scientific reports

OPEN



Emerging role of free triiodothyronine in patients with anti-N-methyl-D-aspartate receptor encephalitis

Tuo Ji^{1,2}, Zhi Huang^{1,2}, Yajun Lian^{1⊠}, Chengze Wang¹ & Qiaoman Zhang¹

We aimed to investigate the role of free triiodothyronine (FT3) in patients with anti-N-methyl-D-aspartate receptor (anti-NMDAR) encephalitis. 137 consecutive inpatients (2016–2019) were registered prospectively and followed up for 12 months. 96 eligible patients were included in the study. The modified Rankin scale (mRS) score was collected, and the score of 3-6 was defined as a poor outcome. The patients were equally classified into 3 subgroups based on their FT3 levels obtained within 24 h of admission, and the subgroup differences were analyzed by parametric or nonparametric tests as appropriate. Logistic regression analysis was performed. We found that there was no difference in the mRS scores upon admission among 3 subgroups, however, patients in the low-FT3 subgroup tended to have higher disease severity during hospitalization and worse outcome in follow-up visits, represented by higher chances of intense care unit (ICU) admission (P < 0.001), longer hospital stay (P < 0.001), greater maximum mRS scores during hospitalization (P = 0.011), lower rates of getting clinical improvement within 4 weeks of starting treatment (P = 0.006), and higher percentages of poor 1-year outcome (P = 0.002). The level of FT3 was an independent factor correlated with ICU admission (P = 0.002) and might be a potential predictor for 1-year outcome. Our preliminary results suggest that the FT3 may be a risk factor involved in the evolution and progression of anti-NMDAR encephalitis, whereas the underline mechanisms remain to be explored. Attention should be paid to these patients with relatively low FT3 upon admission, which might possibly aid clinical prediction and guide clinical decision-making.

Anti-N-methyl-D-aspartate receptor (anti-NMDAR) encephalitis is a newly identified autoimmune encephalitis associated with antibodies against functional NMDA receptors that predominantly affects young females and exhibits a well-defined set of clinical features¹. To tackle the challenges of early diagnosis and risk stratification, several clinical prognostic factors have been developed. Altered consciousness, intensive care unit (ICU) admission and no use of immunotherapy seem to be variables associated with poor outcome in anti-NMDAR encephalitis, whereas other factors, including age, gender, abnormalities of cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) and changes of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), remain controversial^{2,3}. The "anti-NMDAR Encephalitis One-Year Functional Status (NEOS) score", proposed by Balu and his colleagues, contained 5 variables such as ICU admission, treatment delay > 4 weeks, lack of clinical improvement within 4 weeks of starting treatment, abnormal MRI, and CSF white blood cell (WBC) count > 20 cells/ μ L. Each of them was assigned 1 point to create the NEOS score, which was strongly associated with the probability of poor functional status at 1 year⁴. It seemed to be a reliable tool to predict the 1-year outcome and was recently validated by another team in Chinese population⁵. However, some of the variables may not be obtained until 4 weeks of starting treatment, which in some extent limit its use in the early stage of the disease. There is urgent need for novel prognostic biomarkers, especially those that can be obtained early, which could help estimate the velocity of clinical progression in advance.

Abnormal serum levels of thyroid hormones have been reported in patients with a variety of non-thyroidal illnesses. The free triiodothyronine (FT3), an indicator of thyroid function, has been proven to be associated with a worse cardiovascular risk factor profile and could lead to progression of atherosclerosis⁶. Besides that, emerging evidence suggests that the FT3 may also serve as a prognostic factor in several critical diseases (e.g., sepsis, respiratory failure, and stroke) and some autoimmune diseases (e.g., systemic lupus erythematosus and neuromyelitis

¹Department of Neurology, Zhengzhou University First Affiliated Hospital, Zhengzhou city 450052, Henan Province, China. ²These authors contributed equally: Tuo Ji and Zhi Huang. [⊠]email: lianyajun369@yeah.net



Figure 1. Cohort selection process of the study population. Of 137 admissions for anti-NMDAR encephalitis reviewed, 12 patients were excluded because their IgG anti-GluN1 antibodies were only positive in serum but negative in CSF, which couldn't meet the diagnostic criteria of definite anti-NMDAR encephalitis. Another 29 patients were excluded for the lack of results of thyroid hormones within 24 h of admission. Ultimately, a total of 96 patients were included in this study. Based on the levels of serum FT3, the patients were equally divided into three subgroups, i.e. the low-FT3, middle-FT3 and high-FT3 subgroup.

.....

optica spectrum disorders)⁷⁻¹². In clinical practice of treating anti-NMDAR encephalitis, we noticed that several patients with relatively low FT3 upon admission deteriorated fast and achieved an unfavorable outcome eventually. Whether this is an accidental event or there are some underline correlations is of interest to investigate. To date, there are only a few data on this issue^{13,14}, and the evidence gathered to date is inconclusive. Herein, we aimed to investigate the role of the FT3 in patients with anti-NMDAR encephalitis, from the perspectives of clinical picture during hospitalization and outcome in 1-year follow-up visits.

Results

Descriptive characteristics of the study population. In total, 137 consecutive patients were screened, and 96 patients met the inclusion criteria (median 30 [21–40.5] years; 44.79% females). Figure 1 summarizes the cohort selection process, and the baseline clinical features of the study population is shown in Table 1. The most common main symptoms included psychiatric behaviors (79.17%), seizures (65.63%) and cognitive dys-function (58.33%). More than half of the patients had abnormal MRI (57.29%) and pneumonia (56.25%), but only a few of them (5.21%) were detected with tumors, including 2 pulmonary cancers and 3 immature ovarian teratomas. A quarter of the patients had thyroid dysfunction, including 11 patients with subclinical hyperthyroidism (1.04%), 2 patients with subclinical hyperthyroidism (2.08%), 6 patients with low T3 syndrome (6.25%), 4 patients with other conditions (4.17%). A majority of the patients (94.79%) received first-line immunotherapies, but only a minority of them (12.5%) were treated with second-line immunotherapies additionally. All patients (6.25%) died within 12 months due to serious complications, including 3 patients with severe infections and 3 patients with intractable status epileptics.

Comparisons of clinical features among subgroups. Based on the serum FT3 levels, the patients were equally divided into 3 subgroups, including the low-FT3 subgroup (FT3 value <4.13 pmol/L), the middle-FT3 subgroup (FT3 value <4.13 pmol/L) (Fig. 1). In view of clinical data obtained within 24 h of admission (Table 1), there were no differences in gender, clinical symptoms, the modified Rankin scale (mRS) score, ICU admission, FT4 levels, FT3-test delay and thyroid antibodies among subgroups. However, compared with those in the high-FT3 subgroup, patients in the low-FT3 subgroup had an older age at onset (34 [23.5–48.5] vs. 26 [17–33] years old, P=0.003) and lower TSH levels (0.76 [0.49–1.18] vs. 1.48 [0.71–2.13] μ IU/ml, P=0.001). Besides, their underline infectious or stress status tended to be more common, indicated by higher levels of serum WBC (9.15 [7.45–12.8] vs. 6.99 [6.2–8.9] × 10⁹/L, P=0.049) and c-reactive protein (CRP) (6.87 [2.21–11.11] vs. 1 [0.17–2.2] mg/L, P<0.001). The difference remained significant between the low-FT3 subgroup and the middle-FT3 subgroup for levels of CRP (6.87 [2.21–11.11] vs. 1.69 [0.74–3.02] mg/L, P=0.025).

In Regard of the clinical data obtained during hospitalization (Table 1), there were no differences in tumor presence, abnormal MRI, CSF tests and immunotherapy among subgroups. However, compared with those in the high-FT3 subgroup, patients in the low-FT3 subgroup seemed to be more likely to deteriorate after admission, indicated by higher rates of consciousness declination (65.63% vs. 28.13%, P=0.01) and central hypoventilation (34.38% vs. 6.25%, P=0.036). Their chance of accompanying pneumonia was also higher (71.88% vs. 34.48%,

www.nature.com/scientificreports/

Note the series of the series		Total	Low-FT3 subgroup	Middle-FT3 subgroup	High-FT3 subgroup	Р
Orac99999999DenomeQuadors<	Data obtained within 24 h of admission					
NambNambNambNambNambNambNambNambReproduction20000	Cases, n	96	32	32	32	
And anomeBole and any and any and any	Females, n (%)	43 (44.79)	18 (56.25)	11 (34.38)	14 (43.75)	0.235
<table-row><math><table-container><table-container><table-container><math><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row><table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></table-row></math></table-container></table-container></table-container></math></table-row>	Age at onset, median (IQR), years	30 (21-40.5)	34 (23.5-48.5)	29.5 (23-39.5)	26 (17-33)	0.004*
DisplaymentBioPyment <td>The mRS score upon admission, mean (SD)</td> <td>2.69 (0.79)</td> <td>2.72 (0.68)</td> <td>2.69 (0.93)</td> <td>2.66 (0.79)</td> <td>0.953</td>	The mRS score upon admission, mean (SD)	2.69 (0.79)	2.72 (0.68)	2.69 (0.93)	2.66 (0.79)	0.953
speperationinterfactinterfactinterfactDeclamplymethy2070204002070200306003600CaphedactGainea, CN20070201030201030600306003CaphedactGainea, CN4003040030100301010301010306003060030Gandea, Specific Gainea6003010030010104060030600	ICU admission, n (%)	16 (16.67)	6 (18.75)	6 (18.75)	4 (12.5)	0.834
Namespace(NAMA)(N	Symptoms within 24 h of admission					
paymetry20%20%20%20%20%20%20%20%Qenavadamento10070 <td>Prodromal symptoms, n (%)</td> <td>61 (63.54)</td> <td>22 (68.75)</td> <td>20 (62.50)</td> <td>19 (59.38)</td> <td>0.804</td>	Prodromal symptoms, n (%)	61 (63.54)	22 (68.75)	20 (62.50)	19 (59.38)	0.804
Spéndemine960000096000009600000960000096000009600000960000096000009600000960000096000000960000009600000000000096000000000000000000000000000000000000	Psychiatric behavior, n (%)	72 (75)	27 (84.38)	23 (71.88)	22 (68.75)	0.329
speed-query10(27)10(27)10(27)10(28)10(28)10(28)Kinan KOKinan KOKinan KO10(3010(3010(3010(3010(30)10(Cognitive dysfunction, n (%)	56 (58.33)	16 (50)	22 (68.75)	18 (56.25)	0.351
SemanySingle (P)Single (P)Single (P)Single (P)Single (P)Single (P)Commandandam (N)Single (P)Single (P)Sing	Speech dysfunction, n (%)	41 (42.71)	12 (37.5)	14 (43.75)	15 (46.88)	0.813
Nonsendention (n)Statum <td>Seizures, n (%)</td> <td>55 (57.29)</td> <td>17 (53.12)</td> <td>18 (56.25)</td> <td>20 (62.5)</td> <td>0.813</td>	Seizures, n (%)	55 (57.29)	17 (53.12)	18 (56.25)	20 (62.5)	0.813
Sequence consignmentSequence cons	Movement disorder, n (%)	35 (36.46)	12 (37.5)	13 (40.63)	10 (31.26)	0.804
Anomelopanetine, spin (a)1904(b)1904(b)1004(b)	Consciousness declination, n (%)	20 (20.83)	9 (28.12)	6 (18.75)	5 (15.62)	0.540
Action1940.001950.001950.001950.001950.001950.00BateKoden1000Koden1000Koden1000Koden20000Koden20000Koden20000Koden2000Koden20000Ko	Autonomic dysfunction, n (%)	33 (34.38)	15 (46.88)	11 (34.38)	7 (21.88)	0.123
methaviewviewviewviewWardmann (DR), ne Mar, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10	Central hypoventilation, n (%)	10 (10.42)	5 (15.62)	3 (9.38)	2 (6.25)	0.369
NR contanging (QB), public ADMSign (QB), QB, QB)Sign (QB), QB)Sign (QB)	Blood tests					
Result20006702111000000000000000000000000000000000Typachan(Diggongli, Carlon)5000000000000000000000000000000000000	WBC count, median (IQR), n×10 ⁹ /L	8.5 (6.6-11.05)	9.15 (7.45-12.8)	8.75 (7.11-10.8)	6.99 (6.2-8.9)	0.047*
IndextormFundame	CRP, median (IQR), mg/L	2.1 (0.98-7.21)	6.87 (2.21-11.11)	1.69 (0.74-3.02)	1 (0.17-2.2)	< 0.001*
Phaselance Phase	Thyroid status					
PresentationInformati	FT3, median (IQR), pmol/L	4.45 (3.88-5.01)	3.66 (3.37-3.88)	4.45 (4.36-4.62)	5.31 (5.01-5.59)	-
Shandan QhanghanNameNam	FT4, median (IQR), pmol/L	11.97 (10.63–13.52)	12.37 (9.89–13.33)	11.78 (10.84–13.21)	12.03 (10.82-14.69)	0.966
Painer POAA, n(%)Point POAA, n(%)Poin	TSH, median (IQR), uIU/ml	1.07 (0.59–1.93)	0.76 (0.49-1.18)	1.14 (0.83-2.06)	1.48 (0.71-2.13)	0.005*
NewTRAN (%)(20.0)(13.0)(14.0)(14.1)	Positive TPOAb. n (%)	10 (10.42)	5 (15.63)	2 (6.25)	3 (9.38)	0.764
Paner Can, MainPaner Can, Mai	Positive TRAb. n (%)	2 (2.08)	1 (3.13)	0	1 (3.13)	0.524
Protect and any end of the state of the s	Positive TGAb, n (%)	13 (13.54)	7 (21.88)	3 (9,38)	3 (9.38)	0.483
DatabaticControl	FT3-test delay, median(IOR), days	17 (12.5-28.5)	17 (13.5–27.5)	17 (11.5-30.5)	17.5 (12.5-28)	0.902
Permonia, n(m)64(62)2(718)8(62)1(48)(1048)00000Timor preserve, n(m)5(31)2(63)2(63)1(31)11Almora (MA)6(30)2(63)2(63)1(548)11Almora (MA)6(70.00)2(63)2(63)2(63)1(63)111CSF lead5(63)1(63)1(63)1(14.30)102111<	Data obtained during hospitalization					
Images ends623162536263612110121Abornal MR1 (%)5(293)162635(263) <t< td=""><td>Pneumonia, n (%)</td><td>54 (56.25)</td><td>23 (71.88)</td><td>20 (62.50)</td><td>11 (34.38)</td><td>0.008*</td></t<>	Pneumonia, n (%)	54 (56.25)	23 (71.88)	20 (62.50)	11 (34.38)	0.008*
Abornal MCN (%)Default (%) <thdefault (%)<="" th="">Default (%)Default (%)Default</thdefault>	Tumor presence, n (%)	5 (5.21)	2 (6.25)	2 (6.25)	1 (3.12)	1
CFR startCFR start	Abnormal MRI, n (%)	55 (57.29)	18 (56.25)	22 (68.75)	15 (46.88)	0.232
G8vm6708.0m6	CSF tests					
CSP MC comb 20 colls/1, m(%)6 (688,016 (852,0)16 (50,0)1 (4.30,0)10.20CSP Windigolonal bands, m(%)2 (22.20,0)6 (8.57,0)1 (4.30,0)5 (5.63,0)0.82New symptom staring5 (9.01,0)2 (9.02,0)2 (9.02,0)2 (9.02,0)2 (9.02,0)0.92Searara, m(%)6 (6.63,0)2 (6.63,0)1 (4.38,0)2 (9.13,0)0.062Conciouses delination, m(%)1 (6.60,0)1 (6.63,0)1 (1.43,0)2 (9.21,0)0.07Contral propertition, m(%)1 (6.61,0)1 (9.01,0)1 (9.01,0)1 (9.01,0)0.07Immotherap, m(%)1 (9.01,0)1 (9.01,0)1 (9.01,0)1 (9.01,0)1 (9.01,0)0.02Second information propertition (%)1 (9.12,0)1 (9.12,0)1 (9.01,0)1 (9.12,0)<	CSF with pleocytosis, n (%)	68 (70.83)	27 (84.38)	20 (62.5)	21 (65.63)	0.135
CF wind lands, n(%)L (2 20)R (37)R (43)R (5)R (32)CF wind lands, n(%)2 (22)(6187)(143)(56)(12)Nevrymom during hopitalization7 (97)2 (85)2 (7)2 (7)0 (9)Sciares, n(%)3 (663)2 (62)0 (2)2 (7)0 (92)0 (92)Consume declination, n(%)4 (427)1 (63)1 (143)0 (23)0 (23)0 (23)Consume declination, n(%)6 (6)1 (6)1 (6)0 (3)0 (23)0 (23)0 (23)Consume declination, n(%)1 (6)1 (6)1 (6)0 (9)<	CSF WBC count > 20 cells/uL, n (%)	45 (46.88)	18 (56.25)	16 (50)	11 (34.38)	0.192
New synthemNew synthe	CSF with oligoclonal bands, n (%)	22 (22.92)	6 (18.75)	11 (34.38)	5 (15.63)	0.182
Privatic Network, n. M.Privatic Netwo	New symptoms during hospitalization					·
Addition Addition Addition Addition Addition Seizures, n(%) 63653 20625 207.88 6.92 Consciounes delination, n(%) 14271 216530 114330 9(28.13) 0.00° Central hypoventilation, n(%) 161667 114380 3(9.30 2(25) 0.07° Immunotherapy, n(%) 6166.7 9(9.37) 11688 9(9.37) 10688 9(9.37) 1 Second-line immunotherapy, n(%) 12(2.5) 3(9.30 4(12.5) 5(15.62) 0.25 Combined immunotherapy, n(%) 12(12.5) 3(9.38) 4(12.5) 5(15.62) 0.25 Immunotherapy n(%) 12(12.5) 3(9.38) 4(12.5) 5(15.62) 0.25 Immunotherapy n(%) 12(12.5) 3(9.30 4(12.5) 5(15.62) 0.25 Immunotherapy n(%) 2(2.5) 8(2.67) 10(3.26) 8(2.67) 8(2.67) 8(2.67) 8(2.67) 8(2.67) 8(2.67) 8(2.67) 8(2.67) 8(2.67) 8(2.67) 8(2.67) 8(2.67)	Psychiatric behavior. n (%)	76 (79.17)	28 (87.5)	24 (75)	24 (75)	0.398
Consciouses declination, n(%) CaleAction	Seizures. n (%)	63 (65.63)	20 (62.5)	20 (62,5)	23 (71.88)	0.692
Central hypowentilation, n(%)IndexIndexIndexIndexIndexCentral hypowentilation, n(%)6667016667016430693006930060700ImmunotherapyFind-ine inmunotherapy, n(%)910479909375196880909375909375909375Second-line inmunotherapy, n(%)121250603304125506155200252Immunotherapy datay endan (QR) days1212508030041253081633008430Immunotherapy datay-set wets6283708067010323086710088710Inmunotherapy datay-set wets6283708075010432086730080710Indiasion, n(%)62437080750144375010312060014Inmunotherapy datay-set wets5147080750161523001312060143Indiasion, n(%)615430161523016133061430061230061710060143Indiasion, n(%)615201012016152301612000131061143Indiasion, nedian (QR)6152016152301612000141611400611400Indiasion, nedian (QR)61670161202024050161523061637061637061633061633061637061637061637061611061041061014In Norther Setter wets616100616100616100616100616100610410610410610410In Setter wets6161006161006161006161006161006104106104	Consciousness declination, n (%)	41 (42.71)	21 (65.63)	11 (34.38)	9 (28.13)	0.006*
Area for the form Ref and the form Ref and the form Ref and the form Immunotherapy Immunotherapy, n(%) 91 (94.79) 30 (93.75) 31 (96.88) 30 (93.75) 12 Second-line immunotherapy, n(%) 12 (12.5) 3 (9.38) 4 (12.5) 5 (15.62) 0.925 Combined immunotherapy, n(%) 12 (12.5) 3 (9.38) 4 (12.5) 5 (15.62) 0.925 Immunotherapy delay, median (IQR), days 18 (13-31) 18 (14-29) 18 (12-32) 18 (13-30) 0.884 Immunotherapy delay, Aeeks, n (%) 2 (68.77) 8 (26.67) 10 (3.26) 8 (26.70) 0.870 0.877 Disease servity	Central hypoventilation, n (%)	16 (16.67)	11 (34.38)	3 (9.38)	2 (6.25)	0.007*
Image: Processing of the set of	Immunotherapy					
Interfact Interfact <thinterfact< th=""> Interfact <thinterfact< th=""> Interfact Interfact</thinterfact<></thinterfact<>	First-line immunotherapy, n (%)	91 (94,79)	30 (93.75)	31 (96.88)	30 (93.75)	1
International problem Internatinternatinternand problem Internatinternational	Second-line immunotherapy, n (%)	12 (12.5)	3 (9.38)	4 (12.5)	5 (15.62)	0.925
International procession International procession <thinternational procession<="" th=""> <thinternati< td=""><td>Combined immunotherapy, n (%)</td><td>12 (12.5)</td><td>3 (9.38)</td><td>4 (12.5)</td><td>5 (15.62)</td><td>0.925</td></thinternati<></thinternational>	Combined immunotherapy, n (%)	12 (12.5)	3 (9.38)	4 (12.5)	5 (15.62)	0.925
Input County County <thcounty< th=""> <thcounty< th=""> <thcoun< td=""><td>Immunotherapy delay, median (IOR), days</td><td>18 (13-31)</td><td>18 (14-29)</td><td>18 (12-32)</td><td>18.5 (13-30)</td><td>0.884</td></thcoun<></thcounty<></thcounty<>	Immunotherapy delay, median (IOR), days	18 (13-31)	18 (14-29)	18 (12-32)	18.5 (13-30)	0.884
Include Include <t< td=""><td>Immunotherapy delay >4 weeks, n (%)</td><td>26 (28.57)</td><td>8 (26.67)</td><td>10 (32,36)</td><td>8 (26.67)</td><td>0.877</td></t<>	Immunotherapy delay >4 weeks, n (%)	26 (28.57)	8 (26.67)	10 (32,36)	8 (26.67)	0.877
Jump Space Space <ths< td=""><td>Disease severity</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></ths<>	Disease severity					
Name Nam Name Name	ICU admission, n (%)	52 (54.17)	28 (87.5)	14 (43.75)	10 (31.25)	< 0.001*
Instrumentation Instrument	Maximum mRS during hospitalization. median (IOR)	4 (3-5)	5 (4-5)	3 (3-5)	3(3-3.5)	0.011*
Data Data <thdata< th=""> Data Data <thd< td=""><td>Hospital stay, median (IOR), days</td><td>19 (13.5-29)</td><td>32 (20-40.5)</td><td>18 (13.5-23)</td><td>16 (13-20)</td><td>< 0.001*</td></thd<></thdata<>	Hospital stay, median (IOR), days	19 (13.5-29)	32 (20-40.5)	18 (13.5-23)	16 (13-20)	< 0.001*
Lack of clinical improvement within 4 weeks of starting treatment, n(%) 28 (30.77) 16 (53.33) 7 (22.58) 5 (16.67) 0.006* The NEOS score, mean (SD) 2.18 (1.17) 2.8 (0.96) 2.16 (1.16) 1.57 (1.07) <0.001*	Data obtained during follow up		,			
The NEOS score, mean (SD) 218 (1.17) 2.8 (0.96) 2.16 (1.16) 1.57 (1.07) <0.001* Poor one-year outcome (mRS 3–6), n %) 23 (23.96) 15 (46.88) 5 (15.62) 3 (9.38) 0.002*	Lack of clinical improvement within 4 weeks of starting treatment. n (%)	28 (30.77)	16 (53.33)	7 (22.58)	5 (16.67)	0.006*
Poor one-vear outcome (mRS 3-6), n (%) 23 (23.96) 15 (46.88) 5 (15.62) 3 (9.38) 0.002*	The NEOS score, mean (SD)	2.18 (1.17)	2.8 (0.96)	2.16 (1.16)	1.57 (1.07)	< 0.001*
	Poor one-year outcome (mRS 3-6), n (%)	23 (23.96)	15 (46.88)	5 (15.62)	3 (9.38)	0.002*

Table 1. Clinical features and subgroup comparisons of the study population. IQR, interquartile range; SD,standard deviation; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; WBC, white blood cell; CRP, c-reactive protein; CSF,cerebrospinal fluid; FT3, free triiodothyronine; FT4, free thyroxine; TSH, thyroid stimulating hormone;TGAb, anti-thyroglobulin antibodies; TPOAb, anti-thyroid peroxidase antibodies; TRAb, anti-thyroid receptorantibodies; ICU, intense care unit; mRS, modified Rankin scale; NEOS, anti-NMDAR Encephalitis One-YearFunctional Status. *P<0.05. #The new symptoms during hospitalization refer to those firstly manifest after 24 h</td>of admission.

	Univariate regression model		Multivariate regression model		
Variable	OR (95% CI)	Р	OR (95% CI)	Р	
FT3, pmol/L	0.256 (0.129-0.508)	< 0.001*	0.291 (0.134-0.634)	0.002*	
Consciousness declination	6.638 (1.795-24.543)	0.005*	7.589 (1.629–35.354)	0.01*	
Psychiatric behavior	3.143 (1.189-8.307)	0.021*	2.191 (0.631-7.614)	0.217	
WBC count, ×10 ⁹ /L	7.185 (1.947–26.511)	0.003*	3.057 (0.647-14.458)	0.159	
TSH, uIU/ml	0.556 (0.353-0.875)	0.011*	0.668 (0.406-1.099)	0.112	

Table 2. Univariate and multivariate logistic regression analysis of predictors obtained within 24 h of admission for ICU admission during hospitalization. In the univariate model, the eligible variables obtained within 24 h of admission and tumor presence were analyzed, and those identified as not predictors of ICU admission during hospitalization (P>0.05) were not shown in this table. In the multivariate regression model, the predictive value of FT3 was adjusted by consciousness declination, psychiatric behavior, WBC count and TSH within 24 h of admission. *Indicates P<0.05. OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; FT3, free triiodothyronine; WBC, white blood cell; ICU, intense care unit; TSH, thyroid stimulating hormone.

P=0.01). As expected, compared with those in the high-FT3 subgroup, patients in the low-FT3 subgroup had higher disease severity during the acute phase, measured by greater maximum mRS scores during hospitalization (5 [4, 5] vs. 3 [3–3.5], P<0.001), higher percentages of ICU admission (87.5% vs. 31.25%, P<0.001) and longer hospital stay (32 [20–40.5] vs. 16 [13–20], P<0.001). The differences remained significant between the low-FT3 subgroup and the middle-FT3 subgroup for frequencies of consciousness declination (65.63% vs. 34.38%, P=0.042) and ICU admission (87.5% vs. 43.75%, P=0.002), the maximum mRS score during hospitalization (5 [4, 5] vs. 3 [3–5], P<0.001) and the length of hospital stay (32 [20–40.5] vs. 18 [13.50–23], P=0.001).

Since some patients' length of hospital stay was shorter than 28 days, the data of "lack of clinical improvement within 4 weeks of starting treatment" were fully completed during follow-up visits. Compared with those in the high-FT3 subgroup, patients in the low-FT3 subgroup were more likely to lack clinical improvement within 4 weeks (53.33% vs. 16.67%, P=0.013), had higher NEOS scores (2.8 [0.96] vs. 1.57 [1.07], P=0.001), and were prone to achieve poor 1-year outcome (46.88% vs. 9.38%, P=0.007). The differences remained significant between the low-FT3 subgroup and the middle-FT3 subgroup for lack of clinical improvement within 4 weeks (53.33% vs. 22.58%, P=0.047) and poor 1-year outcome (46.88% vs. 15.62%, P=0.029).

Association between the FT3 and ICU admission. Considering that patients in the low-FT3 subgroup had significant higher rates of ICU admission, whereas the percentages of ICU admission upon admission were approximately identical among different subgroups, we performed the univariate and multivariate logistic regression analysis to assess the relationship between the FT3 and ICU admission (Table 2). Given the phenomenon that the FT3 level in critical illness might change over time^{15,16}, we only analyzed the data obtained within the same period as FT3, i.e. within 24 h of admission. The tumor presence, although discovered later during hospitalization, was also included as it could not change in a short time. The level of FT3 (P<0.001) was significantly correlated with ICU admission in the univariate regression model. Other related factors included consciousness declination (P=0.005), psychiatric behavior (P=0.021), the WBC count (P=0.003) and the TSH (P=0.011). The multivariate regression model confirmed the FT3 as an independent factor (P=0.002) after adjustments for the other 4 confounding factors.

Correlation between the FT3 and 1-year outcome. In the univariate regression model assessing all clinical data obtained within 4 weeks of starting treatment (Table 3), the level of FT3 was significantly correlated with 1-year outcome (P=0.004). Other related factors included gender (P=0.008), age (P=0.034), tumor presence (P=0.018), consciousness declination (P=0.047), central hypoventilation (P=0.002), ICU admission (P=0.003), lack of clinical improvement within 4 weeks (P<0.001) and the NEOS score (P<0.001). However, the prognostic value of the FT3 was attenuated (P=0.594) after adjustment for other confounding factors. The NEOS score turned out to be the sole predictor independently related to poor 1-year outcome (P=0.007).

Considering the fact that the level of FT3 might change over time in critical illness^{15,16}, the clinical data obtained within the same period as the FT3 would be more comparable and suitable to assess the role of FT3. Therefore, we performed another univariate logistic regression analysis of the clinical data obtained within 24 h of admission and the tumor presence (Table 4), 5 factors turned out to be significant, including the FT3 (P=0.004), gender (P=0.008), age (P=0.034), tumor presence (P=0.018) and central hypoventilation upon admission (P=0.01). The prognostic value of the FT3 remained to be significant (P=0.030) after adjustment for the other 4 confounding factors.

Discussion

This study has demonstrated two major findings. First, the patients with relatively low FT3 within 24 h of admission tend to have higher disease severity during hospitalization and worse outcome in follow-up visits, represented by higher chances of ICU admission, longer hospital stay, greater maximum mRS scores during hospitalization, lower rates of getting clinical improvement within 4 weeks of starting treatment, and higher percentages of achieving poor one-year outcome. Second, the level of FT3 was an independent factor correlated

	Univariate regression model		Multivariate regression model	
Variable	OR (95% CI)	Р	OR (95% CI)	Р
FT3, pmol/L	0.385 (0.202-0.732)	0.004*	0.792 (0.337-1.863)	0.594
Male	0.267 (0.094-0.703)	0.008*	0.371 (0.106-1.297)	0.120
Age, years	3.457 (1.101-10.851)	0.034*	1.512 (0.294–7.764)	0.620
Tumor presence	15.158 (1.599–143.649)	0.018*	8.393 (0.638-110.452)	0.106
Consciousness declination	2.65 (1.012-6.941)	0.047*	0.771 (0.171-3.474)	0.735
Central hypoventilation	6.061 (1.931-19.024)	0.002*	3.120 (0.551-17.685)	0.199
The NEOS score	3.337 (1.843-6.041)	< 0.001*	2.674 (1.301-5.495)	0.007*
ICU admission	5.758 (1.782-18.599)	0.003*	-	-
Lack of improvement within 4 weeks of starting treatment	36 (8.935-145.053)	< 0.001*	-	-

Table 3. Univariate and multivariate analysis of predictors obtained within 4 weeks of starting treatment for poor one-year outcome. In the univariate model, the eligible variables obtained within 4 weeks of starting treatment were analyzed and those identified as not predictors of poor one-year outcome (P > 0.05) were not shown in this table. In the multivariate regression model, the predictive value of FT3 was adjusted by gender, age, consciousness declination, tumor presence, central hypoventilation and the NEOS score. OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; FT3, free triiodothyronine; ICU, intense care unit; NEOS, anti-NMDAR Encephalitis One-Year Functional Status.

	Univariate regression model		Multivariate regression model		
Variable	OR (95% CI)	Р	OR (95% CI)	Р	
FT3, pmol/L	0.385 (0.202-0.732)	0.004*	0.437 (0.207-0.923)	0.030*	
Male	0.267 (0.094-0.703)	0.008*	0.265 (0.001-0.869)	0.028*	
Age, years	3.457 (1.101-10.851)	0.034*	2.849 (0.658-12.327)	0.161	
Tumor presence	15.158 (1.599–143.649)	0.018*	11.363 (1.071-120.566)	0.044*	
Central hypoventilation	6.088 (1.544-24.006)	0.01*	6.833 (1.442-32.382)	0.015*	

Table 4. Univariate and multivariate logistic regression analysis of predictors obtained within 24 h of admission for poor one-year outcome. In the univariate model, the eligible variables obtained within 24 h of admission and the tumor presence were analyzed, and those identified as not predictors of poor one-year outcome (P>0.05) were not shown in this table. In the multivariate regression model, the predictive value of FT3 was adjusted by gender, age, the tumor presence, and central hypoventilation within 24 h of admission. *Indicates P<0.05. OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; FT3, free triiodothyronine.

with ICU admission during hospitalization and might serve as a potential predictor for 1-year outcome. Taken altogether, our results reveal that the FT3 might be a risk factor involved in the evolution and progression of anti-NMDAR encephalitis.

Thyroid hormones are able to cross the blood-brain barrier and affect neurogenesis, cell differentiation, and myelination^{17,18}. A growing body of literature shows that the FT3 is also closely involved in regulating neutrosphere biology and immune system function (e.g., cell-mediated immunity)^{19,20}. Anti-NMADR encephalitis is mediated by antibodies to neuronal surface antigens, with 25% suffer significant morbidity or mortality^{21,22}. Given the critical role of the FT3 in the proliferation and differentiation of neuronal and glial progenitors during brain development and in the regulation of immune system function^{17,23}, we hypothesize that the FT3 might be a risk factor in the progression and outcome in anti-NMDAR encephalitis. The preliminary results of the study bolstered this assumption, because: (1) Patients in the low-FT3 subgroup, although with the similar symptoms and mRS scores upon admission compared to those in the high-FT3 subgroup, seemed to be more likely to aggravate during hospitalization and exhibit higher disease severity, indicated by greater maximum mRS scores during hospitalization, longer hospital stay, and higher rates of ICU admission. After adjustment for relevant clinical variables, the level of FT3 turned out to be an independent prognostic factor related to ICU admission; (2) Patients in the low-FT3 subgroup had much higher chances of achieving poor one-year outcome, and the univariate regression analysis confirmed the level of FT3 as a significant prognostic factor, although its predictive value was attenuated after adjustment for other confounding factors obtained within 4 weeks of starting treatment. However, since the level of FT3 might change over time in critical illness^{15,16}, the clinical data obtained within the same period as the FT3 would be more comparable and suitable to assess the role of FT3. Therefore, we performed another multivariate regression analysis of clinical data obtained within 24 h of admission. The tumor presence, although discovered later during hospitalization, was also analyzed as it could not change in a short time. As expected, the predictive value of the FT3 remained significant after adjustment for gender, age, the tumor presence and central hypoventilation obtained within 24 h of admission.

The mechanisms of how the FT3 influences the evolution and outcome of anti-NMDAR encephalitis remain elusive. First, we assume that patients with low FT3 might experience decreased neuroprotection and increased

secondary brain damage after anti-NMDAR encephalitis, leading to higher disease severity during hospitalization and poorer outcomes. In some vitro studies, the FT3 has been proven to exert a protective effect against glutamate toxicity in neurons and glial cells through both transcriptional and non-transcriptional mechanisms^{24,25}. Second, patients with low FT3 might exhibit a suppression of endogenous brain repair systems in light of the crucial role of the FT3 in the generation and maturation of new neurons and axonal myelination²⁶. Increasing evidence suggests that the FT3 is closely related to brain acetylcholine activity, cholinergic function, and the secretion of various neurotrophic factors such as nerve growth factor, which are pivotal to the brain repair system²⁷. However, since several critical conditions may have decreased FT3 levels^{6,7,10}, and the exact immunologic relevance of FT3 in anti-NMDAR encephalitis remains obscure^{19,20}, the FT3 might as well be at first interpreted as a biological risk factor, but not as a causal factor directly altering outcome of patients with anti-NMDAR encephalitis.

In the multivariate regression model assessing all clinical data obtained within 4 weeks of starting treatment, the predictive value of the NEOS score was validated in this prospective cohort, which provided another Class III evidence of using the NEOS score as a tool to predict 1-year functional status in patients with anti-NMDAR encephalitis^{3,5}. It is of interest to notice that patients in the low-FT3 subgroup had higher NEOS scores, which might provide a clue to predict the NEOS score in the early stage of the disease.

Several limitations merit consideration in the interpretation of this study. First, it is observational in nature and based on data from a single hospital, which might have led to unintentional bias. Second, the number of patients in this analysis is of only moderate size limiting the statistical power. Third, we only evaluated serum thyroid hormones at a single time point. The level of FT3 in critical illness changes over time, which is a dynamic process^{15,16}. Future studies evaluating multiple time points are required for validating the predictive role of FT3 in anti-NMDAR encephalitis.

In conclusion, our analysis reveals that the FT3 might be a risk factor involved in the evolution and progression of anti-NMDAR encephalitis, whereas the underline mechanisms remain to be explored. Attention should be paid to these patients with relatively low FT3 upon admission, which might possibly aid clinical prediction and guide clinical decision-making. Further investigations in larger cohort of patients are definitely needed to confirm the prognostic value of FT3.

Methods

Subjects and evaluation. In this prospective study, we evaluated consecutive inpatients with anti-NMDAR encephalitis admitted in the Zhengzhou University First Affiliated Hospital between January 1, 2016 and December 31, 2019. Depending on the clinical status, informed consent was obtained from the patients or their relatives. Prior approval of the study protocol was obtained from the ethical committee. All patients' records and information were anonymized and de-identified prior to analysis. The inclusion criteria were (1) met the diagnostic criteria of definite anti-NMDAR encephalitis, i.e. in the presence of one or more of the six major groups of symptoms and positive IgG anti-GluN1 antibodies in the CSF, after reasonable exclusion of other disorders¹; (2) thyroid hormones obtained within 24 h of admission, including serum FT3, FT4 and TSH.

Follow-up visits started from the day of diagnosis, i.e. the day of obtaining positive IgG anti-GluN1 antibodies in the CSF. Each patient underwent a follow-up evaluation by telephone or outpatient interview for 12 months. The mRS values during hospitalization were calculated by referring physicians and medical records. A favorable outcome was defined as a mRS score of 0–2 and a poor outcome was defined as a score of 3–5 or death (mRS score of 6).

Clinical information and thyroid function measurements. Clinical data and physical examination were obtained in all patients upon admission. Blood samples were collected within 24 h of admission and, in addition to standard blood tests, serum levels of FT3, FT4 and TSH were determined using a direct chemiluminescence assay (ADVIA, Bayer Health Care LLC Tarrytown, NY, USA). The reference intervals of our laboratory were as follows: 3.28-6.47 pmol/L for FT3, 7.9-18.4 pmol/L for FT4, and $0.34-5.6 \mu$ IU/ml for TSH. A small number of patients also received tests of thyroid autoantibodies, including anti-thyroglobulin antibodies (TGAb), anti-thyroid peroxidase antibodies (TPOAb), and anti-thyroid receptor antibodies (TRAb)^{13,14}. "Clinical hyperthyroidism" was defined as suppressed TSH and elevated FT4 levels with relevant clinical symptoms, and "subclinical hyperthyroidism" was defined as a suppressed TSH and suppressed FT4 levels with relevant symptoms. In contrast, "clinical hypothyroidism" was defined as an elevated TSH and suppressed FT4 levels with relevant symptoms, and "subclinical hypothyroidism" was defined as a levated TSH level, a normal FT4 level, and the absence of symptoms. "Low T3 syndrome" was defined as a low serum FT3, normal-low FT4, and normal-low TSH levels²⁵. "Other conditions" included slightly elevated FT3 or FT4 levels, normal TSH and the absence of symptoms.

During hospitalization, all patients underwent the lumbar puncture, and the IgG anti-GluN1 antibodies in the CSF were detected by cell-based assays (CBA), using Euroimmun IIFT kits: Autoimmune Encephalitis Mosaic 1 (FA 1121-1005-1), and/or NMDAR kits (FA112d-1005-51), according to the manufacturer's instructions¹. All measurements were performed by laboratory staff who were blinded to patients' clinical information. All patients received the following examinations to screen tumors during hospitalization, including the brain MRI, computerized tomography (CT) scan of the thorax, ultrasound of the abdomen, pelvic and reproductive regions. None of the patients were given methylprednisolone or any other immunotherapies before admission, and the immunotherapies were not started until the GluN1 antibodies in the CSF were confirmed.

The "pneumonia" was diagnosed by respiratory physicians according to the relevant criteria. The "tumor presence" was defined as having ovarian teratoma or any other malignant tumors. The "abnormal MRI" was defined as having relevant brain lesions confirmed by radiologists. The "FT3-test delay" was defined as the interval between the onset of symptoms and the test of FT3 value upon admission. The "immunotherapy delay"

was defined as the interval between the onset of symptoms and the initiation of immunotherapy. The "First-line immunotherapy" included steroids, intravenous immunoglobulins or plasma exchange alone or combined. The "Second-line immunotherapy" comprised rituximab, azathioprine or cyclophosphamide treatment alone or combined²². The "Combined immunotherapy" was defined as having both first-line and second-line immunotherapies. The "NEOS score" contained 5 variables including ICU admission, treatment delay > 4 weeks, lack of clinical improvement within 4 weeks of starting treatment, abnormal MRI, and CSF white blood cell (WBC) count > 20 cells/ μ L, each of which was assigned 1 point.

Statistical analysis. The categorical variables were expressed as counts (%), whereas the continuous variables were expressed as the mean (standard deviation, SD) or median (interquartile range [IQR]) values as appropriate. The age, immunotherapy delay, hospital stay, WBC and the concentrations of CRP were log-transformed to approximate a normal distribution. The univariate logistic regression was used to identify factors significantly associated with an increased risk of poor outcome; for each variable, the odds ratio (OR), and 95% confidence interval (CI) were given. Relevant variables with P < 0.05 in the univariate logistic regression analysis were entered into multivariate logistic regression models to identify whether variables were independently associated with outcome.

Patients were equally divided into 3 subgroups based on their serum FT3 levels. Baseline demographic and clinical features were compared across the three subgroups using the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), the equality-of-medians test or the Fisher's exact test as appropriate. For differences within subgroups, the pair wise comparison with Bonferroni correction was used. All analyses were performed using Stata for Windows, Version 14.0 (StataCorp LLC., USA). *P* value < 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant.

Ethical approval. The Ethics Committee of the Zhengzhou University First Affiliated Hospital approved this study. This study was performed in accordance with the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki and later amendments.

Consent to participate and publication. Written informed consents were obtained from all patients or their guardians prior to their inclusion for sample collection and publication of this paper.

Data availability

Data that support the findings of this study are available upon reasonable request.

Received: 23 November 2020; Accepted: 3 March 2021 Published online: 15 March 2021

References

- Graus, F. et al. A clinical approach to diagnosis of autoimmune encephalitis. Lancet Neurol. 15, 391–404. https://doi.org/10.1016/ S1474-4422(15)00401-9 (2016).
- Titulaer, M. J. et al. Treatment and prognostic factors for long-term outcome in patients with anti-NMDA receptor encephalitis: an observational cohort study. Lancet Neurol. 12, 157–165. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(12)70310-1 (2013).
- 3. Broadley, J. et al. Prognosticating autoimmune encephalitis: a systematic review. J. Autoimmun. 96, 24–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. jaut.2018.10.014 (2019).
- Balu, R. *et al.* A score that predicts 1-year functional status in patients with anti-NMDA receptor encephalitis. *Neurology* 92, e244–e252. https://doi.org/10.1212/WNL.00000000006783 (2019).
- Peng, Y. et al. Validation of the NEOS score in Chinese patients with anti-NMDAR encephalitis. Neurol. Neuroinflamm. https://doi.org/10.1212/NXI.00000000000860 (2020).
- Squizzato, A., Gerdes, V. E., Brandjes, D. P., Buller, H. R. & Stam, J. Thyroid diseases and cerebrovascular disease. Stroke 36, 2302–2310. https://doi.org/10.1161/01.STR.0000181772.78492.07 (2005).
- Meyer, S. et al. Low triiodothyronine syndrome: a prognostic marker for outcome in sepsis?. Endocrine 39, 167–174. https://doi. org/10.1007/s12020-010-9431-4 (2011).
- Iervasi, G. et al. Low-T3 syndrome: a strong prognostic predictor of death in patients with heart disease. Circulation 107, 708–713. https://doi.org/10.1161/01.cir.0000048124.64204.3f (2003).
- 9. Scoscia, E. et al. Low triiodothyronine (T3) state: a predictor of outcome in respiratory failure? Results of a clinical pilot study. Eur. J. Endocrinol. 151, 557–560. https://doi.org/10.1530/eje.0.1510557 (2004).
- Suda, S. *et al.* Low free triiodothyronine predicts poor outcome after acute ischemic stroke. J. Neurol. Sci. 368, 89–93. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.jns.2016.06.063 (2016).
- Tektonidou, M. G., Anapliotou, M., Vlachoyiannopoulos, P. & Moutsopoulos, H. M. Presence of systemic autoimmune disorders in patients with autoimmune thyroid diseases. Ann. Rheum. Dis. 63, 1159–1161. https://doi.org/10.1136/ard.2004.022624 (2004).
- Cho, E. B. *et al.* Low T3 syndrome in neuromyelitis optica spectrum disorder: associations with disease activity and disability. *J. Neurol. Sci.* 370, 214–218. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jns.2016.09.039 (2016).
- Lin, Y. *et al.* Anti-thyroid antibodies and thyroid function in anti-N-methyl-d-aspartate receptor encephalitis. *Neurochem. Int.* 113, 107–111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuint.2017.11.019 (2018).
- Ma, X. *et al.* Thyroid function and autoimmune indications in patients with anti-N-methyl-D-aspartate receptor encephalitis. *NeuroImmunoModulation* 25, 110–117. https://doi.org/10.1159/000492179 (2018).
- 15. Peeters, R. P. *et al.* Serum 3,3',5'-triiodothyronine (rT3) and 3,5,3'-triiodothyronine/rT3 are prognostic markers in critically ill patients and are associated with postmortem tissue deiodinase activities. *J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab.* **90**, 4559–4565. https://doi. org/10.1210/jc.2005-0535 (2005).
- Boelen, A. *et al.* Simultaneous changes in central and peripheral components of the hypothalamus-pituitary-thyroid axis in lipopolysaccharide-induced acute illness in mice. *J. Endocrinol.* 182, 315–323. https://doi.org/10.1677/joe.0.1820315 (2004).
- Desouza, L. A. *et al.* Thyroid hormone regulates hippocampal neurogenesis in the adult rat brain. *Mol. Cell. Neurosci.* 29, 414–426. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mcn.2005.03.010 (2005).
- 18. Ambrogini, P. *et al.* Thyroid hormones affect neurogenesis in the dentate gyrus of adult rat. *Neuroendocrinology* **81**, 244–253. https://doi.org/10.1159/000087648 (2005).

- 19. De Vito, P. *et al.* Nongenomic effects of thyroid hormones on the immune system cells: new targets, old players. *Steroids* 77, 988–995. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.steroids.2012.02.018 (2012).
- van der Spek, A. H., Fliers, E. & Boelen, A. Thyroid hormone metabolism in innate immune cells. J. Endocrinol. 232, R67–R81. https://doi.org/10.1530/JOE-16-0462 (2017).
- Dalmau, J., Lancaster, E., Martinez-Hernandez, E., Rosenfeld, M. R. & Balice-Gordon, R. Clinical experience and laboratory investigations in patients with anti-NMDAR encephalitis. *Lancet Neurol.* 10, 63–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1474-4422(10)70253 -2 (2011).
- 22. Venkatesan, A. & Adatia, K. Anti-NMDA-receptor encephalitis: from bench to clinic. ACS Chem. Neurosci. 8, 2586–2595. https://doi.org/10.1021/acschemneuro.7b00319 (2017).
- 23. Bernal, J. Thyroid hormone receptors in brain development and function. *Nat. Clin. Pract. Endocrinol. Metab.* **3**, 249–259. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncpendmet0424 (2007).
- Mendes-de-Aguiar, C. B. et al. Thyroid hormone increases astrocytic glutamate uptake and protects astrocytes and neurons against glutamate toxicity. J. Neurosci. Res. 86, 3117–3125. https://doi.org/10.1002/jnr.21755 (2008).
- Cheng, S. Y., Leonard, J. L. & Davis, P. J. Molecular aspects of thyroid hormone actions. *Endocr. Rev.* 31, 139–170. https://doi. org/10.1210/er.2009-0007 (2010).
- Lemkine, G. F. *et al.* Adult neural stem cell cycling in vivo requires thyroid hormone and its alpha receptor. *FASEB J.* 19, 863–865. https://doi.org/10.1096/fj.04-2916fje (2005).
- Sui, L., Ren, W. W. & Li, B. M. Administration of thyroid hormone increases reelin and brain-derived neurotrophic factor expression in rat hippocampus in vivo. *Brain Res.* 1313, 9–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2009.12.010 (2010).
- 28. Weetman, A. P. Autoimmune thyroid disease. Autoimmunity 37, 337-340. https://doi.org/10.1080/08916930410001705394 (2004).

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the clinical contribution from patients and their relatives in this study. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 81771397) and the LHGJ program of Henan Province (LHGJ20190084). The founding source did not play any other role than financial support.

Author contributions

The corresponding author was L.Y.J., who dominated this article. J.T. and H.Z. completed the data collection, analysis and writing. W.C.Z. and Z.Q.M. helped the data collection. L.Y.J. had provided lots of help in literature retrieval and article revision. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Additional information

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to Y.L.

Reprints and permissions information is available at www.nature.com/reprints.

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

© The Author(s) 2021