

## **“What do the Experts Recommend about the Treatment of Lyme Disease?”**

Clinical practice guidelines are meant to inform a physician’s decision-making process without replacing a physician’s individual judgment; however, sound decisions obviously must be based on the best available information derived from carefully conducted and rigorously reviewed evidence-based research, i.e., evidence that is widely accepted by the medical community. In this context, the recommendations for the treatment of Lyme disease in the 2006 clinical practice guidelines (1) developed by the Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA), are universally accepted by nationally and internationally known experts on Lyme disease. They are in agreement with recommendations of the European Federation of Neurological Societies (2), the European Union of Concerted Action on Lyme Disease (3), the American Academy of Neurology (4), the Canadian Public Health Network (5), the German Society for Hygiene and Microbiology (6), and the Swiss Society for Neurology (7). They also are in agreement with recommendations of expert panels from at least 10 European countries, i.e., The Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Slovenia, Sweden, and Switzerland (8).

In May, 2008, the IDSA entered into an agreement with the Attorney General of the State of Connecticut (Richard Blumenthal) to voluntarily undertake a critical review of these practice guidelines by a special Review Panel. After multiple meetings, a public hearing in with much testimony both pro and con was presented, and extensive review of more than 2,000 research and other publications, the Review Panel concluded that the recommendations contained in the 2006 guidelines (1) were “medically and scientifically justified on the basis of all available evidence and that no changes to the guidelines were necessary” (9). Indeed, no other guidelines for the treatment of Lyme disease have been subjected to such scrutiny and have such wide acceptance by experts in the field.

Guidelines developed by the International Lyme and Associated Diseases Society (ILADS) have been offered as a reasonable alternative for the management of Lyme disease (10). However, an expert review panel commissioned by the Chief Executive of the UK Health Protection Agency (HPA) found the ILADS guidelines to be unacceptable and flawed. In their detailed final report (11, 12), the expert review panel concluded that “the ILADS guidelines are poorly constructed and do not provide a scientifically sound, evidence-based approach to the diagnosis and care of patients with Lyme borreliosis”. The expert panel also noted that “the ILADS guidelines do not provide reliable and credible evidence to support their treatment recommendations which include prolonged use of oral or parenteral antibiotics, singly, sequentially, or in combination”. It also notes that “use of the ILADS guidelines’ vague treatment recommendations, including prolonged use of antibiotics, has potentially serious consequences”, and that “patients misdiagnosed with Lyme disease risk losing opportunities for diagnosis and treatment of other conditions. They also risk serious, physical, psychological social, and financial adverse events”.

Phillip J. Baker  
Executive Director,  
American Lyme Disease Foundation

(Revised 1/28/17)

## References

1. Wormser, GP, Dattwyler, RJ, Shapiro, ED, et al. The clinical assessment, treatment, and prevention of Lyme disease, human granulocytic anaplasmosis, and babesiosis: clinical practice guidelines by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. Clin. Infect. Dis. 43: 1089-1134, 2006.
2. Mylglund, A, Ljostad, U, Fingele, V et al. EFNS guidelines on the diagnosis and management of European Lyme neuroborreliosis. Eur. J. Neurol. 17: 8-16, 2010.
3. European Union of Concerted Action on Lyme Borreliosis.  
<http://meduni09.edis.at/eucalb/cms/index.php?lang=en>
4. Halperin, JJ, Shapiro, ED, Logigian, E, et al. Practice parameter: treatment of nervous system Lyme disease (as evidence-based review). Report of the Quality Standards Subcommittee of the American Academy of Neurology. Neurol. 69: 91-102, 2007.
5. Canadian Public Health Network. The laboratory diagnosis of Lyme borreliosis; guidelines from the Canadian Public Health Laboratory Network. Can. J. Infect. Dis. 18: 145-148, 2007.
6. Nau, R, Christen, H, and Effert, H. Lyme disease- current state of knowledge. Dtsch. Arztebl. 106: 72-81, 2008.
7. [https://smw.ch/archives-search/article-detail/?tx\\_ezmjournal\\_articledetail\[identifier\]=smw.2016.14353](https://smw.ch/archives-search/article-detail/?tx_ezmjournal_articledetail[identifier]=smw.2016.14353)
8. O'Connell, S. Recommendations for the diagnosis and treatment of Lyme borreliosis: guidelines and consensus papers from specialist societies and expert groups in Europe and North America.  
[http://www.aldf.com/pdf/ECCMID\\_Poster\\_4.22.10.pdf](http://www.aldf.com/pdf/ECCMID_Poster_4.22.10.pdf)
9. Lantos, PM, Charini, WA, Medoff, G et al. Final report of the Lyme Disease Review Panel of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. Clin. Infect. Dis. 51:1-5, 2010.
10. Cameron, D, Gaito, A, Harris, N et al. Evidence-based guidelines for the management of Lyme disease. Expert Rev. Anti-Infect Ther 2: S1-S13, 2004.
11. [http://www.aldf.com/pdf/HPA\\_Review\\_of\\_ILADS\\_Guidelines.pdf](http://www.aldf.com/pdf/HPA_Review_of_ILADS_Guidelines.pdf)
12. (<http://www.hpa.org.uk/Topics/InfectiousDiseases/InfectionsAZ/LymeDisease/GeneralInformation/>)