

Deep Brain Stimulation Improves Restless Legs Syndrome in Patients with Parkinson's Disease

Olga Klepitskaya MD; Ying Liu MD; Sharma Saloni; Stefan H Sillau; Jean Tsai; Arthur S Walters University of Colorado Denver, Aurora, Colorado and Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennesse, United States



Introduction

RLS is highly prevalent in PD. DBS is an effective treatment for dopamineresponsive symptoms of PD. It is reasonable to postulate that because RLS responds well to dopaminergic therapy it would improve with DBS. Literature reports, however, have been inconclusive.

The aim of this study is to evaluate the effect of STN DBS in patients with PD and RLS on their RLS symptoms and RLS-related Quality of Life.

Methods

All patients undergoing STN DBS surgery for PD were asked to complete questionnaires:

• International RLS Study Group rating scale (IRLS)

• RLS Quality of Life (RLS-QoL) Questionnaires were collected at the following time points:

- pre-operatively
- post-operatively at 6 months,
- post-operatively at 1 year
- post-operatively at 2 years.

Inclusion criteria:

- Moderate to severe RLS at baseline (IRLS sum scores>10)
- Completed questionnairs at at 1st one timepoint.
- The primary outcome measure:
 - IRLS sum score and subscales (severity and impact).

The secondary outcome measures:

- RLS QoL scores
- rate of responders, remitters and complete remitters.

Statistical methods:

Differences among the mean scores over time were analyzed using mixed model regression.

Demographic Characteristic at Baseline (n=22)				
Variable	Value (mean/SD)			
Age (years)	58.3 (7.4)			
Sex (male/female)	9/13			
Mean Age at onset (PD)	48.4 (6.8)			
Years since symptoms onset (years)	10.2 (4.9)			
UPDRS III "ON"	17.25 (14.03)			
UPDRS III "OFF"	41.57 (12.40)			
IRLS Sum	19.59 (6.95)			
IRLS Severity	12.91 (4.33)			
IRLS Impact	4.45 (2.72)			
RLS QoL	68.30 (20.26)			
LE	1203.2 (657.5)			

Results:

The overall F tests demonstrated significant differences between preand averaged post-operative IRLS scores.

RLS QoL scale demonstrated improvements as well, but did not reach statistical significance. Rate of responders was 50%, Rate of remitters was 50%, Rate of complete remitters was 27%. There was no significant correlation between improvement in RLS and degree of improvement in PD motor symptoms or reduction in dopaminergic therapy.

Conclusion

STN DBS significantly decreased the symptoms of moderate to severe RLS in patients with PD despite a decrease in dopaminergic treatment. This improvement was sustained over

2 year period.

This study suggests that DBS has a potential to became a valid treatment options for severe refractory RLS, but further studies are needed.

and 2-year post-DBS (n=22)							
		Number of Observati		Standard			
Variable	Time	ons	Mean	Deviation			
IRLS sum score	Baseline	22	19.59	6.95			
	6 Months	17	14.53	12.27			
	1 Year	13	11.74	8.08			
	2 Years	10	12.83	11.26			
Verichie	Time	Number of Observatio	Moon	Standard			
IPI S covority acore	Pacolino	115	12.01	Deviation			
INCO Seventy score	6 Months	47	12.91	4.33			
	1 Voor	17	9.53	7.80			
	2 Veers	13	7.82	5.39			
	∠ rears	10	8.12	7.17			
Variable	Time	Number of Observatio ns	Mean	Standard Deviation			
IRLS impact score	Baseline	22	4.45	2.72			
	6 Months	17	3.41	3.61			
	1 Year	13	2.62	2.29			
	2 Years	10	3.50	3.47			
		Number of Observatio		Standard			
Variable	Time	ns	Mean	Deviation			
RLS QoL transformed	Baseline	22	68.30	20.26			
score	6 Months	16	72.26	24.17			
	1 Year	13	76.15	20.07			
	2 Years	10	78.75	22.15			
		Number of Observatio		%			
Variable	Time	ns	Mean	Reduction			
LE	Baseline	22	1203.2				
	6 Months	16	370.8	-69.2			
	1 Year	13	499.7	-58.5			
	2 Years	10	787.7	-34.5			

Mean Scores on the IRLS and RLS QoL

scores at baseline, 6-months, 1-year,



Model estimates of expected scores of IRSL Sum, Severity and Impact



Longitudinal Model Estimated Differences on the IRLS and RLS QoL scores between baseline and 6 months, 1 year, and 2 years post-STN DBS

|--|

	Contract		Stand	
	Contrast	Estimat	ard	
			Error	value
n score	All Post Operatives vs Baseline			0.010 9
	6 Months vs Baseline	-5.97	1.96	0.005 9
	1 Year vs Baseline	-7.07	1.88	0.001 0
	2 Years vs Baseline	-10.36	3.43	0.006 6
	Post Operatives (averaged) vs Baseline	-7.80	2.18	0.001 7
	Contrast		rd	р
erity score	All Post Operatives vs	Estimate	Error	0.012
	6 Months vs Baseline	-4.12	1.36	0.006
	1 Year vs Baseline	-5.04	1.32	0.001
	2 Years vs Baseline	-7.35	2.11	0.002 3
	Post Operatives (averaged) vs Baseline	-5.50	1.39	0.000 7
	Contrast	Estimate	Standa rd Error	p value
oact score	All Post Operatives vs Baseline	Estimate	Enor	0.000
	6 Months vs Baseline	-0.70	0.70	0.327 6
	1 Year vs Baseline	-1.71	0.55	0.004 9
	2 Years vs Baseline	-1.19	1.01	0.262
	vs Baseline	-1.20	0.65	0.082
	Contrast		Standa	
	Contrast	Estimate	rd	p value
. transformed	All Post Operatives vs Baseline	Loundto	Lindi	0.362
	6 Months vs Baseline	3.32	4.86	0.502 4
	1 Year vs Baseline	5.11	4.38	0.256 9
	2 Years vs Baseline	5.77	6.06	0.358 0
	Post Operatives (averaged) vs Baseline	4.73	4.06	0.257 9