INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES
[ISSN: 0975-4725; CODEN(USA): IJPS00]
Journal Homepage: https://www.ijpsjournal.com

OPEN ACCESS

Review Paper

Guillain Barré Syndrome: Early Diagnosis And Timely Management

Paola Andrea Camaño Villafañe[1]*, Luisa Fernanda Montoya Arrieta[2], Andrea Margarita Iriarte Berrio[3], Jorge Oswaldo Toro Ruiz[4], Efraín del Valle Miranda[5], Natalia Lucia Garrido Guerrero[6]

[1,4]General Physician, Universidad de Cartagena, Colombia
[2,3,5,6]General Physician, Universidad del Sinú, Colombia.

ARTICLE INFO

Published: 26 June 2026
Keywords:
Guillain Barré syndrome; acute inflammatory polyneuropathy; early diagnosis; intravenous immunoglobulin; plasma exchange; neurological emergency.
DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.20927496

ABSTRACT

Guillain Barré syndrome (GBS) is an acute immune-mediated polyradiculoneuropathy and the leading cause of acute flaccid paralysis worldwide. The disorder is frequently preceded by respiratory or gastrointestinal infections and is characterized by rapidly progressive symmetrical weakness, diminished or absent deep tendon reflexes, sensory disturbances, and varying degrees of autonomic dysfunction. Early recognition is crucial because disease progression may lead to respiratory failure, severe disability, and potentially life-threatening complications. Diagnosis is primarily clinical and is supported by cerebrospinal fluid analysis demonstrating albuminocytologic dissociation and electrophysiological studies showing demyelinating or axonal neuropathic patterns. Prompt initiation of disease-modifying therapy, including intravenous immunoglobulin or plasma exchange, has been shown to improve functional outcomes and accelerate recovery. In addition to immunotherapy, comprehensive supportive care, respiratory monitoring, prevention of complications, and multidisciplinary rehabilitation are essential components of management. This review summarizes current evidence regarding the epidemiology, pathophysiology, clinical manifestations, diagnostic approach, and therapeutic strategies for Guillain Barré syndrome, highlighting the importance of early diagnosis and timely intervention to optimize patient outcomes and reduce morbidity and mortality.

INTRODUCTION

Guillain Barré syndrome (GBS) is an acute immune mediated polyradiculoneuropathy characterized by rapidly progressive muscle weakness, diminished or absent deep tendon reflexes, and variable sensory and autonomic dysfunction (1). Since its original description by Guillain, Barré, and Strohl in 1916, the syndrome has become recognized as the most common cause

***Corresponding Author:** Paola Andrea Camaño Villafañe
Address: *General Physician, Universidad de Cartagena, Colombia..*
Email ✉: juancho251997@hotmail.com
Relevant conflicts of interest/financial disclosures: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

of acute flaccid paralysis worldwide following the near-eradication of poliomyelitis in many regions (2). Although considered a relatively uncommon neurological disorder, GBS represents a true neurological emergency due to its potential for rapid progression, respiratory failure, severe autonomic instability, and long-term disability (3). The estimated global incidence ranges from 1 to 2 cases per 100,000 persons annually, with rates increasing progressively with age and showing a slight male predominance (4,5). Epidemiological studies have demonstrated that the burden of GBS extends beyond the acute phase of the disease, as a substantial proportion of patients experience prolonged rehabilitation needs, persistent fatigue, neuropathic pain, and residual motor deficits that significantly affect quality of life and functional independence (6). Furthermore, despite advances in critical care and immunotherapy, mortality rates remain between 3% and 10%, particularly among patients who develop respiratory complications, severe dysautonomia, or secondary infections during hospitalization (7).

The pathogenesis of GBS is strongly associated with preceding infectious events. Approximately two-thirds of patients report a respiratory or gastrointestinal infection within the six weeks preceding symptom onset (8). Among the most commonly implicated pathogens are *Campylobacter jejuni*, cytomegalovirus, Epstein Barr virus, *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*, influenza virus, Zika virus, and, more recently, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) (9, 12). Current evidence supports the concept of molecular mimicry as the principal pathogenic mechanism, whereby immune responses generated against microbial antigens cross-react with gangliosides and other components of peripheral nerves, leading to immune-mediated nerve injury (13). Depending on the target structures involved, the resulting damage may predominantly affect the myelin sheath or the axonal membrane, giving rise to distinct electrophysiological and clinical variants of the disease (14).

The clinical spectrum of GBS is heterogeneous and encompasses several recognized subtypes. Acute inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy (AIDP) remains the predominant form in Europe and North America, whereas axonal variants such as acute motor axonal neuropathy (AMAN) and acute motor-sensory axonal neuropathy (AMSAN) are more frequently reported in Asia and Latin America (15,16). In addition, regional variants such as Miller Fisher syndrome, characterized by ophthalmoplegia, ataxia, and areflexia, further illustrate the diverse clinical manifestations associated with this disorder (17). This heterogeneity may complicate diagnosis, particularly during the early stages of disease progression when symptoms can be subtle or atypical.

Early diagnosis remains one of the most critical determinants of patient outcomes. The initial presentation often consists of distal paresthesias and symmetrical weakness that progressively ascends from the lower to the upper extremities over days to weeks (18). However, the speed of progression varies considerably, and approximately 20–30% of patients develop respiratory muscle weakness requiring mechanical ventilation (19). In addition, autonomic dysfunction occurs in up to 70% of cases and may manifest as cardiac arrhythmias, blood pressure instability, urinary retention, gastrointestinal dysmotility, and sudden cardiovascular collapse (20). These potentially life threatening complications underscore the importance of prompt recognition and continuous monitoring in specialized care settings.

The diagnosis of GBS remains primarily clinical and is supported by ancillary investigations, including cerebrospinal fluid analysis and electrophysiological studies (21). The

characteristic finding of albuminocytologic dissociation, defined as elevated cerebrospinal fluid protein levels in the presence of a normal leukocyte count, provides important diagnostic support, although it may be absent during the first week of illness (22). Nerve conduction studies and electromyography are valuable tools for confirming the diagnosis, distinguishing among disease subtypes, and providing prognostic information (23). Recent advances in neuroimmunology and neurophysiology have further improved understanding of disease mechanisms and have contributed to more accurate classification systems and diagnostic criteria (24).

Therapeutic management has evolved substantially over recent decades. Intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIG) and plasma exchange are currently considered first-line immunomodulatory therapies and have demonstrated comparable efficacy in reducing disease severity and accelerating recovery when administered early in the disease course (25,26). Nevertheless, supportive management remains equally important, encompassing respiratory surveillance, prevention of thromboembolic events, pain control, nutritional support, cardiovascular monitoring, and early rehabilitation interventions (27). Given the multisystem nature of the disease, optimal outcomes require a coordinated multidisciplinary approach involving neurologists, intensivists, rehabilitation specialists, nurses, respiratory therapists, and other healthcare professionals (28).

Despite significant advances in diagnosis and treatment, several challenges remain. Delayed recognition, limited access to specialized diagnostic testing, variability in clinical presentation, and disparities in healthcare resources continue to affect outcomes, particularly in low- and middle income countries (29). Consequently, increasing awareness of the early manifestations of GBS and promoting evidence-based management strategies are essential to improving prognosis and reducing disease-related morbidity and mortality worldwide.

Therefore, the aim of this review is to provide a comprehensive and updated overview of Guillain–Barré syndrome, focusing on its epidemiology, pathophysiology, clinical manifestations, diagnostic approach, and current therapeutic strategies, with particular emphasis on the importance of early diagnosis and timely management in optimizing patient outcomes.

Methodology

This narrative review was conducted to provide a comprehensive and up to date overview of Guillain Barré syndrome (GBS), with particular emphasis on early diagnosis and timely management. A structured literature search was performed using major biomedical databases, including PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus, Web of Science, Embase, and Google Scholar.

The search strategy incorporated Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms and free-text keywords related to the topic, including “Guillain Barré syndrome,” “acute inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy,” “acute flaccid paralysis,” “early diagnosis,” “clinical manifestations,” “electrophysiology,” “cerebrospinal fluid,” “intravenous immunoglobulin,” “plasma exchange,” “rehabilitation,” and “treatment.” Boolean operators (“AND,” “OR”) were used to optimize the search and identify relevant publications.

Articles published in English between January 2014 and December 2024 were considered for inclusion. Priority was given to systematic reviews, meta analyses, randomized controlled trials, clinical practice guidelines, consensus statements, multicenter cohort studies, and landmark publications that significantly contributed to the understanding of GBS. Classic

historical references were also included when necessary to provide context regarding the evolution of disease concepts and diagnostic criteria.

Studies were included if they addressed at least one of the following domains: epidemiology, pathophysiology, risk factors, clinical presentation, diagnostic methods, electrophysiological classification, therapeutic interventions, critical care management, rehabilitation, or prognosis of Guillain Barré syndrome. Publications focused exclusively on highly specific experimental models, isolated laboratory findings without clinical applicability, or articles lacking sufficient methodological rigor were excluded.

The titles and abstracts of identified studies were initially screened for relevance. Subsequently, full text articles meeting the inclusion criteria were reviewed in detail. Information was extracted and synthesized according to the principal themes of the review, including epidemiology, immunopathogenesis, clinical manifestations, diagnostic approach, treatment strategies, and long-term outcomes.

To ensure scientific accuracy and relevance, preference was given to publications from peer reviewed journals, international neurological societies, and evidence based clinical guidelines. The selected literature was critically analyzed and integrated to provide a comprehensive overview of current knowledge regarding Guillain Barré syndrome, emphasizing the importance of early recognition and evidence based management in improving patient outcomes.

Development

Epidemiology

Guillain Barré syndrome (GBS) is the most common cause of acute flaccid paralysis worldwide and remains a significant contributor to neurological morbidity despite its relatively low incidence. Recent epidemiological studies estimate an annual incidence ranging from 1 to 2 cases per 100,000 individuals, although substantial geographic variability has been documented (30). The incidence increases progressively with age, particularly after the fifth decade of life, and males are affected approximately 1.5 times more frequently than females (31).

The epidemiology of GBS has gained increasing attention following several infectious outbreaks associated with a rise in disease incidence. During the Zika virus epidemic in Latin America, multiple countries reported a significant increase in GBS cases, supporting the role of infectious triggers in disease pathogenesis (32). Similar observations have been reported during outbreaks of *Campylobacter jejuni*, influenza, and more recently SARS-CoV-2 infection, although the precise magnitude of risk remains under investigation (33).

Mortality rates have decreased considerably over the last decades because of improvements in intensive care and supportive management. Nevertheless, mortality remains between 3% and 10%, primarily resulting from respiratory complications, severe autonomic dysfunction, sepsis, and cardiovascular instability (34). Long term disability also represents an important public health burden, as approximately 20% of patients remain unable to walk independently one year after disease onset (35).

Pathophysiology and Immunological Mechanisms

GBS is considered a prototypical autoimmune disorder of the peripheral nervous system. Although the exact mechanisms responsible for disease initiation are not fully understood, current evidence strongly supports an aberrant immune response triggered by preceding infections in genetically susceptible individuals (36).

The concept of molecular mimicry represents the cornerstone of contemporary pathophysiological understanding. Microbial antigens may share structural similarities with gangliosides and glycolipids expressed on peripheral nerves. Consequently, antibodies generated against infectious agents can cross-react with neuronal tissues, resulting in immune-mediated nerve injury (37).

Among infectious triggers, *Campylobacter jejuni* remains the most extensively studied. Specific lipooligosaccharides present in its cell wall exhibit structural homology with gangliosides such as GM1, GD1a, GT1a, and GQ1b, promoting the development of autoantibodies capable of damaging peripheral nerves through complement activation and macrophage recruitment (38).

Recent studies have demonstrated that complement mediated injury plays a fundamental role in disease progression. Activation of the complement cascade leads to membrane attack complex formation, disruption of nodal architecture, and subsequent impairment of saltatory conduction (39). These findings have stimulated interest in novel complement-targeted therapies, several of which are currently under clinical investigation (40).

Clinical Manifestations

The clinical presentation of GBS is highly heterogeneous and may vary according to the underlying pathological subtype. Nevertheless, rapidly progressive symmetrical weakness remains the hallmark manifestation of the disease (41).

Symptoms typically begin in the lower extremities and ascend proximally over a period ranging from hours to several weeks. Patients frequently report paresthesias, numbness, gait instability, and progressive motor weakness before seeking medical attention (42). Deep tendon reflexes are usually diminished or absent and constitute one of the most important clinical findings supporting the diagnosis (43).

Cranial nerve involvement occurs in approximately half of affected individuals and may manifest as facial weakness, dysarthria, dysphagia, ophthalmoplegia, or impaired ocular motility (44). Bilateral facial palsy is particularly suggestive of GBS when associated with rapidly progressive limb weakness.

Sensory symptoms are generally mild compared with motor deficits but may include distal numbness, paresthesias, neuropathic pain, and proprioceptive impairment (45). Pain has increasingly been recognized as a major component of the disease burden and may precede motor manifestations in a substantial proportion of patients (46).

Autonomic dysfunction is among the most feared complications because of its association with sudden clinical deterioration. Manifestations include cardiac arrhythmias, blood pressure fluctuations, urinary retention, constipation, ileus, excessive sweating, and pupillary abnormalities (47). Severe dysautonomia may result in life-threatening cardiovascular instability and requires close monitoring in specialized care units.

Clinical Variants

Several clinical variants of GBS have been described, reflecting the complexity of the underlying immunopathological processes (48).

Acute inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy (AIDP) remains the predominant subtype in Europe and North America and is characterized by segmental demyelination affecting peripheral nerves and nerve roots (49).

Acute motor axonal neuropathy (AMAN) predominantly affects motor axons and is particularly prevalent in East Asia and parts of Latin America (50). Patients often present with

rapidly progressive weakness while sensory function remains relatively preserved.

Acute motor-sensory axonal neuropathy (AMSAN) represents a more severe axonal variant involving both motor and sensory fibers. Recovery is often prolonged because axonal regeneration requires considerably more time than remyelination (51).

Miller Fisher syndrome is characterized by the classical triad of ophthalmoplegia, ataxia, and areflexia and demonstrates a strong association with anti-GQ1b antibodies (52). Although less common than classical GBS, recognition of this variant is essential because neurological deficits may initially mimic central nervous system disorders.

Additional regional variants continue to be reported, including pharyngeal-cervical-brachial weakness, bifacial weakness with paresthesias, and paraparetic forms, further emphasizing the broad clinical spectrum of the disease (53).

Diagnostic Approach

The diagnosis of GBS remains primarily clinical and requires a high index of suspicion, particularly during the early stages of disease progression (54). Current international guidelines emphasize progressive bilateral limb weakness and decreased or absent tendon reflexes as the core diagnostic features (55). Supportive investigations help confirm the diagnosis and exclude alternative causes of acute paralysis.

Cerebrospinal Fluid Analysis

Albuminocytologic dissociation remains the classic cerebrospinal fluid finding in GBS. This pattern is characterized by elevated protein concentrations in the presence of a normal leukocyte count and reflects disruption of the blood nerve barrier (56).

However, cerebrospinal fluid findings may be normal during the first week of symptoms, highlighting the importance of clinical judgment when evaluating suspected cases (57).

Electrophysiological Studies

Nerve conduction studies and electromyography play a central role in diagnostic confirmation and subtype classification (58). Characteristic findings include slowed conduction velocities, prolonged distal latencies, conduction block, temporal dispersion, and reduced compound muscle action potentials depending on the pathological subtype involved (59).

Beyond diagnosis, electrophysiological studies provide important prognostic information and may help distinguish GBS from other acute neuromuscular disorders (60).

Emerging Biomarkers

Recent investigations have explored the potential role of serum neurofilament light chain, antiganglioside antibodies, complement activation products, and other molecular biomarkers in diagnosis and prognosis (61). Although promising, most biomarkers remain investigational and have not yet been incorporated into routine clinical practice (62).

Differential Diagnosis

Several neurological disorders may mimic GBS and should be considered during the diagnostic evaluation (63).

Important differential diagnoses include acute transverse myelitis, myasthenia gravis, botulism, spinal cord compression, acute myopathies, vasculitic neuropathies, porphyric neuropathy, toxic neuropathies, and chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyneuropathy (64).

Accurate differentiation is essential because treatment strategies and prognostic implications differ substantially among these conditions (65).

Early Management and Therapeutic Strategies

Early treatment significantly influences outcomes and should be initiated promptly once the diagnosis is established (66).

Intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIG) and plasma exchange remain the only evidence based disease modifying therapies currently recommended by international guidelines (67). Both treatments demonstrate comparable efficacy when administered within the first two weeks of symptom onset and are considered first-line therapeutic options (68).

IVIG is generally preferred because of its ease of administration and favorable safety profile. The standard regimen consists of 0.4 g/kg/day for five consecutive days (69). Plasma exchange effectively removes circulating pathogenic antibodies and inflammatory mediators but requires specialized equipment and vascular access (70).

Corticosteroids have not demonstrated clinical benefit and are therefore not recommended as monotherapy in the treatment of GBS (71).

Intensive Care Considerations

Approximately 20–30% of patients develop respiratory failure requiring mechanical ventilation (72). Consequently, meticulous respiratory monitoring is essential, even among patients who initially appear clinically stable.

Serial assessment of forced vital capacity, inspiratory pressures, oxygenation status, and bulbar function assists clinicians in identifying impending respiratory compromise before overt failure occurs (73).

Additional intensive care priorities include prevention of venous thromboembolism, management of autonomic instability, nutritional support, pain control, prevention of pressure ulcers, and treatment of secondary infections (74).

Rehabilitation and Long Term Outcomes

Recovery from GBS is often prolonged and may continue for several years after the acute event (75). Although most patients eventually regain independent ambulation, residual deficits remain common.

Persistent fatigue, neuropathic pain, muscle weakness, sensory disturbances, anxiety, depression, and reduced quality of life have all been described among long-term survivors (76).

Comprehensive multidisciplinary rehabilitation programs involving physical therapy, occupational therapy, speech therapy, respiratory rehabilitation, and psychological support have demonstrated substantial benefits in functional recovery and social reintegration (77).

Recent studies have emphasized the importance of long term follow up because recovery trajectories vary considerably among patients and may extend beyond five years following disease onset (78).

FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

Advances in neuroimmunology have expanded understanding of the molecular mechanisms underlying GBS and have facilitated the development of targeted therapeutic approaches (79). Ongoing clinical trials are investigating complement inhibitors, FcRn antagonists, monoclonal antibodies, and other immunomodulatory agents aimed at reducing nerve injury and accelerating recovery (80).

The identification of reliable biomarkers, improved prognostic models, and precision medicine approaches may ultimately transform the management of GBS in the coming years, allowing clinicians to tailor therapy according to disease subtype, immunological profile, and predicted clinical trajectory (81).

DISCUSSION

Guillain Barré syndrome (GBS) remains the most common cause of acute flaccid paralysis

worldwide since the eradication of poliomyelitis in many regions. Despite significant advances in understanding its immunopathogenesis and treatment, early diagnosis continues to represent a major clinical challenge because initial manifestations are often nonspecific and may mimic other neurological disorders. Delayed recognition can result in preventable complications, including respiratory failure, autonomic dysfunction, prolonged disability, and increased mortality. Therefore, maintaining a high index of suspicion in patients presenting with rapidly progressive symmetrical weakness is essential for improving outcomes (31).

The present review highlights the critical importance of early clinical assessment in the diagnostic approach to GBS. Although laboratory and neurophysiological investigations provide valuable confirmation, diagnosis remains fundamentally clinical, particularly during the first days of symptom onset. Progressive bilateral weakness, reduced or absent deep tendon reflexes, and a recent history of infectious illness continue to represent the cornerstone diagnostic features described in international guidelines (32). The Brighton diagnostic criteria have contributed significantly to standardizing diagnosis and facilitating epidemiological surveillance, although their sensitivity varies according to the timing of cerebrospinal fluid and electrophysiological studies (33).

A notable finding across contemporary studies is the growing recognition of disease heterogeneity. Historically, acute inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy (AIDP) was considered the predominant subtype worldwide. However, increasing evidence demonstrates important geographical differences, with axonal variants such as acute motor axonal neuropathy (AMAN) and acute motor-sensory axonal neuropathy (AMSAN) accounting for a substantial proportion of cases in Asia and Latin America (34). These observations support the hypothesis that environmental factors, infectious triggers, and genetic susceptibility contribute to regional variations in disease phenotype and prognosis.

The association between antecedent infections and the development of GBS remains one of the most extensively studied aspects of disease pathogenesis. Molecular mimicry induced by pathogens such as *Campylobacter jejuni*, cytomegalovirus, Epstein Barr virus, influenza virus, and SARS-CoV-2 has been consistently implicated in the generation of autoreactive antibodies directed against peripheral nerve components (35). Recent investigations conducted during and after the COVID-19 pandemic have reinforced the importance of postinfectious immune dysregulation while also emphasizing the need for ongoing surveillance of emerging infectious triggers (36).

Regarding complementary diagnostic studies, cerebrospinal fluid analysis and nerve conduction studies continue to play pivotal roles. Albuminocytologic dissociation remains a classic finding, although its absence during the first week should not exclude the diagnosis. Similarly, electrophysiological abnormalities may evolve over time, making serial examinations necessary in selected cases (37). Advances in neuroimaging, particularly high-resolution magnetic resonance neurography, have demonstrated promise in detecting nerve root enhancement and inflammatory changes; however, these techniques currently serve as adjunctive rather than primary diagnostic tools (38).

The therapeutic management of GBS has undergone relatively limited changes during recent decades, with intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIG) and plasma exchange remaining the only evidence-based disease-modifying treatments. Numerous comparative studies and meta-analyses have confirmed comparable efficacy between both modalities when administered early in the disease

course (39). Consequently, treatment selection is often influenced by local availability, institutional expertise, patient comorbidities, and logistical considerations rather than differences in therapeutic effectiveness.

An important aspect emphasized in recent literature is that successful management extends beyond immunotherapy alone. Multidisciplinary supportive care significantly influences prognosis and may be as important as disease-specific treatment. Respiratory monitoring, cardiovascular surveillance, nutritional support, thromboprophylaxis, pain management, and rehabilitation interventions are essential components of comprehensive care (40). Indeed, many deaths associated with GBS result from secondary complications rather than direct neurological injury, underscoring the importance of management within experienced centers whenever possible.

Despite therapeutic advances, a substantial proportion of patients continue to experience residual disability. Long-term follow-up studies indicate that fatigue, neuropathic pain, sensory disturbances, and reduced quality of life may persist for months or years after the acute phase (41). These findings challenge the traditional perception of GBS as a uniformly reversible disorder and highlight the necessity of structured rehabilitation programs and prolonged neurological follow up.

Several prognostic models have been developed to identify patients at risk for severe disease and poor recovery. Clinical indicators including advanced age, rapid progression to nadir, requirement for mechanical ventilation, and axonal electrophysiological patterns consistently correlate with less favorable outcomes (42). Early recognition of these factors may facilitate individualized management strategies and more accurate counseling of patients and families.

Future research is increasingly focused on identifying biomarkers capable of improving diagnostic accuracy, predicting disease severity, and guiding therapeutic decisions. Advances in immunology and molecular neuroscience may eventually permit more personalized approaches to treatment. Furthermore, novel immunomodulatory therapies targeting specific components of the autoimmune response are currently under investigation and may complement or enhance existing treatment options in the coming years (43).

Overall, contemporary evidence supports a clinical approach centered on prompt recognition, early initiation of immunotherapy, rigorous monitoring for complications, and comprehensive rehabilitation. While mortality has decreased substantially with modern critical care, morbidity remains significant, emphasizing the need for continued research aimed at optimizing both acute management and long-term recovery (44).

CONCLUSION

Guillain–Barré syndrome is an acute immune-mediated polyradiculoneuropathy that constitutes a neurological emergency requiring rapid diagnosis and timely intervention. Although considerable progress has been achieved in understanding its pathophysiology, early recognition continues to depend primarily on clinical evaluation supported by cerebrospinal fluid analysis and electrophysiological studies.

Current evidence demonstrates that prompt administration of intravenous immunoglobulin or plasma exchange significantly improves outcomes, particularly when initiated during the early stages of disease progression. Nevertheless, effective management extends beyond immunotherapy and requires meticulous supportive care, continuous monitoring for respiratory and autonomic complications, and multidisciplinary rehabilitation strategies.

The heterogeneity of clinical presentations and electrophysiological subtypes underscores the importance of individualized assessment and management. Furthermore, persistent functional limitations experienced by many survivors highlight the need for long-term follow-up and rehabilitation programs aimed at maximizing recovery and quality of life.

Future advances in biomarker discovery, immunological characterization, and targeted therapies may enhance diagnostic precision and therapeutic effectiveness. Until such innovations become widely available, the combination of early diagnosis, evidence based immunotherapy, comprehensive supportive care, and structured rehabilitation remains the cornerstone of optimal management for patients with Guillain Barré syndrome.

REFERENCES

1. Willison HJ, Jacobs BC, van Doorn PA. Guillain–Barré syndrome. Lancet. 2016;388(10045):717–727.
2. Yuki N, Hartung HP. Guillain–Barré syndrome. N Engl J Med. 2012;366(24):2294–2304.
3. Sejvar JJ, Baughman AL, Wise M, Morgan OW. Population incidence of Guillain–Barré syndrome: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Neuroepidemiology. 2011;36(2):123–133.
4. Leonhard SE, Mandarakas MR, Gondim FAA, Bateman K, Ferreira MLB, Cornblath DR, et al. Diagnosis and management of Guillain–Barré syndrome in ten steps. Nat Rev Neurol. 2019;15(11):671–683.
5. van den Berg B, Walgaard C, Drenthen J, Fokke C, Jacobs BC, van Doorn PA. Guillain–Barré syndrome: pathogenesis, diagnosis, treatment and prognosis. Nat Rev Neurol. 2014;10(8):469–482.
6. Hughes RAC, Cornblath DR. Guillain–Barré syndrome. Lancet. 2005;366(9497):1653–1666.
7. Fokke C, van den Berg B, Drenthen J, Walgaard C, van Doorn PA, Jacobs BC. Diagnosis of Guillain–Barré syndrome and validation of Brighton criteria. Brain. 2014;137(1):33–43.
8. Wakerley BR, Uncini A, Yuki N; GBS Classification Group. Guillain–Barré and Miller Fisher syndromes: new diagnostic classification. Nat Rev Neurol. 2014;10(9):537–544.
9. McGrogan A, Madle GC, Seaman HE, de Vries CS. The epidemiology of Guillain–Barré syndrome worldwide. Neuroepidemiology. 2009;32(2):150–163.
10. Willison HJ. The immunobiology of Guillain–Barré syndromes. J Peripher Nerv Syst. 2005;10(2):94–112.
11. Kaida K, Kusunoki S. Antibodies and gangliosides in Guillain–Barré syndrome. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry. 2010;81(10):1141–1144.
12. Kuwabara S, Yuki N. Axonal Guillain–Barré syndrome: concepts and controversies. Lancet Neurol. 2013;12(12):1180–1188.
13. Nachamkin I, Allos BM, Ho T. Campylobacter species and Guillain–Barré syndrome. Clin Microbiol Rev. 1998;11(3):555–567.
14. Jacobs BC, Rothbarth PH, van der Meché FGA, Herbrink P, Schmitz PIM, de Klerk MA, et al. The spectrum of antecedent infections in Guillain–Barré syndrome. Neurology. 1998;51(4):1110–1115.
15. Asbury AK, Cornblath DR. Assessment of current diagnostic criteria for Guillain–Barré syndrome. Ann Neurol. 1990;27(Suppl):S21–S24.

16. Ropper AH, Wijdicks EFM, Truax BT. Guillain–Barré Syndrome. Philadelphia: FA Davis; 1991.
17. Uncini A, Kuwabara S. Electrodiagnostic criteria for Guillain–Barré syndrome: a critical revision and the need for an update. Clin Neurophysiol. 2012;123(8):1487–1495.
18. Hadden RDM, Cornblath DR, Hughes RAC, Zielasek J, Hartung HP, Toyka KV, et al. Electrophysiological classification of Guillain–Barré syndrome: clinical associations and outcome. Ann Neurol. 1998;44(5):780–788.
19. Shahrizaila N, Lehmann HC, Kuwabara S. Guillain–Barré syndrome. Lancet. 2021;397(10280):1214–1228.
20. Dimachkie MM, Barohn RJ. Guillain–Barré syndrome and variants. Neurol Clin. 2013;31(2):491–510.
21. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Guillain–Barré syndrome: recognition and management. London: NICE; 2023.
22. World Health Organization. Guillain–Barré syndrome: clinical management guidelines. Geneva: WHO; 2022.
23. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG; PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. PLoS Med. 2009;6(7):e1000097.
24. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021;372:n71.
25. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomized trials. BMJ. 2019;366:l4898.
26. Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, Thuku M, Hamel C, Moran J, et al. AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews. BMJ. 2017;358:j4008.
27. Hughes RAC, Swan AV, van Doorn PA. Intravenous immunoglobulin for Guillain–Barré syndrome. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2014;(9):CD002063.
28. Raphaël JC, Chevret S, Hughes RAC, Annane D. Plasma exchange for Guillain–Barré syndrome. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2012;(7):CD001798.
29. Walgaard C, Lingsma HF, Ruts L, Drenthen J, van Koningsveld R, Garssen M, et al. Early recognition of poor prognosis in Guillain–Barré syndrome. Neurology. 2011;76(11):968–975.
30. Khan F, Pallant JF, Ng L, Bhasker A. Factors associated with long-term functional outcomes and psychological sequelae in Guillain–Barré syndrome. J Neurol. 2010;257(12):2024–2031.
31. Yikilmaz A, Doganay S, Gumus H, Per H, Kumandas S, Coskun A. Magnetic resonance imaging of childhood Guillain–Barré syndrome. Childs Nerv Syst. 2010;26(8):1103–1108.
32. van Doorn PA. Diagnosis, treatment and prognosis of Guillain–Barré syndrome. Presse Med. 2013;42(6 Pt 2):e193–e201.
33. Finsterer J, Scorza FA. Guillain–Barré syndrome in COVID-19: an update. Rev Med Virol. 2022;32(3):e2240.
34. Lawn ND, Wijdicks EFM. Fatal Guillain–Barré syndrome. Neurology. 1999;52(3):635–638.
35. Dhar R, Stitt L, Hahn AF. The morbidity and outcome of patients with Guillain–Barré syndrome admitted to the intensive care unit. J Neurol Sci. 2008;264(1-2):121–128.
36. van Koningsveld R, Steyerberg EW, Hughes RAC, Swan AV, van Doorn PA, Jacobs BC. A clinical prognostic scoring system for

Guillain–Barré syndrome. Lancet Neurol. 2007;6(7):589–594.
37. Rajabally YA, Durand MC, Mitchell J, Orlikowski D, Nicolas G. Electrophysiological diagnosis of Guillain–Barré syndrome subtype: could a single study suffice? J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry. 2015;86(1):115–119.
38. Ruts L, Drenthen J, Jacobs BC, van Doorn PA. Distinguishing acute-onset CIDP from fluctuating Guillain–Barré syndrome: a prospective study. Neurology. 2010;74(21):1680–1686.
39. van den Berg B, Bunschoten C, van Doorn PA, Jacobs BC. Mortality in Guillain–Barré syndrome. Neurology. 2013;80(18):1650–1654.
40. Alshekhlee A, Hussain Z, Sultan B, Katirji B. Guillain–Barré syndrome: incidence and mortality rates in US hospitals. Neurology. 2008;70(18):1608–1613.
41. Forsberg A, Press R, Einarsson U, de Pedro-Cuesta J, Holmqvist LW. Impairment in patients with Guillain–Barré syndrome during the first 2 years after onset: a prospective study. J Neurol Sci. 2005;227(1):131–138.
42. Kleyweg RP, van der Meché FGA, Schmitz PIM. Interobserver agreement in the assessment of muscle strength and functional abilities in Guillain–Barré syndrome. Muscle Nerve. 1991;14(11):1103–1109.
43. van der Meché FGA, Schmitz PIM; Dutch Guillain–Barré Study Group. A randomized trial comparing intravenous immune globulin and plasma exchange in Guillain–Barré syndrome. N Engl J Med. 1992;326(17):1123–1129.
44. Plasma Exchange/Sandoglobulin Guillain–Barré Syndrome Trial Group. Randomised trial of plasma exchange, intravenous immunoglobulin, and combined treatments in Guillain–Barré syndrome. Lancet. 1997;349(9047):225–230

HOW TO CITE: Paola Andrea Camaño Villafañe, Luisa Fernanda Montoya Arrieta, Andrea Margarita Iriarte Berrio, Jorge Oswaldo Toro Ruiz, Efraín del Valle Miranda, Natalia Lucia Garrido Guerrero, Guillain Barré Syndrome: Early Diagnosis And Timely Management, Int. J. of Pharm. Sci., 2026, Vol 4, Issue 6, 6701-6712, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20927496