. There was, however, very little description of other syndromes of pain; there was no official evaluation of pain intensity, pain relief or disability; and there was restricted follow-up. We report the personality, intensity, and frequency of GBS pain and the reaction to therapy in a prospective longitudinal survey.

Dysesthetic extremity pain 27 (49.1 percent)

Myalgx-rheumatic extremity pain 19 (34.5 percent)

Visceral pain 11 (20 percent)

Pressure paralysis (ulnar nerve) 1 (2 percent)

Headache induced by dysautonomia l (2 percent)

Mortality in GBS

Mortality is reported to be caused by respiratory disorder, cardiovascular or autonomic complication and following coronary bypass surgery followed by stroke owing to other fungal infections.

We recognized the following mortality risk factors: elderly age, greater entry weakness, and ventilation.

More intensified ventilation and dysautonomia management, better monitoring and early treatment of diseases, increased attention to patients with cardiovascular risk variables, and the use of step-down units after ICU transfer, particularly for patients with enhanced risk profiles and for patients with tracheal cannula, may reduce the mortality rate in GBS. Further potential study must determine the effectiveness of such interventions. [78-81]

Influence of Exercise on GBS patients

Guillain-Barre's (GBS) syndrome is an acute, inflammatory, post-infectious autoimmune polyneuropathy that causes peripheral and autonomic nerve demyelination and leads to severe sensory and motor loss.[82,83] Studies have shown that physical fitness in GBS patients (GBSPs) can have a positive impact not only on results such as mobility and fatigue but also on mental function.[84] While some papers mentioned beneficial impacts of exercise on GBSPs, some indicated the opposite, saying that this population had unfavorable reactions to exercise. Accordingly, we attempted to evaluate the literature available on the present exercise measures used in GBSP rehabilitation and to evaluate its usefulness in maintaining physical health in this population.[85] Overall, our assessment demonstrates that exercise is associated with physical results of enhanced GBS. Only one research showed non-direct connections between physical fitness and progression of GBS.8 However, significant and clinically significant post-intervention improvements were shown in relation to physical fitness in the baseline. That research also outlined how exercise could enhance both physical

fitness and mental function, but choosing patients with severe fatigue could have enhanced the potential for enhanced FSS results and caused confounding bias.

In a research, progressive functional training quickly enhanced muscle efficiency and FIM ratings in a former marathon runner during a 3-week intervention.3 However, the progression of the patient's atypical disease and prior elevated exercise ability restricted the study's outcomes to generalization. The patient was treated with a mixture of immunoglobulin, plasmapheresis, and corticosteroids prior to the intervention, all of which influenced patient ratings. A superimposed axonal injury may also have changed the functional prognosis, creating confusing bias.[86]

Similarly, another research showed that low-aerobic walking activity (10 wk) followed by biking (15 wk) enhanced exercise ability, pulmonary functions, and grip strength to improve functional ability. However, the use of successive interventions avoided autonomous evaluation of cycling efficiency with walking-over impacts, creating confounding bias. Furthermore, having a single topic with chronic GBS relapse may have changed exercise results relative to other patients, thus generating bias in choice.[87] It is worth repeating that intensity of practice should be controlled carefully. Although patients generally recover with muscle re-innervation from GBS, it has been shown that partly denervated muscle overworking can cause additional harm, including a loss of functioning motor units.[88]

In addition, with a reduced amount of remaining motor units, core fatigue was associated. Recent studies have shown that core fatigue could be the cause of chronic fatigue experienced by patients many years after recovering from GBS.[89] It is therefore essential to be careful and to prevent excessive exercise in this population of diseased motor units.[90,91]

Biological therapy used in GBS

Approaches to complement pathway and antibodies

Cobra Venom Factor, Soluble Complement Receptor and APT070 (Mirocept)

Anti-C5 Monoclonal Antibody (Eculizumab)

rEV576

Nafamostat Mesilate (NM)

Anti-C1q Monoclonal Antibody (M1)

Anti-GD3 Idiotype Monoclonal Antibody (BEC2)

Approaches to cellular and humoral immune system

OK3 (Anti-T Cell Monoclonal Antibody)

OX34 (Anti-CD2 Monoclonal Antibody)

HRL3 (Anti L-selectin Monoclonal Antibody)

Rituximab (Anti-CD20 Monoclonal Antibody)

Alemtuzumab (Anti-CD52 Monoclonal Antibody)

APPROACHES TO CYTOKINE MODULATION

IFNs (α/β/γ)

TNF Receptor Type I (sTNFR I)

Rolipram (Phosphodiesterase Type 4 Inhibitor)

Linomide

Erythropoietin (EPO)

Treatment

Treatment usually focuses on supporting care and tracking the respiratory, heart and electrolyte status of the patient.

Supportive care

The following suggestions are in agreement with a 2005 expert assessment of supportive care for GBS patients and are based on observational research and expert opinion:

• Immunizations are not advised during the acute GBS stage and are not recommended for a period of 1 year or more after the start of GBS.

• Immunizations should not be withheld after 1 year, but the need for immunization should be examined individually.[92]

Annual influenza vaccination is regarded beneficial for most patients with a history of GBS not caused by influenza vaccination and with risk variables for serious complications of influenza (e.g., elderly age or immunosuppression).

Plasma exchange (PLEX) and IV immunoglobulin (IVIG) are the two primary GBS treatments.

In two large, open, controlled trials, plasma exchange (PE) shortened the duration of disability in Guillain-Barré syndrome compared to conventional support therapy.[93,94]

Both medications had comparable impacts on recovery time in a relative open trial of intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIg) and PE. IVIg may be a safer and more convenient therapy, but it was not widely accepted as the preferred therapy due to reports of ongoing development or recurrence of the disease after IVIg and the fact that the IVIg trial (150 patients) was lower than the PE tests (2421 and 2202). While PE (and likely IVIg) shortens the average length of the disease, after either therapy, about 20 percent of patients are left with significant disability.[95,96,97] Rebound synthesis of antibodies to peripheral nerve myelin may be stimulated after PE removal of immunoglobulin and antibodies. This rebound synthesis may be prevented by IVIg administration instantly after PE. In the therapy of Guillain-Barré syndrome, we undertook a multicenter, randomized controlled trial to determine whether IVIg is equal to or inferior to PE and whether PE followed by IVIg is inferior to the better single treatment.[98]

PLEX

PLEX, first defined more than 30 years ago as a therapy for GBS lists pathogenic substances from the blood and removes the offending antibodies behind the neural destruction pathophysiology. Antiphospholipid antibody syndrome, various sclerosis, myasthenia gravis, optica neuromyelitis, and rhabdomyolysis may also be treated with PLEX. PLEX's long-term impacts include responses to immunosuppression and transfusion. Some instant negative responses include hypocalcemia-related symptoms (seen in about 20% of patients) and allergic responses including hives or pruritus.[99]

PLEX treatment significantly decreased the need for mechanical ventilation of patients from 27% to 14%. PLEX has also improved recovery rates and lowered the need for outpatient aids. Five medicines with PLEX are typical of GBS patients.[100]

IVIG

When pooled human plasma was used to treat measles and hepatitis, this therapy started more than 50 years ago. Clinicians have since used IVIG to treat Kawasaki disease, idiopathic purpura thrombocytopenic, and chronic ammatory inflammatory polyneuropathy demyelinating.[101] IVIG is believed to have various action mechanisms that are not fully understood. One hypothesis suggests that IVIG offers an antigen that blocks the binding of autoantibodies to lymphocytes B. Multiple other mechanisms of IVIG are linked to T-cells (reduction of interleukin manufacturing) and complementary systems (antibodies to C3 and C4) and will not be discussed in detail here.[102]

IVIG prevents patients from infection and suppresses procedures involving inflammation and immune mediation. The normal dose for 5 days is 0.4 g / kg / day. This operation is most beneficial if it starts within 2 weeks after the start of the symptom, although it has been shown to be beneficial if it starts within 4 weeks of the onset of the symptom.[103] Trials analyzing the effectiveness of IVIG versus PLEX found that they were equal in effectiveness.[104] IVIG has become more commonly used as a first-line treatment for GBS due to the incidence of negative responses to PLEX.[105]

Other treatments

Corticosteroids have not been shown to be useful, but rather to delay GBS recovery, although they are used when symptoms become chronic.[106] Sodium channel blockers for the therapy of GBS are being researched. These drugs can mean that nerve axons are protected from harm. [107]

CONCLUSION

GBS typically leads motor weakness to be acute, quick, and progressive. Early recognition and therapy are essential, particularly for mechanical ventilation patients. For cardiac and respiratory monitoring, most patients are admitted to the hospital. GBS treatment may pose a challenge to patients and doctors.

In distinct instances, GBS is a disease with varied results and varying severity. While many o f the patients achieve complete recovery with regular medicines (IVIg and PE), residual defic iencies could still be identified in elevated incidence of instances. In some cases, patients are unable to wal unassisted 6 months after the start of the disease despite getting immunotherapy with traditional treatments.

The two most efficient therapeutic choices for GBS in enhancing symptoms are IVIG and PL EX. With occasional residual difficulties, most patients show nearfull functional recovery in a bout a year. The syndrome has a mortality rate of 3% to 5%.

Current review is a summary of what has already been investigated with respect to immunotherapeutic biological approaches to GBS and what progress is needed to improve these approaches through future studies. It is to be hoped that GBS patients will experience better clinical results and previous function retrieval through further investigation of biological drugs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author thanks his partner (Ms.Anam) for constantly supporting and sharing her knowledge regarding the disease and all the colleagues who supported during the work.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There is no conflict of interest between any of the authors.

REFERENCES

1. Ropper AH, Brown RH. Adams and Victor's Principles of Neurology. 8th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill; 2005.
2. McGrogan A, Madle GC, Seaman HE, deVries CS. The epidemiology of Guillain-Barré syndrome worldwide. A systematic literature review. Neuroepidemiology.2009;32(2):150-63.DOI: 10.1159/000184748
3. Soysal A, Aysal F, Caliskan B, Dogan AkP, Mutluay B, Sakalli N, Baybas S, Arpaci B. Clinico-electrophysiological findings and prognosis of Guillain-Barré syndrome--10years'experience. Acta Neurol Scand. 2011 Mar; 123(3):181-6.DOI:10.1111/j.16000404.2010.01366.x
4. Cuadrado JI, dePedro-Cuesta J, Ara JR, Cemillán CA, Díaz M, Duarte J, Fernández MD, Fernández O, García-López F, García Merino A, García-Montero R, Martínez-Matos JA, Palomo F, Pardo J, Tobías A; Spanish GBS Epidemiological Study Group. Guillain Barrésyndrome in Spain, 1985-1997: epidemiological and public health views. Eur Neurol. 2001; 46(2):83-91.DOI: 10.1159/000050769
5. Bogliun G, Beghi E; Italian GBS Registry Study Group. Incidence and clinical features of acute inflammatory polyradiculo neuropathy in Lombardy, Italy, 1996. Acta Neurol Scand. 2004 Aug; 110 (2):100-6.DOI:10.1111/j.16000404.2004.00272.x
6. Hughes RA, Cornblath DR. Guillain-Barrésyndrome. Lancet. 2005 Nov; 366 (9497):1653-66.DOI:10.1016/S0140-6736(05)676659

7. Hung KL, Wang HS, Liou WY, Mak SC, Chi CS, Shen EY, Lin MI, Wang PJ, Shen YZ, Chang KP. Guillain-Barrésyndrome in children: a cooperative study in Taiwan. Brain Dev.1994MayJun;16(3):204-8.DOI:10.1016/0387-7604(94)90070-1
8. Sudulagunta SR, Sodalagunta MB, Sepehrar M, et al. Guillain-Barré syndrome: clinical profile and management. *Ger Med Sci*. 2015;13:Doc16. Published 2015 Sep 21. doi:10.3205/000220
9. G. Guillain, J. Barr´e, and A. Strohl, "Sur un syndrome de radiculo-nevrite avec hyper albuminose du liquide cephalorachidiensansreactioncellulaire. Remarquessurles characteres cliniqueet graphiquedes reflexestendinaux,"Bulletinset Memories de la Societe Medicale des Hopitaux de Paris, vol. 40, pp. 1462–1470,1916.
10. W. K. J. Haymaker, "The Landry-Guillain-Barr´e syndrome: a clinicopathologicic report of fifty fatal cases and a critique of theliterature,"Medicine,vol.28,pp.59–141,1949.
11. J.W. Griffin, C.Y. Li, T.W. Hoetal., "Guillain-Barr´e syndrome in northern China.The spectrum of neuropathological changes in clinically defined cases," Brain, vol. 118, no. 3, pp. 577–595, 1995.
12. Koul R, Al-Futaisi A, Chacko A et al. Clinical Characteristics of Childhood GuillainBarré Syndrome. Oman Med J. 2008; 23(3): 158–61.
13. Kumar, Maneesh; Aroor, Shrikiran; Mundkur, Suneel; Kumar, Sandeep Journal of Clinical & Diagnostic Research. Jan2015, Vol. 9 Issue 1, p9-12. 4p.
14. Landry O. Note sur la paralysie ascendante aigue. Gazette Hebdomadaire de Medicin 1859;6:472–4; 486–8.
15. Guillain G, Barré JA, Strohl A. Sur un syndrome de radiculo-névrite hyperalbuminose du liquide céphalorachidien sans réaction cellulaire. Bull Soc Méd Hôp Paris 1916;40:1462–70.
16. Seneviratne U Guillain-Barré syndrome Postgraduate Medical Journal 2000;76:774-782
17. Yuki, N.; Hartung, H.P. Guillain-Barré syndrome. N. Engl. J. Med., 2012, 366(24), 2294-2304.
18. Pithadia, A.B.; Kakadia, N. Guillain-Barre syndrome (GBS). Pharmacol. Reports, 2010, 62(2), 220-232.
19. Soliven, B. Animal models of autoimmune neuropathy. ILAR J., 2014, 54(3), 282-290.
20. Linington, C.; Izumo, S.; Suzuki, M.; Uyemura, K.; Meyermann, R.; Wekerle, H. A permanent rat T cell line that mediates experimental allergic neuritis in the Lewis rat in vivo. J. Immunol., 1984, 133(4), 1946-1950.
21. Dhar R, Stitt L, Hahn AF. The morbidity and outcome of patients with Guillain-Barré syndrome admitted to the intensive care unit. J Neurol Sci 2008;264:121– 128.
22. Lawn ND, Wijdicks FM. Fatal Guillain-Barré syndrome. Neurology 1999;52:635–638.
23. Winer JB, Hughes RAC, Osmond C. A prospective study of acute idiopathic neuropathy. I. Clinical features and their prognostic value. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 1988;51:605–612.
24. Plasma Exchange/Sandoglobulin Guillain-Barré Syndrome Trial Group. Randomised trial of plasma exchange, intravenous immunoglobulin, and combined treatments in Guillain-Barré syndrome. Lancet 1997;349:225–230.
25. Italian Guillain-Barré Study Group. The prognosis and main prognostic indicators of Guillain-Barré syndrome: a multicentre prospective study of 297 patients. Brain 1996; 119:2053–2061.
26. Alshekhlee A, Hussain Z, Sultan B, Katirji B. GuillainBarré syndrome: incidence and mortality rates in US hospitals. Neurology 2008;70:1608–1613.
27. Sejvar JJ, Baughman AL, Wise M, Morgan OW. Population incidence of Guillain-Barré syndrome: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Neuroepidemiology. 2011;36(2):123-133.
28. Estridge, Robert & Iskander, Mariana. (2015). Understanding Guillain-Barré syndrome. JAAPA: official journal of the American Academy of Physician Assistants. 28. 10.1097/01.JAA.0000466585.10595.f5.
29. Rees JH, Thompson RD, Smeeton NC, et al. Epidemiological study of Guillain-Barré syndrome in southeast England. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 1998;64:74–7.
30. Govoni V, Granieri E, Casetta I, et al. The incidence of Guillain-Barré syndrome in Ferrara, Italy: is the disease really increasing? J Neurol Sci 1996;137:62–8.
31. Jiang GX, de Pedro Cuesta J, Fredrikson S. Guillain-Barré syndrome in south-west Stockholm, 1973–1991. 1. Quality of registered hospital diagnoses and incidence. Acta Neurol Scand 1995;91:109–17.
32. McLean M, Duclos P, Jacob P, et al. Incidence of GuillainBarré syndrome in Ontario and Quebec, 1983–1989, using hospital service databases. Epidemiology 1994;5:443–8
33. Sedano MJ, Calleja J, Canga E, et al. Guillain-Barré syndrome in Cantabria, Spain. An epidemiological and clinical study. Acta Neurol Scand 1994;89:287–92.

34. Jiang GX, Cheng Q, Link H, et al. Epidemiological features of Guillain-Barré syndrome in Sweden, 1978–93. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 1997;62:447–53.
35. Hankey GJ. Guillain-Barré syndrome in Western Australia,1980–85.Med J Aust 1987;146:130–3.
36. Beghi E, Kurland LT, Mulder DW, et al. Guillain-Barré syndrome: clinico-epidemiologic features and eVect of influenza vaccine. Arch Neurol 1985;42:1053–7.
37. Jiang GX, de Pedro Cuesta J, Strigard K, et al. Pregnancy and Guillain-Barré syndrome: a nationwide register cohort study. Neuroepidemiology 1996;15:192–200.
38. Seneviratne U Guillain-Barré syndrome Postgraduate Medical Journal 2000;76:774-782
39. Sejvar JJ, Baughman AL, Wise M, Morgan OW. Population incidence of Guillain-Barré syndrome: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Neuroepidemiology. 2011;36(2):123-133.
40. Hadden RD, Karch H, Hartung HP, et al.; Plasma Exchange/Sandoglobulin Guillain-Barré Syndrome Trial Group. Preceding infections, immune factors, and outcome in Guillain-Barré syndrome. Neurology. 2001; 56(6):758-765.
41. Van Doorn PA, Ruts L, Jacobs BC. Clinical features, pathogenesis, and treatment of Guillain-Barré syndrome. Lancet Neurol. 2008;7(10):939-950.
42. Lehmann HC, Hartung HP, Kieseier BC, Hughes RA. Guillain-Barré syndrome after exposure to influenza virus. Lancet Infect Dis. 2010; 10(9):643-651.
43. Dimachkie MM, Barohn RJ. Guillain-Barré syndrome and variants. Neurol Clin. 2013;31(2):491-510.
44. Walling AD, Dickson G. Guillain-Barré syndrome. Am Fam Physician. 2013;87(3):191-197.
45. Estridge, Robert & Iskander, Mariana. (2015). Understanding Guillain-Barré syndrome. JAAPA: official journal of the American Academy of Physician Assistants. 28. 10.1097/01.JAA.0000466585.10595.f5.
46. Asbury AK, Arnason BG, Adams RD. The inflammatory lesion in idiopathic polyneuritis. Its role in pathogenesis. Medicine 1969;48:173–215
47. Prineas JW. Pathology of the Guillain-Barré syndrome. Ann Neurol 1981;9(suppl):6–19
48. Lampert P. Mechanism of demyelination in experimental allergic neuritis. Electron microscopic studies. Lab Invest 1969;20:127–38.
49. Hadden RD, Comblath DR, Hughes RA, et al.Electrophysiological classification of Guillain-Barré syndrome: clinical associations and outcome. Plasma exchange/Sandoglobulin Guillain-Barré syndrome trial group. Ann Neurol 1998;44: 780–8.
50. Ho TW, Willison HJ, Nachamkin I, et al. Anti-GD1a antibody is associated with axonal but not demyelinating forms of Guillain-Barré syndrome. Ann Neurol 1999;45: 168–73
51. D. R. Cornblath, “Electrophysiology in Guillain-Barré syndrome,” Annals of Neurology, vol. 27, pp. S17–S20, 1990. View at Publisher · View at Google Scholar · View at Scopus
52. R. D. M. Hadden, D. R. Cornblath, R. A. C. Hughes et al., “Electrophysiological classification of Guillain-Barré syndrome: clinical associations and outcome,” Annals of Neurology, vol. 44, no. 5, pp. 780–788, 1998. View at Google Scholar · View at Scopus
53. Melnick S. 38 cases of the Guillain-Barré syndrome; an immunological study.BMJ 1963;1:368–73.
54. Koski CL, Humphrey R, Shin ML. Anti-peripheral myelin antibody in patients with demyelinating neuropathy: quantitative and kinetic determination of serum antibody by complement component 1 fixation. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 1985;82:905–9.
55. Gregson NA, Koblar S, Hughes RS. Antibodies to gangliosides in Guillain-Barré syndrome: specificity and relationship to clinical features [see comments]. Q J Med1993;86 111–17.
56. Kusunoki S. Antiganglioside antibodies in the pathogenesis of autoimmune neuropathies. Rinsho Shinkeigaku 1999;39: 93–5.
57. Chiba A,Kusunoki S,Obata H,et al.Serum anti-GQ1b IgG antibody is associated with ophthalmoplegia in Miller Fisher syndrome and Guillain-Barré syndrome: clinical and immunohistochemical studies. Neurology 1993;43: 1911–17.
58. Willison HJ, Veitch J, Paterson G, et al. Miller Fisher syndrome is associated with serum antibodies to GQ1b ganglioside. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 1993;56:204–6.
59. Ho TW, Willison HJ, Nachamkin I, et al. Anti-GD1a antibody is associated with axonal but not demyelinating forms of Guillain-Barré syndrome. Ann Neurol 1999;45: 168–73
60. Winer, John. (2007). Guillain-Barré syndrome. British journal of hospital medicine. 51. 313.

61. Dimachkie MM, Barohn RJ. Guillain-Barré syndrome and variants. Neurol Clin. 2013;31(2):491-510.
62. Walling AD, Dickson G. Guillain-Barré syndrome. Am Fam Physician. 2013;87(3):191-197
63. Fokke C, van den Berg B, Drenthen J, et al. Diagnosis of Guillain-Barré syndrome and validation of Brighton criteria. Brain. 2014;137(Pt 1):33-43.
64. Yuki N, Hartung HP. Guillain–Barré syndrome. N Engl J Med. 2012;366(24):229-304.
65. Estridge, Robert & Iskander, Mariana. (2015). Understanding Guillain-Barré syndrome. JAAPA: official journal of the American Academy of Physician Assistants. 28. 10.1097/01.JAA.0000466585.10595.f5.
66. Pritchard J. Guillain-Barré syndrome. *Clin Med (Lond)*. 2010;10(4):399–401. doi:10.7861/clinmedicine.10-4-399
67. Longo DL, Fauci AS, Kasper DL, et al., eds. Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine. 18th ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill; 2012
68. Yuki N, Hartung HP. Guillain–Barré syndrome. N Engl J Med. 2012;366(24):229-304.
69. Watanabe T, Matsuura O, Natsume J, et al. Dramatic improvement with immune absorption therapy in a 7-year old girl with severe Guillain-Barré syndrome after unsuccessful gamma globulin therapy. No To Hattatsu 1998;30: 255–60.
70. Haymaker W, Kernohan JW. Landry-Guillain-Barre syndrome: a clinicopathological report of fifty fatal cases and a critique of the literature. Medicine 1949;28:59-141.
71. Asbury A, Arnason B, Adams RD. The inflammatory lesion in idiopathic polyneuritis: its role in pathogenesis. Medicine 1969;48:173-215.
72. Loffel NB. Rossi LN. Mumenthaler M, Lutschg J, Ludin HP. The Landy-Guillain-Barre syndrome:' complications, prognosis, and natural history in 123 cases. J Neurol Sci 1977;33:71- 79.
73. Samantray SK, Johnson SC, Mathai KV, Pulimood BM. Landry-Guillain-Barre syndrome: a study of 302 cases. Med J Aust 1977;2:84-91
74. Winer JB, Hughes RAC, Osmond C. A prospective study of acute idiopathic neuropathy. I. Clinical features and their prognostic value. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 1988;51: 605- 612
75. De Jager AE, Sluiter HJ. Clinical signs in severe Guillain- Barre syndrome: analysis of 63 patients. J Neurol Sci 1991; 104:143-150.
76. Ng KKP, Howard RS, Fish DR, et al. Management and outcome of severe Guillain-Barre syndrome. Q J Med 1995;88: 243-250.
77. Ropper AH, Shahani BT. Pain in Guillain-Barre syndrome. Arch Neurol 1984;41:511-514.
78. Dhar R, Stitt L, Hahn AF. The morbidity and outcome of patients with Guillain-Barré syndrome admitted to the intensive care unit. J Neurol Sci 2008;264:121– 128.
79. Lawn ND, Wijdicks FM. Fatal Guillain-Barré syndrome. Neurology 1999;52:635–638.
80. Winer JB, Hughes RAC, Osmond C. A prospective study of acute idiopathic neuropathy. I. Clinical features and their prognostic value. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 1988;51:605–612.
81. Plasma Exchange/Sandoglobulin Guillain-Barré Syndrome Trial Group. Randomised trial of plasma exchange, intravenous immunoglobulin, and combined treatments in Guillain-Barré syndrome. Lancet 1997;349:225–230.
82. Albiol-Pe ´rez S, Forcano-Garcı ´a M, Mun ˜oz-Toma ´s MT, et al. A novel virtual motor rehabilitation system for Guillain-Barre ´ syndrome: two single case studies. Methods Inf Med. 2015;54(2):127–34. http://dx.doi.org/10.3414/ME14-02-0002. Medline:25609504
83. Garssen MP, Bussmann JB, Schmitz PI, et al. Physical training and fatigue, fitness, and quality of life in Guillain-Barre ´ syndrome and CIDP. Neurology. 2004;63(12):2393–5. http://dx.doi.org/10.1212/01.WNL.0000148589.87107.9C. Medline:15623709
84. Bussmann JB, Garssen MP, van Doorn PA, et al. Analysing the favourable effects of physical exercise: relationships between physical fitness, fatigue and functioning in Guillain-Barre´ syndrome and chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy. J Rehabil Med. 2007;39(2):121–5.
85. Karper WB. Effects of low-intensity aerobic exercise on one subject with chronic-relapsing Guillain-Barre ´ syndrome. Rehabil Nurs. 1991;16(2):96–8.
86. Fisher TB, Stevens JE. Rehabilitation of a marathon runner with Guillain-Barre ´ syndrome. J Neurol Phys Ther. 2008;32(4):203–9

87. Karper WB. Effects of low-intensity aerobic exercise on one subject with chronic-relapsing Guillain-Barre ´ syndrome. Rehabil Nurs. 1991;16(2):96–8.
88. Herbison GJ, Jaweed MM, Ditunno JF Jr. Exercise therapies in peripheral neuropathies. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 1983;64(5):201–5. Medline:6303270
89. Garssen MP, Schillings ML, Van Doorn PA, et al. Contribution of central and peripheral factors to residual fatigue in Guillain-Barre ´ syndrome. Muscle Nerve. 2007;36(1):93–9. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1002/mus.20739. Medline:17238173
90. Drory VE, Bronipolsky T, Bluvshtein V, et al. Occurrence of fatigue over 20 years after recovery from Guillain-Barre ´ syndrome. J Neurol Sci. 2012;316(1–2):72–5.
91. Simatos Arsenault N, Vincent PO, Yu BH, Bastien R, Sweeney A. Influence of Exercise on Patients with Guillain-Barré Syndrome: A Systematic Review. *Physiother Can*. 2016;68(4):367–376. doi:10.3138/ptc.2015-58
92. Lawn ND, Fletcher DD, Henderson RD, et al. Anticipating mechanical ventilation in Guillain-Barré syndrome. Arch Neurol. 2001;58(6):893-898.
93. The Guillain-Barré Syndrome Study Group. Plasmapharesis and acute Guillain-Barré syndrome. Neurology 1985; 35: 1096–104.
94. French Cooperative group in plasma exchange in Guillain-Barré syndrome. Efficiency of plasma exchange in Guillain-Barré syndrome: role of replacement fluids. Ann Neurol 1987; 22: 753–61.
95. 3 Vander Meché FGA, Schmitz PIM, Dutch Guillain-Barré Study Group. A randomized trial comparing intravenous immune globulin and plasma exchange in Guillain-Barré syndrome. N Engl J Med 1992; 326: 1123–29.
96. Irani DN, Cornblath DR, Chaudhry V, Borel C, Hanley DF. Relapse in Guillain-Barré syndrome after treatment with human immune globulin. Neurology 1993; 43: 872–75
97. Castro LHM, Ropper AH. Human immune globulin infusion in Guillain-Barré syndrome: worsening during and after treatment. Neurology 1993; 43: 1034–36.
98. Vriesendorp FJ, Mayer RF, Koski CL. Kinetics of anti-peripheral nerve myelin antibody in patients with Guillain-Barré syndrome treated and not treated with plasmapheresis. Arch Neurol 1991; 48: 858–61.
99. Szczepiorkowski ZM, Winters JL, Bandarenko N, et al. Apheresis Applications Committee of the American Society for Apheresis. Guidelines on the use of therapeutic apheresis in clinical practice—evidence-based approach from the Apheresis Applications Committee of the American Society for Apheresis. J Clin Apher. 2010;25(3):83-177.
100. Arcila-Londono X, Lewis RA. Guillain-Barré syndrome. Semin Neurol. 2012;32(3):179-186.
101. Darabi K, Abdel-Wahab O, Dzik WH. Current usage of intravenous immune globulin and the rationale behind it: the Massachusetts General Hospital data and a review of the literature. Transfusion. 2006;46(5):741-753.
102. Pierce LR, Jain N. Risks associated with the use of intravenous immunoglobulin. Transfus Med Rev. 2003;17(4):241-251.
103. Walling AD, Dickson G. Guillain-Barré syndrome. Am Fam Physician. 2013;87(3):191-197.
104. Lawn ND, Fletcher DD, Henderson RD, et al. Anticipating mechanical ventilation in Guillain- Barré syndrome. Arch Neurol. 2001;58(6):893-898.
105. VanDer Meché FG, Van Doorn PA, Meulstee J, Jennekens FG. GBS-consensus group of the Dutch Neuromuscular Research Support Centre. Diagnostic and classification criteria for the Guillain-Barré syndrome. Eur Neurol. 2001;45(3):133-139.
106. Ropper AH. The Guillain-Barré syndrome. N Engl J Med. 1992;326(17):1130-1136.
107. Arcila-Londono X, Lewis RA. Guillain-Barré syndrome. Semin Neurol. 2012;32(3):179-186.

Image *Author -1*	***Author Name – Corresponding Author*** **SALMAN KAPADIA** *Author Affiliation :* Master's in Pharmacology *Author Address/Institute Address:* Department of pharmacology, Oriental college of Pharmacy, Sanpada, Navi Mumbai-400705, India.