CHAPTER 11

TECHNOLOGY REVIEW: THE NEUROMETER®
CURRENT PERCEPTION THRESHOLD (CPT)

INTRODUCTION

The American Association of Electrodiagnostic Medicine (AAEM) undertook this technology review based on AAEM member inquiries received in the Executive Office regarding the Neurometer® Current Perception Threshold (CPT). The Neurometer® CPT is a device for evaluating and quantifying sensory function which has been available in the medical market place for some years. The AAEM is currently undertaking a review of the general topic of quantitative sensory testing (QST), and technology reviews of other specific methodologies and instruments are anticipated in the future.

The Neurometer® CPT is a transcutaneous electrical stimulator which delivers sinusoidal electrical stimuli via surface electrodes at frequencies of 5 Hz, 250 Hz, and 2000 Hz, and at a current intensity range of 0.01 to 9.99 milliamperes. It is the only commercially available instrument applying this technology to the evaluation of sensory nerve function. Patients are asked to identify the presence or absence of the stimulus through a forced choice protocol. After an initial tentative threshold is determined, stimuli are presented that vary around the presumed threshold to confirm threshold stability and replicability. To prevent guessing, results are verified with placebo stimulation. The placebo stimulation is given by turning off all current without informing the patient and presenting these absent stimuli. Therefore, determination of threshold requires consistent patient response. The threshold of perception is the measured response. The testing procedure requires a brief time to perform (the promotional literature suggests 15 to 20 minutes), uses few consumable supplies, and will print out results in a standard format. The instrument weighs 12 pounds (including rechargeable batteries) and includes software for the analysis of information.

Scientific publications and information from promotional literature report the usefulness of this instrument for the detection, screening, diagnosis, and management of diseases of the peripheral nervous system. Capabilities attributed to the instrument in the literature include the:

1. Detection of axonal and demyelinating peripheral neuropathies (specific conditions include those associated with diabetes,3,11,13,15,16,25,46,53-55 uremia,3,11,13,55-57 organophosphate pesticides,13 heavy metals,13 vinca alkaloids,3 hyperthyroidism,13 cisplatin toxicity,3 HIV infection,17,18,19 Lyme disease,33 leprosy,34 hereditary conditions,3 primary biliary cirrhosis,21,22 and other toxins33,34).

2. Detection of carpal tunnel syndrome (CTS),4,11,15,16 cervical radiculopathy,33 lumbosacral radiculopathy,33,35 tarsal tunnel syndrome,33 reflex sympathetic dystrophy,33 fibromyalgia,62 and neuroma.33

3. Ability to selectively measure and quantitate the response to stimulation of different size sensory nerve populations (the 2000 Hz stimulus is described as specific for measuring the response of A-beta fibers, the 250 Hz for A-delta fibers, and the 5 Hz for type C fibers).3,5,12,16,26,40,45,51-53

4. Differentiation of mononeuropathies from poly-neuropathies (including enhanced sensitivity for the detection of ischemic mononeuropathies) through multisite testing.3,14,39

5. Quantification of hyperesthetic and hypoesthetic conditions.11,13,16,25,46,55

METHODS - REVIEW OF PUBLISHED ARTICLES OR ABSTRACTS

Criteria for Review and Literature Search Methods

Studies utilizing the Neurometer® CPT for the detection and diagnosis of peripheral nervous system disorders
published through February 1, 1998, were reviewed. A Medline text-word search (“neurometer” or “current perception threshold”) revealed 26 articles. Other articles were obtained through cross-referencing bibliographies from already obtained articles and from lists provided by the manufacturer. This search yielded 44 articles (original investigations or case reports) and 115 abstracts, textbook chapters, or review articles. The staff of the AAEM, Mayo Clinic Library, and Baystate Medical Center Library assisted with obtaining articles, some of which were only obtainable from large reference libraries. References not obtainable through these sources were requested directly from the manufacturer of the Neurometer® CPT.

The criteria used for the evaluation of these publications were modified from those used by the AAEM Quality Assurance Committee for the evaluation of CTS¹ and from the consensus report³ on QST of the Peripheral Neuropathy Association.

The 6 criteria used in the evaluation are:

1. A prospective study.
2. Independent ascertainment of the clinical condition evaluated by the Neurometer® CPT.
3. A detailed description of methodology (sufficient to permit replication).
4. Attention to testing conditions that could potentially affect the results.
5. A suitable reference population from the same laboratory (obtained either concurrently or previously in the same laboratory).
6. Criteria for abnormality obtained from the reference population and defined in statistical terms. This last criterion allows comparison of a given procedure with other procedures.

**SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE**

**General Issues**

1. Most of the published articles involve studies correlating the performance of the Neurometer® CPT to results obtained from standard nerve conduction studies (NCSs) (or other diagnostic techniques) within populations of affected individuals with known diseases. Differing and conflicting conclusions are drawn from several of these evaluations; examples include the usefulness of the Neurometer® CPT for the evaluation of CTS⁴,¹⁵,¹⁶ and for the assessment of diabetic associated peripheral neuropathy. ⁵⁻²⁶,³⁵⁻⁴¹,⁴⁴⁻⁴⁵ The studies frequently show abnormalities in Neurometer® CPT measures that correlate with NCS results (or other means of evaluating nerve deficits). The Neurometer® CPT findings in these studies are often more numerous or pronounced than those abnormalities on NCS testing. However, there is the fundamental problem of what constitutes an appropriate standard against which to measure the Neurometer® CPT (for example, NCS values cannot be used as the standard if the Neurometer® CPT is being compared to these values). Another problem with the technique is that it elicits multiple measures (thresholds for 3 frequencies at each site), and any abnormality detected during the assessment of a diffuse or multifocal condition is considered significant. This causes a problem when multiple measures are being compared. Also, there is a tendency in the literature to arbitrarily assign various degrees of deviation from a normal population as grades of severity.¹⁵,¹⁶,⁵³ These grades do not add any additional information. Some of the reports use ratios of sensory threshold values.¹⁵,¹⁶,⁵³ These ratios are difficult to interpret given the current state of knowledge about this technique.

The following issues were apparent in the Neurometer® CPT literature, however, these same comments apply to other applications of QST as well.

2. Since the Neurometer® CPT test requires an intact sensorimotor system from the sensory receptor to the motor speech area (to signal stimulus detection), a report of abnormal sensory perception lacks localizing value and can reflect abnormality at any site along this pathway. Therefore, the technique is limited in its ability to distinguish between anatomic sites of peripheral nerve injury. For example, it is not possible with the Neurometer® CPT to distinguish between distal median nerve entrapment, proximal median nerve injury, or cervical radiculopathy, since these may all cause the same Neurometer® CPT abnormality.

3. Unlike an NCS, which requires only minimal patient cooperation, the Neurometer® CPT test requires active patient participation. In the absence
of cooperation (due to physical or motivational limitations, including a failure to follow instructions) the Neurometer® CPT test will generally fail to result in a reproducible score. This limitation excludes certain classes of patients from investigation (such as children, those too weak to communicate, and the comatose patient).

4. The influence upon current perception threshold of central nervous system diseases, conditions which affect sensory perception such as local cutaneous diseases, or painful states not due to nerve pathology has not been established.

Specific Issues

1. Evidence supporting the ability of the Neurometer® CPT to selectively measure the function of different nerve size nerve fiber populations is based primarily upon studies correlating stimulation frequency with results from other examination techniques (such as thermal threshold and vibration threshold) in diseased patients or studies on normal volunteers undergoing spinal anesthesia. However, there is a problem regarding what constitutes an appropriate way to validate these studies. It is not clear what constitutes an appropriate standard against which to test this hypothesis. For instance, it is possible that different classes of sensory fibers are being stimulated simultaneously, resulting in the subjective sensations described by the patient. (The only study examining the relationship between CPT measures and pathologic nerve specimens shows no correlation between myelinated nerve fiber density and current perception threshold.)

2. Although normal values for Neurometer® CPT measures are reported, it is unclear if these values depend upon accumulated studies or have been obtained by a systematic program for establishing normal values. Also, the source of these values is not easily gleaned from the publications that were reviewed. For instance, Weseley, Sadler, and Katims report in a table for normal values, “healthy CPT measures (n=84)” and reference this to 2 earlier papers. The referenced papers however do not report the tabular data. The papers describe testing “44 normal volunteers” and “60 normal volunteers,” respectively, and report normal data only in a graphical format. The same table is presented by Weseley, Liebowitz, and Katims. This paper, however, indicates that the values are derived from “60 neurologically healthy subjects.” These values are then referenced to 2 publications, 1 of which does not mention or present the tabular accumulation of normative data and was not referenced by Weseley and colleagues. The other reference was 1 of those referenced by Weseley and colleagues. This same table is also presented by Katims, Rouvelas, Sadler, and Weseley, but describes “N=137,” and incorporates into the table of normal values “n=68” published by Appenzeller and colleagues. Therefore, it is not possible to know from the literature if patient evaluations for the different conditions to which usefulness of this technique has been attributed have been performed over the same sites or with the same techniques used for obtaining normal values. This is a significant limitation when attempting to interpret the published studies examining the usefulness of the Neurometer® CPT for assessment of patients with diabetes, uremia, CTS, and the other described applications. In addition, there is little published information about reliability of test results between operators and the replicability of results between testing times.

3. Unlike an NCS, which provides information on conduction velocity and amplitude across a number of proximal and distal nerve segments, the Neurometer® CPT provides only 1 set of values for each site studied. Therefore, the location and type (axonal or demyelinating) of peripheral nerve pathology is less clear with Neurometer® CPT testing compared to NCSs to which needle electromyography (EMG) may add nonredundant information.

4. Evidence supporting the ability of the CPT evaluation to quantify hyperesthesia, as well as hypoesthesia, is based upon the assumption that detection of stimuli that fall either below or above the reported normal ranges represent the former or latter condition, respectively. This assumption forms the basis of several published reports. However, “in hypersensitivity states, threshold may be reduced, normal, or increased, but typically, as the stimulus strength is gradually increased above threshold, perception increases abnormally in magnitude, kind (an altered
sensation), or both.” Testing and validation of this assumption using the Neurometer® CPT has not been described.

Safety

There have been no reports of adverse effects or injury in association with performance of Neurometer® CPT studies by personnel trained in the use of this equipment. The test procedure appears to be safe when performed by trained and experienced medical personnel.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Determination of current perception threshold has the potential for evaluation of patients with peripheral nervous system diseases resulting in altered cutaneous sensation. This type of testing could potentially complement needle EMG and NCSs, to assist with evaluating treatment response or disease progression after a diagnosis is made. However, conflicting information and methodologic problems exist regarding the utility of the Neurometer® CPT for the diagnostic evaluation of specific disease conditions such as CTS and polyneuropathy. Future research is needed to establish statistically expressed normal values and to demonstrate the sensitivity and specificity of the Neurometer® CPT data.

1. Reference values need to be established for well characterized and representative populations. Values should be available for each of the sites used for patient testing. Reference values should be expressed as either mean ± a number of standard deviations (when values are normally distributed or so transformed) or as percentile values (providing sufficient numbers of control subjects are studied). The effects of potentially influential variables such as age and temperature should be characterized so that appropriate adjustments can be considered.

2. Reproducibility and interoperator variability of Neurometer® CPT normal values need to be established and expressed statistically in control subjects and patients with specific diseases.

3. The sensitivity and specificity need to be established and compared to an appropriate standard (for example, by studies comparing Neurometer® CPT data to the final diagnosis of CTS in patients and a group of healthy control subjects with a full clinical and electrodiagnostic evaluation).

4. Studies are needed to analyze the cost and outcome when Neurometer® CPT data is used for evaluating treatment or disease progression.

The ultimate value of the Neurometer® CPT in the settings to which it is suited will also depend upon comparison of its usefulness against other methods of QST. This may involve assessment of the sensitivity and specificity of the different methodologies to which it is compared, as well as a cost-benefit analysis.

Although the abstracts, textbook chapters, and review articles describe many of the useful features attributed to this instrument, the reviewers concluded that information in these publications is insufficient to make conclusions about the usefulness of this form of sensory testing at the present time.

DISCLAIMER

This technology review is provided as an educational service of the AAEM and is provided for informational purposes only. This review was undertaken by the AAEM at the request of members and third parties. It is based on an objective assessment of current scientific and clinical information. The AAEM has not conducted any product testing and does not intend for this review to address the features, safety, or reliability of any particular product. Specific patient care decisions are the prerogative of the patient and the physician caring for the patient, based on the individual facts and circumstances involved in each case. This review was not written with the intent that it be used as a basis for reimbursement decisions.

This is the disclaimer that appeared with the original publication of this article. The disclaimer that previously appeared on the Web site with this article inadvertently contained different language than the original disclaimer, including the omission of the final statement that this review was not intended to be used as a basis for reimbursement decisions.

Approved by the American Association of Electrodiagnostic Medicine: October 1998.
DEFINITIONS

Safety: A judgment of the acceptability of risk in a specified situation, e.g., for a given medical problem, by a provider with specified training, at a specified type of facility.
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