

Multiple sclerosis in adults: management (update)

Committee discussion for diagnostic criteria for multiple sclerosis; possible multiple sclerosis; neuromyelitis optica and clinically isolated syndrome

NICE guideline <number>

Committee discussion underpinning recommendations 1.1.1 to 1.1.9 and research recommendations in the NICE guideline

December 2021

Draft for consultation

This evidence review was developed by the National Guideline Centre, hosted by the Royal College of Physicians

Disclaimer

The recommendations in this guideline represent the view of NICE, arrived at after careful consideration of the evidence available. When exercising their judgement, professionals are expected to take this guideline fully into account, alongside the individual needs, preferences and values of their patients or service users. The recommendations in this guideline are not mandatory and the guideline does not override the responsibility of healthcare professionals to make decisions appropriate to the circumstances of the individual patient, in consultation with the patient and, where appropriate, their carer or guardian.

Local commissioners and providers have a responsibility to enable the guideline to be applied when individual health professionals and their patients or service users wish to use it. They should do so in the context of local and national priorities for funding and developing services, and in light of their duties to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, to advance equality of opportunity and to reduce health inequalities. Nothing in this guideline should be interpreted in a way that would be inconsistent with compliance with those duties.

NICE guidelines cover health and care in England. Decisions on how they apply in other UK countries are made by ministers in the [Welsh Government](#), [Scottish Government](#), and [Northern Ireland Executive](#). All NICE guidance is subject to regular review and may be updated or withdrawn.

Copyright

© NICE 2022. All rights reserved. Subject to Notice of rights.

Contents

1	Diagnosis	5
1.1	Review question:	5
1.1.1	The committee’s discussion and interpretation of the evidence	5
1.1.2	Recommendations supported by this evidence review	6

1

1 Diagnostic criteria

1.1 Review question:

3 What are the key diagnostic criteria for the following: multiple sclerosis; possible multiple
4 sclerosis; neuromyelitis optica and clinically isolated syndrome?

5 The committee agreed that the recommendations for the diagnosis of multiple sclerosis
6 should be based on McDonald criteria. These criteria are well established and accepted
7 across the multiple sclerosis community. The McDonald criteria are widely accepted as the
8 gold standard for diagnosis MS. They were used to base the recommendations on in the
9 2014 version of the guideline and these recommendations were therefore updated in
10 accordance with the revised 2017 criteria. An evidence review looking at the diagnostic
11 accuracy of different diagnostic criteria was therefore not thought to be helpful in informing
12 recommendations. Committee consensus opinion was used to word the recommendations
13 that would be useful for clinicians in practice (by informal consensus methods).

1.1.1 The committee's discussion and interpretation of the evidence

1.1.1.1 The outcomes that matter most

16 An accurate diagnosis of multiple sclerosis will help direct appropriate management and
17 treatment.

1.1.1.2 The quality of the evidence

19 The recommendations for diagnosis are based on agreed international criteria for diagnosis
20 of Multiple Sclerosis. The committee used informal consensus to agree the wording of the
21 recommendations, adapting the McDonald criteria for use by non-MS specialists.

1.1.1.3 Benefits and harms

23 A prompt and accurate diagnosis will ensure that people have timely access to interventions
24 to manage their symptoms. Clinical harms include delay in diagnosis and misdiagnosis. If
25 non-specialists have a clearer idea of the clinical presentation of MS they may refer at an
26 earlier stage. The committee therefore highlighted common symptoms of MS as well as
27 those which are not suggestive of the condition. The committee added the importance of
28 excluding fever and infection as these can mimic the symptoms of MS. The committee
29 removed the recommendation on performing blood tests to exclude alternative diagnosis.
30 They highlighted that these need to be tailored to the individual and their presenting
31 symptoms. Providing information as to which patients are unlikely to have MS is also of
32 benefit to non-specialists and people with symptoms. The committee emphasised the
33 importance of a review for people who had symptoms but did not meet the McDonald criteria
34 for diagnosis. The committee discussed the impact of a diagnosis of MS and the importance
35 of providing information on support groups and reliable internet sources. This is further
36 supported by the recommendations on information and support.

1.1.1.4 Cost effectiveness and resource use

38 Considering specific characteristics for the diagnosis of multiple sclerosis does not have any
39 economic implications. The recommendations reflect current clinical practice and are not
40 expected to increase the number of referrals or the cost of making a diagnosis.

1.1.1.5 Other factors the committee took into account

2 The committee considered that the diagnosis of MS is complex but diagnostic criteria are a
3 guide to who should be referred to a specialist. MS occurs primarily in people between ages
4 of 20 and 50 years. The pathology of MS is of an inflammatory process and the time course
5 can help differentiate symptoms from those caused for example, by TIA or stroke where the
6 symptoms occur suddenly or over a time course of minutes to hours. The committee
7 considered it useful to identify common patterns of presentation, but the list is not exhaustive.
8 Fatigue, depression and dizziness are non-specific symptoms and would not usually suggest
9 a diagnosis of MS if a person does not have accompanying neurological symptoms and
10 signs.

11 The committee discussed how it may be difficult for people living in rural areas to access a
12 consultant neurologist and they may have to travel long distances. However, the committee
13 confirmed that due to the importance of obtaining an accurate diagnosis a referral to a
14 consultant neurologist is essential.

15 The committee were aware of the NICE guideline on suspected neurological conditions:
16 recognition and referral (NG127) and made a cross reference to this.

1.1.2 Recommendations supported by this evidence review

18 This evidence review supports recommendations 1.1.1 to 1.1.9.

19