

Neurological diseases of unknown etiology: Brain-biopsy diagnostic yields and safety

Bertrand Mathon, Alexandre Le Joncour, Franck Bielle, Karima Mokhtari, Anne-Laure Boch, Matthieu Peyre, Zahir Amoura, Patrice Cacoub, Nadia Younan, Sophie Demeret, et al.

▶ To cite this version:

Bertrand Mathon, Alexandre Le Joncour, Franck Bielle, Karima Mokhtari, Anne-Laure Boch, et al.. Neurological diseases of unknown etiology: Brain-biopsy diagnostic yields and safety. European Journal of Internal Medicine, 2020, 80, pp.78-85. 10.1016/j.ejim.2020.05.029 . hal-02946474

HAL Id: hal-02946474 https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-02946474

Submitted on 23 Sep 2020 $\,$

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

- 1 Neurological Diseases of Unknown Etiology: Brain-Biopsy Diagnostic Yields and Safety
- 2 **Running title:** Brain Biopsy For Diseases of Unknown Etiology
- 3
- 4 Bertrand Mathon^{1,2,3}, MD; Alexandre Le Joncour⁴, MD; Franck Bielle^{2,3,5}, MD, PhD; Karima Mokhtari⁵,
- 5 MD; Anne-Laure Boch¹, MD, PhD; Matthieu Peyre^{1,2,3}, MD, PhD; Zahir Amoura^{2,6}, MD; Patrice
- 6 Cacoub^{2,4,7,8,9}, MD, PhD; Nadia Younan^{2,10}, MD; Sophie Demeret¹¹, MD, PhD; Eimad Shotar¹², MD; Sonia
- 7 Burrel^{2,16}, MD, PhD; Arnaud Fekkar¹⁷, MD, PhD; Jérôme Robert^{2,18}, MD, PhD; Aymeric Amelot^{1,2}, MD,
- 8 PhD; Marc Pineton de Chambrun^{2,6,14}, MD, and the PSL BRAIN-BIOPSY STUDY GROUP*.
- 9
- 10 1 AP-HP, Hôpitaux Universitaires La Pitié-Salpêtrière Charles Foix, Service de Neurochirurgie, F-75013,
- 11 Paris, France
- 12 2 Sorbonne Université, UPMC Univ. Paris 06, F-75005, Paris, France
- 13 3 Institut du Cerveau et de la Moelle Epinière (ICM; INSERM, UMRS 1127; CNRS, UMR 7225), Paris, France
- 14 4 AP-HP, Hôpitaux Universitaires La Pitié-Salpêtrière Charles Foix, Service de Médecine Interne et
- 15 d'Immunologie Clinique, F-75013, Paris, France
- 16 5 AP-HP, Hôpitaux Universitaires La Pitié-Salpêtrière Charles Foix, Service de Neuropathologie, F-75013,
- 17 Paris, France
- 18 6 AP-HP, Hôpitaux Universitaires La Pitié-Salpêtrière Charles Foix, Institut E3M, Service de Médecine Interne
- 19 2, Centre de Référence National Lupus Systémique, Syndrome des Anticorps Anti-Phospholipides et Autres
- 20 Maladies Auto-Immunes Systémiques Rares, F-75013, Paris, France
- 21 7 INSERM, UMR_S 959, F-75013, Paris, France
- 22 8 CNRS, FRE3632, F-75005, Paris, France
- 23 9 Département d'Inflammation-Immunopathologie-Biothérapie (DHU i2B), UMR 7211, Sorbonne Université,
- **24** F-75005, Paris, France
- 25 10 AP-HP, Hôpitaux Universitaires La Pitié-Salpêtrière Charles Foix, Service de Neuro-Oncologie, F-75013,
- 26 Paris, France
- 27 11 AP-HP, Hôpitaux Universitaires La Pitié-Salpêtrière Charles Foix, Département de neurologie, Unité de
- 28 Médecine Intensive Réanimation Neurologique, F-75013, Paris, France
- 29 12 AP-HP, Hôpitaux Universitaires La Pitié-Salpêtrière Charles Foix, Service de Neuroradiologie, F-75013,
- 30 Paris, France

- 1 13 AP-HP, Hôpitaux Universitaires La Pitié-Salpêtrière Charles Foix, Service d'Hématologie Clinique, F-
- **2** 75013, Paris, France
- 3 14 AP-HP, Hôpitaux Universitaires La Pitié-Salpêtrière Charles Foix, Institut de Cardiométabolisme et
- 4 Nutrition (ICAN), Service de Médecine Intensive–Réanimation, F-75013, Paris, France
- 5 15 AP-HP, Hôpitaux Universitaires La Pitié-Salpêtrière Charles Foix, Service des Maladies Infectieuses et
- 6 Tropicales, F-75013, Paris, France
- 7 16 AP-HP, Hôpitaux Universitaires La Pitié-Salpêtrière Charles Foix, Service de Virologie, INSERM, Institut
- 8 Pierre Louis d'Epidémiologie et de Santé Publique (iPLESP), F-75013, Paris, France
- 9 17 AP-HP, Hôpitaux Universitaires La Pitié-Salpêtrière Charles Foix, Service de Parasitologie, F-75013, Paris,
 10 France
- 11 18 AP-HP, Hôpitaux Universitaires La Pitié-Salpêtrière Charles Foix, Laboratoire de Bactériologie, Centre
- 12 National de Référence des Mycobactéries et de la Résistance des Mycobactéries aux Antituberculeux, and
- 13 INSERM, U1135, Centre d'Immunologie et des Maladies Infectieuses, Cimi-Paris, F-75013, Paris, France
- 14 19 AP-HP, Hôpitaux Universitaires La Pitié-Salpêtrière Charles Foix, Service de d'Anesthésie et de
- 15 Réanimation Neurochirurgicale, F-75013, Paris, France
- 16 20 AP-HP, Hôpitaux Universitaires La Pitié-Salpêtrière Charles Foix, Département de Neurologie, F-75013,
- 17 Paris, France
- 18
- *PSL BRAIN-BIOPSY STUDY GROUP: Alexandre Carpentier^{1,2,3}, MD, PhD; Laurent Capelle¹, MD; 19 Soledad Navarro¹, MD; Olivier Benveniste^{2,4}, MD, PhD; Dimitri Psimaras¹⁰, MD, PhD; Khê Hoang-20 21 Xuan^{2,3,10}, MD, PhD; Jean-Yves Delattre^{2,3,10}, MD, PhD; Nicolas Weiss^{2,11}, MD, PhD; Clémence Marois¹¹, 22 MD; Sarah Benghanem¹¹, MD; Nadine Martin-Duverneuil¹², MD, PhD; Véronique Leblond^{2,13}, MD; Sylvain Choquet¹³, MD; Charles-Edouard Luyt^{2,14}, MD, PhD; Alain Combes^{2,14}, MD, PhD; Eric 23 Caumes^{2,15}, MD, PhD; Vincent Calvez^{2,16}, MD, PhD; Aude Jary^{2,16}, MD; Renaud Piarroux^{2,17}, MD, PhD; 24 Alexandra Aubry^{2,18}, MD, PhD ; Vincent Degos^{2,19}, MD, PhD; Alice Jacquens¹⁹, MD; Caroline Papeix²⁰, 25 MD, PhD; Vincent Navarro^{2,3,20}, MD, PhD; 26 27
- 28 Reprints and Correspondence: Bertrand Mathon, MD, MSc, Service de Neurochirurgie, Hôpital La Pitié-
- 29 Salpêtrière, 47–83, boulevard de l'Hôpital, 75651 Paris Cedex 13, France. Tel: +33 (0)1 84 82 73 63; e-mail:
- 30 bertrand.mathon@aphp.fr, ORCID: 0000-0002-9182-5846

1	Supplemental Data: Supplemental Tables 1-5
2	Word counts: abstract 243/250, text 3373, references 46, figure: 1, tables: 4, title: 83 characters.
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	HIGHLIGHTS
9	
10	• In patients undergoing brain biopsy for neurological diseases of unknown etiology, we found high rates
11	of specific histological (71.3%) and final diagnoses (83.1%), leading to therapeutic management
12	change(s) for 75% of cases.
13	• Immunodepression was independently associated with specific histological diagnosis.
14	• Brain biopsy-related mortality occurred in 1.1% and permanent neurological morbidity in 0.6% of the
15	patients.
16	• For highly selected patients with neurological diseases of unknown etiology, brain biopsy has a high
17	diagnostic yield and low frequency of severe complications.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	

1	ADCTDA	CT
T	ADSINA	υı

2

3 Background: For nonneoplastic neurological diseases, no recommendation exists regarding the place or 4 appropriate timing of brain biopsy. The aim of this study was to evaluate the diagnostic yield and safety of brain 5 biopsies from patients with neurological diseases of unknown etiology. 6 Methods: We performed a retrospective cohort study from January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2018. We analyzed 7 1847 brain-biopsied patients, including 178 biopsies indicated for neurological diseases of unknown etiology. 8 Specific histological and final diagnosis rates, positive diagnosis-associated factors, complication rate and 9 complication-associated factors were assessed. 10 **Results:** Specific histological diagnosis and final diagnosis rates were 71.3% and 83.1%, respectively, leading to 11 therapeutic management change(s) for 75.3% of patients. Brain- biopsy-related mortality and permanent 12 neurological morbidity occurred in 1.1% and 0.6% of the patients, respectively. The multivariable logistic-13 regression model retained (odds ratio [95% CI] only immunodepression (2.2 [1.1-4.7]; P=.04) as being 14 independently associated with specific histological diagnosis, while supratentorial biopsy-targeted lesions (4.1 15 [1.1-15.2]; P=.04) were independently associated with a final diagnosis. Biopsies obtained from comatose 16 patients were less contributive to the diagnosis (0.2 [0.05-0.7]; P=.01). Prebiopsy platelet count <100 G/L (28.5 17 [1.8-447]; *P*=.02), hydrocephalus (6.3 [1.2-15.3]; *P*=.02) and targeted lesions <1 cm (4.3 [1.2-15.3]; *P*=.03) were 18 independently associated with brain biopsy-related complications. 19 **Conclusion:** For highly selected patients with neurological diseases of unknown etiology, brain biopsy has a 20 high diagnostic yield and low frequency of severe complications. We advocate that this procedure be considered 21 early in the diagnosis algorithm of these patients. 22 23 Keywords: brain lesion; cryptogenic neurological disease; diagnostic workup; neuropathology; neurosurgery. 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

1	DECLARATIONS
2	Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest: None
3	Author's contribution: All authors had access to the data and a role in writing the manuscript.
4	Funding: None
5	
6	Acknowledgements: We thank the French Society of Neurosurgery and Cormedica for their support.
7	
8	Availability of data: on request.
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	

1 INTRODUCTION

2 The contribution of brain biopsy is well-established for patients with suspected neoplastic lesions, for which 3 its diagnostic yield approaches 95% [1,2]. For nonneoplastic neurological diseases, no recommendation exists 4 regarding the place or appropriate timing of brain biopsy. Limited data support using brain biopsy to determine a 5 diagnosis in human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)-positive patients with neurological symptoms [3,4], cerebral 6 angiitis [5], Creutzfeldt–Jakob disease [6] or dementia [7]. For patients with neurological diseases of unknown 7 etiology, brain biopsy is usually the investigational modality of last resort after exhaustive workups with less 8 invasive tests, including imaging, cerebrospinal fluid analysis and electroencephalography, have failed to make a 9 diagnosis. Because brain biopsy is an invasive procedure carrying a risk of severe complications, many 10 physicians favor empirical treatments over taking the risk associated with biopsy to establish a diagnosis. 11 Considering the lack of evidence to guide the decision to biopsy for this challenging subgroup of patients, we 12 conducted a retrospective monocenter study to investigate brain-biopsy diagnostic yield and safety in adults with 13 neurological diseases of unknown etiology. 14 15 16 **METHODS** 17 **Patients** 18 We retrospectively reviewed the medical records and histology reports of all adults brain-biopsied at our 19 tertiary medical center, between January 1, 2008 and December 31, 2018. Patients meeting the following 20 conditions were included: 1) neurological disease of unknown etiology or atypical cerebral evolution of systemic 21 and/or neurological underlying diseases; 2) negative comprehensive less-invasive diagnostic work-up including 22 physical examination, laboratory tests, morphological examinations and extra-neurological histological findings; 23 3) indication for brain biopsy validated by a multidisciplinary team including neurologists, neurosurgeons, 24 neurooncologists, neuroradiologists, neuropathologists, internists and nuclear medicine specialists; and 4) 25 complete 6 months follow-up post biopsy or death before 6 months. 26 Patients were not considered for brain biopsy until a comprehensive less-invasive diagnostic work-up was 27 fully performed and came back negative. 28 Patients who underwent brain biopsy for histological confirmation of an obvious primary or secondary 29 cerebral neoplasm, or brain abscess were not included. Patients with incomplete data were excluded. For the 4 30 patients with repeat biopsies, only the first was included in the analysis.

1 Study Variables and Outcomes

7

Main outcome variables were: 1) obtaining a specific histological diagnosis, 2) making a final diagnosis, 3)
brain-biopsy-related complications. Other variables included demographic characteristics, medical history,
clinical manifestations, laboratory findings before brain biopsy, full less-invasive diagnostic work-up conducted
for every patient and 6-month survival postbiopsy.

6 Histological results of brain biopsies were categorized into 3 groups: specific lesion, nonspecific lesion, 7 normal brain. Obtaining a specific histological diagnosis was defined as brain-biopsy findings of a specific 8 lesion sufficient by itself to make a diagnosis and to modify therapeutic management. The final diagnosis was 9 reached by combining the brain-biopsy findings integrated with the patient's medical history and the results of 10 the less-invasive diagnostic work-up. Brain biopsies containing specific lesion(s) were classified as contributory 11 to the final diagnosis. Brain biopsies with nonspecific lesion(s) could nonetheless be classified as contributing to 12 a final diagnosis. A multidisciplinary discussion among neurosurgeons, pathologists, neuroradiologists, 13 neurologists and internists determined whether a brain biopsy with nonspecific lesion(s) contributed to a final 14 diagnosis. During those discussions, participants systematically and comprehensively reviewed each patient's 15 medical history, neurological and extra-neurological findings, less-invasive diagnostic work-up, brain-biopsy 16 microbiology and histology results. The treating physician's main hypothetical diagnosis and treatment at the 17 time of biopsy and changes made thereafter were noted. Two senior neuroradiologists analyzed all the imaging 18 studies, including available 3.0 Tesla magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) (T1-weighted and T2-weighted, fluid-19 attenuated inversion-recovery [FLAIR], T1-weighted with gadolinium injection, gradient-echo T2*-weighted, 20 and diffusion-weighted) sequences and multiparametric imaging data. Two senior neuropathologists examined 21 all histological slides. During the multidisciplinary discussion, participants had to agree unanimously that the 22 brain biopsy contributed to making the final diagnosis.

Brain-biopsy-related complications were defined as occurring during the month following the procedure. In the light of current literature on complications of diagnostic intracerebral procedures, we used a previously published graded severity scale with composite items including a prevailing surgical component [8,9]: grade 1: complication visible only on postoperative computed-tomography (CT) scan or transient event that did not require treatment; grade 2: transient complication that resolved completely but required treatment; grade 3: persistent neurological deficit >12 months postbiopsy; grade 4: biopsy-related death.

29

30

1 Surgical Procedures and Postoperative Management

2 A stereotactic biopsy technique was used for deep-seated lesions. The biopsies were taken under local 3 anesthesia with all the patients placed in a Leksell-G stereotactic frame; 3-dimensional, spoiled, gradient-4 recalled, gadolinium-enhanced MRI and FLAIR sequences were obtained on a 1.5 Tesla MR scanner (Signa, 5 General Electric, Boston, MA) after intravenous injection of gadolinium contrast material. An enhanced CT scan 6 was rarely obtained instead of the MRI for technical reasons. Once these images were acquired, the trajectory 7 and depth were planned according to the lesion to be targeted. Stereotactic coordinates were calculated with 8 Framelink (Medtronic, Minneapolis, MN) software. The biopsy path was carefully chosen so as to avoid 9 damaging critical superficial and deep veins and arteries. This route was simultaneously controlled millimeter-10 by-millimeter in the 3 spatial planes (3D view), and in the perpendicular and parallel oblique views of the needle 11 trajectory. The entry site was shaved, and biopsy was obtained under standard aseptic surgical conditions 12 without antibiotic prophylaxis. Patients were place in a semi-recumbent position and the stereotactic arc was 13 used to determine the incision site. After making a stab incision, a 3-mm twist-drill hole was made at the 14 previously calculated coordinates. An intracerebral biopsy needle was then introduced through the drill hole and 15 advanced towards the target and 6–10 tissue samples, $\sim 1 \times 10$ mm, at different depths surrounding and within 16 the targeted lesion.

For cortical and/or meningeal lesions, biopsies were obtained via open craniotomy or a burr hole. We
considered a gold standard diagnostic open biopsy to be 1 cm³ of leptomeninges and cortex including grey and
white matter. For MRI-negative patients, the biopsy was preferentially taken from the right middle frontal lobe
gyrus, unless history, examination or imaging asymmetry suggested another location would provide a higher
diagnostic yield.

22 The tissue samples collected were divided into several parts for neuropathological, bacteriological, 23 parasitological and virological investigations. When the available tissue was deemed sufficient, smears were 24 routinely prepared for urgent intraoperative neuropathological examination [10]. When the histological diagnosis 25 could not be made based on tissue from one target, another target was selected. When the differential diagnosis 26 included infection, tissue was set aside for microbiology studies. The management of samples in the pathology 27 lab relied on the following process: (i) systematic freezing of one fragment to allow further molecular 28 investigations looking for infectious agents or for mutations of neoplasms or for an abnormal clonality of 29 lymphoid cells, (ii) short fixation before overnight paraffin embedding to allow urgent preliminary results in less 30 than 30 hours, (iii) a first-line panel of technics adapted to the clinical context and to the examination of the

1 smear, (iv) preparation of unstained sections to spare the sample from iterative sessions of microtome cutting 2 and to allow fast execution of a second-line panel. The first line panel included -in the absence of neoplasm on 3 the smear- : (i) Gram, Grocott methenamine silver, Periodic Acid-Schiff/PAS, and Ziehl-Neelsen stains to detect 4 infectious pathogens, (ii) Ki67, CD3, CD20, Iba1 immunolabelings to evaluate inflammation, potential 5 lymphoproliferation and microglial activation, (iii) if immunocompromised patient, toxoplasma and virus JC 6 immunolabelings. The second-line panel was adapted to the histological aspect of the standard staining and to 7 results of the first-line panel: for example Epstein-Barr Virus hybridization in case of large lymphoid B cells, or 8 luxol blue and double immunolabeling of myelin basic protein & neurofilament in case of potential 9 demyelinating lesion.

Patients were monitored for at least 6 h in the recovery unit. Prior to transfer to the neurosurgery department,
a postoperative CT scan was obtained to rule out immediate complications.

12

13 Statistical Analyses

14 Results expressed as number (%) were compared with χ^2 tests; continuous variables expressed as mean \pm SD 15 or median [interquartile range, IQR] were compared with Student's t-test or Wilcoxon's rank test. Patients' 16 demographic, clinical and biological characteristics were tested in univariable analyses for association with 17 obtaining a specific histological diagnosis, final diagnosis or the occurrence of any complication. 18 Thereafter, multiple logistic-regression analyses using backward, stepwise variable elimination were run 19 (with the variable exit threshold set at P > 0.10). Factors achieving $P \le 0.10$ in our univariable analyses and 20 parameters previously reported to be strongly associated with diagnosis or complication(s) were entered into the 21 multivariable model. All potential explanatory variables included in the multivariable analyses were subjected to 22 collinearity analysis with a correlation matrix. Variables associated with one another were not included in the 23 model. Model goodness-of-fit was assessed with the determination coefficient (R^2). P < .05 defined statistical 24 significance. Analyses were computed with IBM SPSS Statistics v22.0 software (IBM Corp, Armonk, NY). 25 26 **Standard Protocol Approvals, Registrations and Patient Consents** 27 The database is registered with the Commission Nationale de l'Informatique et des Libertés. In accordance

with the ethical standards of our hospital's institutional review board, the Committee for the Protection of
Human Subjects, and French law, written informed consent was not needed for demographic, physiological and

30 hospital-outcome data analyses because this observational study did not modify existing diagnostic or

1	therapeutic strategies; however, patients were informed of their inclusion in the study. The manuscript was
2	prepared in accordance with the STrengthening the Reporting of OBservational studies in Epidemiology
3	(STROBE) statement.
4	
5	Data Availability Statement
6	Anonymized data will be shared on request from any qualified investigator.
7	
8	RESULTS
9	Study Population
10	During the study period, 1847 patients underwent a brain biopsy; the 178 biopsied to investigate a
11	neurological disease of unknown etiology were included in the study (Figure 1). The yearly number of brain
12	biopsies and their indications for the 1847 patients are reported in Supplemental Table 1. The main reason for
13	those latter biopsies was the histological confirmation of an obvious primary or secondary cerebral neoplasm (n
14	= 1504, 90.4%).
15	The general characteristics of the 178 retained patients and their brain biopsies are presented in Table 1. The
16	male-to-female ratio was 1.9 and the mean age on biopsy day was 47.1 ± 15.4 years. Their medical histories
17	worth noting included immunocompromised status (42.7%), autoimmune diseases (14.6%), HIV (14.0%),
18	hematological malignancies (10.1%), organ transplantations (7.3%) and solid-organ tumors (6.2%). One-third
19	had been taking or were prescribed corticosteroids before the biopsy. Clinical manifestations included
20	neurological deficit (74.9%), extra-neurological symptoms (32.2%), altered consciousness (30.3%), seizures
21	(28.1%), fever (15.5%) and coma (11.4%). Elevated cerebrospinal fluid proteins and meningitis, respectively,
22	were reported in 53.8% and 30.3% of patients with lumbar puncture. Most patients had multifocal (58.8%),
23	bilateral (54.2%) or gadolinium-enhanced (57.4%) lesions. The biopsy-targeted lesion was predominantly
24	supratentorial (93.2%), with largest diameter >1 cm (71.0%) and gadolinium-enhanced (58%). The most
25	frequent biopsy technique was stereotaxic (69.5%), with MRI-guidance for 74.8%.
26	
27	Diagnoses and Main Outcomes
28	Brain biopsies contained a specific lesion, nonspecific lesion or normal brain, respectively, for 127 (71.3%),
29	46 (25.8%) and 5 (2.8%) patients. Nonspecific lesions contributed to a final diagnosis for 21/46 (45.7%)
30	patients. A final diagnosis could be made for 148 (83.1%) patients (Figure 1), most frequently: autoimmune or

inflammatory diseases (21.9%), infections (20.2%), hematological malignancies (19.6%), demyelinating disease
(6.7%), metastasis (3.9%) and glioma (3.4%) (**Table 2**). Four patients had multiple diagnoses. Another biopsy
was obtained from 4 (2.2%) patients and it contributed to the diagnosis for 4 of them. Brain-biopsy findings led
to therapeutic management change(s) for 75.3% of the patients. The mean ± SD follow-up postbiopsy was 23.7 ±
28.8 months and 1-year survival was 75.8%.

7 Diagnostic Yield-Associated Factors

8 Comparisons between patients with specific and nonspecific histological lesion are reported in **Table 1**.

9 Patients with specific lesions suffered significantly more frequently from immunocompromised status, fever,

10 meningitis and elevated C-reactive protein levels. The logistic-regression model for multivariable analyses

11 retained only immunocompromised status as being a significantly independent predictor of a specific

12 histological lesion (Table 3). Comparisons between patients whose biopsies contributed or not to the final

13 diagnosis are presented in **Supplemental Table 2.**

14 Univariable analyses (**Supplemental Table 3**) identified patients given a final diagnosis as having only more

15 frequent supratentorial biopsy-targeted lesions (95.2% vs. 83.3%; P = .02). The logistic-regression model for

16 multivariable analyses retained (odds ratio [95% confidence interval]) supratentorial biopsy-targeted lesion (4.1

17 [1.1 to 15.2]; P = .04) as independent predictors of a final diagnosis, while biopsies obtained from comatose

18 patients were less contributive to the diagnosis (0.2 [0.05 to 0.7]; P = .01).

20 Complications and Factors Associated with Them

21 During the month following the biopsy, 22 (12.3%) patients developed grade-1, -2, -3 or

4 complications (Supplemental Table 4). Fifteen (68.2%) of those complications were grade-1 asymptomatic

and diagnosed only on systematic postbiopsy imaging. Seventeen complications were postbiopsy hemorrhages,

24 none of which required surgical hematoma evacuation. Two biopsies were fatal: 1 in the context of acute

25 myeloid leukemia and persistent profound thrombopenia, and the other of multiple myeloma on mechanical

ventilation and hemodialyzed.

27 Univariable analyses of complication-associated factors are reported in Supplemental Table 5.

28 The multivariable logistic-regression model (Table 4) retained prebiopsy platelet count <100 G/L,

29 hydrocephalus and targeted lesions <1 cm as being independently associated with developing a brain biopsy-

30 related complication, while a prebiopsy history of seizures or neurological deficit was significantly associated

¹⁹

- 1 with less postbiopsy complication.
- 2

3 DISCUSSION

For patients with neurological disease of unknown etiology, the place of brain biopsy remains controversial,
because it is an invasive option that should only be considered when the global benefit surpasses the risk of
inducing harm.

7 Previous series, mostly published in the 1990s and 2000s, included 14 to 64 patients brain biopsied for 8 cryptogenic neurological disease [5,11–20]. Their reported diagnostic yields were relatively low, 29–68% 9 [11,14,15,18,20–23], leading some authors to argue that it was too low and that the procedure was not 10 contributory to patient management [12–15.24], while others emphasized brain-biopsy usefulness [5,16–20]. 11 Since then, the numerous breakthroughs made in neurosurgery, pathology, immunology and microbiology have 12 increased the diagnostic yield and improved the safety of the procedure. Our frequency of diagnoses made 13 directly with brain biopsies during the last decade was higher for our series (71.3%) and was even better (83.1%) 14 when nonspecific lesions were interpreted in light of the patient's medical history. Moreover, since 2016, 15 metagenomic next-generation sequencing (NGS) of brain tissue has enabled diagnoses that cannot be made using 16 routine microbiological testing [25]. These recently reported new techniques [26] pave the way to further 17 improve in the diagnostic yield of these invasive procedures. Further studies will be needed to evaluate the need 18 for brain biopsy and its diagnostic yield is the setting of new neuronal antibodies and NGS techniques. Lastly, 19 although 16.9% of the biopsies were non-contributory for a final diagnosis, they indeed excluded neoplastic or 20 infectious diseases, thereby enabling specific therapy (e.g., immunosuppressants ...) to be started, if needed. 21 We highlighted several new characteristics associated with obtaining a diagnosis. First, 22 immunocompromised status was the sole factor associated with specific histological lesions. This subgroup's 23 frequency and diversity of neurological diseases (opportunistic infections, inflammatory diseases and neoplasia) 24 [4,27–29] render brain biopsies highly informative. Moreover, dual pathologies were found in 4/76 (5.2%) 25 immunocompromised patients. Second, infratentorial biopsy-targeted lesions were less frequently associated 26 with making a final diagnosis. Deep cerebellum and brain-stem lesions, which prevent efficiently obtaining 27 biopsies, are indeed technically more complex [30,31]. Third, contrary to preconceived ideas, small or 28 noncontrast-enhanced lesions were not associated with a low diagnosis rate. Last, biopsies taken from comatose 29 patients were less likely to contribute to the final diagnosis. In these patients, the urgent need for diagnosis might

lead to retain wider indication of brain biopsy. Although, our results suggest that the benefit/risk ratio should be
 careful weighed for these patients.

3 Comparing the diagnostic yields in a context of diseases of unknown etiology, brain biopsy appears to be 4 highly beneficial compared to those of other solid-organ biopsies. The diagnostic yields were all lower than 5 herein: 40–59% for transbronchial lung biopsies for suspected sarcoidosis, with a complication rate of 12% 6 [32,33]; slightly better at ~65% for percutaneous biopsies of benign lung nodules [34]; worse with only 18% 7 definite diagnoses for endomyocardial biopsies, which impacted therapeutic management for 29% of the 8 patients [35]; 30-50% for accessory salivary-gland biopsies for Löfgren's syndrome and other forms of 9 sarcoidosis [36,37]; and 81% for punch skin biopsies from patients with suspected cutaneous sarcoidosis [38]. 10 Pertinently, brain biopsy is an invasive procedure as its complications may be fatal. However, large series of 11 brain biopsies obtained for brain tumor investigations showed that permanent neurological morbidity and 12 mortality frequencies were low, ranging from 0 to 5.6% [39,40] and 0 to 4% [41,42], respectively. Herein, we 13 also reported a low rate of severe (grade 3-4, 1.7%) complications in the setting of neurological diseases of 14 unknown etiology. Likewise the frequencies of silent hemorrhagic complications in our series (7.9%) agreed 15 with those previously reported (7-26%) [43,44].

16 Intriguingly, the main factor associated with complications in our study was low platelet counts on the days 17 preceding biopsy, despite all patients having had >100 G/L platelets the day of biopsy. This finding underscores 18 that, for thrombocytopenic patients, perioperative platelet transfusions do not prevent the risk of late biopsy-site 19 bleeding. Based on those findings, we think that a platelet count >100 G/L should be maintained for at least 7 20 days postbiopsy [45,46]; however, we observed very late (21 days) hemorrhagic complications in patients with 21 sustained profound thrombocytopenia. For thrombocytopenic, brain-biopsy candidates, the procedure's 22 benefit/risk ratio must be thoroughly evaluated, especially when sustained thrombocytopenia is foreseeable. 23 Notably, small targeted lesions were more frequently associated with complications. Those outcomes can be 24 explained by the limited number of possible trajectories to reach the target lesion. Notably, the topography of 25 lesions was not associated with complications. Finally, preoperative hydrocephalus was associated with a higher 26 rate of postoperative complications, suggesting that brain biopsy could exacerbate radiological findings and 27 clinical symptoms related to hydrocephalus, probably through hemorrhagic and edema-inducing mechanisms. 28 Ultimately, we would like to emphasize that the risk of severe complications of a brain biopsy should always be 29 weighed against the risks borne by the natural evolution of an undiagnosed and untreated severe neurological 30 disease (lymphoma, leukemia, infection, cancer, vasculitis...). In many cases, the latter is frequently more lifethreatening than the former, as supported by the 2 biopsy-attributable deaths during the year following biopsy vs.
 42 because of disease-attributed deaths.

3 In the end, we suggest that several elements should be required to consider a brain biopsy in a patient with 4 neurological disease of unknown etiology : 1) 3.0 Tesla brain MRI with spectroscopy and perfusion sequence, 2) 5 negative comprehensive less-invasive laboratory and morphologic work-up including a total-body CT-scan, 3) 6 negative pathological examination of extra-neurological lesions, if present, 4) brain lesion considered accessible 7 by a trained neurosurgical team, 5) no bleeding disorders and the possibility of maintaining platelets over 100 8 G/L during the first 7 days after the biopsy, 6) validation of the brain biopsy indication during a 9 multidisciplinary discussion. When these criteria are met cumulatively, we advocate that this procedure be 10 considered early in the diagnosis algorithm of these patients.

11 Our study has limitations and strengths. First, it is retrospective, monocentric, observational design, but many 12 patients with rare diseases undergoing a rather uncommon procedure were included. Second, our definition of 13 "neurological disease of unknown etiology" may be controversial; however, all cases were analyzed 14 retrospectively during retrospective multidisciplinary discussions to ascertain the diagnosis. Third, our institution 15 being a tertiary referral center induces a selection bias, but also reflects the real-world picture of neurological 16 diseases of unknown etiology. While some of the final diagnosis in this study can usually be achieve without a 17 brain biopsy (tuberculosis, viral encephalitis, multiple sclerosis, ADEM...), many patients were referred to our 18 institution because of a diagnostic dilemma that had not been solved with the comprehensive less-invasive work-19 up. Fourth, we could not obtain the median time from symptoms onset to brain biopsy. Indeed, some patients 20 had a long medical history with many clinical symptoms while others had no specific neurological symptoms. 21 Last, brain-biopsy safety and efficacy in our center relies on the experience of our neurosurgeons and 22 neuropathologists, and those results may not be immediately reproducible in every center.

23

24 CONCLUSIONS

Our results suggest that, for highly selected patients with neurological diseases of unknown etiology, brain
 biopsy has a high diagnostic yield and low frequency of severe complications. We advocate that this procedure
 be considered early in the diagnosis algorithm of patients with neurological diseases of unknown etiology.

- 28
- 29
- 30

1	REFERENCES
-	

- [1] Livermore LJ, Ma R, Bojanic S, Pereira EAC. Yield and complications of frame-based and frameless
 stereotactic brain biopsy--the value of intra-operative histological analysis. Br J Neurosurg 2014;28:637–
 44. https://doi.org/10.3109/02688697.2014.887657.
- 5 [2] Hall WA. The safety and efficacy of stereotactic biopsy for intracranial lesions. Cancer 1998;82:1749–55.
- 6 [3] Hornef MW, Iten A, Maeder P, Villemure JG, Regli L. Brain biopsy in patients with acquired
- 7 immunodeficiency syndrome: diagnostic value, clinical performance, and survival time. Arch Intern Med
 8 1999;159:2590–6.
- 9 [4] Antinori A, Ammassari A, Luzzati R, Castagna A, Maserati R, Rizzardini G, et al. Role of brain biopsy in the
- 10 management of focal brain lesions in HIV-infected patients. Gruppo Italiano Cooperativo AIDS &
- **11** Tumori. Neurology 2000;54:993–7.
- 12 [5] Alrawi A, Trobe JD, Blaivas M, Musch DC. Brain biopsy in primary angiitis of the central nervous system.
- **13** Neurology 1999;53:858–60.
- [6] Heinemann U, Krasnianski A, Meissner B, Kallenberg K, Kretzschmar HA, Schulz-Schaeffer W, et al. Brain
 biopsy in patients with suspected Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease. J Neurosurg 2008;109:735–41.
- 16 https://doi.org/10.3171/JNS/2008/109/10/0735.
- 17 [7] Warren JD, Schott JM, Fox NC, Thom M, Revesz T, Holton JL, et al. Brain biopsy in dementia. Brain
 18 2005;128:2016–25. https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awh543.
- 19 [8] Mathon B, Clemenceau S, Hasboun D, Habert M-O, Belaid H, Nguyen-Michel V-H, et al. Safety profile of
- 20 intracranial electrode implantation for video-EEG recordings in drug-resistant focal epilepsy. J Neurol
- 21 2015;262:2699–712. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00415-015-7901-6.
- 22 [9] Mathon B, Navarro V, Bielle F, Nguyen-Michel V-H, Carpentier A, Baulac M, et al. Complications After
- Surgery for Mesial Temporal Lobe Epilepsy Associated with Hippocampal Sclerosis. World Neurosurg
 2017;102:639-650.e2. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2017.03.128.
- 25 [10] Mathon B, Amelot A, Mokhtari K, Bielle F. Increasing the diagnostic yield of stereotactic brain biopsy
- using intraoperative histological smear. Clin Neurol Neurosurg 2019;186:105544.
- 27 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clineuro.2019.105544.
- 28 [11] Josephson SA, Papanastassiou AM, Berger MS, Barbaro NM, McDermott MW, Hilton JF, et al. The
- 29 diagnostic utility of brain biopsy procedures in patients with rapidly deteriorating neurological conditions
- 30 or dementia. J Neurosurg 2007;106:72–5. https://doi.org/10.3171/jns.2007.106.1.72.

- [12] Anderson NE, Willoughby EW, Synek BJ. Leptomeningeal and brain biopsy in chronic meningitis. Aust
 N Z J Med 1995;25:703–6.
- 3 [13] Duna GF, Calabrese LH. Limitations of invasive modalities in the diagnosis of primary angiitis of the
 4 central nervous system. J Rheumatol 1995;22:662–7.
- 5 [14] Javedan SP, Tamargo RJ. Diagnostic yield of brain biopsy in neurodegenerative disorders. Neurosurgery
 6 1997;41:823–8; discussion 828-830.
- 7 [15] Schuette AJ, Taub JS, Hadjipanayis CG, Olson JJ. Open biopsy in patients with acute progressive
 8 neurologic decline and absence of mass lesion. Neurology 2010;75:419–24.
- 9 https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.0b013e3181eb5889.
- 10 [16] Hulette CM, Earl NL, Crain BJ. Evaluation of cerebral biopsies for the diagnosis of dementia. Arch
 11 Neurol 1992;49:28–31.
- [17] Cheng TM, O'Neill BP, Scheithauer BW, Piepgras DG. Chronic meningitis: the role of meningeal or
 cortical biopsy. Neurosurgery 1994;34:590–5; discussion 596.
- [18] Burns JD, Cadigan RO, Russell JA. Evaluation of brain biopsy in the diagnosis of severe neurologic
 disease of unknown etiology. Clin Neurol Neurosurg 2009;111:235–9.
- 16 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clineuro.2008.10.003.
- 17 [19] Wong SH, Jenkinson MD, Faragher B, Thomas S, Crooks D, Solomon T. Brain biopsy in the management
- 18 of neurology patients. Eur Neurol 2010;64:42–5. https://doi.org/10.1159/000315032.
- 19 [20] Rice CM, Gilkes CE, Teare E, Hardie RJ, Scolding NJ, Edwards RJ. Brain biopsy in cryptogenic
- 20 neurological disease. Br J Neurosurg 2011;25:614–20. https://doi.org/10.3109/02688697.2010.551677.
- 21 [21] Bai HX, Zou Y, Lee AM, Lancaster E, Yang L. Diagnostic Value and Safety of Brain Biopsy in Patients
- 22 With Cryptogenic Neurological Disease: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of 831 Cases.
- 23 Neurosurgery 2015;77:283–95; discussion 295. https://doi.org/10.1227/NEU.00000000000756.
- 24 [22] Magaki S, Gardner T, Khanlou N, Yong WH, Salamon N, Vinters HV. Brain biopsy in neurologic decline
- 25 of unknown etiology. Hum Pathol 2015;46:499–506. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humpath.2014.12.003.
- 26 [23] Noronha C, Figueiredo G, Pinheiro C, Carvalho E, Calheiros A, Pires MM, et al. Brain biopsy in
- suspected non-neoplastic neurological disease. Acta Neurochir (Wien) 2019;161:1139–47.
- 28 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00701-019-03910-8.

- [24] Abdullah KG, Li Y, Agarwal P, Nayak NR, Thawani JP, Balu R, et al. Long-term utility and complication
 profile of open craniotomy for biopsy in patients with idiopathic encephalitis. J Clin Neurosci 2017;37:69–
 72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jocn.2016.11.013.
- 4 [25] Seilhean D. Infections of the central nervous system: Neuropathology. Rev Neurol (Paris) 2019;175:431–
 5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neurol.2019.07.006.
- 6 [26] Wilson MR, Sample HA, Zorn KC, Arevalo S, Yu G, Neuhaus J, et al. Clinical Metagenomic Sequencing
 7 for Diagnosis of Meningitis and Encephalitis. N Engl J Med 2019;380:2327–40.
- 8 https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1803396.
- 9 [27] Alesch F, Armbruster C, Budka H. Diagnostic value of stereotactic biopsy of cerebral lesions in patients
 10 with AIDS. Acta Neurochir (Wien) 1995;134:214–9.
- 11 [28] Clifford null. Focal Brain Lesions in People with HIV. Curr Treat Options Neurol 1999;1:167–72.
- 12 [29] Clifford null. Central Neurologic Complications of HIV Infection. Curr Infect Dis Rep 1999;1:187–91.
- 13 [30] Tobin WO, Meyer FB, Keegan BM. Diagnostic Yield and Safety of Cerebellar and Brainstem
- 14Parenchymal Biopsy. World Neurosurg 2015;84:1973–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2015.08.062.
- [31] Shad A, Green A, Bojanic S, Aziz T. Awake stereotactic biopsy of brain stem lesions: technique and
 results. Acta Neurochir (Wien) 2005;147:47–9; discussion 49-50. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00701-004-
- **17** 0420-3.
- 18 [32] Sehgal IS, Bal A, Dhooria S, Gupta N, Ram B, Aggarwal AN, et al. Predictors of Successful Yield of
- Transbronchial Lung Biopsy in Patients With Sarcoidosis. J Bronchology Interv Pulmonol 2018;25:31–6.
 https://doi.org/10.1097/LBR.0000000000439.
- 21 [33] Akten HS, Kilic H, Celik B, Erbas G, Isikdogan Z, Turktas H, et al. Diagnostic Yield of Transbronchial
- 22 Biopsy in Comparison to High Resolution Computerized Tomography in Sarcoidosis Cases. Asian Pac J

```
23 Cancer Prev 2018;19:1029–33. https://doi.org/10.22034/APJCP.2018.19.4.1029.
```

- 24 [34] Portela de Oliveira E, Souza CA, Inacio JR, Abdelzarek M, Dennie C, Gupta A, et al. Imaging-guided
- 25 Percutaneous Biopsy of Nodules ≤1 cm: Study of Diagnostic Performance and Risk Factors Associated
- 26 With Biopsy Failure. J Thorac Imaging 2019. https://doi.org/10.1097/RTI.00000000000427.
- 27 [35] Khan T, Selvakumar D, Trivedi S, Rao K, Harapoz M, Thiagalingam A, et al. The value of
- endomyocardial biopsy in diagnosis and guiding therapy. Pathology 2017;49:750–6.
- 29 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pathol.2017.08.004.

1	[36]	Michon-Pasturel U, Hachulla E, Bloget F, Labalette P, Hatron PY, Devulder B, et al. [Role of biopsy of
2		the accessory salivary glands in Löfgren's syndrome and other forms of sarcoidosis]. Rev Med Interne
3		1996;17:452–5.

- 4 [37] Szpirglas H, Giozza S, Agbo-Godeau S, Le Charpentier Y. [Biopsy of the accessory salivary glands. 5
 5 years' experience]. Rev Stomatol Chir Maxillofac 1994;95:204–6.
- 6 [38] Yanardag H, Tetikkurt C, Bilir M, Demirci S, Iscimen A. Diagnosis of cutaneous sarcoidosis; clinical and
- 7 the prognostic significance of skin lesions. Multidiscip Respir Med 2013;8:26.
- 8 https://doi.org/10.1186/2049-6958-8-26.
- 9 [39] Kongkham PN, Knifed E, Tamber MS, Bernstein M. Complications in 622 cases of frame-based
 10 stereotactic biopsy, a decreasing procedure. Can J Neurol Sci 2008;35:79–84.
- 11 [40] Lara-Almunia M, Hernandez-Vicente J. Frame-based Stereotactic Biopsy: Description and Association of
- 12 Anatomical, Radiologic, and Surgical Variables with Diagnostic Yield in a Series of 407 Cases. J Neurol

13 Surg A Cent Eur Neurosurg 2019;80:149–61. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0038-1676597.

- [41] Malone H, Yang J, Hershman DL, Wright JD, Bruce JN, Neugut AI. Complications Following
 Stereotactic Needle Biopsy of Intracranial Tumors. World Neurosurgery 2015;84:1084–9.
- 16 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2015.05.025.
- 17 [42] Riche M, Amelot A, Peyre M, Capelle L, Carpentier A, Mathon B. Complications after frame-based
- 18 stereotactic brain biopsy: a systematic review. Neurosurg Rev 2020. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10143-019-
- **19** 01234-w.
- 20 [43] Grossman R, Sadetzki S, Spiegelmann R, Ram Z. Haemorrhagic complications and the incidence of
- 21 asymptomatic bleeding associated with stereotactic brain biopsies. Acta Neurochir (Wien) 2005;147:627–
- 22 31; discussion 631. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00701-005-0495-5.
- 23 [44] Weise LM, Bruder M, Eibach S, Seifert V, Byhahn C, Marquardt G, et al. Efficacy and safety of local
- 24 versus general anesthesia in stereotactic biopsies: a matched-pairs cohort study. J Neurosurg Anesthesiol
- 25 2013;25:148–53. https://doi.org/10.1097/ANA.0b013e318274ce41.
- 26 [45] Field M, Witham TF, Flickinger JC, Kondziolka D, Lunsford LD. Comprehensive assessment of
- hemorrhage risks and outcomes after stereotactic brain biopsy. J Neurosurg 2001;94:545–51.
- 28 https://doi.org/10.3171/jns.2001.94.4.0545.

1	[46]	Kreth FW, Muacevic A, Medele R, Bise K, Meyer T, Reulen HJ. The risk of haemorrhage after image
2		guided stereotactic biopsy of intra-axial brain tumoursa prospective study. Acta Neurochir (Wien)
3		2001;143:539–45; discussion 545-546.
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		

1	FIGURE LEGENDS
2	
3	Figure 1. Flow-chart of patient inclusion in this study on brain-biopsy contribution to diagnosis.
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	

Characteristic	All patients	Specific lesion	No specific	Р
	n = 178	n = 127	lesion <i>n</i> = 51	
Males	117 (65.7)	88 (69.3)	29 (56.9)	0.1
Age on biopsy day, years	47.1±15.4	47.4±15.4	46.4±15.5	0.7
Medical history				
Immunocompromised	76 (42.7)	62 (48.8)	14 (27.5)	0.009
Cardiovascular	34 (19.1)	22 (17.3)	12 (23.5)	0.3
Autoimmune diseases	26 (14.6)	21 (16.5)	5 (9.8)	0.2
Human immunodeficiency virus	25 (14.0)	21 (16.5)	4 (7.8)	0.1
Hematological malignancies	18 (10.1)	13 (10.2)	5 (9.8)	0.9
Organ transplantation	13 (7.3)	12 (9.4)	1 (2)	0.08
Solid-organ tumor	11 (6.2)	6 (4.7)	5 (9.8)	0.2
Treatments before biopsy				
Corticosteroids	60/173 (34.7)	42/122 (34.4)	18 (35.3)	0.9
Antiplatelet therapy	21/174 (12.1)	15/123 (12.2)	6 (11.8)	0.9
Anticoagulant	6/174 (3.4)	3/123 (2.4)	3 (5.9)	0.3
Clinical findings before biopsy				
Neurological defect	131/175 (74.9)	92/124 (74.2)	39 (76.5)	0.7
Altered consciousness (GCS 8-14)	53/175 (30.3)	38/124 (30.6)	15 (29.3/4)	0.9
Coma (GCS 3-7)	27/174 (15.5)	12/124 (9.7)	8 (15.7)	0.3
Seizure	20/175 (11.4)	38 (29.9)	12 (23.5)	0.4
Extra-neurological symptoms	56/174 (32.2)	43/123 (35)	13 (25.5)	0.2
Fever	50 (28.1)	24/123 (19.5)	3 (5.9)	0.02
Laboratory findings before biopsy				
Meningitis	44/145 (30.3)	35/99 (35.4)	9/46 (19.6)	0.05
Elevated CSF proteins	78/145 (53.8)	57/99 (57.6)	21/46 (45.7)	0.2
White blood cell count, <3 G/L	6/163 (3.6)	4/119 (3.4)	2/50 (4)	0.9

Hemoglobin, <10 g/dL	35/168 (20.8)	28/119 (23.5)	7/49 (14.3)	0.2
Platelet count, G/L	250 [197-317]	244 [192-307]	274 [221-334]	0.04
<150 G/L	24/169 (14.2)	19/120 (15.8)	5/49 (10.2)	0.3
<100 G/L	2/168 (1.2)	5/120 (4.2)	1/49 (2.0)	0.5
C-Reactive protein, >10 mg/L	50/169 (29.6)	41/120 (34.2)	9/49 (18.4)	0.04
MRI findings before biopsy				
Multifocal lesions	104/177 (58.8)	74 (58.3)	30/50 (60)	0.8
Bilateral lesions	96/177 (54.2)	64 (50.4)	32/50 (64)	0.1
Hydrocephalus	16/176 (9.1)	11/126 (8.7)	5/50 (10)	0.8
Gadolinium enhancement	101/176 (57.4)	75/126 (59.5)	26/50 (52)	0.4
Meningeal involvement	27/176 (15.3)	19/126 (15.1)	8/50 (16)	0.9
Largest lesion diameter, mm	18.3 [10.9-28.7]	18.2 [10.6-28.3]	19.6 [11.1-30.2]	0.9
<10 mm	40/172 (23.3)	29/123 (23.6)	11/49 (22.4)	0.9
10-20 mm	53/172 (30.8)	39/123 (31.7)	14/49 (28.6)	0.7
>20 mm	79/172 (45.9)	55/123 (44.7)	24/49 (49)	0.6
Biopsy-targeted lesion characteristics				
Subcortical	72/176 (40.9)	52/126 (41.3)	20/50 (40)	0.9
Deep-brain	64/176 (36.4)	44/126 (34.9)	20/50 (40)	0.5
Cortical	29/176 (16.5)	21/126 (16.7)	8/50 (16)	0.9
Meningeal	9/176 (5.1)	8/126 (6.3)	1/50 (2)	0.2
Supratentorial	164/176 (93.2)	119/126 (94.4)	45/50 (90)	0.3
Size >1 cm	125/176 (71.0)	93/126 (73.8)	32/50 (64)	0.2
Gadolinium-enhanced	102/176 (58)	74/126 (58.7)	28/50 (56)	0.7
Biopsy technique				
Stereotaxic	123/177 (69.5)	88/126 (69.3/8)	35 (68.6)	0.9
MRI-guided	92/123 (74.8)	67/88 (76.1)	25/35 (71.4)	0.6

1 Abbreviations: CSF = cerebrospinal fluid; GCS = Glasgow coma score; MRI = magnetic resonance imaging.

2 Continuous variables, expressed as mean ± SD or median [interquartile range (IQR)], were compared with

Student's *t*-test or Wilcoxon's rank test; categorical variables, expressed as *n* (%), were compared with χ^2 tests. 3

Table 2. Final Diagnoses for the 178 Patients Brain-Biopsied for Neurological Diseases of

Unknown Etiology

Final Diagnosis	Value	
Autoimmune or inflammatory diseases	39 (21.9)	
Cerebral vasculitis	16	
Sarcoidosis	9	
Behçet's disease	5	
Autoimmune encephalitis	2	
Others*	7	
Infectious diseases	36 (20.2)	
Toxoplasmosis	9	
Progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy	8	
Tuberculosis	7	
Viral encephalitis	7	
Parasitic/fungal diseases	4	
Nocardiosis	1	
Hematological malignancies	35 (19.6)	
Lymphoma	13	
EBV-induced lymphoproliferative disease	12	
Histiocytosis	6	
AL Amyloidosis [£]	2	
Graft-vshost disease	1	
Acute myeloid leukemia	1	
Demyelinating disease	12 (6.7)	
Multiple sclerosis	6	
Acute disseminated encephalomyelitis	6	

Metastasis	7 (3.9)
Glioma	6 (3.4)
Others [†]	9 (5.1)
Multiple diagnoses [‡]	4 (2.2)
None	30 (16.9)

Abbreviation: EBV = Epstein–Barr virus; AL, Amyloid Light. Results are expressed as n (%) or n.

* Immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome, 2; and 1 each: inflammatory pseudotumor, CD8+

encephalitis, Rasmussen encephalitis, paraneoplastic encephalitis or neuromyelitis optica.

[£]Two Lambda Light Chain Amyloidosis.

[†]One each: mitochondrial cytopathy, Alzheimer's disease, mycosis fungoides, radionecrosis, methotrexate toxicity, craniospinal hypotension pachymeningitis, hemiplegic migraine, progressive cerebral ataxia or orthochromic leukodystrophia.

^{*} Progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy and EBV-induced lymphoproliferative disease *n* = 2, and 1 each: toxoplasmosis and Immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome or toxoplasmosis and EBVinduced lymphoproliferative disease.

1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			

Table 3. Univariable and Multivariable Logistic-Regression Model Analyses of Factors Associated with Brain

Biopsy Containing a Specific Lesion

Variable	Univ	Univariable analysis			Multivariable analysis		
	OR	95% CI	Р	OR	95% CI	Р	
Male	1.7	0.8-3.3	0.1				
Medical history							
Immunocompromised	2.5	1.2-5.1	0.01	2.2	1.1-4.7	0.04	
Human immunodeficiency virus	2.3	0.7-7.1	0.1				
Clinical findings before biopsy							
Fever	3.8	1.1-13.2	0.03				
C-Reactive protein >10 mg/L	2.3	1.1-5.2	0.04				
MRI findings before biopsy							
Bilateral lesions	0.6	0.3-1.1	0.1				
Biopsy-targeted lesion characteristic							
Size >1 cm	1.6	0.8-3.2	0.2				
Abbreviation: OR = odds ratio; MRI = magn	etic resonance	imaging.					
The multiple logistic-regression model was	run using bacl	ward-stepwi	se variable	eliminatio	n (with the v	ariable	
exit threshold set at <i>P</i> > 0.10). All potentia	l explanatory v	variables inclu	ded in the r	nultivariat	ole analyses v	were	
subjected to collinearity analysis with a cor	relation matri	x. Variables as	ssociated w	ith one and	other were n	ot	
included in the model . $P < 0.05$ defined sta	tistical significa	ance.					

- тЭ

Table 4. Univariable and Multivariable Logistic-Regression Model Analyses of Brain-Biopsy Complication-

Associated Factors (grade 1–4).

ariable Univariable Analysis		Multivariable Analysis				
	OR	95% CI	Р	OR	95% CI	Р
Age, years	1.0	0.9-1.1	0.1			
Clinical findings before biopsy						
Neurological defect	0.4	0.2-1.1	0.07	0.2	0.06-0.9	0.04
Seizure	0.2	0.05-0.9	0.049	0.08	0.1-0.4	0.006
Laboratory findings before biopsy						
Elevated CSF proteins	2.0	0.7-5.2	0.16			
White blood cell count < 3G/L	3.5	0.6-20.6	0.6			
Platelet count <100 G/L	16.0	2.7-93.6	0.002	28.5	1.8-447	0.02
MRI findings before biopsy						
Hydrocephalus	2.6	0.7-8.9	0.1	6.3	1.3-30.4	0.022
Largest lesion diameter, mm						
<10 mm	2.7	0.8-5.9	0.1	4.3	1.2-15.3	0.03
>10 mm	0.4	0.1-1.1	0.1			
>20 mm	0.4	0.1-1.2	0.1			
Targeted-lesion characteristic						
Size > 1 cm	0.4	0.18-1.1	0.08			

Abbreviation: OR = odds ratio; CI = confidence interval.

The multiple logistic-regression model was run using backward-stepwise variable elimination (with the variable exit threshold set at P > 0.10). All potential explanatory variables included in the multivariable analyses were subjected to collinearity analysis with a correlation matrix. Variables associated with one another were not included in the **model**. P < 0.05 defined statistical significance.

1

2

2	
3	Supplemental Table 1. Yearly numbers and indications of brain biopsies between 2008 and 2018
4	
5	Supplemental Table 2. Patient and biopsy characteristics with comparison according to biopsy contribution to
6	the final diagnosis
7	
8	Supplemental Table 3. Univariable and multivariable logistic-regression model analyses of factors associated
9	with brain biopsy contributing to the final diagnosis
10	
11	Supplemental Table 4. Details of the 22 brain-biopsy complications according their grade
12	

13 Supplemental Table 5. Univariable analysis of factors associated with a brain-biopsy-related complication