



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Functional Neurological Disorder in the Emergency Department

Citation for published version:

Finkelstein, SA, Cortelleblanc, MA, Cortelleblanc, A & Stone, J 2021, 'Functional Neurological Disorder in the Emergency Department', *Academic Emergency Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/acem.14263>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1111/acem.14263](https://doi.org/10.1111/acem.14263)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Academic Emergency Medicine

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is the author's peer-reviewed manuscript as accepted for publication.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Functional Neurological Disorder in the Emergency Department

ABSTRACT

We provide a narrative review of functional neurological disorder (FND, or conversion disorder) for the emergency department (ED). Diagnosis of FND has shifted from a ‘rule-out’ disorder to one now based on the recognition of positive clinical signs, allowing the ED physician to make a suspected or likely diagnosis of FND. Pubmed, Google Scholar, academic books, and a hand search through review article references were used to conduct a literature review. We review clinical features and diagnostic pitfalls for the most common functional neurologic presentations to the ED, including functional limb weakness, functional (non-epileptic) seizures, and functional movement disorders. We provide practical advice for discussing FND as a possible diagnosis and suggestions for initial steps in workup and management plans.

INTRODUCTION

Functional neurological disorder (FND), also called conversion disorder, is an involuntary change in motor or sensory function, where clinical findings provide evidence of incompatibility or incongruity with other recognized neurological or medical disorders.¹ Patients with FND may present acutely to the Emergency Department (ED) with symptoms similar to epileptic seizure, stroke, or other neurological conditions.² These patients often have a high return rate to the ED,³ and their symptoms have traditionally been seen as difficult to manage in the ED setting. Shorter time from symptom onset to diagnosis is an important positive prognostic factor,⁴ demonstrating the importance of identifying these patients in an acute care setting.

In recent years, understanding of and clinical practice around FND have changed substantially. There has been increasing research in evidence-based diagnosis in this patient group, focusing on the use of positive clinical signs to make a ‘rule in’ diagnosis.¹ Emerging evidence regarding the neural basis of FND and its treatment places it at the interface between neurology and psychiatry. In this new paradigm, ED physicians are well-positioned to raise FND as a possible diagnosis with the patient, helping to improve outcomes and decrease unnecessary healthcare utilization.

30 This review aims to make the recognition of FND more accessible to the emergency physician,
31 such that they can consider it as a likely or suspected diagnosis. We discuss in detail positive
32 clinical signs observed in the most common functional neurological disorders presenting to the
33 ED. Common diagnostic pitfalls are addressed, as well as an approach to diagnostic testing. We
34 then discuss how to have a conversation with patients about a possible FND diagnosis and first
35 steps in management.

36 **Methodology**

37 A panel of four physicians co-authored this paper: two neurologists with subspecialty expertise
38 in FND (JS and SF), a general neurologist (AC), and a board-eligible emergency physician
39 (MC). All authors agreed on an outline of important sections to include in the article at the
40 beginning of the project. Various search strategies (e.g., Pubmed, Google Scholar, academic
41 books, hand search through review article references) were then used to identify evidence-based
42 and up-to-date references for each section. References were reviewed and evaluated for
43 relevancy, and included based on review by all authors.

44 **A Brief Word on Terminology**

45 Terminology regarding functional disorders has evolved over time. Some terms, including
46 ‘psychogenic,’ ‘psychosomatic’ and ‘conversion’ disorder, along with ‘somatization,’ presume
47 an exclusively psychological cause, which is often not evident. ‘Non-organic’ suggests a dualism
48 of brain and mind and ‘medically unexplained’ suggests a problem where we have no idea about
49 etiology, diagnosis, or treatment. Terms like ‘hysteria’ or ‘pseudoseizures’ are pejorative or
50 suggest a problem that is faked. The research community have supported the use of the term
51 ‘functional neurological disorder’ as one that is etiologically agnostic. FND seizures will be
52 referred to in this paper as functional seizures, but are alternatively referred to in the literature as
53 dissociative, psychogenic or non-epileptic seizures or attacks.

54 Factitious disorder is the deliberate feigning of symptoms without external motivators, while
55 malingering is deliberate feigning for the purposes of secondary gain such as financial benefit.
56 These are distinguished from FND by their intentionality – FND symptoms are unintentional and
57 involuntary (See ‘Dealing with Doubt’ section).

58 **EPIDEMIOLOGY**

59 The overall prevalence of FND in the ED has been reported as 0.4 to 4%, although studies likely
60 underestimate rates due to inconsistency in diagnostic coding and under-recognition.^{5,6} Patients
61 with FND account for 9% of all acute neurological admissions.⁷ Functional seizures represent
62 around 10% of all seizures in the ED,⁸ and of patients presenting with refractory status
63 epilepticus resulting in ICU care, 25% have FND seizures and not epilepsy.⁹ Up to one third of
64 patients with functional seizures will develop functional status epilepticus,¹⁰ often with
65 accompanying ED visits. Of patients presenting with acute onset motor or sensory symptoms, up
66 to 25% of cases have been found to be stroke mimics, with about 1 in 10 of those representing
67 patients with functional neurological symptoms.¹¹⁻¹³ Patients with functional disorders,
68 including FND, have a higher utilization of ED care correlating with higher healthcare costs,
69 even after they have received a diagnosis.^{3,14} Moeller et al., when examining diagnostic accuracy
70 of neurological disorders in the ED, found that functional disorders were the leading cause of
71 misdiagnosis of neurological presentations.¹⁵ Costs of ED treatment for FND in 2017 among
72 around 40,000 adults and children from a population of around 130 million US citizens was \$163
73 million, compared to \$135 million for refractory epilepsy.⁵

74 **PATHOPHYSIOLOGY**

75 Previous etiological ideas for FND were exclusively psychological. New ideas about the
76 pathophysiology of FND retain the importance of psychological models, but introduce a
77 neurobiological perspective that places FND at the interface of the brain and mind.¹⁶⁻¹⁹ Research
78 using functional imaging suggests that these disorders are associated with dysfunction of brain
79 networks involved in attention and perception, sense of agency, and prior sensorimotor
80 expectations (Figure 1). A number of functional neuroimaging and neurophysiologic studies
81 have demonstrated differences in activations between patients with FND, healthy controls and
82 participants asked to feign symptoms. Symptom generation and maintenance is likely due to a
83 combination of predisposing, precipitating, and perpetuating factors. These arise from the
84 patient's biology, cognition, environmental factors, previous experiences, and in some cases
85 acute triggers, which are more often a pathophysiological experience such as injury or migraine,
86 than a psychological one.²⁰⁻²³

87 Dysregulation of attention is a major component of FND. Most people are likely familiar with
88 the effect of focused attention on the self altering the outcome of an intended action - for

89 example, being more likely to mix up one’s words during a public speaking engagement. Our
90 nervous system is designed to balance ‘bottom-up’ sensory information travelling from the body
91 to the brain with ‘top down’ predictions about what that sensory information will be.
92 Dysregulation of this system in patients with FND is supported by electrophysiologic studies.^{24,25}
93 There appears to be an abnormally high amount of involuntary attention directed towards
94 symptom-related prior beliefs and expectations, serving to reinforce and perpetuate symptoms.²⁶
95 This may explain why FND symptoms tend to improve with distraction, which physiotherapists
96 capitalize on to treat FND motor symptoms.^{27,28}

97 **MAKING THE DIAGNOSIS OF POSSIBLE OR LIKELY FND**

98 The basis for FND diagnosis is the demonstration of clinical features of internal inconsistency
99 (reversibility) and/or to a lesser extent incongruency with known patterns of structural
100 neurological disease.²⁹ This is done primarily by looking for positive clinical signs of these
101 disorders.²⁹ No clinical sign in isolation should be taken as confirmation of a functional disorder.
102 Importantly, the need for a stressor preceding onset of physical symptoms has been removed
103 from the DSM-5. In the absence of an established therapeutic relationship, as would be typical in
104 the ED, we suggest avoiding routinely questioning patients about past trauma. While it is a risk
105 factor for FND, occurring in 10-30%, diagnosis should not be based on its presence or absence,
106 and harm can be done by bringing this up with patients if they are not prepared to talk about it.

107 In gathering the history, care should be given, as always, to taking the patient’s symptoms
108 seriously. Practically, this can include making statements indicating that these symptoms are
109 familiar, that this is a real problem, and that you believe them.³⁰ It is important to ask about the
110 amount of disability the symptoms are causing for the patient on a day-to-day basis.³¹

111 **Functional Limb Weakness**

112 Functional limb weakness is one of the most common presentations of FND to the ED,² and can
113 present similarly to a variety of structural disorders including stroke and demyelinating lesions.
114 About half of patients with functional limb weakness will present with acute onset of
115 symptoms.³² One or any combination of limbs can be affected, although unilateral symptoms are
116 the most common.^{20,33} Often when there is only one limb that feels weak, subtle weakness will
117 also be found in the other ipsilateral ‘normal’ feeling limb on examination.³⁴

118 Patients may subjectively note that their limb feels heavy, like it is ‘not there,’ or ‘not a part’ of
119 them.³⁴ If the upper limb is affected, patients may report frequently dropping things. If the lower
120 limb is affected, patients may drag their leg behind them,^{20,35} or find their knee giving way
121 leading to falls.³⁴ Sensory symptoms, in conjunction with weakness, are very common.³⁴

122 A variety of clinical signs have been studied to aid in diagnosis of functional limb weakness
123 (Table 1; Figure 2; Figure 3). Current data regarding sensitivity and specificity of clinical signs
124 are limited, and needs to be interpreted with caution. For example, specificity of Hoover’s sign
125 has been reported as 100% in two studies,^{36,37} but infrequently present in patients with structural
126 neurological disease in another.²⁰ Similarly, drift without pronation as a sign of functional arm
127 weakness has a reported high specificity of 93-95%.³⁸ However, most providers would agree that
128 this can be seen in clinical practice in a variety of non-FND patients. Caution in interpretation
129 should be taken when only one positive sign is present, when they are only mildly positive, or
130 when there is significant pain. Patients with neglect or apraxia may also have falsely positive
131 signs.³⁴ We present the reliability of these signs in Table 1 as a composite of the data available
132 and author consensus based on clinical experience.

133 **How Do I Know It’s Not a Stroke?**

134 Stroke and transient ischemic attacks, as well as other stroke mimics, will necessarily be on the
135 differential for acute onset neurological symptoms, and **typical stroke protocol should be**
136 **followed in the initial workup of these patients.** Data from a systematic review and a meta-
137 analysis show that FND represents between 7-15% of stroke mimics, making it only slightly less
138 common than stroke mimics related to migraine or seizure.^{12,13} If the diagnosis remains
139 uncertain, patients can usually be treated safely with tPA: the rate of symptomatic intracerebral
140 hemorrhage in stroke mimics is 0-0.5%, with systemic hemorrhage and angioedema being
141 similarly rare.⁴⁶⁻⁵⁰ Other potential harms of giving tPA to a patient with FND include increased
142 cost, with one study showing a median excess cost for stroke mimics given tPA to be over \$5000
143 USD per admission,⁵¹ as well as a potential for adverse psychological impact. On balance, it is
144 likely best to err on the side of over-treating, rather than under-treating, with tPA in cases of
145 uncertainty when patients otherwise meet criteria for thrombolysis.

146 **Functional Sensory Loss**

147 Sensory symptoms in FND range from pain or a ‘pins and needles’ sensation, to heaviness or
148 numbness.^{52,53} It may be useful to look for motor signs of FND, such as a Hoover sign, as these
149 often occur in conjunction with sensory changes and can help put the sensory symptoms in a
150 broader clinical context.⁵⁴ Sensory testing on examination is necessarily subjective and prone to
151 bias, both on the part of the patient and the examiner.⁵⁵ The clinical signs for functional sensory
152 loss have not been found to be reliable in terms of differentiating from structural sensory loss.⁵³
153 For example, reliability for splitting of vibration sense across the sternum or forehead varies
154 widely across studies, ranging from 50-95% for sensitivity and 14-88% for specificity.³⁸

155 **Functional Seizures**

156 Functional seizures are perhaps the most well-studied of all functional disorders, and several
157 attempts have been made to determine the reliability of various distinguishing features from
158 epilepsy. Patients often report warning symptoms of autonomic arousal prior to the event.⁵⁶⁻⁶⁰
159 They may also report dissociation – a feeling that the world or their body is disconnected from
160 them.^{56,61,62} A note of caution: symptoms of autonomic arousal and dissociation can also precede
161 focal onset seizures as well as syncopal episodes.

162 A detailed history from the patient and any witnesses to the event should be taken, going over
163 any warning symptoms, ictal features, and post-ictal state. Examining any video the patient or
164 their family members have of similar events can help greatly with diagnosis.⁶³ Table 2 lists
165 selective features that have been shown to be useful in differentiating between functional and
166 epileptic seizures. The sum of the clinical signs and history, rather than one clinical sign
167 provided, should be taken as a whole to determine whether the episode is likely a functional
168 seizure.⁶⁴ We strongly discourage maneuvers that may harm an individual, such as dropping the
169 patient’s arm on to their face. These tests are diagnostically unhelpful as they will often be
170 negative in dissociative states, even when the patient is able to experience them. For a patient in
171 a persistent unrousable state, to assess responsiveness, a high-pitched tuning fork applied to the
172 nostrils is a kinder and more effective stimulus.⁶⁵

173 While the majority of functional seizures are convulsive, thrashing, or tremulous events, about
174 30% of patients will have events that resemble syncope, in which they fall down, are still, and
175 unresponsive.³⁸ For these types of events, a phenotype of sudden collapse to the ground, with

176 eyes closed, and documentation of two or more minutes of loss of consciousness is highly
177 specific for a functional disorder etiology.^{38,66,67}

178 Research on biomarkers to differentiate functional from epileptic seizures has thus far not proven
179 helpful. Serum lactate and prolactin levels may be raised in epileptic seizures as compared to
180 functional seizures, but levels are highly dependent on timing in relation to the seizure and can
181 be elevated in functional seizures.⁶⁸⁻⁷⁰ For example, one study asking participants to feign a
182 seizure demonstrated an increase in lactate levels from baseline.⁷¹ Similarly, elevation of creatine
183 kinase (CK) or white blood cell count, while possibly more common after an epileptic seizure in
184 comparison to a functional seizure, are non-specific and should not be relied upon for
185 diagnosis.⁶⁸

186 **Functional Movement Disorders**

187 Functional movement disorders are the second most common cause of acute movement disorders
188 presenting to the ED.⁷⁸ The primary characteristics of functional movement disorders are that
189 they diminish or resolve with distraction and/or entrain (change frequency to match that of other
190 motor tasks).⁷⁹⁻⁸¹ Movements may be sudden in onset and have spontaneous remissions. The
191 affected body part may change over time. Do not assume that just because the movement appears
192 to be 'bizarre' that it relates to a functional disorder. Many movement disorders can appear
193 strange, such as task specific dystonia or stiff person syndrome, emphasizing the need for a
194 neurologist to usually be involved in making a diagnosis.

195 In the case of functional tremor, it may be present at rest, with sustained postures, or on action.
196 Look for variability in frequency, rhythm, and axis or direction (but not amplitude, as this can
197 vary in a number of tremor etiologies).⁸² Improvement with distraction may be seen while taking
198 a history, or may require the examiner to ask the patient to perform other motor tasks with a non-
199 affected body part.⁷⁹ Entrainment can be demonstrated by asking the patient to copy a rhythmic
200 movement with an unaffected limb, such as finger tapping.⁸³ In functional tremor, tremor will
201 either improve, change to match the frequency of the voluntary movement, or the patient will
202 have trouble copying the movement.

203 **FND and Suspected Cauda Equina Syndrome**

204 Over 50% of patients presenting with cauda equina syndrome (CES) will have normal imaging
205 ('scan negative CES').^{84,85} Recent studies have pointed to a high frequency of associated FND
206 symptoms and signs, especially lower limb weakness FND signs, in these patients.⁸⁶ Patients
207 with scan-positive CES are more likely to have diminished or absent ankle jerks than scan-
208 negative patients (78% vs 12%). Abnormal anal sphincter tone on digital rectal examination and
209 high post-void residual volume (200 or 500 cc) have *not* been shown to be clinically useful
210 differentiators.⁸⁷ Ultimately, given the potential morbidity of CES, no historical features or
211 clinical signs remove the need for urgent neuroimaging. If imaging fails to identify a structural
212 etiology, however, then discussing FND as a possible contributor to symptoms may be
213 appropriate.

214 **Diagnostic Pitfalls**

215 The diagnosis of possible or likely FND should usually be made on the basis of positive clinical
216 features, usually from the physical examination (including seizure semiology), not from the
217 clinical history. Table 3, adapted from Stone 2013,⁷⁴ addresses some common misconceptions
218 that may unduly sway a physician towards or away from a diagnosis of FND.

219 **Psychiatric Comorbidity**

220 Many patients with FND have a comorbid psychiatric disorder, such as depression or anxiety,
221 which can complicate their presentation to the ED. Rates of depression amongst patients with
222 FND are likely between 20-40%,⁸⁹⁻⁹¹ and rates of anxiety around 40%.⁹² Rates of psychiatric
223 comorbidity are higher in FND patients (two-thirds to three-quarters of patients) than in other
224 neurology patients with similar levels of disability (one-half to two-thirds of patients).^{20,90,91,93}
225 Co-morbid personality disorder may also be present in patients with FND at rates increased from
226 those in the general population.⁹⁴ Despite the higher rate of psychiatric disorders in the FND
227 population, not all FND patients have a psychiatric diagnosis (indeed, up to one third may not).
228 As such, psychiatric comorbidity is best seen as a risk factor, rather than a causative factor, for
229 FND. In patients who do present with clear psychiatric symptoms, ensuring that these are
230 optimally managed is often necessary for patients to engage meaningfully in therapy for FND
231 symptoms.

232 **DEALING WITH DOUBT: IS MY FND PATIENT FAKING THEIR SYMPTOMS?**

233 In the ED setting, perhaps more than any other, the issue arises as to whether someone with
234 clinical features of FND really does have a genuinely experienced condition, or whether they
235 could be feigning symptoms for attention or other reward. Many patients report psychologically
236 and sometimes physically harmful experiences in EDs from healthcare professionals including
237 not being believed, being laughed at,⁹⁵ unnecessarily painful procedures during presentations
238 with altered states of awareness, and clinicians jumping to conclusions about potential
239 psychiatric causes.

240 There is a range of evidence to support what patients with FND tell us, which is that they really
241 do experience the neurological symptoms with which they present. This includes similar
242 presentations and symptom clusters around the world and across history, persistent symptoms at
243 long term follow-up studies, evidence from functional neuroimaging and neurophysiological
244 studies with findings that are different between FND and feigning, and positive responses in
245 randomized controlled trials. One cannot prove that someone is not feigning, and exaggeration
246 can occur in all medical conditions, often to convince skeptical doctors. Evidence of feigning
247 should come from evidence of lying, or finding a marked discrepancy between what the patient
248 says they can do, and what they are seen to do. This is not the same as observing variability that
249 the patient is aware of. Frank deception remains rare, and the error of considering that someone
250 is feigning when they are not is one that every doctor should strive to avoid.

251 **INVESTIGATIONS**

252 In the ED, an important focus is to rule out diagnoses with a high chance of immediate
253 morbidity. In addition, the presence of positive clinical signs of FND doesn't exclude the
254 presence of a concomitant neurological condition. Consequently, we recommend a low threshold
255 to investigate patients in the ED – especially in patients with unclear diagnoses, acute focal
256 neurological presentations, and seizures. Moreover, investigations should be done selectively
257 according to the presenting symptom and guided by a thorough physical exam. Many symptoms
258 that go along with FND, such as a fatigue, can be due to many causes, and should be investigated
259 appropriately. Patients may benefit from investigations being done all at once at the outset, and
260 not in a prolonged, serial or repetitious way,⁹⁶ which typically reinforces the idea that their
261 doctors do not know what the problem is. There are many neurological disorders with normal
262 investigations and doing tests is not the way to achieve a positive FND diagnosis. Tests that are

263 ordered to ‘reassure’ the patient often do not. In a randomized controlled trial of 150 patients
264 with chronic daily headache, investigators found that patients receiving neuroimaging had no
265 difference in anxiety scores at 1 year compared to those who had not undergone neuroimaging.⁹⁷

266 **MANAGEMENT**

267 Recognition of FND is one of the first challenges, especially in “acute stroke” or “status
268 epilepticus” presentations. Generally, we recommend involving a clinician with expertise in
269 neurological diagnosis as there are many pitfalls in the diagnosis of FND, most importantly
270 failure to recognize another comorbid neurological/medical condition. Nonetheless, the ED
271 physician can make and communicate a suspected FND diagnosis and is often involved in seeing
272 people with an established diagnosis of FND from a previous encounter, where diagnostic
273 conversations still need to occur.

274 The pillars of managing suspected FND in the emergency department include:

- 275 1. Effective and therapeutic disclosure of the possible/likely diagnosis
- 276 2. Avoidance of iatrogenic harm
- 277 3. Appropriate referral for follow-up care

278 The first step in management of FND is to provide patients with a name for their likely or
279 suspected diagnosis. While it is important to address specific illness concerns, avoid only telling
280 them what it is not and discuss FND as a possible or likely diagnosis. Although this sounds
281 obvious, often patients are told what has been ruled out, or are presented with a possible risk
282 factor for their symptoms, such as stress, without actually being told what the problem is, leaving
283 them with a sense that the diagnosis is still unknown and that they remain a medical mystery.
284 Providing patients with a diagnosis of possible or likely FND is the first step in management, and
285 this can be therapeutic in and of itself when done well.³⁰

286 The diagnosis of possible or likely FND can be delivered in the same manner as diagnosing any
287 other condition (Table 4). The clinician should explain to the patient the name of the diagnosis,
288 how the diagnosis was made, and provide some basics regarding pathophysiology. In explaining
289 how the diagnosis was made, it is often useful to demonstrate to the patient any positive physical
290 signs on their exam, such as a Hoover’s sign.⁹⁸ In the case of functional seizures, review
291 semiologic features that are strongly suggestive of FND rather than focusing on why it is not

292 epilepsy. Any specific concerns the patients may have had about alternative diagnoses should be
293 addressed.

294 In explaining pathophysiology, it can be effective to use analogies, such as comparing the brain
295 to a computer and explaining that FND is ‘software problem’ of the brain (Table 5).

296 **Referral**

297 Assessment by a neurologist is usually necessary in order to confirm the diagnosis, arrange
298 therapy, and identify any concurrent neurological disorders. Once the diagnosis of FND is
299 confirmed by a neurologist, typical avenues for treatment include physiotherapy or psychological
300 therapy.^{27,99} There is increasing evidence of effectiveness of these approaches, which should
301 ideally be delivered in a multidisciplinary team.¹⁰⁰ Therapies for FND have become much more
302 tailored in recent years. Consensus recommendations for physiotherapy have been tested with
303 promising results in randomized clinical trials for patients with motor FND.^{27,101–104}
304 Psychological therapy is the treatment of choice for functional seizures, where treatment has
305 similarities to the management of panic attacks.¹⁰⁵ Psychiatric assessment is often important to
306 provide a more detailed formulation and assessment of common comorbidities including anxiety,
307 panic disorder and depression.

308 **CONCLUSION**

309 Functional neurological disorder is a disabling and distressing condition that commonly presents
310 to the emergency department and can take many forms. As a first point of contact, emergency
311 physicians are well-positioned to suspect the diagnosis of FND. The diagnosis of FND is based
312 on identifying positive diagnostic phenomena that typically indicate a disorder of voluntary but
313 not automatic movement or have other characteristic features. The treatment of FND begins in
314 the ED by disclosing the potential diagnosis to patients in a clear manner, providing a brief
315 explanation for why this diagnosis is suspected, and referring on to neurology for further
316 treatment.

- 317 1. American Psychiatric Association: Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders,
318 Fifth Edition. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Association; 2013.
- 319 2. Dula DJ, DeNaples L. Emergency department presentation of patients with conversion
320 disorder. *Acad Emerg Med* 1995;2(2):120–3.
- 321 3. Merkler AE, Parikh NS, Chaudhry S, Chait A, Allen NC, Navi BB, et al. Hospital revisit
322 rate after a diagnosis of conversion disorder. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*
323 2016;87(4):363–6.
- 324 4. Gelauff J, Stone J, Edwards M, Carson A. The prognosis of functional (psychogenic)
325 motor symptoms: A systematic review. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2014;85(2):220–6.
- 326 5. Stephen CD, Fung V, Lungu CI, Espay AJ. Assessment of emergency department and
327 inpatient use and costs in adult and pediatric functional neurological disorders. *JAMA*
328 *Neurol* 2021;78(1):88–101.
- 329 6. Williams ERL, Guthrie E, Mackway-Jones K, James M, Tomenson B, Eastham J, et al.
330 Psychiatric status, somatisation, and health care utilization of frequent attenders at the
331 emergency department: A comparison with routine attenders. *J Psychosom Res*
332 2001;50(3):161–7.
- 333 7. Beharry J, Palmer D, Wu T, Wilson D, Le Heron C, Mason D, et al. Functional
334 neurological disorders presenting as emergencies to secondary care. *Eur J Neurol*
335 2021;Online ahead of print.
- 336 8. Dickson JM, Dudhill H, Shewan J, Mason S, Grunewald RA, Reuber M. Cross-sectional
337 study of the hospital management of adult patients with a suspected seizure (EPIC2). *BMJ*
338 *Open* 2017;7(7):e015696.
- 339 9. Walker MC, Howard RS, Smith SJ, Miller DH, Shorvon SD, Hirsch NP. Diagnosis and
340 treatment of status epilepticus on a neurological intensive care unit. *QJM*
341 1996;89(12):913–20.
- 342 10. Reuber M, Mitchell AJ, Elger CE, Pukrop R, Mitchell AJ, Bauer J, et al. Clinical
343 significance of recurrent psychogenic nonepileptic seizure status. *J Neurol*
344 2003;250(11):1355–62.

- 345 11. Popkirov S, Stone J, Buchan AM. Functional neurological disorder: A common and
346 treatable stroke mimic. *Stroke* 2020;51(5):1629–35.
- 347 12. Gibson LM, Whiteley W. The differential diagnosis of suspected stroke: A systematic
348 review. *J R Coll Physicians Edinb* 2013;43(2):114–8.
- 349 13. Jones AT, O’Connell NK, David AS. Epidemiology of functional stroke mimic patients: a
350 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur. J. Neurol.* 2020;27(1):18–26.
- 351 14. Barsky AJ, Orav EJ, Bates DW. Somatization increases medical utilization and costs
352 independent of psychiatric and medical comorbidity. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*
353 2005;62(8):903–10.
- 354 15. Moeller JJ, Kurniawan J, Gubitz GJ, Ross JA, Bhan V. Diagnostic accuracy of
355 neurological problems in the emergency department. *Can J Neurol Sci* 2008;35(3):335–
356 41.
- 357 16. Stone J, Zeman A, Simonotto E, Meyer M, Azuma R, Flett S, et al. FMRI in patients with
358 motor conversion symptoms and controls with simulated weakness. *Psychosom Med*
359 2007;69(9):961–9.
- 360 17. Cojan Y, Waber L, Schwartz S, Rossier L, Forster A, Vuilleumier P. The brain under self-
361 control: Modulation of inhibitory and monitoring cortical networks during hypnotic
362 paralysis. *Neuron* 2009;62(6):862–75.
- 363 18. Beilen M Van, Jong BM De, Gieteling EW, Renken R, Leenders KL. Abnormal parietal
364 function in conversion paresis. *PLoS One* 2011;6(10):e25918.
- 365 19. Voon V, Gallea C, Hattori N, Bruno M, Ekanayake V, Hallett M. The involuntary nature
366 of conversion disorder. *Neurology* 2010;74(3):223–8.
- 367 20. Stone J, Warlow C, Sharpe M. The symptom of functional weakness: a controlled study of
368 107 patients. *Brain* 2010;133(Pt 5):1537–51.
- 369 21. Stone J, Carson A, Aditya H, Prescott R, Zaubi M, Warlow C, et al. The role of physical
370 injury in motor and sensory conversion symptoms: A systematic and narrative review. *J*
371 *Psychosom Res* 2009;66(5):383–90.

- 372 22. Schrag A, Trimble M, Quinn N, Bhatia K. The syndrome of fixed dystonia: an evaluation
373 of 103 patients. *Brain* 2004;127(Pt 10):2360–72.
- 374 23. Voon V, Cavanna AE, Coburn K, Sampson S, Reeve A, Curt LaFrance W. Functional
375 neuroanatomy and neurophysiology of functional neurological disorders (Conversion
376 disorder). *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci* 2016;28(3):168–90.
- 377 24. Macerollo A, Chen JC, Parees I, Sadnicka A, Kassavetis P, Bhatia KP, et al. Abnormal
378 movement-related suppression of sensory evoked potentials in upper limb dystonia. *Eur J*
379 *Neurol* 2016;23(3):562–8.
- 380 25. Pareés I, Saifee TA, Kassavetis P, Kojovic M, Rubio-Agusti I, Rothwell JC, et al.
381 Believing is perceiving: Mismatch between self-report and actigraphy in psychogenic
382 tremor. *Brain* 2012;135(1):117–23.
- 383 26. Edwards MJ, Adams RA, Brown H, Pareés I, Friston KJ, Parees I, et al. A Bayesian
384 account of “hysteria.” *Brain* 2012;135(Pt 11):3495–512.
- 385 27. Nielsen G, Stone J, Matthews A, Brown M, Sparkes C, Farmer R, et al. Physiotherapy for
386 functional motor disorders: A consensus recommendation. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*
387 2015;86(10):1113–9.
- 388 28. Espay AJ, Edwards MJ, Oggioni GD, Phielipp N, Cox B, Gonzalez-Usigli H, et al.
389 Tremor retraining as therapeutic strategy in psychogenic (functional) tremor. *Park Relat*
390 *Disord* 2014;20(6):647–50.
- 391 29. Carson A, Hallett M, Stone J. Assessment of patients with functional neurologic disorders.
392 In: Hallett M, Stone J, Carson A, editors. *Handbook of Clinical Neurology; Vol 139.*
393 *Amsterdam: Elsevier B.V.; 2016. p. 169–88.*
- 394 30. Stone J, Carson A, Hallett M. Explanation as treatment for functional neurologic
395 disorders. In: Hallett M, Stone J, Carson A, editors. *Handbook of Clinical Neurology; Vol*
396 *139. Amsterdam: Elsevier B.V.; 2016. p. 543–53.*
- 397 31. Stone J, Carson A, Sharpe M. Functional symptoms and signs in neurology: assessment
398 and diagnosis. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2005;76:i2–12.

- 399 32. Stone J, Warlow C, Sharpe M. Functional weakness: clues to mechanism from the nature
400 of onset. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2011;83(1):67–9.
- 401 33. Gargalas S, Weeks R, Khan-Bourne N, Shotbolt P, Simblett S, Ashraf L, et al. Incidence
402 and outcome of functional stroke mimics admitted to a hyperacute stroke unit. *J Neurol*
403 *Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2017;88(1):2–6.
- 404 34. Stone J, Aybek S. Functional limb weakness and paralysis. In: Hallett M, Stone J, Carson
405 A, editors. *Handbook of Clinical Neurology*; Vol 139. Amsterdam: Elsevier B.V.; 2016. p.
406 213–28.
- 407 35. Daum C, Gheorghita F, Spatola M, Stojanova V, Medlin F, Vingerhoets F, et al.
408 Interobserver agreement and validity of bedside “positive signs” for functional weakness,
409 sensory and gait disorders in conversion disorder: A pilot study. *J Neurol Neurosurg*
410 *Psychiatry* 2015;86(4):425–30.
- 411 36. McWhirter L, Stone J, Sandercock P, Whiteley W. Hoover’s sign for the diagnosis of
412 functional weakness: A prospective unblinded cohort study in patients with suspected
413 stroke. *J Psychosom Res* 2011;71(6):384–6.
- 414 37. Sonoo M. Abductor sign: a reliable new sign to detect unilateral non-organic paresis of the
415 lower limb. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2004;75(1):121–5.
- 416 38. Gasca-salas C, Lang AE. Neurologic diagnostic criteria for functional neurologic
417 disorders. In: Hallett M, Stone J, Carson A, editors. *Handbook of Clinical Neurology*; Vol
418 139. Amsterdam: Elsevier B.V.; 2016. p. 193–212.
- 419 39. Ziv I, Djaldetti R, Zoldan Y, Avraham M, Melamed E. Diagnosis of “non-organic” limb
420 paresis by a novel objective motor assessment: the quantitative Hoover’s test. *J Neurol*
421 1998;245(12):797–802.
- 422 40. Fasano A, Valadas A, Bhatia KP, Prashanth LK, Lang AE, Munhoz RP, et al.
423 Psychogenic facial movement disorders: clinical features and associated conditions. *Mov*
424 *Disord* 2012;27(12):1544–51.
- 425 41. Gould R, Miller BL, Goldberg MA, Benson DF. The validity of hysterical signs and
426 symptoms. *J Nerv Ment Dis* 1986;174(10):593–7.

- 427 42. Rolak LA. Psychogenic sensory loss. *J Nerv Ment Dis* 1988;176(11):686–7.
- 428 43. Daum C, Aybek S. Validity of the “Drift without pronation” sign in conversion disorder.
429 *BMC Neurol* 2013;13:31.
- 430 44. Koehler PJ. Freud’s Comparative Study of Hysterical and Organic Paralyses: How
431 Charcot’s Assignment Turned Out. *Arch Neurol* 2003;60(11):1646–50.
- 432 45. Chabrol H, Peresson G, Clanet M. Lack of specificity of the traditional criteria of
433 conversion disorders. *Eur Psychiatry* 1995;10:317–9.
- 434 46. Chernyshev OY, Martin-Schild S, Albright KC, Barreto A, Misra V, Acosta I, et al. Safety
435 of tPA in stroke mimics and neuroimaging-negative cerebral ischemia. *Neurology*
436 2010;74(17):1340–5.
- 437 47. Ali-Ahmed F, Federspiel JJ, Liang L, Xu H, Sevilis T, Hernandez AF, et al. Intravenous
438 Tissue Plasminogen Activator in Stroke Mimics: Findings from the Get with the
439 Guidelines-Stroke Registry. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes* 2019;12(8):e005609.
- 440 48. Kostulas N, Larsson M, Kall TB, Von Euler M, Nathanson D. Safety of thrombolysis in
441 stroke mimics: An observational cohort study from an urban teaching hospital in Sweden.
442 *BMJ Open* 2017;7(10):e016311.
- 443 49. Sivakumaran P, Gill D, Mahir G, Baheerathan A, Kar A. A retrospective cohort study on
444 the use of intravenous thrombolysis in stroke mimics. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis*
445 2016;25(5):1057–61.
- 446 50. Tsivgoulis G, Zand R, Katsanos AH, Goyal N, Uchino K, Chang J, et al. Safety of
447 intravenous thrombolysis in stroke mimics. *Stroke* 2015;46(5):1281–7.
- 448 51. Goyal N, Male S, Al Wafai A, Bellamkonda S, Zand R. Cost burden of stroke mimics and
449 transient ischemic attack after intravenous tissue plasminogen activator treatment. *J Stroke*
450 *Cerebrovasc Dis* 2015;24(4):828–33.
- 451 52. Toth C. Hemisensory syndrome is associated with a low diagnostic yield and a nearly
452 uniform benign prognosis. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2003;74(8):1113–6.
- 453 53. Stone J, Vermeulen M. Functional sensory symptoms. In: Hallett M, Stone J, Carson A,

- 454 editors. Handbook of Clinical Neurology; Vol 139. Amsterdam: Elsevier B.V.; 2016. p.
455 271–81.
- 456 54. Stone J, Sharpe M, Rothwell PM, Warlow CP. The 12 year prognosis of unilateral
457 functional weakness and sensory disturbance. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*
458 2003;74(5):591–6.
- 459 55. Lindley RI, Warlow CP, Wardlaw JM, Dennis MS, Slattery J, Sandercock PA.
460 Interobserver reliability of a clinical classification of acute cerebral infarction. *Stroke*
461 1993;24(12):1801–4.
- 462 56. Reuber M, Jamnadas-khoda J, Broadhurst M, Grunewald R, Howell S, Koepp M, et al.
463 Psychogenic nonepileptic seizure manifestations reported by patients and witnesses.
464 2011;52(11):2028–35.
- 465 57. Vein AM, Djukova GM, Vorobieva O V. Is panic attack a mask of psychogenic seizures? -
466 -a comparative analysis of phenomenology of psychogenic seizures and panic attacks.
467 *Funct Neurol* 1994;9(3):153–9.
- 468 58. Hendrickson R, Popescu A, Dixit R, Ghearing G, Bagic A. Panic attack symptoms
469 differentiate patients with epilepsy from those with psychogenic nonepileptic spells
470 (PNES). *Epilepsy Behav* 2014;37:210–4.
- 471 59. Galimberti CA, Teresa Ratti M, Murelli R, Marchioni E, Manni R, Tartara A. Patients
472 with psychogenic nonepileptic seizures, alone or epilepsy-associated, share a
473 psychological profile distinct from that of epilepsy patients. *J Neurol* 2003;250(3):338–46.
- 474 60. Witgert ME, Wheless JW, Breier JJ. Frequency of panic symptoms in psychogenic
475 nonepileptic seizures. *Epilepsy Behav* 2005;6(2):174–8.
- 476 61. Reuber M, Rawlings GH. Nonepileptic seizures – subjective phenomena. In: Hallett M,
477 Stone J, Carson A, editors. Handbook of Clinical Neurology; Vol 139. Amsterdam:
478 Elsevier B.V.; 2016. p. 283–96.
- 479 62. Goldstein LH, Mellers JDC. Ictal symptoms of anxiety, avoidance behaviour, and
480 dissociation in patients with dissociative seizures. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*
481 2006;77(5):616–21.

- 482 63. Tatum WO, Hirsch LJ, Gelfand MA, Acton EK, Lafrance WC, Duckrow RB, et al.
483 Assessment of the predictive value of outpatient smartphone videos for diagnosis of
484 epileptic seizures. *JAMA Neurol* 2020;77(5):593–600.
- 485 64. Goldstein LH, Mellers JDC. Recent developments in our understanding of the semiology
486 and treatment of psychogenic nonepileptic seizures. *Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep*
487 2012;12(4):436–44.
- 488 65. Ludwig L, McWhirter L, Williams S, Derry C, Stone J. Functional Coma. In: Hallett M,
489 Stone J, Carson A, editors. *Handbook of Clinical Neurology*; Vol 139. Amsterdam:
490 Elsevier B.V.; 2016. p. 313–27.
- 491 66. Blad H, Lamberts RJ, Dijk JG Van, Thijs RD. Tilt-induced vasovagal syncope and
492 psychogenic pseudosyncope. *Neurology* 2015;85(23):2006–10.
- 493 67. Tannemaat MR, Van Niekerk J, Reijntjes RH, Thijs RD, Sutton R, Van Dijk JG. The
494 semiology of tilt-induced psychogenic pseudosyncope. *Neurology* 2013;81(8):752–8.
- 495 68. Sundararajan T, Tesar GE, Jimenez XF. Biomarkers in the diagnosis and study of
496 psychogenic nonepileptic seizures : A systematic review. *Seizure Eur J Epilepsy*
497 2016;35:11–22.
- 498 69. Doğan EA, Ünal A, Ünal A, Erdoğan Ç. Clinical utility of serum lactate levels for
499 differential diagnosis of generalized tonic–clonic seizures from psychogenic nonepileptic
500 seizures and syncope. *Epilepsy Behav* 2017;75:13–7.
- 501 70. Matz O, Zdebik C, Zechbauer S, Bündgens L, Litmathe J, Willmes K, et al. Lactate as a
502 diagnostic marker in transient loss of consciousness. *Seizure* 2016;40:71–5.
- 503 71. Isenberg A Lou, Jensen ME, Lindelof M. Plasma-lactate levels in simulated seizures - An
504 observational study. *Seizure* 2020;76:47–9.
- 505 72. Lafrance WC, Ranieri R, Blum AS. Nonepileptic seizures – objective phenomena. In:
506 Hallett M, Stone J, Carson A, editors. *Handbook of Clinical Neurology*; Vol 139.
507 Amsterdam: Elsevier B.V.; 2016. p. 297–304.
- 508 73. Avbersek A, Sisodiya S. Does the primary literature provide support for clinical signs

- 509 used to distinguish psychogenic nonepileptic seizures from epileptic seizures? *J Neurol*
510 *Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2010;81(7):719–25.
- 511 74. Stone J, Reuber M, Carson A. Functional symptoms in neurology: mimics and
512 chameleons. *Pract Neurol* 2013;13(2):104–13.
- 513 75. Syed TU, Lafrance WC, Kahriman ES, Hasan SN, Rajasekaran V, Gulati D, et al. Can
514 semiology predict psychogenic nonepileptic seizures? A prospective study. *Ann Neurol*
515 2011;69(6):997–1004.
- 516 76. Mostacci B, Bisulli F, Alvisi L, Licchetta L, Baruzzi A, Tinuper P. Ictal characteristics of
517 psychogenic nonepileptic seizures : What we have learned from video / EEG recordings
518 — A literature review. *Epilepsy Behav* 2011;22(2):144–53.
- 519 77. Dhiman V, Sinha S, Rawat VS, Harish T, Chaturvedi SK, Satishchandra P. Semiological
520 characteristics of adults with psychogenic nonepileptic seizures (PNESs): An attempt
521 towards a new classification. *Epilepsy Behav* 2013;27(3):427–32.
- 522 78. Dallochio C, Marinella A, Arbasino C, Arno' N, Glorioso M, Sciarretta M, et al.
523 Movement disorders in emergency settings: a prospective study. *Neurol Sci*
524 2019;40(1):133–8.
- 525 79. Thenganatt MA, Jankovic J. Psychogenic tremor: a video guide to its distinguishing
526 features. *Tremor Other Hyperkinet Mov (N Y)* 2014;4:253.
- 527 80. Kenney C, Diamond A, Mejia N, Davidson A, Hunter C, Jankovic J. Distinguishing
528 psychogenic and essential tremor. *J Neurol Sci* 2007;263(1–2):94–9.
- 529 81. Gupta A, Lang AE. Psychogenic movement disorders. *Curr Opin Neurol* 2009;22(4):430–
530 6.
- 531 82. Barbey A, Aybek S. Functional movement disorders. *Curr Opin Neurol* 2017;30(4):427–
532 34.
- 533 83. Roper LS, Saifee TA, Parees I, Rickards H, Edwards MJ. How to use the entrainment test
534 in the diagnosis of functional tremor. *Pract Neurol* 2013;13(6):396–8.
- 535 84. Rooney A, Statham PF, Stone J. Cauda equina syndrome with normal MR imaging. *J*

- 536 Neurol 2009;256(5):721–5.
- 537 85. Bell DA, Collie D, Statham PF. Cauda equina syndrome - What is the correlation between
538 clinical assessment and MRI scanning? *Br J Neurosurg* 2007;21(2):201–3.
- 539 86. Hoeritzauer I, Pronin S, Carson A, Statham P, Demetriades AK, Stone J. The clinical
540 features and outcome of scan-negative and scan-positive cases in suspected cauda equina
541 syndrome: a retrospective study of 276 patients. *J Neurol* 2018;265(12):2916–26.
- 542 87. Hoeritzauer I, Carson A, Statham P, Panicker JN, Granitsiotis V, Eugenicos M, et al.
543 Scan-negative cauda equina syndrome: a prospective cohort study. *Neurology*
544 2021;96(3):e433–47.
- 545 88. Stone J, Smyth R, Carson A, Warlow C, Sharpe M. La belle indifférence in conversion
546 symptoms and hysteria: systematic review. *Br J Psychiatry* 2006;188(3):204–9.
- 547 89. Crimlisk HL, Bhatia K, Cope H, David A, Marsden CD, Ron MA. Slater revisited: 6 year
548 follow up study of patients with medically unexplained motor symptoms. *BMJ*
549 1998;316(7131):582–6.
- 550 90. Carson a J, Ringbauer B, Stone J, McKenzie L, Warlow C, Sharpe M. Do medically
551 unexplained symptoms matter? A prospective cohort study of 300 new referrals to
552 neurology outpatient clinics. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2000;68(2):207–10.
- 553 91. Carson A, Stone J, Hibberd C, Murray G, Duncan R, Coleman R, et al. Disability, distress
554 and unemployment in neurology outpatients with symptoms “unexplained by organic
555 disease.” *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2011;82(7):810–3.
- 556 92. Feinstein A, Stergiopoulos V, Fine J, Lang AE. Psychiatric outcome in patients with a
557 psychogenic movement disorder: A prospective study. *Neuropsychiatry, Neuropsychol*
558 *Behav Neurol* 2001;14(3):169–76.
- 559 93. Diprose W, Sundram F, Menkes DB. Psychiatric comorbidity in psychogenic nonepileptic
560 seizures compared with epilepsy. *Epilepsy Behav* 2016;56:123–30.
- 561 94. Carson A, Lehn A. Epidemiology. In: Hallett M, Stone J, Carson A, editors. *Handbook of*
562 *Clinical Neurology*; Vol 139. Amsterdam: Elsevier B.V.; 2016. p. 47–60.

- 563 95. Tolchin B, Baslet G, Dworetzky B. Psychogenic seizures and medical humor: Jokes as a
564 damaging defense. *Epilepsy Behav* 2016;64(Pt A):26–8.
- 565 96. Wei D, Garlinghouse M, Li W, Swingle N, Samson KK, Taraschenko O. Utilization of
566 brain imaging in evaluating patients with psychogenic nonepileptic spells. *Epilepsy Behav*
567 2018;85:177–82.
- 568 97. Howard L, Wessely S, Leese M, Page L, McCrone P, Husain K, et al. Are investigations
569 anxiolytic or anxiogenic? A randomised controlled trial of neuroimaging to provide
570 reassurance in chronic daily headache. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2005;76(11):1558–
571 64.
- 572 98. Sethi NK, Stone J, Edwards MJ. Trick or treat? Showing patients with functional
573 (psychogenic) motor symptoms their physical signs. *Neurology* 2013;80(9):869.
- 574 99. Sharpe M, Walker J, Williams C, Stone J, Cavanagh J, Murray G, et al. Guided self-help
575 for functional (psychogenic) symptoms. *Neurology* 2011;77(6):564–72.
- 576 100. Espay AJ, Aybek S, Carson A, Edwards MJ, Goldstein LH, Hallett M, et al. Current
577 concepts in diagnosis and treatment of functional neurological disorders. *JAMA Neurol*
578 2018;75(9):1132–41.
- 579 101. Nielsen G, Buszewicz M, Stevenson F, Hunter R, Holt K, Dudzic M, et al. Randomised
580 feasibility study of physiotherapy for patients with functional motor symptoms. *J Neurol*
581 *Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2017;88(6):484–90.
- 582 102. Jordbru AA, Smedstad LM, Klungsoyr O, Martinsen EW. Psychogenic gait: a randomized
583 controlled trial on effect on rehabilitation. *J Rehabil Med* 2014;46(2):181–7.
- 584 103. McCormack R, Moriarty J, Mellers JD, Shotbolt P, Pastena R, Landes N, et al. Specialist
585 inpatient treatment for severe motor conversion disorder: A retrospective comparative
586 study. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2014;85(8):893–8.
- 587 104. Maggio JB, Ospina JP, Callahan J, Hunt AL, Stephen CD, Perez DL. Outpatient Physical
588 Therapy for Functional Neurological Disorder: A Preliminary Feasibility and Naturalistic
589 Outcome Study in a U.S. Cohort. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci* 2020;32(1):85–9.

590 105. Goldstein LH, Robinson EJ, Mellers JDC, Stone J, Carson A, Reuber M, et al. Cognitive
591 behavioural therapy for adults with dissociative seizures (CODES): a pragmatic,
592 multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2020;7(6):491–505.

593

594

595 Table 1 – Selected clinical signs in functional weakness

CLINICAL SIGN	DESCRIPTION	RELIABILITY*
Hoover’s sign ^{20,35–37,39}	Weakness of voluntary hip extension that resolves with voluntary contralateral resisted hip flexion. Difficult to detect in bilateral leg weakness.	+++
Platysma overactivation ⁴⁰	Contraction of one side of the platysma, creating the effect of a facial droop.	++
Hip abductor sign ³⁷	Return of strength to hip abduction in the weak leg with contralateral hip abduction against resistance	++
Give-way/collapsing weakness ^{35,41,42}	Strength is initially normal and then collapses with resistance.	++
Dragging monoplegic leg ^{20,35}	Plegic leg is dragged behind body often with hip internal or external rotation and without hip circumduction.	++
Drift without pronation ^{35,43}	Isolated downward arm-drift without associated pronation.	+
Global pattern of weakness ^{35,44}	Equal weakness of both flexor and extensor muscles, both proximally and distally.	+
Motor Inconsistencies ⁴⁵	Inability to produce one movement, while using the same muscles to produce a different movement. For example, a patient may have difficulty dorsiflexing while supine, but be able to stand on heels without difficulty.	+

596 *Reliability determined based on available clinical data³⁴ and author consensus.

597 +++ = highly reliable; ++ = reliable; + = suggestive

598

Table 2 – Clinical features distinguishing functional from epileptic seizures^{38,72 73,74}

CLINICAL SIGN	NOTES	RELIABILITY*
Highly suggestive of functional seizures		
Closed eyelids during ictal peak	Patients may actively resist eyelid opening.	+++
Prolonged duration	Most epileptic seizures will stop spontaneously in 2 minutes or less. Particularly useful if it resolves spontaneously after prolonged duration, without significant post-ictal period. Caution: patients with status epilepticus will have prolonged seizure activity.	++
Fluctuating course	Movements may wax and wane in intensity or stop and start.	++
Ictal awareness/memory of seizure	Only relevant for generalized seizures (abnormal movements of all four limbs). Caution: frontal lobe seizures can involve bizarre movements with retained awareness. Loss of awareness is standard for most functional seizures.	++
Ictal/Post-ictal weeping	Relatively specific for functional seizures, although low sensitivity. May also have other signs of emotional distress.	++
Asynchronous limb movements	Caution: can also be present in frontal lobe seizures.	++
Side to side head shaking	May rarely be present in epileptic seizures. Good differentiator for generalized shaking events only.	++
Response to stimuli during ictal period	Only applies to generalized shaking attacks.	++
Highly suggestive of epileptic seizures		
Figure of four sign	One arm flexed at elbow, other arm extended at the elbow, usually present just before secondary generalization.	+++
Guttural cry / scream	During tonic phase, typically at seizure onset.	++
Prolonged rigid phase with cessation of respiration	Based on authors' experience.	++
Post-ictal stertorous breathing	Low-pitched sound from back of throat, like sound from nasal congestion or snoring.	+++
Unhelpful features common to both		
Tongue biting		
Injury (although severe burns and shoulder dislocation should prompt consideration of epilepsy)		
Urinary incontinence		
Attack appearing from sleep / No witnesses to seizure		
Presence of aura or post-ictal confusion		
Breath holding		
High serum lactate after an event ⁷¹		

600 *Reliability determined based on available clinical data^{73,75-77} and author consensus.

601 +++ = highly reliable; ++ = reliable; + = suggestive

602 Table 3* – FND Diagnostic Pitfalls⁷⁴

1. Presence of psychiatric comorbidity: A diagnosis of FND should not be based on the patient having a psychiatric disorder such as anxiety, depression, or a personality disorder.
2. Failure to consider structural disease comorbidity: One of the commonest risk factors for FND is the presence of minor or major disease comorbidity such as multiple sclerosis, stroke or epilepsy. Therefore, even in a patient with clear FND, always consider whether they may have an *additional* medical or neurological condition.
3. Putting too much weight on the presence or absence of ‘stress’: A diagnosis of FND should not be based on the presence of an obvious life event or stressor, nor should it be discarded due to lack of recent stress. Similarly, just because the patient attributes their symptoms to stress, does not mean this is the case.
4. La belle indifférence: I.e., the patient seemingly not caring about their symptoms, is not a reliable marker for FND and occurs just as commonly in structural disorders.⁸⁸
5. The patient is not a young female: FND should not be excluded based on demographics. Patients can be male or female, young or elderly, and from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds.
6. The patient seems too ‘normal’: patients with FND may be nice, normal people, too!

603 Adapted by permission from BMJ Publishing Group Limited from “Functional Symptoms in
604 Neurology: mimics and chameleons” by J Stone, M Reuber, and A Carson, 2013, Practical
605 Neurology, 13, p. 104–113.

606 Table 4 – Key Elements to Include and to Avoid in Discussing a Possible Diagnosis of FND

DO Include	Avoid
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The name of the diagnosis • How the diagnosis was made (including sharing positive diagnostic signs) • A brief explanation of pathophysiology • Tell the patient their symptoms are real and not imagined • Emphasize that these symptoms are common • Emphasize that symptoms are potentially reversible and therefore could improve • Offer further resources to learn more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only an explanation of what they do <i>not</i> have • Attributing symptoms to psychological problems or stress • Saying or inferring that this is ‘imagined’, ‘all in their head’, or voluntary in some way • Misattribution of symptoms • Using negative investigations as evidence of the diagnosis

607

608 Table 5 – Examples of ways to explain the diagnosis of possible FND

“You likely have functional neurological disorder, or FND, which is causing your weakness. I can see from your examination that your nervous system is not damaged, however it’s struggling in getting its messages through.

Can you see how the more you try, the worse your leg weakness gets, but when you are focused on your other leg it works much better? [demonstrate Hoover sign]

What this tells me is that your brain is having difficulty sending messages to your leg, but that improves when you are distracted.

It’s like the opposite of phantom limb pain. Your brain thinks the leg isn’t there even though it is.


It shows us that there is no damage to your nervous system and the problem is potentially reversible.”

“Seizures/Attacks in FND are caused by a ‘trance-like’ state in the brain called dissociation. The brain shuts itself down temporarily, often in response to a ‘red-alert’ state and this becomes a reflex or habit, which is why it keeps happening.”

609

610

611 Figure 1* - Decreased functional connectivity between the right temporo-parietal junction and bilateral
612 sensorimotor regions in patients with functional movement disorder.



613
614 *Reproduced from Maurer CW, LaFaver K, Ameli R, Epstein SA, Hallett M, Horovitz SG. Impaired self-
615 agency in functional movement disorders: A resting-state fMRI study. *Neurology*. 2016;87(6):564-570.
616 <https://n.neurology.org/>

617

FND in the ED 28

618 Figure 2 - Hip Abductor and Hoover's sign of Functional Leg Weakness



619

620 Top left: Hip abductor sign – weak left hip abduction. Top right: Hip abductor sign – strength in left hip
621 returns to normal with abduction of right hip. Bottom left: Hoover’s sign – weak left hip extension.

622 Bottom right: Hoover’s sign – strength in left hip extension returns to normal with right hip flexion.

623

624 Figure 3 - Platysma sign of functional facial spasm, Dragging monoplegic gait of functional leg weakness



625

626 Top left and top right: Platysma overactivation causing appearance of facial droop, with return of normal
627 strength when asked to show teeth. Bottom left: Dragging monoplegic leg.

628