

Neurological soft signs

Introduction

Neurological soft signs (NSS) are neurological abnormalities that can be identified by clinical examination using valid and reliable testing measures. They are referred to as 'soft' because they are not related to a localised pathological lesion and are not thought to be part of a well-defined neurological syndrome.

Categories of NSS are varied but they are commonly grouped into three categories: integrative sensory functioning, motor coordination, and complex motor sequencing. Integrative sensory functioning can include deficits in bilateral extinction (difficulty perceiving stimuli when presented to both hemispheres simultaneously), impaired audio-visual integration, agraphesthesia (inability to recognise by touch letters and numbers drawn on the skin) and astereognosis (inability to identify an object by touch without visual input). Motor coordination involves general coordination, intention tremor, finger thumb opposition, balance, and gait. Motor sequencing measures complex motor tasks, such as repetitive alternating hand positions, i.e. fist-edge-palm test where subjects place their hand in three different positions sequentially: a fist resting horizontally, a palm resting vertically, and a palm resting horizontally. Abnormalities in eye movements and developmental reflexes may also be apparent.

Method

We have included only systematic reviews (systematic literature search, detailed methodology with inclusion/exclusion criteria) published in full text, in English, from the year 2010 that report results separately for people with a diagnosis of bipolar or related disorders. Reviews were identified by searching the databases MEDLINE, EMBASE, and PsycINFO. Hand searching reference lists of identified reviews was also conducted. When multiple copies of review topics were found, only the most recent and comprehensive

version was included. Reviews with pooled data are prioritised for inclusion.

Review reporting assessment was guided by the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses ([PRISMA](#)) checklist that describes a preferred way to present a meta-analysis. Reviews were assigned a low, medium or high possibility of reporting bias* depending on how many items were checked. Reviews rated as having less than 50% of items checked have now been excluded from the library. The PRISMA flow diagram is a suggested way of providing information about studies included and excluded with reasons for exclusion. Where no flow diagram has been presented by individual reviews, but identified studies have been described in the text, reviews have been checked for this item. Note that early reviews may have been guided by less stringent reporting checklists than the PRISMA, and that some reviews may have been limited by journal guidelines.

Evidence was graded using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation ([GRADE](#)) Working Group approach where high quality evidence such as that gained from randomised controlled trials (RCTs) may be downgraded to moderate or low if review and study quality is limited, if there is inconsistency in results, indirect comparisons, imprecise or sparse data and high probability of reporting bias. It may also be downgraded if risks associated with the intervention or other matter under review are high. Conversely, low quality evidence such as that gained from observational studies may be upgraded if effect sizes are large, there is a dose dependent response or if results are reasonably consistent, precise and direct with low associated risks (see end of table for an explanation of these terms)¹. The resulting table represents an objective summary of the available evidence, although the conclusions are solely the opinion of staff of NeuRA (Neuroscience Research Australia).

Neurological soft signs

Results

We found one systematic review that met our inclusion criteria².

- Moderate quality evidence suggests a large effect of more NSS in people with bipolar disorder than controls. This effect remained large in subgroup analyses of NSS task (sensory integration, motor coordination or motor sequencing), bipolar disorder type I and euthymia patients. There were no moderating effects of age, sex, duration of illness, age of onset, or antipsychotic use.
- Moderate to high quality evidence suggests a small to medium-sized effect of less NSS in people with bipolar disorder compared to people with schizophrenia. Subgroup analyses showed only motor coordination scores were significantly lower in bipolar disorder. There were also no significant differences between people with bipolar disorder with psychotic symptoms, and people with schizophrenia. There were no moderating effects of age, sex, duration of illness or age of onset.

Neurological soft signs

Bora E, Akgul O, Ceylan D, Ozerdem A

Neurological soft signs in bipolar disorder in comparison to healthy controls and schizophrenia: A meta-analysis

European Neuropsychopharmacology 2018; 28: 1185-93

[View online review abstract](#)

Comparison 1	NSS in people with bipolar disorder vs. controls.
Summary of evidence	Moderate quality evidence (large sample size, inconsistent, imprecise, direct) suggests a large effect of more NSS in people with bipolar disorder than controls. This effect remained large regardless of NSS task (sensory integration, motor coordination or motor sequencing), bipolar disorder type (I) or stage (euthymia), age, sex, duration of illness, age of onset, or antipsychotic use.
NSS	
<p><i>A significant, large effect of increased total NSS scores in people with bipolar disorder;</i> 13 studies, N = 1,359, $d = 1.14$, 95%CI 0.89 to 1.44, $p < 0.001$, $I^2 = 77\%$</p> <p>The results were similar in subgroup analyses of studies using the Neurological Evaluation Scale, studies of people with bipolar I disorder or euthymic patients, and studies using sensory integration, motor coordination, or sequential motor tasks.</p> <p>There were no moderating effects of age, sex, duration of illness, age of onset and percentage of patients on antipsychotics.</p>	
Comparison 2	NSS in people with bipolar disorder vs. people with schizophrenia.
Summary of evidence	Moderate to high quality evidence (large sample size, inconsistent, precise, direct) suggests a small to medium-sized effect of less NSS in people with bipolar disorder compared to people with schizophrenia. Subgroup analyses showed only motor coordination tasks were significantly lower. There were also no significant differences between people with bipolar disorder with psychotic symptoms and people with schizophrenia. There were no moderating effects of age, sex, duration of illness or age of onset.
NSS	
<p><i>A significant, small to medium-sized effect of increased total NSS scores in people with schizophrenia;</i></p>	

Neurological soft signs

10 studies, N = 862, $d = 0.42$, 95%CI 0.18 to 0.65, $p < 0.001$, $I^2 = 59\%$

The results were similar in subgroup analyses of studies using the Neurological Evaluation Scale, but only studies of motor coordination tasks showed a significant result (higher NSS in schizophrenia; $d = 0.40$).

Subgroup analysis of studies comparing people with bipolar disorder and psychotic symptoms with people with schizophrenia showed no significant differences ($d = 0.14$).

There were no moderating effects of age, sex, duration of illness or age of onset.

Consistency in results	Inconsistent
Precision in results	Imprecise for control comparison, precise for schizophrenia comparison.
Directness of results	Direct

Explanation of acronyms

CI = confidence interval, d = Cohen's d , standardised mean difference, I^2 = the percentage of the variability in effect estimates that is due to heterogeneity rather than sampling error (chance), N = number of participants, NSS = neurological soft signs, p = statistical probability of obtaining that result ($p < 0.05$ generally regarded as significant), vs. = versus

Neurological soft signs

Explanation of technical terms

* Bias has the potential to affect reviews of both RCT and observational studies. Forms of bias include; reporting bias – selective reporting of results, publication bias - trials that are not formally published tend to show less effect than published trials, further if there are statistically significant differences between groups in a trial, these trial results tend to get published before those of trials without significant differences; language bias – only including English language reports; funding bias - source of funding for the primary research with selective reporting of results within primary studies; outcome variable selection bias; database bias - including reports from some databases and not others; citation bias - preferential citation of authors. Trials can also be subject to bias when evaluators are not blind to treatment condition and selection bias of participants if trial samples are small³.

† Different effect measures are reported by different reviews.

Prevalence refers to how many existing cases there are at a particular point in time. Incidence refers to how many new cases there are per population in a specified time period. Incidence is usually reported as the number of new cases per 100,000 people per year. Alternatively some studies present the number of new cases that have accumulated over several years against a person-years denominator. This denominator is the sum of individual units of time that the persons in the population are at risk of becoming a case. It takes into account the size of the underlying population sample and its age structure over the duration of observation.

Weighted mean difference scores refer to mean differences between treatment and

comparison groups after treatment (or occasionally pre to post treatment) and in a randomised trial there is an assumption that both groups are comparable on this measure prior to treatment. Standardised mean differences are divided by the pooled standard deviation (or the standard deviation of one group when groups are homogenous) that allows results from different scales to be combined and compared. Each study's mean difference is then given a weighting depending on the size of the sample and the variability in the data. 0.2 represents a small effect, 0.5 a medium effect, and 0.8 and over represents a large treatment effect³.

Reliability and validity refers to how accurate the instrument is. Sensitivity is the proportion of actual positives that are correctly identified (100% sensitivity = correct identification of all actual positives) and specificity is the proportion of negatives that are correctly identified (100% specificity = not identifying anyone as positive if they are truly not).

Odds ratio (OR) or relative risk (RR) refers to the probability of a reduction (< 1) or an increase (> 1) in a particular outcome in a treatment group, or a group exposed to a risk factor, relative to the comparison group. For example, a RR of 0.75 translates to a reduction in risk of an outcome of 25% relative to those not receiving the treatment or not exposed to the risk factor. Conversely, an RR of 1.25 translates to an increased risk of 25% relative to those not receiving treatment or not having been exposed to a risk factor. An RR or OR of 1.00 means there is no difference between groups. A medium effect is considered if $RR > 2$ or < 0.5 and a large effect if $RR > 5$ or < 0.2 ⁴. InOR stands for logarithmic OR where a InOR of 0 shows no difference between groups. Hazard ratios measure the effect of an explanatory variable on the hazard or risk of an event.

Correlation coefficients (eg, r) indicate the strength of association or relationship

Neurological soft signs

between variables. They are an indication of prediction, but do not confirm causality due to possible and often unforeseen confounding variables. An r of 0.10 represents a weak association, 0.25 a medium association and 0.40 and over represents a strong association. Unstandardised (b) regression coefficients indicate the average change in the dependent variable associated with a 1 unit change in the independent variable, statistically controlling for the other independent variables. Standardised regression coefficients represent the change being in units of standard deviations to allow comparison across different scales.

‡ Inconsistency refers to differing estimates of effect across studies (i.e. heterogeneity or variability in results) that is not explained by subgroup analyses and therefore reduces confidence in the effect estimate. I^2 is the percentage of the variability in effect estimates that is due to heterogeneity rather than sampling error (chance) - 0% to 40%: heterogeneity might not be important, 30% to 60%: may represent moderate heterogeneity, 50% to 90%: may represent substantial heterogeneity and 75% to 100%: considerable heterogeneity. I^2 can be calculated from Q (chi-square) for the test of heterogeneity with the following formula;

$$I^2 = \left(\frac{Q - df}{Q} \right) \times 100\%$$

§ Imprecision refers to wide confidence intervals indicating a lack of confidence in the effect estimate. Based on GRADE recommendations, a result for continuous data (standardised mean differences, not weighted mean differences) is considered imprecise if the upper or lower confidence limit crosses an effect size of 0.5 in either direction, and for binary and correlation data, an effect size of 0.25. GRADE also recommends downgrading the evidence when

sample size is smaller than 300 (for binary data) and 400 (for continuous data), although for some topics, these criteria should be relaxed⁵.

|| Indirectness of comparison occurs when a comparison of intervention A versus B is not available but A was compared with C and B was compared with C that allows indirect comparisons of the magnitude of effect of A versus B. Indirectness of population, comparator and/or outcome can also occur when the available evidence regarding a particular population, intervention, comparator, or outcome is not available and is therefore inferred from available evidence. These inferred treatment effect sizes are of lower quality than those gained from head-to-head comparisons of A and B.

Neurological soft signs

References

1. GRADEWorkingGroup (2004): Grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *British Medical Journal* 328: 1490.
2. Bora E, Akgul O, Ceylan D, Ozerdem A (2018): Neurological soft signs in bipolar disorder in comparison to healthy controls and schizophrenia: A meta-analysis. *European Neuropsychopharmacology* 28: 1185-93.
3. CochraneCollaboration (2008): Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. Accessed 24/06/2011.
4. Rosenthal JA (1996): Qualitative Descriptors of Strength of Association and Effect Size. *Journal of Social Service Research* 21: 37-59.
5. GRADEpro (2008): [Computer program]. Jan Brozek, Andrew Oxman, Holger Schünemann. *Version 32 for Windows*.