Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Mark Slee, Flinders University, Australia

REVIEWED BY Stephen Bacchi, Royal Adelaide Hospital, Australia Peter A. Maple, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, United Kingdom

*CORRESPONDENCE Mohammed Al-mahdi Al-kurdi ⊠ mohammedmahdikurdi@gmail.com

RECEIVED 01 February 2024 ACCEPTED 03 April 2024 PUBLISHED 18 April 2024

CITATION

Elgenidy A, Abdelhalim NN, Al-kurdi MA-m, Mohamed LA, Ghoneim MM, Fathy AW, Hassaan HK, Anan A and Alomari O (2024) Hypogammaglobulinemia and infections in patients with multiple sclerosis treated with anti-CD20 treatments: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 19,139 multiple sclerosis patients.

Front. Neurol. 15:1380654. doi: 10.3389/fneur.2024.1380654

COPYRIGHT

© 2024 Elgenidy, Abdelhalim, Al-kurdi, Mohamed, Ghoneim, Fathy, Hassaan, Anan and Alomari. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Hypogammaglobulinemia and infections in patients with multiple sclerosis treated with anti-CD20 treatments: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 19,139 multiple sclerosis patients

Anas Elgenidy^{1,2}, Nagham Nader Abdelhalim¹, Mohammed Al-mahdi Al-kurdi³*, Lobna A. Mohamed⁴, Mohamed M. Ghoneim⁵, Ahmed Wagdy Fathy⁶, Hazem Khaled Hassaan⁷, Ahmed Anan⁸ and Omar Alomari⁹

¹Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University, Giza, Egypt, ²Karl-Jaspers-Klinik, Bad Zwischenahn, Germany, ³Faculty of Medicine, University of Aleppo, Aleppo, Syria, ⁴Faculty of Medicine, Menoufia University, Shibin Al Kawm, Egypt, ⁵Faculty of Medicine, Alexandria University, Alexandria, Egypt, ⁶Faculty of Medicine, Kafrelshikh University, Kafrelsheikh, Egypt, ⁷Faculty of Medicine, Benha University, Benha, Egypt, ⁸Faculty of Medicine, Suez Canal University, Ismailia, Egypt, ⁹Hamidiye International School of Medicine, University of Health Sciences, Istanbul, Türkiye

Background: Recent years have seen the emergence of disease-modifying therapies in multiple sclerosis (MS), such as anti-cluster of differentiation 20 (anti-CD20) monoclonal antibodies, aiming to modulate the immune response and effectively manage MS. However, the relationship between anti-CD20 treatments and immunoglobulin G (IgG) levels, particularly the development of hypogammaglobulinemia and subsequent infection risks, remains a subject of scientific interest and variability. We aimed to investigate the intricate connection between anti-CD20 MS treatments, changes in IgG levels, and the associated risk of hypogammaglobulinemia and subsequent infections.

Method: PubMed, Scopus, Embase, Cochrane, and Web of Science databases have been searched for relevant studies. The "R" software utilized to analyze the occurrence of hypogammaglobulinemia, infections and mean differences in IgG levels pre- and post-treatment. The subgrouping analyses were done based on drug type and treatment duration. The assessment of heterogeneity utilized the *I*² and chi-squared tests, applying the random effect model.

Results: Thirty-nine articles fulfilled our inclusion criteria and were included in our review which included a total of 20,501 MS patients. The overall prevalence rate of hypogammaglobulinemia was found to be 11% (95% CI: 0.08 to 0.15). Subgroup analysis based on drug type revealed varying prevalence rates, with rituximab showing the highest at 18%. Subgroup analysis based on drug usage duration revealed that the highest proportion of hypogammaglobulinemia occurred in individuals taking the drugs for 1 year or less (19%). The prevalence of infections in MS patients with a focus on different infection types stratified by the MS drug used revealed that pulmonary infections were the most prevalent (9%) followed by urinary tract infections (6%), gastrointestinal infections (2%), and

skin and mucous membrane infections (2%). Additionally, a significant decrease in mean IgG levels after treatment compared to before treatment, with a mean difference of 0.57 (95% CI: 0.22 to 0.93).

Conclusion: This study provides a comprehensive analysis of the impact of anti-CD20 drugs on serum IgG levels in MS patients, exploring the prevalence of hypogammaglobulinemia, based on different drug types, treatment durations, and infection patterns. The identified rates and patterns offer a foundation for clinicians to consider in their risk-benefit.

Systematic review registration: https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?RecordID=518239, CRD42024518239.

KEYWORDS

anti-CD20, meta-analysis, multiple sclerosis, hypogammaglobulinemia, infections

1 Introduction

Multiple sclerosis (MS) is a complex autoimmune disorder affecting the central nervous system, characterized by demyelination and nerve function impairment (1). MS predominantly affects young adults, typically beginning between 20 to 40 years of age, and is a significant contributor to neurological disability in this age group (2). The disease presents with diverse clinical manifestations and has a multifactorial etiology involving genetic and environmental factors. The main aspect of MS pathology involves the formation of demyelinating lesions, which are predominantly found in the white and grey matter of the brain, along with the spinal cord (1). The immune system and inflammation play crucial roles in the neurodegenerative process of MS (3). From a clinical perspective, MS can exhibit two primary trajectories: relapsing or progressive (4). The most frequent presentation involves relapsingremitting MS (RRMS), characterized by discrete episodes of neurological dysfunction, followed by partial, complete, or no recovery. However, it is important to acknowledge the growing body of evidence suggesting the presence of progression independent of relapse activity (3, 4). With time, the frequency of RRMS relapses generally diminishes. However, a gradual decline often emerges, leading to a continuous worsening of symptoms, a phase known as secondary progressive MS (SPMS) (1). Diagnosis is based on clinical manifestations, radiological findings (notably MRI T2 lesions), and laboratory evidence (including cerebrospinal fluid-specific oligoclonal bands). These constituent elements collectively adhere to the guidelines outlined in the 2017 McDonald criteria (5).

In recent years, various therapeutic interventions, including disease-modifying therapies (DMTs), have been developed to manage MS effectively. DMTs, such as anti-cluster of differentiation 20 (anti-CD20) monoclonal antibodies, aim to modulate the immune response and ameliorate the disease course. These treatments have revolutionized MS management by targeting B cells, which play a pivotal role in the pathogenesis of MS (3).

The intriguing relationship between anti-CD20 treatments, including rituximab, ocrelizumab, ofatumumab, ublituximab, and immunoglobulin G (IgG) levels has garnered scientific interest. However, its noteworthy to mention that these treatments can lead to low levels of immunoglobulin, known as hypogammaglobulinemia (6). The impact on IgG levels and the subsequent risk of infections varies among individuals and types of MS. Different anti-CD20 therapies may also have variable impacts on IgG

levels. While advancements in anti-CD20 treatments have greatly benefited patients, there are inconsistencies and heterogeneity in the available data regarding the connection between these treatments, IgG levels, and the risk of infections. Currently, there is a lack of standardized data to guide physicians in adjusting treatment dosages based on IgG levels. Addressing these knowledge gaps is crucial for enhancing the quality of life for individuals living with MS. However, results from studies in this area have differed.

This review aims to investigate the relationship between anti-CD20 MS treatments, IgG levels, and the risk of hypogammaglobulinemia and infections. By doing so, it aims to inform discussions on anti-CD20 MS treatment strategies and improve treatment decisions to prevent severe infections in patients.

2 Methods

The study was designed and reported with adherence to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analysis (PRISMA) guidelines (7). We submitted the research protocol for this systematic review to the International Prospective Registry of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) database¹ and assigned the PROSPERO ID: CRD42024518239. All working group members agreed on the study protocol before beginning the literature search.

2.1 Search strategy and study selection

We conducted a comprehensive search across five electronic databases (Medline via PubMed, Scopus, Embase, Cochrane, and Web of Science) from their inception up to Jan 25, 2024, to identify relevant studies. We used the Medical Subject Headings (Mesh) database to retrieve the synonyms of our search strategy, and the terms were combined using "OR" and "AND" Boolean operators, following the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews (Chapter 4.4.4) (8). The search strategy utilized were as follows: ("Immunoglobulin OR

¹ www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/

10.3389/fneur.2024.1380654

globulin OR Antibody OR Ig OR AB AND (G OR GAMMA OR γ) OR Hypogammaglobulinemia OR Agammaglobulinemia") AND ((Multiple OR disseminated OR "Acute Fulminating") AND (sclerosis OR "encephalomyelitis disseminata" OR "ADEM")) OR MS AND ("Rituximab OR Mabthera OR Anti-CD20 OR Rituxan OR Ocrelizumab OR Ublituximab OR Ofatumumab OR Riabni OR Ruxience OR Truxima OR GP2013 OR CD20 OR IDEC-C2B8 OR "IDEC C2B8"). The detailed search terms and results for each database are provided in Supplementary Table S1.

Following the removal of duplicates by the endnote software, two authors screened the retrieved studies independently based on our predefined eligibility criteria using titles and abstracts. Subsequently, the list of included studies was subjected to further scrutiny by two authors. Studies deemed relevant and any conflicts were subjected to full-text screening. Additionally, we conducted a manual search by reviewing the references of the articles included, and literature reviews for possible relevant studies.

2.2 Eligibility criteria

We included studies that met the following criteria: (1) all studies regardless of language or study type, and (2) studies that examined the effects of anti-CD20 monoclonal antibody treatments on serum IgG levels among diverse subtypes of MS patients. We excluded the following: (1) reviews, editorial correspondence, book chapters, animal and laboratory experiments, and *in vitro* inquiries, and (2) studies that did not explicitly mention serum IgG levels as a quantifiable factor. This meticulous approach ensures that the included studies meet high standards of quality and relevance.

2.3 Data extraction

Two authors independently extracted the data from the studies included entering the collected information into a pre-piloted Excel spreadsheet. To guarantee data accuracy and consistency, another author meticulously reviewed the completed extraction sheet, reconciled any discrepancies, and validated the precision of the data.

The data extraction encompassed several key elements, starting with study characteristics such as the first author's name, publication year, study design, geographical location, and duration of the disease under investigation. Population characteristics, including sample size, gender distribution, age, duration of anti-CD20 treatment, type of MS, and interventions administered, were also recorded.

Furthermore, when applicable data on population characteristics were gathered based on after and before anti-CD20 administration, Expanded Disability Status Scale (EDSS) scores at the start and at the end of treatment, and different phases of the condition (PPMS, RRMS, SPMS). For the quantitative analysis, the same authors independently extracted information; the serum IgG levels in patients with MS, which was also extracted for different types of MS when applicable, and for different subtypes of anti-CD20 drugs data necessary to analyze the correlation of anti-CD20 treatment with serum IgG levels, and crucial variables for conducting the necessary statistical analysis. They also extracted data for different types of infections such as GIT, skin, pulmonary, and urinary. The data of interest were collected in the form of event, total, mean, and standard deviation. Data reported using different formats were converted into mean and standard deviation values using the website developed by

McGrath et al. (9) which is an online tool used to facilitate the estimation of sample mean and standard deviation, ensuring consistency in the data presentation and analysis.

2.4 Methodology of the data analysis

Our meta-analysis was conducted using the meta-package of the R software (R version 4.1.0) (10), This package provided a systematic approach to extracting and analyzing data from the selected studies. We performed an initial analysis to calculate the percentage of occurrence of hypogammaglobulinemia among MS patients undergoing treatment with anti-CD20 drugs. Additionally, a subgroup analysis was performed based on drug type and treatment duration to identify specific effects. We also calculated the mean difference in IgG levels by comparing baseline (pre-treatment) and post-treatment levels among different drug types. Furthermore, we calculated the infections rate during treatment, including pulmonary, urinary tract, gastrointestinal, and skin/mucous membrane infections. The proportion of patients developing specific infections for each drug was calculated, providing insights into infection patterns associated with anti-CD20 therapies.

We assessed the heterogeneity using the I^2 and chi-squared tests and applied the random effect model. Heterogeneity was considered substantial when I^2 was more than 50% at a *p*-value <0.05. Mean differences were reported with 95% confidence intervals for continuous data. Publication bias was assessed visually using a funnel plot when enough studies were included in the analysis ($n \ge 10$). For all the outcomes, we conducted leave-one-out meta-analyses, in which each of the meta-analyses was repeated by removing a single study, one at a time, to demonstrate how each study influences the total estimate.

2.5 The methodological quality of the included studies

Two authors independently assessed the quality of the included studies and resolved any disagreements through discussion with a third author. The updated Cochrane risk of bias tool for randomized trials (ROB 2.0) was used to evaluate the risk of bias in the RCT studies (11). The risk of bias table covered biases related to randomization, deviations from expected interventions, missing data, outcome measurement, and selection of reported results. Each trial was categorized as high risk, some concerns, or low risk based on the assessment. In addition, we used the NIH tool to assess the quality of cohort and cross-sectional studies, which consisted of 14 questions related to the research methodology (12). Each question is answered with yes, no, or unclear. The risk bias of the included case-control studies was determined using the Newcastle–Ottawa Scale (NOS), a star system consisting of nine questions, with a point awarded for each answer marked with an asterisk (13).

3 Results

3.1 Study selection

Following full-text screening, we identified 39 articles that met our inclusion criteria and were included in our review. These articles included six randomized clinical trials, 29 observational cohort, one was cross-sectional study, and three case control studies (Figure 1) (14–52).

3.2 Study characteristics

The relevant studies encompassed a total of 20,501 MS patients. Geographically. These studies were conducted in various countries, including France, Italy, Sweden, the USA, Qatar, Croatia, Switzerland, Norway, Denmark, Canada, Australia, Spain, Sweden, Greece, and the United Kingdom, providing a global perspective on MS treatments. The interventions investigated involve a range of anti-CD20 drugs, including therapies like rituximab, ocrelizumab, ofatumumab, and ublituximab. The patient populations studied in these diverse MS investigations represented a wide range of ages, typically spanning from the late 20s or early 30s to beyond 70 years. Sex distribution across the studies varies, with the percentage of female participants typically ranging from approximately 45 to 75%, indicating a higher representation of females across the studies. The studies also included different MS subtypes, such as Relapsing-Remitting MS (RRMS), Secondary Progressive MS (SPMS), Primary Progressive MS (PPMS), and Progressive-Relapsing MS (PRMS), ensuring a comprehensive representation of the disease spectrum. The duration of the disease, measured in years since onset or diagnosis, covers a broad spectrum, ranging from a few years to several decades. EDSS scores, indicating disability levels, vary across the studies, generally spanning from low scores indicative of mild disability to higher scores associated with more severe disability. In some studies, the specific type of immunosuppressive therapy used among the previously mentioned three drugs was not specified, so we referred to them collectively as "Anti CD20 drugs" in our analysis. A summary of the baseline characteristics of the included studies is presented in Table 1. To simplify the results of our subgroup analysis, we have provided a table summarizing the different correlations explored between the aforementioned factors (Table 2).



TABLE 1 Baseline characteristics of papers included in the meta-analysis.

Paper Study type		e Country	Intervention	Dose	Mode of administration	Mean Se n age Fen	ean Sex No ge Female_pat	No. MS			MS t	ypes		EDSS
name and year			drug		administration	age	Female (%)	patients	RRMS	SP MS	PP MS	PR MS	Disease duration	
Full papers														
Hawker 2009	Randomized double-blind placebo-controlled multicenter trial	US and Canada	Rituximab	1,000 mg every 24 weeks, through 96 weeks (4 courses)	Intravenous	50.1 (9.0)	81 (55.1)	292	_	_	_	_	Since onset = 9.0 (6.8) Since diagnosis = 3.8 (4.2)	Baseline Mean (SD) = 4.7 (1.4) Change from baseline to week 96 Mean (SD) = 0.33 (1.0)
Kappos 2011	Phase 2, randomized, placebo- controlled, multicenter trial	58 patients = North America 120 patients = East- Central Europe and Asia	Ocrelizumab 600	1st cycle = two 300 mg doses 15 days apart 2nd cycle = 600 mg	Intravenous	35.6 (8.5)	35 (64)	55	_	_	_	_	Years (range) since onset = 6.5 (0.5–20.5) Years (range) since diagnosis = 3.6 (0.1–16.5)	Baseline Mean (SD) = 3.5 (1.5)
		34 patients = Western Europe 8 patients = Latin America	Ocrelizumab 2000	1st cycle = two 1,000 mg doses 15 days apart 2nd cycle = 1,000 mg	Intravenous	38.5 (8.7)	38 (69)	55	_			_	Years (range) since onset = 7.7 (0.25– 28.0) Years (range) since diagnosis = 4.4 (0.1–19.2)	Baseline Mean (SD)=3.4 (1.3)
			Interferon Beta-1a followed by ocrelizumab	1st dose interferon = 30 μg every week Following doses ocrelizumab = two 300 mg doses 15 days apart	Interferon = intramuscular Ocrelizumab = intravenous	38.1 (9.3)	32 (59)	54	_	_	_	_	Years (range) since onset = 5.3 (0.8–35.2) Years (range) since diagnosis = 3.3 (0.1–20.2)	Baseline Mean (SD)=3.1 (1.5)
Graves 2014	Retrospective cohort	USA	Rituximab	375 mg/m ² once weekly/ four doses (4.9% of patients) (72% of patients)1 g/two weeks apart (13% of patients) two doses 500 mg/two weeks apart	Intravenous	46.1 (13.6)	72 (63)	114	27	45	17	9	Mean (SD) = 15 (9.9)	Baseline Median = 6 Range = 2–8

Paper	Study type	Country I	Intervention	tion Dose	Mode of	Mean	Sex	No. MS			MS t	ypes		EDSS
name and year			drug		administration	age	Female (%)	patients	RRMS	SP MS	PP MS	PR MS	Disease duration	
Salzer et al. 2016	Retrospective cohort	Sweden	Rituximab	(Possible initial high loading dose of 1,000– 2,000 mg divided into 2 infusions given within 1 month) 500 or 1,000 mg rituximab IV every 6–12 months	Intravenous	42.6 (11.1)	545 (66.3)	822	557	198	67		11.3 (8.5)	Baseline Median (range) = 3 (0-9)
Montalban et al. 2017	Randomized double-blind placebo-controlled multicenter trial	Multicenter	Ocrelizumab	600 mg	Intravenous	44.7 (7.9)	237 (48.6)	488	_	_	488	_	2.9 (3.2)	Baseline Mean (SD) = 4.7 (1.2)
Gracia- Canibano 2019	Retrospective observational cohort	Qatar	Ocrelizumab	1st dose = two 300 mg doses two weeks apart Following doses = 600 mg/6 months	Intravenous	35.4 (10.5)	28 (46.7)	60	57	3			Mean (SD) = 7.8 (6.8)	Baseline Mean = 2.3 (SD = 2.6) IQR = 4.0 At 12 months follow up Mean = 2.2 IQR = 2.4
	Retrospective cross-sectional study	Switzerland	Anti-CD20 (NS)	_	_	Median = 38 IQR = 29–53	150 (66.4)	226	175	28	23	_	_	Baseline Median = 2.8 IQR = 1.5–5
Zoehner 2019		Greece				Median = 35 IQR = 30-44	63 (62.4)	101	101	-	_	-	-	Baseline Median = 2.0 IQR = 1-2.3

Frontiers	
Ľ.	
Neurology	

Paper	Study type	Country	Intervention	Dose	Mode of administration	Mean Sex M ion age Female p (%)	Sex No. MS Female patients			MS t	ypes	EDSS		
name and year			drug		administration		patients	RRMS	SP MS	PP MS	PR MS	Disease duration		
Bauthman 2020	Retrospective longitudinal observational	France	Anti-CD20 (NS)			43.9 (9.4)	25 (54.3)	46	23	9	14			At start of treatment mean Primary progressive = 5.6 (1) Relapsing remitting = 2.3 (1.3) Secondary progressive = 5.9 (1) At 12 months mean Primary progressive = 5.9 (1.2) Relapsing remitting = 2.2 (1.5) Secondary progressive = 5.7 (1.6)
Evertsson 202	0 Retrospective cohort	Sweden/USA	Rituximab	1st dose = 500 or 1,000 mg Following doses = 500 mg/5– 7 months	Intravenous	44.0 (11.7)	222 (71.3)	311	225	86	_	_	Mean (SD) = 11.3 (8.87)	Baseline Median = 2.5 IQR = 2.125
			Ocrelizumab	1st dose = two 300 mg doses two weeks apart Following doses = 600 mg/5– 7 months	Intravenous	49.8 (11.9)	95 (59.0)	161	161	_	_	_	Mean (SD) = 12.5 (8.32)	_
Vollmer 2020	Retrospective cohort	USA	Rituximab	First dose = 1,000 mg twice in two weeks Following doses = 1,000 mg/6 months	Intravenous	43 (12.5)	644 (67)	907	574	215	118	_	Mean (SD)=9.1 (8.3)	_

(Continued)

07

Paper	Paper Study type Country Intervention Dose Mode of Me				Mean Sex		No. MS	MS types				EDSS		
and year			arug		administration	age	Female (%)	patients	RRMS	SP MS	PP MS	PR MS	Disease duration	
Disanto 2021	Prospective observational cohort	Switzerland	Rituximab	500 mg/6 months	Intravenous	Median Age = 51.0 IQR = 37.5- 57.0	44 (74.6)	59	37	22			Median = 10 IQR = 5-18	l year prior to therapy Median = 4.0 At start of therapy Median = 4.0 After 12 months Median = 3.5
			Rituximab	1,000 mg/6 months	Intravenous									l year prior to therapy Median = 4.0 At start of therapy Median = 3.5
Oksbjerg 2021	Retrospective	Denmark	Anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab)	Ofatumumab and ocrelizumab First dose = 300 mg twice two weeks apart	Intravenous	Median = 43 IQR = 34–51	266 (63.9)	416	343	36	18	_	Median years =1.2 IQR = 0.8–2.0	At follow up Median = 3 IQR = 2-4.5
			Anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab)/ (discontinued)	Following doses = 600 mg/6 months Rituximab First dose = 1,000 mg twice in two weeks Following doses = 1,000 mg/6 months		Median = 42 IQR = 34–52	25 (80.6)	31		_	_	_	Median years=12.7 IQR=2.8-17.1	At follow up Median = 5 IQR = 2.5–6.5
Seery 2021	Retrospective cohort	Australia	Ocrelizumab	-	-	43.4 (10.6)	134 (72.4)	185	167	7	7	_	Mean (SD) = 10.65 (7.46)	Baseline Median = 2.0 IQR = 1-4
Torgauten 2021	Retrospective cohort	Norway	Rituximab	1st dose = 1,000 mg Following doses = 500 mg/6 months	Intravenous	42.3 (12.1)	255 (69.9)	365	320	23	22		Since diagnosis Mean (SD) = 5.3 (7.0)	Baseline Median (range) = 2 (0-8) Change from baseline Median (range) =0 (-3.0 to 2.5)
Habek 2022	Retrospective cohort	Croatia	Ocrelizumab	-		44.6 (9.5)	75 (67)	109	73	36	_	_	Mean (SD) = 8.5 (5.8)	Baseline Median = 3.5 Range = 0–7.0

Frontiers in Neurology

(Continued)

D	
ē	
⊇.	
9	
0	
÷	
a	

Paper	Study type	v type Country	Country Intervention Dos drug	ition Dose Mode of Me administration ag	Mean Sex No ration age Fem <u>ale pa</u>	No. MS			MS t	ypes		EDSS		
name and year			drug		administration	age	Female (%)	patients	RRMS	SP MS	PP MS	PR MS	Disease duration	
Hauser 2022	Retrospective cohort	_	Ofatumumab	First dose = 20 mg at weeks 0, 1, 2 Follow up dose = 20 mg monthly starting week 4	Subcutaneous	38.7 (9.2)	1,345 (68.3)	1969	1869	100	_	_	Mean (SD) since onset = 9.0 (7.3) Mean (SD) since diagnosis = 6.4 (6.2)	Baseline Mean = 2.9 SD = 1.4
Perriguey 2022	Prospective observational study	France	Rituximab	First dose = 1,000 mg twice in two weeks Following doses = 1,000 mg/ 6 months	Intravenous	43.4 (12.9)	118 (62.8)	188	151	20	17	_	Median years = 10 Range = 0-36	Baseline Range = 0-8
Peters 2022	Retrospective, single-center observational study	USA	Rituximab/ocrelizumab	_		(Data is not o patier	exclusive to MS ats only)	261	_		_	_		
Capasso 2023	Prospective observational cohort	Italy	Ocrelizumab	1st dose = two 300 mg doses two weeks apart Following doses = 600 mg/6 months	Intravenous	47.8 (10.5)	38 (48.7)	78	38	9	31		Mean (SD) = 13.2 (8.6)	Baseline Median = 3.5 Range = 1.5-7.0 Follow up 36.5 (6.8) months median = 4.0 range = 1.5-8.0
Karlowicz 2023	Retrospective cohort	Norway	Rituximab	1st dose = 1,000 mg Following doses = 500 mg/6 months	Intravenous	42.1 (12.0)	398 (71.2)	556	515	_	41	_	Mean (SD)=8.2 (9.1)	Baseline Mean (SD) = 2.2 (1.8)
Veronica	Retrospective	USA	All	_	-	48.3 (13.6)		184	94	43	17	-	-	-
Mears 2023	Cohort		Rituximab	_		49.3 (14.3)	26 (81.25)	32	2	_	_	_	_	-
			Ocrelizumab			48.1 (13.5)	97 (63.81)	152	92	43	17	_	-	-
Abstracts and p	oosters			1			1	1				1		
López Ruiz et al. 2021	Retrospective cohort	Spain	Ocrelizumab		Intravenous	39.5 (8.7)	34 (65.3)	52	52		_		Mean (range) = 11.1 (1-27.3)	Baseline Median (range) = 3.5 (1.5-6.5) At follow up at 19 months (SD15.1) Median (range) = 2.5 (1.5-6.5)

(Continued)

Paper	Study type	Country	Intervention	Dose	Mode of administration	Mean on age	Mean Sex No tion age Female pat	No. MS			MS t	ypes		EDSS
name and year			drug		administration	age	Female (%)	patients	RRMS	SP MS	PP MS	PR MS	Disease duration	
Chang 2019	Retrospective cohort	USA	Ocrelizumab			Range 31 to 77	47 (65.3)	72	_	-	-	_	-	_
Defruss 2019	Retrospective multivariate analysis	Europe, Canada, Australia, South America, USA	Ocrelizumab OPERA trial	_	_	38.1 (9.3)	949 (65.5)	1,448	_	_	_	_	<5 years = 658 (45.4) 5-10 years = 405 (28.0) >10 = 13 (0.9)	<3.0, n (%) = 810 (55.9) 3.0-6.0, n (%) = 625 (43.2) >6.0, n (%) = 13 (0.9)
			Ocrelizumab ORATORIO trial	-	-	45.8 (8.1)	320 (49.7)	644	_	_			<5 years = 190 (29.5) 5-10 years = 288 (44.7) >10 = 147 (22.8) Missing = 19 (3.0)	<3.0, n (%) = 12 (1.9) 3.0-6.0, n (\%) = 529 (82.1) >6.0, n (\%) = 102 (15.8) Missing, n (\%) = 1 (0.2)
Hallberg 2019	Retrospective cohort	Sweden	Rituximab	First dose = 1,000 mg Follow up dose = 500 mg/6 months for 3 years	Intravenous	_	_	251	_	_	_	_	_	-
Tran 2019	Retrospective cohort	USA	Ocrelizumab	-	-	-	_	207	_	_	-	_		
Tsao 2019	Retrospective	USA	B-cell depleting therapy	_	-	_	_	80	_	_	_	_		
	cohort		Rituximab	-	_	_	_	32	-	_	-	_		
			Ocrelizumab	-	-	_	_	37	_	_	-	_		
			Both Rituximab and Ocrelizumab	-	-	_	—	11	—	_	-	_		
Seze 2020	Randomized controlled trial	_	Ofatumumab	1st dose: 60 mg Following doses = 20 mg every 4 weeks, starting from week 4	Subcutaneous		_	944	_					Baseline Range = 0–5.5
Vollmer 2020	Retrospective cohort	USA	Ocrelizumab	-	-	44.2	71 (75.5)	94	76	16	2	_	Mean years = 10	Baseline Median (IQR) = 5.5

Frontiers in Neurology

(Continued)

Paper	Study type	Country	Intervention	Dose	Mode of administration	Mean Sex ion age Female	ean Sex No ge Female pat	No. MS			MS t	ypes		EDSS
name and year			drug		administration	age	Female (%)	patients	RRMS	SP MS	PP MS	PR MS	Disease duration	
Vollmer 2020	Retrospective cohort	USA	Anti-CD20 (NS)			(Data is not exclusive to MS patients only)	527							
Wiendl 2020	Retrospective cohort	_	Ofatumumab	1st dose = 20 mg, days 1, 7, and 14 Follow up doses = 20 mg/4 weeks from week 4 onwards	Subcutaneous			964						
Illiopoulou 2021	Prospective observational cohort	Sweden	Rituximab	-	-	_	60 (100)	60	_	_	_	_		
Khatri 2021	Prospective observational cohort	USA	Ocrelizumab			_	_	223	_	_	_	_		
Mehta2021	Retrospective cohort	_	Rituximab	1,000 mg/6.10 months	Intravenous		-	34	_	—	—	-		
Vollmer 2021	Retrospective cohort	USA	Ocrelizumab	_	_	44.4	181 (73.9)	245	200	37	8	-	Mean years = 9.6	
Wiendl 2021	Retrospective cohort		Ofatumumab					1969						
Nobile 2022	Retrospective cohort	Canada	Ocrelizumab	1st dose = two 300 mg doses two weeks apart Following doses = 600 mg/6 months	Intravenous	_	_	266	232	34	_			
Rempe 2022	Retrospective	USA	Ocrelizumab Standard dosing (SD) regimen	1st dose = two 300 mg doses two weeks apart Following doses = 600 mg/6 months	Intravenous	_	_	65		_	_	_		
			Ocrelizumab B-cell based extended interval dosing (EID) regimen	Repeat infusions are delayed until there is evidence for B-cell repopulation	Intravenous	_	_	52	_	_	_	_		
Xavier 2022	Retrospective cohort		Rituximab					48						

EDSS, Expanded Disability Status Scale; PRMS, primary progressive multiple sclerosis; PRMS, progressive relapsing multiple sclerosis; RRMS, relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis; SPMS, secondary progressive multiple sclerosis. Baseline Mean (SD): levels of IgG before the treatment as a mean and standard deviations. Baseline Median (range): levels of IgG before the treatment as a median and IQR. Change from baseline to week 96: change in the IgG levels during the treatment. At follow up: change in the IgG levels during the follow up.

TABLE 2 Summary Correlations Explored in Subgroup Analysis.

Subgroups	No. of entries	RR (95% CI)	l² (%)	p _(interaction) (between subgroups)
Total incidence of l	nypogamma	globulinemia		
By drug type				
Ocrelizumab	11	0.11 [0.07; 0.16]	93	<0.01
Rituximab	12	0.18 [0.11; 0.28]	95	
Ofatumumab	3	0.02 [0.01; 0.02]	14	
Anti-CD20 (NS*)	6	0.10 [0.06; 0.15]	91	
By level of hypogam	maglobuliner	nia		
More than or	3	0.10 [0.03; 0.30]	95	0.03
equal to 7				
6-7	11	0.14 [0.09; 0.23]	95	
4-6	10	0.05 [0.03; 0.09]	96	
2-4	2	0.01 [0.00; 0.10]	92	
Less than or equal	2	0.03 [0.00; 0.35]	92	
to 2				
By treatment duration	on			
Less than or equal	4	0.19 [0.08; 0.40]	91	0.06
to 1 year				
About 2 years	6	0.12 [0.05; 0.26]	95	
About 3 years	5	0.07 [0.02; 0.17]	98	
About 4 years	4	0.13 [0.06; 0.26]	93	
5 years	1	0.07 [0.06; 0.08]		
8 years	1	0.05 [0.03; 0.08]	_	
By infection type				
Pulmonary infection	15			
Ocrelizumab	5	0.24 [0.08; 0.54]	95	< 0.01
Rituximab	3	0.01 [0.00; 0.29]	99	
Ofatumumab	3	0.07 [0.02; 0.22]	96	
Anti-CD20 (NS*)	1	0.03 [0.01; 0.05]	_	
Urinary tract infecti	ons			
Ocrelizumab	5	0.10 [0.03; 0.25]	89	0.21
Rituximab	3	0.03 [0.02; 0.06]	66	
Ofatumumab	2	0.02 [0.00; 0.14]	98	
Anti-CD20	1	0.03 [0.02, 0.05]	_	
(NS*)				
Gastrointestinal infe	ctions			
Ocrelizumab	3	0.01 [0.00; 0.05]	87	0.10
Rituximab	3	0.04 [0.02; 0.09]	55	
Ofatumumab	1	0.03 [0.01; 0.07]	_	
Anti-CD20	1	0.01 [0.00; 0.03]	_	
(NS*)				
Skin and mucous me	embrane infe	ctions		
Ocrelizumab	3	0.06 [0.01; 0.22]	79	0.01
Rituximab	2	0.00 [0.00; 0.02]	0	

(Continued)

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Subgroups	Number of entries	MD (95% CI)	² (%)	p _(interaction) (between subgroups)
Pre and post drug	intake IgG leve	els		
By drug				
Ocrelizumab	6	1.01 [0.45; 1.57]	52	<0.01
Rituximab	3	0.14 [-0.33; 0.61]	26	
Ofatumumab	2	-0.06 [-0.25; 0.14]	0	
Anti-CD20 (NS*)	2	0.91 [-0.25; 0.14]	82	
By treatment duration	on			
Less than or equal	8	0.44 [0.19; 0.69]	0	<0.01
to 1 year				
About 2 years	1	1.03 [-0.36; 2.42]	_	
About 3 years	3	0.65 [-0.83; 2.13]	90	
About 4 years	1	1.45 [0.32; 2.57]	_	

NS*, not specified.

3.3 Subgrouping by drug type and IgG level in serum

We identified 28 studies involving 12,012 patients that reported on the prevalence rate of hypogammaglobulinemia in patients of MS. The prevalence rate in the overall analysis was 11% (95% CI: 0.08 to 0.15), with substantial heterogeneity $[I^2 > 91\% (p < 0.01)]$. Examining subgroups based on drug type indicated that rituximab exhibited the highest prevalence at 18%, followed by ocrelizumab at 11%, non-specified anti-CD20 at 10%, and ofatumumab at 2%. The statistical test for subgroup differences yielded significance, indicating that the prevalence of hypogammaglobulinemia varies across drug types (rituxumab, ocrelizumab, ofatumumab, anti-CD20 (NS)) subgroups (*p* interaction <0.01) (Figure 2). The hypogammaglobulinemia thresholds determined by the included articles are listed in Table 3.

3.4 Subgrouping by treatment duration

We identified 20 studies involving 9,405 patients revealed that the duration of drug intake was a significant factor in hypogammaglobulinemia development. The prevalence rate of hypogammaglobulinemia in patients who take these drugs was 11% (95% CI: 0.07 to 0.16), with substantial heterogeneity $[I^2 > 96\%]$ (p < 0.01)] (Figure 3). Upon conducting subgroup analysis based on drug usage duration, it was observed that the highest proportion of hypogammaglobulinemia development occurred in individuals taking these drugs for 1 year or less (19%), followed by 4 years (13%), 2 years (12%), and 3 years (7%). There was no statistically significant difference between the six subgroups regarding duration of treatment with the specified disease modifying therapy (1 year or less, about 2 years, about 3 years, about 4 years, about 5 years or about 8 years) denoting that the proportion of hypogammaglobulinemia development does not vary majorly across different groups of drug intake duration (p interaction = 0.06).

Study E	vents	Total	Proportion	95%-CI
drug = Ocrelizumab Mears et al., 2023 Habek et al., 2022 Rempe et al., 2022 Nobile et al., 2022	14 5 38 11	152 37 117 266	0.09 0.14 0.32 0.04	[0.05; 0.15] [0.05; 0.29] [0.24; 0.42] [0.02; 0.07]
Seery et al., 2021 Khatri et al., 2021 Vollmer et al., 2021 Vollmer et al.,2020 Chang et al.,2019	16 26 11 7 25	185 223 245 94	0.09 0.12 0.04 0.07 0.36	[0.05; 0.14] [0.08; 0.17] [0.02; 0.08] [0.03; 0.15] [0.25: 0.49]
Tran et al., 2019 Derfuss et al., 2019 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 93\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.5782$, $p < 0.01$	27 152	207 2092 3687	0.13 0.07 0.11	[0.09; 0.18] [0.06; 0.08] [0.07; 0.16]
drug = Rituximab Mears et al., 2023 Karlowicz et al., 2023 Xavier et al., 2022	8 60 8	32 556	0.25 0.11 0.20	[0.11; 0.43] [0.08; 0.14] [0.09; 0.35]
lliopoulou et al., 2021 (during pregnancy) lliopoulou et al., 2021 (postpartum) Disanto et al., 2021 Mehta et al., 2021 Torgauten et al., 2021	32 22 17 17 19	71 62 59 34	0.45 0.35 0.29 0.50 0.05	[0.33; 0.57] [0.24; 0.49] [0.18; 0.42] [0.32; 0.68] [0.03; 0.08]
Vollmer et al., 2020 Hallberg et al., 2019 Graves et al., 2014 Hawker et al., 2009 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.9620$, $p < 0.01$	46 58 12 13	907 251 52 274 2704	0.05 0.23 0.23 0.05 0.18	[0.04; 0.07] [0.18; 0.29] [0.13; 0.37] [0.03; 0.08] [0.11; 0.28]
drug = Ofatumumab	22	1202	0.02	[0.01:0.03]
Wiendel et al., 2021 Seze et al., 2020 Random effects model Heterogeneity: I^2 = 14%, τ^2 = 0, p = 0.31	30 9	1969 1 333 - 3594 1	0.02 0.02 0.03 0.02	[0.01; 0.03] [0.01; 0.02] [0.01; 0.05] [0.01; 0.02]
drug = Anti-CD20 (NS) Oksbjerg et al., 2021 Bauhtman et al., 2020 Zoehner et al., 2019 Peters et al., 2022	19 1 71 22	$\begin{array}{c} 370 \\ 26 \\ 327 \\ 204 \end{array}$	0.05 0.04 0.22 0.11	[0.03; 0.08] [0.00; 0.20] [0.17; 0.27] [0.07: 0.16]
Tsao et al., 2019 Vollmer 2020 Random effects model Heterogeneity: l^2 = 91%, τ^2 = 0.3045, p < 0.01	80 38	573 + 527 2027 <	0.14 0.07 0.10	[0.11; 0.17] [0.05; 0.10] [0.06; 0.15]
Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.0884$, $p < 0.01$ Test for subgroup differences: $\chi_3^2 = 113.19$, df = 3 ($p < 0.01$)	Propo	12012 0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 rtion (hypogammaglobulinemia) subgro	0.11 1 puped by drug	[0.08; 0.15]
FIGURE 2 Analysis of drug type and IgG level in serum.				

3.5 Subgrouping by infection type

In this analysis, our aim was to identify prevalent infection types that occurred during the patients' treatment. The analysis was stratified for each infection type based on the MS drug used during the study.

3.5.1 Pulmonary infections

Fourteen studies involving 6,598 patients indicated the prevalence rate of pulmonary infections in MS patients. These infections ranged from upper respiratory tract issues like rhinitis and sinusitis to lower tract infections, including pneumonia requiring hospitalization. The prevalence rate in the overall analysis was 9% (95% CI: 0.04 to 0.20), with substantial heterogeneity [$I^2 > 98\%$ (p < 0.01)] (Figure 4). Examining subgroups based on drug type indicated that patients who used ocrelizumab exhibited the highest prevalence of pulmonary infections at 26%, followed by rituxumab at 6%, non-specified anti-CD20 at 3%, and ofatumumab at 1%. The statistical test for subgroup differences yielded significance, indicating that the prevalence of pulmonary infections varies across drug types (rituxumab, ocrelizumab, ofatumumab), subgroups (p interaction <0.01).

TABLE 3	Hypogammaglobulinemia	thresholds	determined	by the
included	articles.			

Subgrouping by reference point										
Study	Year	Reference point of hypogammaglobulinemia (g/L)								
Salzer et al.	2016	6.2								
Tran et al.	2019	6								
Hallberg et al.	2019	5.65								
Bauhtman et al.	2020	6								
Seze et al. (16–19 years)	2020	5.49								
Seze et al.										
(>19 years)	2020	7								
Vollmer et al.	2020	7								
Vollmer et al.	2020	5								
Disanto et al.	2021	7.37								
Wiendel et al.	2020	7								
Oksbjerg et al.	2021	6.1								
Iliopoulou et al.	2021	6.7								
Wiendel et al.	2021	5.65								
Khatri et al.	2021	6								
Vollmer et al.	2021	5								
Seery et al.	2021	5.52								
Perriguey et al.	2022	7								
Habek et al.	2022	7								
Hauser et al.	2022	5.65								
Peters et al.	2022	6								
Xavier et al.	2022	6								
Pukaj et al.	2022	7								
Mears et al.	2023	6								
Karlowicz et al.	2023	6								
Capasso et al.	2023	7.37								

3.5.2 Urinary tract infections

Thirteen studies involving 4,484 patients indicated the prevalence rate of urinary tract infections (UTI) in MS patients. These infections ranged from upper to lower tract infections. The prevalence rate in the overall analysis was 6% (95% CI: 0.03 to 0.11), with substantial heterogeneity [$I^2 > 95\%$ (p < 0.01)] (Figure 5). Examining subgroups based on drug type indicated that patients use ocrelizumab exhibited the highest prevalence of urinary infections at 13%, followed by rituxumab at 3%, non-specified anti-CD20 at 3%, and ofatumumab at 2%. The statistical test for subgroup differences did not yield significance, indicating that the prevalence of urinary infections does not vary across drug types (rituxumab, ocrelizumab, ofatumumab), subgroups (p interaction <0.01).

3.5.3 Gastrointestinal infections

Nine studies involving 2,664 patients indicated the prevalence rate of gastrointestinal (GIT) infections in MS patients. The prevalence rate

in the overall analysis was 2% (95% CI: 0.01 to 0.04), with substantial heterogeneity [$I^2 > 79\%$ (p < 0.01)] (Figure 6). Examining subgroups based on drug type indicated that patients use ocrelizumab exhibited the highest prevalence of gastrointestinal infections at 4%, followed by ofatumumab at 3%, rituxumab at 1%, and non-specified anti-CD20 at 1%. The statistical test for subgroup differences did not yield significance, indicating that the prevalence of gastrointestinal infections does not vary across drug types (rituxumab, ocrelizumab, ofatumumab), subgroups (p interaction = 0.12).

3.5.4 Skin and mucous membrane infections

Five studies involving 1,058 patients indicated the prevalence rate of skin and mucous membrane infections in MS patients. The prevalence rate in the overall analysis was 2% (95% CI: 0.00 to 0.09), with substantial heterogeneity [I^2 >90% (p<0.01)] (Figure 7). Examining subgroups based on drug type indicated that patients use ocrelizumab exhibited the highest prevalence of gastrointestinal infections at 6%, followed by rituxumab at 0%. The statistical test for subgroup differences yielded significance, indicating that the prevalence of skin and mucous membrane infections varies across drug types (rituxumab, ocrelizumab), subgroups (p interaction <0.01).

3.5.5 Herpes virus infections

Nine studies involving 4,405 patients indicated the prevalence rate of herpes virus infections in MS patients. The prevalence rate in the overall analysis was 1% (95% CI: 0.00 to 0.03), with substantial heterogeneity [$I^2 > 90\%$ (p < 0.01)] (Figure 8). Examining subgroups based on drug type indicated that patients use ocrelizumab exhibited the highest prevalence of gastrointestinal infections at 4%, followed by rituxumab at 1%; ofatumumab at 0%. The statistical test for subgroup differences yielded significance, indicating that the prevalence of skin and mucous membrane infections varies across drug types (rituxumab, ocrelizumab and ofatumumab), subgroups (p interaction <0.01).

3.6 Mean difference in IgG level pre-drug and post-drug intake

Our analysis aimed to investigate the relationship between the MS drugs and IgG levels drop by comparing the mean IgG before and after drug intake taking into account the drug type and duration of the drug intake.

Ten studies involving 3,589 MS patients demonstrated significantly lower IgG level in post treatment group compared to pre-treatment. The mean difference was 0.57 (95% CI: 0.22 to 0.93), with substantial heterogeneity ($I^2 > 80\%$) (Figure 9). However, when subgrouping by different drugs only Ofatumumab showed statistically significant IgG levels drop of -0.06 mean difference (-0.25; 013, $I^2 = 82\%$, p = 0.02) while ocrelizumab, rituximab and anti-CD20 all showed no statistical significance (p = 0.10, 0.26, 0.56 respectively). Subgroups of different drugs [rituxumab, ocrelizumab, ofatumumab, anti-CD20 (NS)], Figure 9 shows statistical significance in mean differences of serum IgG levels decrease (p interaction = <0.01). The statistical test for subgroup differences yielded significance, indicating that the mean differences of serum IgG levels vary across drug types [rituxumab, ocrelizumab, ofatumumab, anti-CD20 (NS)], subgroups (p interaction <0.01).

Study	Events Total	Proportion 95%-CI
time = less than or equal to 1 year Mears et al., 2023 Disanto et al., 2021 Iliopoulou et al., 2021 Bauhtman et al., 2020 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 91\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.8797$, $p < 0.01$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0.12 [0.08; 0.18] 0.29 [0.18; 0.42] 0.45 [0.33; 0.57] 0.04 [0.00; 0.20] 0.19 [0.08; 0.40]
time = about 2 years Karlowicz et al., 2023 Nobile et al., 2022 Mehta et al., 2021 Seze et al., 2020 Tran et al., 2019 Hallberg et al., 2019 Random effects model Heterogeneity: I^2 = 95%, τ^2 = 1.3060, p < 0.01	60 556 11 266 + 17 34 9 333 = 27 207 + 58 251 + 1647 -	0.11 [0.08; 0.14] 0.04 [0.02; 0.07] 0.50 [0.32; 0.68] 0.03 [0.01; 0.05] 0.13 [0.09; 0.18] 0.23 [0.18; 0.29] 0.12 [0.05; 0.26]
time = about 3 years Hauser et al., 2022 Khatri et al., 2021 Tsao et al., 2019 Wiendel et al., 2021 Zoehner et al., 2019 Random effects model Heterogeneity: I^2 = 98%, τ^2 = 1.4841, p < 0.01	22 1292 26 223 91 573 30 1969 71 327 4384	0.02 [0.01; 0.03] 0.12 [0.08; 0.17] 0.16 [0.13; 0.19] 0.02 [0.01; 0.02] 0.22 [0.17; 0.27] 0.07 [0.02; 0.17]
time = about 4 years Peters et al., 2022 Habek et al., 2022 Iliopoulou et al., 2021 (post partum) Torgauten et al., 2021 Random effects model Heterogeneity: I^2 = 93%, τ^2 = 0.6594, p < 0.01	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0.11 [0.07; 0.16] 0.14 [0.05; 0.29] 0.35 [0.24; 0.49] 0.05 [0.03; 0.08] 0.13 [0.06; 0.26]
time = 5 years Derfuss et al., 2019	152 2092 💽	0.07 [0.06; 0.08]
time = 8 years Hawker et al., 2009	13 274 🛨	0.05 [0.03; 0.08]
Random effects model Heterogeneity: I^2 = 96%, τ^2 = 1.2602, p < 0.01 Test for subgroup differences: χ_5^2 = 10.60, df = 5 (p = 0.06) Propo	9405 0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0 tion (hypogammaglobulinemia) subgroup	0.11 [0.07; 0.16] 0.8 1 ed by the duration of the drug

Analysis of IgG level and treatment duration.

Regarding the duration of drug intake, the overall showed a mean difference of 0.57 in IgG level between pre-drug and postdrug intake (0.17; 0.93, $I^2 = 79\%$, p < 0.01) (Figure 10). Subgroup analysis based on drug usage duration revealed that drug intake for one year or less showed no significant change when comparing pre to post mean IgG level (p = 0.43). Subgroups of treatment duration of about 3 years also show no statistically significant mean difference of IgG level. There were not enough studies available for drug intake durations of 2 years, 1.5 years or 4 years to apply the random effects model on the data. Subgroups of different treatment durations (1 year or less, 1.5 years, about 2 years, about 3 years, about 4 years) Figure 10 showed no statistical significance in mean differences of serum IgG levels decrease (p interaction = 0.33).

3.7 Funnel plot analyses: publication bias

The assessment of potential publication bias through funnel plots yielded consistently revealed no evidence of publication bias or asymmetry. Overall, funnel plot assessments consistently revealed no evidence of publication bias or asymmetry. In the subgroup analysis based on drug type and IgG levels in serum, the linear regression Egger's test yielded no detectable funnel plot asymmetry (p = 0.5908). Similarly, the investigation into treatment duration and its relationship with hypogammaglobulinemia showed no funnel plot asymmetry, as indicated by the Egger's test result of p = 0.9035. Furthermore, in the analysis of mean differences in IgG levels pre-drug and post-drug intake, the Egger's test for the overall results once again demonstrated no funnel plot asymmetry (p = 0.9035).

$ \begin{array}{c} drug = Ocrelizumab \\ Capasso et al., 2023 \\ Serey et al., 2021 \\ Ruiz et al., 2021 \\ Habek et al., 2021 \\ Montalban et al., 2020 \\ Montalban et al., 2020 \\ Montalban et al., 2017 \\ Radom effects model \\ Heterogeneity: f^2 = 94\%, \tau^2 = 0.6962, p < 0.01 \\ \hline drug = Ofatumumab \\ Wiendel et al., 2022 \\ Random effects model \\ Heterogeneity: f^2 = 99\%, \tau^2 = 12.8166, p < 0.01 \\ \hline drug = Rituximab \\ Karlowicz et al., 2021 \\ Monteffects model \\ Heterogeneity: f^2 = 99\%, \tau^2 = 12.8166, p < 0.01 \\ \hline drug = not-CD20 \\ Hauser et al., 2021 \\ Hauser et al., 2020 \\ Satzer et al., 2021 \\ Hauser et al., 2021 \\ Heterogeneity: f^2 = 99\%, \tau^2 = 12.8166, p < 0.01 \\ \hline drug = Rituximab \\ Karlowicz et al., 2021 \\ Heterogeneity: f^2 = 99\%, \tau^2 = 12.8166, p < 0.01 \\ \hline drug = not-CD20 \\ Hauser et al., 2021 \\ Heterogeneity: f^2 = 99\%, \tau^2 = 12.8166, p < 0.01 \\ \hline drug = not-CD20 \\ Hauser et al., 2021 \\ Heterogeneity: f^2 = 99\%, \tau^2 = 1.6189, p < 0.01 \\ \hline drug = not-CD20 \\ Heterogeneity: f^2 = 99\%, \tau^2 = 1.6189, p < 0.01 \\ \hline drug = not-CD20 \\ Heterogeneity: f^2 = 99\%, \tau^2 = 1.1689, p < 0.01 \\ \hline drug = not-CD20 \\ Heterogeneity: f^2 = 99\%, \tau^2 = 1.1689, p < 0.01 \\ \hline drug = not-CD20 \\ Heterogeneity: f^2 = 99\%, \tau^2 = 1.1689, p < 0.01 \\ \hline drug = not-CD20 \\ \hline drug = not-C$		Study	Events	Total					Ρ	roportion	95%-CI	Weight	
Capasso et al., 2023 2 78 0 0.03 $[0.00, 0.09]$ 6.0% Servy et al., 2021 94 185 0 0.51 $[0.43; 0.58]$ 7.0% Hubek et al., 2021 3 52 0 0.66 $[0.01; 0.16]$ 6.3% Habek et al., 2022 74 109 0.68 $[0.58; 0.77]$ 6.9% Montalban et al., 2017 222 488 0.45 $[0.41; 0.50]$ 7.0% Kappos et al., 2011 9 55 0.16 $[0.00; 0.00]$ 6.8% Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.6962$, $p < 0.01$ Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.6962$, $p < 0.01$ drug = Ofatumumab Wiendel et al., 2022 1 1222 0 0.01 $[0.00; 0.00]$ 6.8% Hauser et al., 2020 56 134 0 0.01 $[0.00; 0.00]$ 6.8% Andom effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 12.8166$, $p < 0.01$ drug = Rituximab Karlowicz et al., 2021 55 $[0.15; 0.41]$ 46.7% Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 12.8166$, $p < 0.01$ drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbiger et al., 2021 1 22 0 0.03 $[0.02; 0.04]$ 6.9% Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.1689$, $p < 0.01$ drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbiger et al., 2021 1 2 447 0 0.03 $[0.01; 0.05]$ 6.8% Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbiger et al., 2021 1 2 447 0 0.03 $[0.01; 0.05]$ 6.8% Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbiger et al., 2021 1 2 447 0 0.03 $[0.01; 0.05]$ 6.8% Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbiger et al., 2021 1 2 447 0 0.03 $[0.01; 0.05]$ 6.8% Andom effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbiger of ulumonary infections subgrouped by drug		drug = Ocrelizumab			1								
Seery et al., 2021 Ruiz et al., 2021 Ruiz et al., 2021 Habek et al., 2022 Garcia-Canibano et al., 2020 Garcia-Canibano et al., 2020 Garcia-Canibano et al., 2020 Garcia-Canibano et al., 2020 Garcia-Canibano et al., 2017 Kappos et al., 2011 $10 ext{ 160} ext{ 160}$		Capasso et al., 2023	2	78 +	-					0.03	[0.00; 0.09]	6.0%	
Ruiz et al., 2021 3 52 0.06 [0.01; 0.16] 6.3% Habek et al., 2020 11 60 0.68 [0.58; 0.77] 6.9% Garcia-Canibano et al., 2017 222 488 0.45 [0.41; 0.50] 7.0% Kappos et al., 2011 9 55 0.16 [0.08; 0.29] 6.7% Random effects model 1027 0.26 [0.15; 0.41] 46.7% Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$, $t^2 = 0.6962, p < 0.01$ 10 1969 0.01 [0.00; 0.00] 5.3% Seze et al., 2022 1 1292 0.01 [0.00; 0.00] 5.3% Seze et al., 2020 56 134 0.42 [0.33; 0.51] 7.0% Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%$, $t^2 = 12.8166, p < 0.01$ 15 556 0.03 [0.02; 0.04] 6.9% Maxer et al., 2021 17 59 0.04 [0.03; 0.06] 7.0% Satzer et al., 2021 17 59 0.04 [0.02; 0.07] 6.8% Hawker et al., 2021 12 2447 0.03 [0.04; 0.20] 100.0% Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$, $t^2 = 1.089, p < 0.01$		Seery et al., 2021	94	185		-	•			0.51	[0.43; 0.58]	7.0%	
Habek et al., 2022 Garcia-Canibano et al., 2020 Montalban et al., 2017 Kappos et al., 2017 222 488 Montalban et al., 2017 222 488 9 55 1027 11 60 11 129 11 1292 11 12 447 11 1292 11 12 447 11 12 447		Ruiz et al., 2021	3	52 🕂	-					0.06	[0.01; 0.16]	6.3%	
Garcia-Caribano et al., 2020 Montalban et al., 2017 Kappos et al., 2011 Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.6962$, $p < 0.01$ drug = Ofatumumab Wiendel et al., 2021 Hauser et al., 2020 Kandom effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.28166$, $p < 0.01$ drug = Rituximab Karlowicz et al., 2021 Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.28166$, $p < 0.01$ drug = arti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbjerg et. al., 2021 Test for subgroup differences: $\chi_3^2 = 32.61$, $df = 3$ ($p < 0.01$ recurs 4 Analysis of Pulmonary infections among the included studies.		Habek et al., 2022	74	109			+	-		0.68	[0.58; 0.77]	6.9%	
Montalban et al., 2017 222 488 9 95 0.22 0.45 0.41; 0.50; 0.7% 0.645 0.01; 0.06; 0.29; 0.16 0.08; 0.29; 0.16 0.08; 0.29; 0.16 0.08; 0.29; 0.11; 0.145; 0.45; 0.01; 0.00; 0.01; 0.00; 0.01; 0.00; 0.01; 0.00; 0.01; 0.00; 0.01; 0.01; 0.00; 0.01; 0.00; 0.01; 0.00; 0.01; 0.00; 0.01; 0.00; 0.01; 0.01; 0.02; 0.04; 0.03; 0.02; 0.04; 0.03; 0.02; 0.04; 0.03; 0.04; 0.03; 0.04; 0.03; 0.04; 0.03; 0.04; 0.02; 0.04; 0.02; 0.04; 0.02; 0.04; 0.02; 0.03; 0.01; <li0.02< td=""><td></td><td>Garcia-Canibano et al., 2020</td><td>11</td><td>60</td><td>+</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>0.18</td><td>[0.10; 0.30]</td><td>6.8%</td><td></td></li0.02<>		Garcia-Canibano et al., 2020	11	60	+					0.18	[0.10; 0.30]	6.8%	
Kappos et al., 20119550.16 $[0.08; 0.29]$ 6.7% Random effects model10270.26 $[0.15; 0.41]$ 46.7% Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%, \tau^2 = 0.6962, p < 0.01$ 10 1969 0.01 $[0.00; 0.01]$ 6.8% Wiendel et al., 202110 1969 0.01 $[0.00; 0.00]$ 5.3% Seze et al., 202056 134 0.42 $[0.33; 0.51]$ 7.0% Random effects model0.01 $[0.00; 0.48]$ 19.0% Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%, \tau^2 = 12.8166, p < 0.01$ 15 556 0.03 $[0.02; 0.04]$ 6.9% Disanto et al., 202315 556 0.03 $[0.02; 0.04]$ 6.9% Disanto et al., 201633 822 0.04 $[0.03; 0.02]$ 0.04 $[0.02; 0.07]$ 6.8% Hawker et al., 201633 822 0.04 $[0.02; 0.07]$ 6.8% Hauser et al., 201611 292 0.04 $[0.02; 0.07]$ 6.8% Hauser et al., 201612 44.7 0.03 $[0.01; 0.05]$ 6.8% Gradom effects model 1729 0.04 $[0.02; 0.16]$ 27.5% Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%, \tau^2 = 1.1689, p < 0.01$ 12 447 0.03 $[0.01; 0.05]$ 6.8% Oksbjerg et. al., 202112 12 447 0.03 $[0.01; 0.05]$ 6.8% Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%, \tau^2 = 3.0032, p < 0.01$ 12 447 0.03 $0.01; 0.05]$ 6.8% Random effects model 0.02 0.4		Montalban et al., 2017	222	488		++				0.45	[0.41; 0.50]	7.0%	
Random effects model 1027 0.26 [0.15; 0.41] 46.7% Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.6962$, $p < 0.01$ 0.01 [0.00; 0.01] 6.8% Wiendel et al., 2021 10 1969 0.01 [0.00; 0.01] 6.8% Hauser et al., 2020 56 134 0.42 [0.33; 0.51] 7.0% Seze et al., 2020 56 134 0.01 [0.00; 0.04] 6.9% Miendel et al., 2021 17 59 0.03 [0.02; 0.04] 6.9% Disanto et al., 2016 33 822 0.04 [0.03; 0.06] 7.0% Hawker et al., 2020 11 292 0.04 [0.02; 0.07] 6.8% Salzer et al., 2016 33 822 0.04 [0.02; 0.01] 6.9% Havker et al., 2019 11 292 0.04 [0.02; 0.07] 6.8% Random effects model 11 292 0.04 [0.02; 0.07] 6.8% Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.1689$, $p < 0.01$ 12 247 0.03 [0.01; 0.05] 6.8% Random effects model 12 247 0.03 [0.01; 0.05] 6.8% Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ 12 447 0.03 [0.01; 0.05] 6.8% Grug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, occrelizumab and rituximab) 0.0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 0.09 [0.04; 0.		Kappos et al., 2011	9	55	++					0.16	[0.08; 0.29]	6.7%	
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 94\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.6962$, $p < 0.01$ drug = Ofatumumab Wiendel et al., 2021 Hauser et al., 2022 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 12.8166$, $p < 0.01$ drug = Rituximab Karlowicz et al., 2023 Disanto et al., 2021 Salzer et al., 2016 Hawker et al., 2021 Hawker et al., 2020 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.1689$, $p < 0.01$ drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbierg et. al., 2021 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.1689$, $p < 0.01$ drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbierg et. al., 2021 Text for subgroup differences: $\chi_3^2 = 32.61$, df = 3 ($p < 0.01$) FIGURE 4 Analysis of Pulmonary infections among the included studies.		Random effects model		1027	<	>				0.26	[0.15; 0.41]	46.7%	
drug = Ofatumumab Wiendel et al., 2021 Hauser et al., 202010 1969 1 1292 5 6 1340.01 [0.00; 0.01] 6.8% 0.00 [0.00; 0.00] 5.3% 6 0.01 [0.00; 0.00] 5.3% 0.02 [0.33; 0.51] 7.0% 0.01 [0.00; 0.48] 19.0%Random effects model Heterogeneity: l^2 = 99%, τ^2 = 12.8166, $p < 0.01$ 0.03 [0.02; 0.04] 6.9% 0.01 [0.00; 0.48] 19.0%drug = Rituximab Marlowicz et al., 2023 Disanto et al., 2021 Salzer et al., 2016 Hawker et al., 2009 Hawker et al., 2009 Heterogeneity: l^2 = 95%, τ^2 = 1.1689, $p < 0.01$ 0.03 [0.02; 0.04] 6.9% 0.04 [0.03; 0.06] 7.0% 1729drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbjerg et. al., 2021 Test for subgroup differences: χ_3^2 = 32.61, df = 3 ($p < 0.01$ 12 447 0.02 0.07 12 4470.03 [0.01; 0.05] 6.8% 0.02 0.01 jolo.0%Random effects model Heterogeneity: l^2 = 98%, τ^2 = 3.0032, $p < 0.01$ Test for subgroup differences: χ_3^2 = 32.61, df = 3 ($p < 0.01$ 12 447 0.02 0.07 0.01 jolo.0%FIGURE 4 Proportion of pulmonary infections among the included studies.6598 0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 0 0.2 0.7 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 0 0.2 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7		Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 94\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.6962$, $p < 0.01$											
Wiendel et al., 2021 Hauser et al., 202210 1969 1 12920.01 $[0.00; 0.01]$ 6.8% 0.00 $[0.00; 0.00]$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 12.8166, p < 0.01$ 6.8% 1 12920.00 $[0.00; 0.00]$ 5.3% 0.00 $[0.00; 0.00]$ drug = Rituximab Karlowicz et al., 202315 5560.03 $[0.02; 0.04]$ 6.9% 0.01 $[0.00; 0.48]$ 19.0%drug = Rituximab Karlowicz et al., 202117 590.29 $[0.18; 0.42]$ 6.8% 0.04 $[0.02; 0.07]$ 6.8% 6.8% 0.04 $[0.02; 0.07]$ drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbjerg et. al., 202112 4470.03 $[0.01; 0.05]$ 6.8% 0.09 $[0.04; 0.20]$ drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbjerg et. al., 202112 4470.03 $[0.01; 0.05]$ 6.8%Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.032$, $p < 0.01$ 65980.09 $[0.04; 0.20]$ 100.0%Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.032$, $p < 0.01$ 12 2470.03 $[0.01; 0.05]$ 6.8%Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.032$, $p < 0.01$ 12 4470.03 $[0.01; 0.05]$ 6.8%Figure 4 Analysis of Pulmonary infections among the included studies.		drug = Ofatumumab											
Hauser et al., 2022 Seze et al., 2020 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 12.8166$, $p < 0.01$ drug = Rituximab Karlowicz et al., 2023 Disanto et al., 2021 Salzer et al., 2016 Hawker et al., 2009 Hawker et al., 2009 Hawker et al., 2009 Hawker et al., 2009 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.1689$, $p < 0.01$ drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbjerg et. al., 2021 Test for subgroup differences: $\chi_3^2 = 32.61$, df = 3 ($p < 0.01$) 0, 0 , 2 , 0 , 4 , 0 , 6 , 8 , $1Proportion of pulmonary infections subgrouped by drug$		Wiendel et al., 2021	10	1969						0.01	[0.00; 0.01]	6.8%	
Seze et al., 2020 56 134 0.42 $(0.33; 0.51)$ 7.0% Random effects model 0.01 $(0.00; 0.48]$ 19.0% Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%, \tau^2 = 12.8166, p < 0.01$ 15 556 0.03 $(0.02; 0.04]$ 6.9% Disanto et al., 2023 15 556 0.03 $(0.02; 0.04]$ 6.9% Salzer et al., 2016 33 822 0.04 $(0.03; 0.06]$ 7.0% Hawker et al., 2009 11 292 0.04 $(0.02; 0.07]$ 6.8% Random effects model 1729 0.06 $(0.02; 0.07]$ 6.8% Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%, \tau^2 = 1.1689, p < 0.01$ 12 447 0.03 $(0.01; 0.05]$ 6.8% Random effects model 12 447 0.03 $(0.01; 0.05]$ 6.8% Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%, \tau^2 = 3.0032, p < 0.01$ 12 447 0.03 $(0.01; 0.05]$ 6.8% Output 0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 Proportion of pulmonary infections subgrouped by drug FiGURE 4		Hauser et al., 2022	1	1292						0.00	[0.00; 0.00]	5.3%	
Random effects model 3395 0.01 $[0.00; 0.48]$ 19.0% Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%, \tau^2 = 12.8166, p < 0.01$ 0.01 $[0.00; 0.48]$ 19.0% drug = Rituximab 0.03 $[0.02; 0.04]$ 6.9% Karlowicz et al., 2023 15 556 Disanto et al., 2021 17 59 Salzer et al., 2016 33 822 Hawker et al., 2009 11 292 Random effects model 1729 Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 95\%, \tau^2 = 1.1689, p < 0.01$ drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbjerg et. al., 2021 12 447 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 98\%, \tau^2 = 3.0032, p < 0.01$ Test for subgroup differences: $\chi_3^2 = 32.61, df = 3 (p < 0.01)$ Proportion of pulmonary infections subgrouped by drug		Seze et al., 2020	56	134						0.42	[0.33; 0.51]	7.0%	
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 12.8166$, $p < 0.01$ drug = Rituximab Karlowicz et al., 2023 Disanto et al., 2021 Salzer et al., 2016 Hawker et al., 2016 Hawker et al., 2009 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.1689$, $p < 0.01$ drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbjerg et. al., 2021 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Heter		Random effects model		3395 🧲	:					0.01	[0.00; 0.48]	19.0%	
drug = Rituximab Karlowicz et al., 2023155560.03 $[0.02; 0.04]$ 6.9% $0.29Disanto et al., 202117590.29[0.18; 0.42]6.8\%0.04Salzer et al., 2016338220.04[0.02; 0.07]6.8\%0.04Hawker et al., 2009112920.04[0.02; 0.07]6.8\%0.06Random effects model17290.06[0.02; 0.16]27.5\%Heterogeneity: l^2 = 95\%, \tau^2 = 1.1689, p < 0.01124470.03[0.01; 0.05]6.8\%Markom effects model124470.03[0.01; 0.05]6.8\%Heterogeneity: l^2 = 98\%, \tau^2 = 3.0032, p < 0.0165980.90.020.40.09[0.04; 0.20]100.0\%Heterogeneity: l^2 = 98\%, \tau^2 = 3.0032, p < 0.0100.20.40.60.81Proportion of pulmonary infections subgrouped by drug0.90.04; 0.20100.0\%Heterogeneity: l^20.020.40.60.81Proportion of pulmonary infections subgrouped by drug0.90.020.40.60.8Heterogeneity: l^20.98\%, \tau^2 = 3.0032, p < 0.0100.20.40.60.81Proportion of pulmonary infections subgrouped by drug0.90.020.40.60.81$		Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 99\%$, $\tau^2 = 12.8166$, $p < 0.01$											
Karlowicz et al., 2023 15 556 0.03 [0.02; 0.04] 6.9% Disanto et al., 2021 17 59 0.29 [0.18; 0.42] 6.8% Salzer et al., 2016 33 822 0.04 [0.03; 0.06] 7.0% Hawker et al., 2009 11 292 0.04 [0.02; 0.07] 6.8% Random effects model 11 292 0.06 [0.02; 0.16] 27.5% Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.1689$, $p < 0.01$ 12 447 0.03 [0.01; 0.05] 6.8% Random effects model 12 447 0.03 [0.04; 0.20] 100.0% Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ 12 447 0.03 [0.04; 0.20] 100.0% Test for subgroup differences: $\chi_3^2 = 32.61$, df = 3 ($p < 0.01$) 0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 Proportion of pulmonary infections subgrouped by drug 10.00% 10.00% 10.00% 10.00% 10.00% 10.00% 10.00% 10.00% 10.00% 10.00% 10.00% 10.00% 10.00% 10.00% 10.00% 10.00% 10.00% 10.00%<		drug = Rituximab											
Disanto et al., 2021 Salzer et al., 2016 Hawker et al., 2009 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.1689$, $p < 0.01$ drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbjerg et. al., 2021 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Test for subgroup differences: $\chi_3^2 = 32.61$, df = 3 ($p < 0.01$) FIGURE 4 Analysis of Pulmonary infections among the included studies.		Karlowicz et al., 2023	15	556 📩						0.03	[0.02; 0.04]	6.9%	
Salzer et al., 2016 Hawker et al., 2009 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.1689$, $p < 0.01$ drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbjerg et. al., 2021 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Test for subgroup differences: $\chi_3^2 = 32.61$, df = 3 ($p < 0.01$) FIGURE 4 Analysis of Pulmonary infections among the included studies. Salzer et al., 2016 33 822 11 292 12 447 1729 0.04 [0.03; 0.06] 7.0% 0.04 [0.02; 0.07] 6.8% 0.06 [0.02; 0.16] 27.5% 0.03 [0.01; 0.05] 6.8% 0.09 [0.04; 0.20] 100.0%		Disanto et al., 2021	17	59	-+	-				0.29	[0.18; 0.42]	6.8%	
Hawker et al., 2009 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.1689$, $p < 0.01$ drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbjerg et. al., 2021 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Test for subgroup differences: $\chi_3^2 = 32.61$, df = 3 ($p < 0.01$) FIGURE 4 Analysis of Pulmonary infections among the included studies.		Salzer et al., 2016	33	822 📑						0.04	[0.03; 0.06]	7.0%	
Random effects model17290.06 $[0.02; 0.16]$ 27.5%Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.1689$, $p < 0.01$ drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbjerg et. al., 20210.03 $[0.01; 0.05]$ 6.8%Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Test for subgroup differences: $\chi_3^2 = 32.61$, df = 3 ($p < 0.01$)65980.09 $[0.04; 0.20]$ 100.0%FIGURE 4 Analysis of Pulmonary infections among the included studies.FIGURE 4 Analysis of Pulmonary infections among the included studies.65980.09 $[0.04; 0.20]$ 100.0%		Hawker et al., 2009	11	292						0.04	[0.02; 0.07]	6.8%	
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.1689$, $p < 0.01$ drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbjerg et. al., 2021 12 447 0.03 [0.01; 0.05] 6.8% Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.032$, $p < 0.01$ Test for subgroup differences: $\chi_3^2 = 32.61$, df = 3 ($p < 0.01$) 0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 Proportion of pulmonary infections subgrouped by drug FIGURE 4 Analysis of Pulmonary infections among the included studies.		Random effects model		1729 <	>					0.06	[0.02; 0.16]	27.5%	
drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rituximab) Oksbjerg et. al., 2021 12 447 $0.03 [0.01; 0.05] 6.8\%$ Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Test for subgroup differences: $\chi_3^2 = 32.61$, df = 3 ($p < 0.01$) 0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 Proportion of pulmonary infections subgrouped by drug FIGURE 4 Analysis of Pulmonary infections among the included studies.		Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 95\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.1689$, $p < 0.01$									•		
Oksbjerg et. al., 202112 4470.03 [0.01; 0.05]6.8%Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Test for subgroup differences: $\chi_3^2 = 32.61$, df = 3 ($p < 0.01$)12 4470.03 [0.01; 0.05]6.8%Output to the subgroup differences: $\chi_3^2 = 32.61$, df = 3 ($p < 0.01$)00.20.40.60.81FIGURE 4 Analysis of Pulmonary infections among the included studies.		drug = anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rit	tuximab)									
Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$ Test for subgroup differences: $\chi_3^2 = 32.61$, df = 3 ($p < 0.01$)65980.09 [0.04; 0.20] 100.0%Proportion of 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 Proportion of pulmonary infections subgrouped by drugFIGURE 4 Analysis of Pulmonary infections among the included studies.		Oksbjerg et. al., 2021	12	447 🔤						0.03	[0.01; 0.05]	6.8%	
Test for subgroup differences: χ_3^2 = 32.61, df = 3 (p < 0.01) 0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1 Proportion of pulmonary infections subgrouped by drug FIGURE 4 Analysis of Pulmonary infections among the included studies.		Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 3.0032$, $p < 0.01$		6598 <		-	- 1	-1		0.09	[0.04; 0.20]	100.0%	
FIGURE 4 Analysis of Pulmonary infections among the included studies.		Test for subgroup differences: $\chi_3^2 = 32.61$, df = 3 ($p < 0.01$)		0	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	1				
FIGURE 4 Analysis of Pulmonary infections among the included studies.			Prop	ortion of	pulmona	ary infe	ections	subgr	rouped	d by drug			
Analysis of Pulmonary infections among the included studies.	FIG	URE 4											
	An	alysis of Pulmonary infections among the included studies.											

3.8 Leave-one-out results

We conducted leave-one-out analyses to evaluate the impact of individual studies on the overall findings within each subgroup analysis. Across all subgroup analyses based on drug type, IgG levels in serum, treatment duration, and infection type, no single study significantly influenced the results. This suggests the robustness and stability of the reported data.

3.9 Quality assessment of included studies

We utilized various tools to assess the quality of the 36 studies included in our analysis. We used the ROB2 tool for six RCTs; three of them were rated as good quality (24, 26, 51), and the other three studies were of low quality (23, 36, 46) due to the limited available data in the studies. We used the NIH tool for 30 Cohort and crosssectional studies, 19 of them were of good quality (14, 15, 17–22, 25, 27, 28, 32, 35, 37, 40, 41, 47, 50, 52), 11 studies were of fair quality (16, 29, 30, 38, 39, 42–45, 48, 49). Three studies were assessed using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale, with two scoring nine stars (31, 33), and one scoring eight stars (34). We also encountered challenges with incomplete data in some conference abstracts, leading to a fair quality rating for many of the assessments. Further details can be found in the Supplementary material containing the tables of quality assessment.

4 Discussion

To our knowledge this is the first large population-based study investigating the intricate connection between anti-CD20 MS treatments, changes in IgG levels, and the associated risk of hypogammaglobulinemia and subsequent infections. In our comprehensive analysis, we examined 36 studies aiming to elucidate the link between the immunosuppressive impacts of various anti-CD20 monoclonal antibody drugs used in MS and the occurrence of hypogammaglobulinemia, along with the resulting infections. The analysis indicates a significant prevalence overall of hypogammaglobulinemia (11%) among MS patients take anti-CD20 drugs. Examining subgroups based on drug type indicated that rituximab exhibited the highest prevalence at 18%, followed by ocrelizumab at 11%, non-specified anti-CD20 at 10%, and ofatumumab at 2%. Chronic usage of anti-CD20 therapies, such as rituximab and ocrelizumab, has been associated with a decline in immunoglobulin levels, particularly IgG and IgM. The decrease in IgG levels may persist even after the discontinuation of therapy. Also, anti-CD20 therapies, particularly of atumumab and ocrelizumab, are effective in treating MS but pose a higher risk of infections.

Various disease-modifying therapies for MS differ in mechanisms, efficacy, and safety profiles, with a focus on targeting the immune response (53). Anti-CD20 therapies such as rituximab, ocrelizumab, ofatumumab, and ublituximab have proven effective and well-tolerated in MS patients through clinical trials, thereby expanding

Study	Events Total	Proportion 95%-C	l Weigh
drug = Ocrelizumab			
Capasso et al., 2023	1 78 🛨	0.01 [0.00; 0.07] 5.3%
Habek et al., 2022	40 109	0.37 [0.28; 0.46] 8.5%
Seery et al., 2021	33 185	0.18 [0.13; 0.24] 8.5%
Ruiz et al., 2021	3 52	0.06 [0.01; 0.16] 7.1%
Garcia-Canibano et al., 2019	3 60	0.05 [0.01; 0.14] 7.1%
Montalban et al., 2017	96 488	0.20 [0.16; 0.23] 8.6%
Kappos et al., 2011	5 55	0.09 [0.03; 0.20] 7.6%
Random effects model	1027	0.13 [0.08; 0.21]	52.6%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 86\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.4233$, $p < 0.01$			
drug = Rituximab			
Karlowicz et al., 2023	27 556 🕂	0.05 [0.03; 0.07	8.5%
Disanto et al., 2021	3 59	0.05 [0.01; 0.14	7.1%
Hawker et al., 2009	4 292 +	0.01 [0.00; 0.03	7.5%
Random effects model	907 🔶	0.03 [0.02; 0.07	23.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 66\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.3429$, $p = 0.05$		-	
drug = Ofatumumab			
Wiendel et al., 2021	6 1969	0.00 [0.00; 0.01	1 7.9%
Seze et al., 2020	11 134	0.08 [0.04; 0.14	8.2%
Random effects model	2103	0.02 [0.00; 0.31]	16.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 98\%$, $\tau^2 = 5.5662$, $p < 0.01$		•	
drug = Anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab and rit	uximab)		
Oksbjerg et al., 2021	13 447 🛨	0.03 [0.02; 0.05] 8.3%
Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 95\% r^2 = 1.5473 ho < 0.01$	4484	0.06 [0.03; 0.11]] 100.0%
Test for subgroup differences: $\gamma_{e}^{2} = 17.81$. df = 3 ($p < 0.01$)	0 01 02 03 04 0	5	
	Proportion of urinary tract infections subgrou	uped by drug	
RE 5			
lysis of Urinary tract infections (UTI) among the included st	udies.		

Study	Events Total	Proportion 95%-CI Weigh
drug = Rituximab		
Karlowicz et al., 2023	2 556	0.00 [0.00; 0.01] 10.3%
Disanto et al., 2021	4 59 +	0.07 [0.02; 0.16] 11.9%
Salzer et al., 2016	5 822	0.01 [0.00; 0.01] 12.4%
Hawker et al., 2009	1 292 🛏	0.00 [0.00; 0.02] 8.1%
Random effects model	1729 🝅	0.01 [0.00; 0.04] 42.7%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 84\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.9831$, $p < 0.01$		
drug = Ocrelizumab		
Habek et al., 2022	3 109 🕂 🚽	0.03 [0.01; 0.08] 11.3%
Garcia-Canibano et al., 2022	1 60 💻	0.02 [0.00; 0.09] 8.0%
Seery et al., 2021	14 185	0.08 [0.04; 0.12] 13.6%
Random effects model	354 🧼	0.04 [0.02; 0.10] 32.9%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 55\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.3864$, $p = 0.11$		
drug = ofatumumab		
Seze et al., 2020	4 134 🛨	0.03 [0.01; 0.07] 12.0%
drug = Anti-CD20 (ofatumumab, ocrelizumab an	d rituximab)	
Oksbjerg et al., 2021	5 447 📑	0.01 [0.00; 0.03] 12.4%
Random effects model	2664 🔷	0.02 [0.01; 0.04] 100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 83\%$, $\tau^2 = 1.2785$, $p < 0.01$		
Test for subgroup differences: $\gamma_2^2 = 5.93$, df = 3 ($p = 0.12$	2) 0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4	0.5
5 1 23 7 0		

Analysis of Gastrointestinal (GIT) infections among the included studies.



Analysis of Skin and mucous membrane infections among the included studies.



treatment options (54). Specifically, the anti-CD20 monoclonal antibodies of atumumab and ocrelizumab, approved by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the European Medicines Agency (EMA), demonstrate efficacy in relapsing multiple sclerosis (RMS) by delaying disease progression, reducing relapses, and limiting new lesion formations on brain scans (55, 56). Even though B-cell depleting (anti-CD20) therapy is effective in treating MS patients (32, 57), it comes with the highest infection risk among MS disease-modifying therapies (58).

As a complication of anti-CD20 therapy, a common occurrence is a decline in immunoglobulin levels. In the phase 3 trials for rituximab and ocrelizumab, there was an observed increase in the percentage of patients with serum IgG and IgM levels below the normal range, however, ofatumumab and ublituximab resulted in a rise in the proportion of patients displaying IgM levels below the lower limit of normal (LLN), while not impacting IgG levels (32, 53–59).

Hypogammaglobulinemia can manifest during prolonged anti-CD20 therapy (60, 61). One hypothesis suggests that despite anti-CD20 treatment not directly affecting IgG and IgM-producing plasma cells, it delays the regeneration of B-cells (54). Reports indicate the time required for B-cell regeneration post-treatment: 24 weeks for ofatumumab, 72 weeks (ranging 27–175) for ocrelizumab, and

Study	p Total	re-drug Mean	intake SD	pos Total	st-drug Mean	j intake SD		Mean Diff	erence		MD	9	5%-CI	Weight
Drug = Ocrelizumab Mears et al., 2023 a Evertsson et al., 2020 b Baker et al., 2020 a Ruiz 2021 Baker et al., 2020 b Capasso et al., 2023 Habek et al., 2022 Random effects model Heterogeneity: I^2 = 44%, τ	14 161 97 52 97 78 109 608 ² = 0.13	5.92 8.80 10.30 9.60 10.30 11.17 10.18 374, <i>p</i> =	2.2540 1.9600 2.4100 1.6700 2.4100 4.5400 2.9080 0.10	14 155 36 52 11 78 37 383	5.03 8.36 9.50 8.70 9.27 8.71 8.73	0.9120 1.2200 2.5000 1.8600 2.2100 4.1800 3.0450					0.89 0.44 0.80 1.03 2.46 1.45 0.95	[-0.38; [0.08; [-0.15; [0.22; [-0.36; [1.09; [0.32; [0.50;	2.16] 0.80] 1.75] 1.58] 2.42] 3.83] 2.57] 1.39]	4.8% 11.2% 6.6% 8.6% 4.3% 4.4% 5.6% 45.5%
Drug = Rituximab Mears et al., 2023 b Disanto et al., 2021 Evertsson et al., 2020 a Random effects model Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 26\%$, τ	8 59 311 378 ² = < 0.	6.04 8.62 10.30 0001, <i>p</i>	2.5230 2.1600 2.2400 = 0.26	8 59 109 176	4.60 8.97 10.12	1.1840 3.2300 2.6400			-		1.45 -0.35 0.18 0.14	[-0.48; [-1.34; [-0.37; [-0.33;	3.38] 0.64] 0.73] 0.61]	2.6% 6.3% 9.7% 18.7%
Drug = Anti-CD20 (Mult Mears et al., 2023 c Bauhtman et al., 2020 Random effects model Heterogeneity: $J^2 = 0\%$, τ^2	tible) 22 27 49 = 0, p	5.98 9.80 = 0.56	2.2160 2.5000	22 27 49	4.89 9.20	1.0030 2.4000			 >		1.09 0.60 0.91	[0.08; [-0.71; [0.11;	2.11] 1.91] 1.71]	6.2% 4.6% 10.8%
Drug = Ofatumumab Hauser et al., 2022 Wiendel et al., 2021 Random effects model Heterogeneity: I^2 = 82%, τ	1292 1271 2563 ² = 0.0	10.38 10.31 162, <i>p</i> =	0.1232 0.8200 0.02	1292 241 1533	10.52 10.25	0.1231 1.2700		•			-0.14 0.06 -0.06	[-0.15; [-0.11; [-0.25;	-0.13] 0.23] 0.13]	12.7% 12.4% 25.1%
Random effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 80\%$, τ Test for subgroup difference	3598 $r^{2} = 0.23$ ses: χ_{3}^{2}	546, <i>p <</i> = 20.26,	0.01 df = 3 (µ	2141 o < 0.01 MD in) IgG lev	- vel betwe	2 -1 een pre-	0 1 odrug and p	l 2 post-dru	34 g intake	0.57 e subg	[0.22; rouped	0.93] by dru	100.0% g
FIGURE 9 Mean difference in IgG level pr	re-drug	and pos	t-drug ir	ntake by	drug ty	/pe.								

70 weeks (ranging 0.1–75) for ublituximab (56). Even after 48 weeks from rituximab discontinuation, B-cell levels were merely 30.7% of baseline values (57). Another explanation involves certain B-cell subsets experiencing impaired reconstitution; for instance, postrituximab therapy, regenerated B cells mainly comprise naïve B cells with fewer differentiated memory B cells (40, 62). These regenerated naïve B cells display reduced ability to become plasma cells, leading to decreased IgG and IgA production while still capable of producing IgM (61). This suggests that the impact of anti-CD20 therapies on immunoglobulin levels might involve complex interactions between different types of B cells, affecting humoral immunity (54, 63, 64).

Our overall analysis shows a statistically significant decrease in IgG levels from pre- to post-drug intake and a significant hypogammaglobulinemia development rate among anti-CD20 drugs users. Ofatumumab showed a significant decrease in IgG levels, while ocrelizumab, and rituximab, did not show statistical significance. Saidha et al. (65) conducted a systematic review of clinical trials and real-world evidence (RWE) studies to investigate alterations in immunoglobulin levels in individuals diagnosed with RMS who underwent treatment with either ocrelizumab or ofatumumab, as well as to understand the correlation between changes in Ig levels and the occurrence of infections. The obtained results emphasized that the most frequently documented outcome was the variation in IgG levels.

Among the ocrelizumab trial groups, four trial populations observed a decline in IgG levels over 24 to 336 weeks follow-up period. Conversely, in the five of atumumab trial groups monitored for 104 to 168 weeks, a temporary drop in IgG levels occurred at week 48, but no sustained decrease was noted thereafter. In both ocrelizumab and of atumumab trials, IgM displayed a declining trend over time. Additionally, a reduction in mean IgA levels was observed in the ocrelizumab treatment group throughout the 336-week follow-up period.

Our analysis also revealed that the duration of drug intake significantly influenced hypogammaglobulinemia development. However, no statistically significant difference was observed in the subgroup analysis based on different treatment durations, indicating that reduced IgG levels within 1 year did not necessarily lead to increased hypogammaglobulinemia with prolonged treatment. In a recent retrospective analysis of a considerable group of individuals with MS who were administered rituximab or ocrelizumab, 3.7% exhibited a decline in their IgG levels, dropping below 5 g/L on average after an exposure period of approximately 29.7 months (44).

Several studies in the literature have sought to investigate the potential association between low IgG levels and demographic characteristics of patients. In a study by Mears et al. (40) involving 184 patients treated with rituximab and ocrelizumab, 22 patients

Study	p Total	re-drug Mean	intake SD	pos Total	st-drug Mean	intake SD	M	ean Differen	ce	MD	95	5%-CI	Weight
Time = less than or eq	ual to	1 vear											
Mears et al., 2023 a	14	5.92	2.2540	14	5.03	0.9120	-		-	0.89	[-0.38;	2.16]	4.8%
Mears et al., 2023 b	8	6.04	2.5230	8	4.60	1.1840	_			1.45	[-0.48;	3.381	2.6%
Mears et al., 2023 c	22	5.98	2.2160	22	4.89	1.0030				1.09	80.01	2.111	6.2%
Disanto et al., 2021	59	8.62	2.1600	59	8.97	3.2300		<u> </u>		-0.35	[-1.34:	0.641	6.3%
Evertsson et al., 2020 a	a 311	10.30	2.2400	109	10.12	2.6400	_			0.18	[-0.37:	0.731	9.7%
Evertsson et al., 2020 b	5 161	8.80	1.9600	155	8.36	1.2200				0.44	80.01	0.801	11.2%
Baker et al., 2020 a	97	10.30	2.4100	36	9.50	2.5000				0.80	[-0.15:	1.751	6.6%
Bauhtman et al., 2020	27	9.80	2.5000	27	9.20	2.4000				0.60	[-0.71:	1.911	4.6%
Random effects mode	699			430				\diamond		0.44	0.19:	0.691	52.1%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, τ^2	$p^2 = 0, p$	= 0.43											
Time = 1.5 years													
Ruiz 2021	52	9.60	1.6700	52	8.70	1.8600				0.90	[0.22;	1.58]	8.6%
Time = about 2 years													
Baker et al., 2020 b	97	10.30	2.4100	11	9.27	2.2100	-	-	_	1.03	[-0.36;	2.42]	4.3%
Time = about 3 years													
Capasso et al., 2023	78	11.17	4.5400	78	8.71	4.1800			1	2.46	[1.09;	3.83]	4.4%
Hauser et al., 2022	1292	10.38	0.1232	1292	10.52	0.1231				-0.14	[-0.15; ·	-0.13]	12.7%
Wiendel et al., 2021	1271	10.31	0.8200	241	10.25	1.2700		•		0.06	[-0.11;	0.23]	12.4%
Random effects mode	2641			1611			\sim			0.65	[-0.83;	2.13]	29.4%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 90\%$, 1	z ² = 1.5	765, p <	0.01										
Time = about 4 years													
Habek et al., 2022	109	10.18	2.9080	37	8.73	3.0450				1.45	[0.32;	2.57]	5.6%
Random effects mode	3598			2141				\diamond		0.57	[0.22;	0.93]	100.0%
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 80\%$, a	$c^2 = 0.2$	546, p <	0.01						1	1			
Test for subgroup differen	ces: χ_4^2	= 4.64, d	df = 4 (p	= 0.33)		-	2 -1	0 1 2	3	4			
			Μ	D in Ig	G leve	l betwee	n pre-drug	g and post-dr	ug intake	subgro	uped by	durat	ion
GURE 10													
ean difference in IgG level p	ore-drug	and pos	st-drug ir	ntake by	time.								

experienced hypogammaglobulinemia. Those with hypogammaglobulinemia were more likely to be aged \geq 50 years and exhibited lower initial IgG levels. In another prospective observational study encompassing all patients with MS after undergoing a median of 5 (1–6) cycles of rituximab (32). The research revealed that age was linked to an increased risk of reduced IgG levels below 6 g/L, while there was no significant association with sex or a history of immunosuppressive treatment.

Evidence from certain clinical trials and observational studies has suggested an relationship between Ig antibody levels and infection rates, as well as infection severity in patients with MS (17, 65). Having an improved understanding of such risks is particularly relevant within the context of B cell-depleting therapeutic strategies because one of the main functions of B cells is antibody production. In a broader sense, people with MS taking B cell-depleting therapies that may interfere with the generation and/or release of Ig antibodies in response to infectious exposures may accordingly have a greater risk for serious infections (65). Our study reports an overall infection rate of 11% among MS patients receiving anti-CD20 drugs with ocrelizumab shows the highest prevalence of pulmonary infections (24%), urinary tract infections (10%), gastrointestinal infections (4%), and skin and mucous membrane infections (6%). This infection rate represents the proportion of MS patients who developed hypogammaglobulinemia out of the total number of patients on anti-CD20 drugs.

For rituximab, multiple retrospective studies have indicated that within the MS patient cohort receiving rituximab, a subset displaying

reduced levels of IgG experienced escalated rates of severe infections necessitating hospitalization, prolonged antibiotic therapies, or intravenous antibiotic interventions when compared to counterparts with higher IgG levels (44). Another three observational studies encompassing a range of 59 to 1,000 patients, undergoing up to 3.5 years of rituximab treatment, established an augmented infection risk associated with IgG deficiency in MS patients, whereas IgM deficiency did not exhibit a similar association (17, 32, 33). Notably, one study highlighted those patients manifesting diminished IgG levels encountered elevated rates of severe infections even before their IgG levels declined, attributed to factors such as advanced age, extended disease duration, and diminished CD19 count (expressed in pro-B cells, B cells, and short-lived plasma cells) (63). These findings emphasize the intricate interplay of various factors contributing to infection risk beyond solely IgG levels.

Screening for hypogammaglobulinemia is vital as it helps identify patients at risk of severe infections (66). Therefore, initiation of anti-CD20 therapy demands careful monitoring due to the increased potency of infections. However, the medical literature lacks a universally agreed upon threshold for defining hypogammaglobulinemia in MS studies (67). Various definitions of the lower limit of normal (LLN) for immunoglobulins (IgG and IgM) have been utilized across different clinical investigations. The LLN for these immunoglobulins can differ depending on factors such as patient age and the specific clinical laboratory used (67). The range of studies included in our analysis provides a diverse spectrum of

reported values for defining hypogammaglobulinemia in MS. Across the studies, the reported cutoff values vary considerably, with the lowest being 5 mg/dL and the highest reaching 7 mg/dL. Considering this broad range, it is evident that there is substantial variability in the defining literature regarding the threshold for hypogammaglobulinemia. To suggest the most suitable cutoff value, a balance between inclusivity and clinical relevance must be struck. Based on the distribution of reported values, a cutoff between 6 and 7 mg/dL emerges as a pragmatic choice, capturing a significant portion of the reported data while maintaining clinical significance. Therefore, a cutoff value of approximately 6-7 mg/dL may offer a reasonable compromise in defining hypogammaglobulinemia in MS studies.

Finally, anti-CD20 therapies have shown a link to higher chances of severe COVID-19 infection and hospitalization, as indicated by real-world data. While there was speculation regarding hypogammaglobulinemia contributing to this heightened risk, a retrospective study involving 758 patients found no significant association between IgG levels below 700 mg/dL and COVID-19 (68). Additionally, in individuals with MS, factors such as advanced age, Black ethnicity, lack of ambulatory ability, existing health conditions, and the use of glucocorticoids have been linked to an increased likelihood of COVID-19 hospitalization or death (53).

This study has some limitations to be addressed. Notably, challenges arose from incomplete data within certain conference abstracts, prompting a fair quality rating for several assessments. Moreover, the study acknowledges the presence of moderate to high heterogeneity in some analyses, may be attributable to differences in populations, ethnicity, and study designs. Mitigation strategies, such as random-effects models and subgroup analyses, were employed, with leave-one-out analyses conducted to validate the precision of estimates across various subanalysis groups. The intricate nature of confounding factors, particularly those associated with infections, poses complexities to the analysis, acknowledging that the considerable challenge in drawing definitive conclusions due to the high degree of heterogeneity. Additionally, the apparent differing rate of hypogammaglobulinemia may be influenced by patient-specific factors that could have varied between the groups receiving different medications, such as disease severity, duration, and individual immune response variations. Further investigation into these potential confounders is warranted to better elucidate the relationship between anti-CD20 MS treatments, IgG levels, and the risk of hypogammaglobulinemia. Also, the study underscores a limitation concerning the scarcity of studies, notably for specific drugs like ofatumumab. The limited data for certain interventions necessitates caution in drawing definitive conclusions, and future research endeavors addressing these gaps could significantly enhance the depth of understanding in this domain.

5 Conclusion

In conclusion, the study reveals a noteworthy prevalence rate of hypogammaglobulinemia development among MS patients take anti-CD20 therapies, with rituximab demonstrating the highest prevalence of low IgG concentration when compared to other MS drugs. This study contributes valuable insights into the immunosuppressive effects, infection risks, and implications of anti-CD20 therapies in MS treatment. The identified relationships and patterns offer a foundation for clinicians to consider in their risk-benefit assessments and underscore the importance of ongoing monitoring and research to optimize therapeutic strategies and patient outcomes in the context of MS treatment.

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/Supplementary material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Author contributions

AE: Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Visualization, Validation, Software, Resources, Project administration, Methodology, Investigation, Funding acquisition, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization. NA: Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Methodology, Investigation, Data curation. MA-k: Writing – original draft, Visualization, Resources. LM: Writing – original draft, Resources, Methodology, Investigation. MG: Writing – original draft, Resources, Project administration, Methodology. AF: Writing – original draft, Investigation. HH: Writing – original draft, Resources, Project administration, Investigation. OA: Writing – original draft, Resources, Methodology, Investigation. OA: Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Visualization, Validation, Supervision, Software, Resources, Project administration, Methodology, Investigation, Funding acquisition, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization.

Funding

The author(s) declare that no financial support was received for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Conflict of interest

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.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Supplementary material

The Supplementary material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fneur.2024.1380654/ full#supplementary-material

References

1. Filippi M, Bar-Or A, Piehl F, Preziosa P, Solari A, Vukusic S, et al. Multiple sclerosis. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*. (2018) 4:43. doi: 10.1038/s41572-018-0041-4

2. Yeshokumar AK, Narula S, Banwell B. Pediatric multiple sclerosis. *Curr Opin Neurol.* (2017) 30:216–21. doi: 10.1097/WCO.00000000000452

3. Sharrad D, Chugh P, Slee M, Bacchi S. Defining progression independent of relapse activity (PIRA) in adult patients with relapsing multiple sclerosis: a systematic review★. *Mult Scler Relat Disord.* (2023) 78:104899. doi: 10.1016/j.msard.2023.104899

4. Müller J, Cagol A, Lorscheider J, Tsagkas C, Benkert P, Yaldizli Ö, et al. Harmonizing definitions for progression independent of relapse activity in multiple sclerosis: a systematic review. *JAMA Neurol.* (2023) 80:1232–45. doi: 10.1001/jamaneurol.2023.3331

5. McGinley MP, Goldschmidt CH, Rae-Grant AD. Diagnosis and treatment of multiple sclerosis. JAMA. (2021) 325:765. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.26858

6. Smith JB, Hellwig K, Fink K, Lyell DJ, Piehl F, Langer-Gould A. Rituximab, MS, and pregnancy. *Neurol Neuroimmunol Neuroinflamm*. (2020) 7:e734. doi: 10.1212/NXI.000000000000734

7. 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. *PLoS Med.* (2021) 18:e1003583. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003583

8. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, et al. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons (2020) Available at: www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.

9. McGrath S, Zhao X, Steele R, Thombs BD, Benedetti A, Levis B, et al. Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from commonly reported quantiles in meta-analysis. *Stat Methods Med Res.* (2020) 29:2520–37. doi: 10.1177/0962280219889080

10. Balduzzi S, Rücker G, Schwarzer G. How to perform a meta-analysis with R: a practical tutorial. *Evid Based Ment Health.* (2019) 22:153–60. doi: 10.1136/ ebmental-2019-300117

11. 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 randomised trials. *BMJ*. (2019) 366:14898. doi: 10.1136/bmj.14898

12. National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute. (2019). Study quality assessment tools. Available at: https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/study-quality-assessment-tools

13. Lo CK-L, Mertz D, Loeb M. Newcastle–Ottawa scale: comparing reviewers' to authors' assessments. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* (2014) 14:45. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-14-45

14. Bauthman MS. Effectiveness of anti-cluster of differentiation 20 as a diseasemodifying therapy in multiple sclerosis across its different phenotypes at the University Hospital of Caen. *Cureus*. (2022) 14:e22120. doi: 10.7759/cureus.22120

15. Capasso N, Palladino R, Cerbone V, Spiezia AL, Covelli B, Fiore A, et al. Ocrelizumab effect on humoral and cellular immunity in multiple sclerosis and its clinical correlates: a 3-year observational study. *J Neurol.* (2023) 270:272–82. doi: 10.1007/s00415-022-11350-1

16. Chang L, Jehli L, Simkover R, Cooper J. ECTRIMS 2019—poster session 3. Mult Scler J Exp Transl Clin. (2019) 25:581–805. doi: 10.1177/1352458519868081

17. Disanto G, Ripellino P, Riccitelli GC, Sacco R, Scotti B, Fucili A, et al. De-escalating rituximab dose results in stability of clinical, radiological, and serum neurofilament levels in multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler J.* (2021) 27:1230–9. doi: 10.1177/1352458520952036

18. Evertsson B, Hoyt T, Christensen A, Nimer FAL, Foley J, Piehl F. A comparative study of tolerability and effects on immunoglobulin levels and CD19 cell counts with ocrelizumab vs. low dose of rituximab in multiple sclerosis. *Mult Scler J Exp Transl Clin.* (2020) 6:205521732096450. doi: 10.1177/2055217320964505

19. Garcia-Cañibano B, Ouanes S, Ganesan GS, Yousuf W, Humos B, Baig T, et al. Real-world experience of ocrelizumab in multiple sclerosis in an Arab population. J Drug Assess. (2021) 10:106–13. doi: 10.1080/21556660.2021.1989193

20. Graves J, Vinayagasundaram U, Mowry EM, Matthews IR, Marino JA, Cheng J, et al. Effects of rituximab on lymphocytes in multiple sclerosis and neuromyelitis optica. *Mult Scler Relat Disord.* (2014) 3:244–52. doi: 10.1016/j.msard.2013.10.003

21. Habek M, Piskač D, Gabelić T, Barun B, Adamec I, Krbot SM. Hypogammaglobulinemia, infections and COVID-19 in people with multiple sclerosis treated with ocrelizumab. *Mult Scler Relat Disord*. (2022) 62:103798. doi: 10.1016/j. msard.2022.103798

22. Hallberg S, Boremalm M, Evertsson B, Lillvall E, Johansson F, Lycke J, et al. ECTRIMS 2019—oral presentations. *Mult Scler J Exp Transl Clin.* (2019) 25:3–130. doi: 10.1177/1352458519868070

23. Hauser SL, Cross AH, Winthrop K, Wiendl H, Nicholas J, Meuth SG, et al. Safety experience with continued exposure to ofatumumab in patients with relapsing forms of multiple sclerosis for up to 3.5 years. *Mult Scler J.* (2022) 28:1576–90. doi: 10.1177/13524585221079731

24. Hawker K, O'Connor P, Freedman MS, Calabresi PA, Antel J, Simon J, et al. Rituximab in patients with primary progressive multiple sclerosis: results of a

randomized double-blind placebo-controlled multicenter trial. Ann Neurol. (2009) 66:460–71. doi: 10.1002/ana.21867

25. Iliopoulou VA, Starvaggi Cucuzza C, Gorczyca A, Manouchehrinia A, Piehl F, Fink K. ECTRIMS 2021—ePoster. *Mult Scler J Exp Transl Clin.* (2021) 27:134–740. doi: 10.1177/13524585211044667

26. Kappos L, Li D, Calabresi PA, O'Connor P, Bar-Or A, Barkhof F, et al. Ocrelizumab in relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis: a phase 2, randomised, placebo-controlled, multicentre trial. *Lancet.* (2011) 378:1779–87. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61649-8

27. Karlowicz JR, Klakegg M, Aarseth JH, Bø L, Myhr KM, Torgauten HM, et al. Predictors of hospitalization due to infection in rituximab-treated MS patients. *Mult Scler Relat Disord*. (2023) 71:104556. doi: 10.1016/j.msard.2023.104556

28. Khatri B, Van Zealand P, Tarima S, Schutten S, Baker A, Sershon L, et al. Hypogammaglobulinemia and infection rates in ocrelizumab treated multiple sclerosis patients over 3 years: a real-world single center study. ECTRIMS 2021—ePoster. *Mult Scler J*. (2021) 27:134–740. doi: 10.1177/13524585211044667

29. Mehta N, Balasa A, Shukla N, Fisher K, Lotze T. Effect of rituximab on immunoglobulin levels in pediatric multiple sclerosis patients. *Neurology*. (2021) 96:4398. doi: 10.1212/wnl.96.15_supplement.4398

30. Nobile S, Beauchemin P. Ocrelizumab and hypogammaglobulinemia: a real-world retrospective MS cohort study. ECTRIMS 2022—poster. *Mult Scler J.* (2022) 28:130–691. doi: 10.1177/13524585221123687

31. Oksbjerg NR, Nielsen SD, Blinkenberg M, Magyari M, Sellebjerg F. Anti-CD20 antibody therapy and risk of infection in patients with demyelinating diseases. *Mult Scler Relat Disord*. (2021) 52:102988. doi: 10.1016/j.msard.2021.102988

32. Perriguey M, Maarouf A, Stellmann JP, Rico A, Boutiere C, Demortiere S, et al. Hypogammaglobulinemia and infections in patients with multiple sclerosis treated with rituximab. *Neurol Neuroimmunol Neuroinflamm*. (2022) 9:e1115. doi: 10.1212/NXI.00000000001115

33. Peters J, Longbrake EE. Infection risk in a real-world cohort of patients treated with long-term B-cell depletion for autoimmune neurologic disease. *Mult Scler Relat Disord*. (2022) 68:104400. doi: 10.1016/j.msard.2022.104400

34. Rempe T, Elfasi A, Rodriguez E, Vasquez M, Graves J, Kinkel R. Ocrelizumab extended interval dosing compared to standard dosing—a safe alternative with significantly decreased immunoglobulin M deficiency rates. ECTRIMS 2022 LB poster. *Mult Scler J.* (2022) 28:956–83. doi: 10.1177/13524585221126909

35. Seery N, Sharmin S, Li V, Nguyen AL, Meaton C, Atvars R, et al. Predicting infection risk in multiple sclerosis patients treated with ocrelizumab: a retrospective cohort study. *CNS Drugs.* (2021) 35:907–18. doi: 10.1007/s40263-021-00810-3

36. de Seze J, Bar-Or JCA, Cross AH, Kappos L, Selmaj K, Wiendl H, et al. Effect of ofatumumab on serum immunoglobulin levels and infection risk in relapsing multiple sclerosis patients from the phase 3 ASCLEPIOS I and II trials. *Neurology.* (2021) 96:1300. doi: 10.1212/WNL.96.15_supplement.1300

37. Torgauten HM, Myhr KM, Wergeland S, Bø L, Aarseth JH, Torkildsen Ø. Safety and efficacy of rituximab as first- and second line treatment in multiple sclerosis—a cohort study. *Mult Scler J Exp Transl Clin.* (2021) 7:205521732097304. doi: 10.1177/2055217320973049

38. Tran V, Miller PA, Jarrar R, Olson J, Miller T, Miravalle A. Real world efficacy and safety profile of ocrelizumab therapy in patients with multiple sclerosis. ECTRIMS 2019—poster session 3. *Mult Scler J.* (2019) 25:581–805. doi: 10.1177/1352458519868081

39. Tsao L, Otani IM, Bove R. Hypogammaglobulinemia in multiple sclerosis patients receiving disease-modifying immunomodulatory agents. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* (2019) 143:AB16. doi: 10.1016/j.jaci.2018.12.051

40. Mears V, Jakubecz C, Seeco C, Woodson S, Serra A, Abboud H. Predictors of hypogammaglobulinemia and serious infections among patients receiving ocrelizumab or rituximab for treatment of MS and NMOSD. *J Neuroimmunol.* (2023) 377:578066. doi: 10.1016/j.jneuroim.2023.578066

41. Derfuss T, Bermel R, Lin C, Hauser S, Kappos L, Vollmer T, et al. Risk factors for serious infections in patients with MS receiving long-term ocrelizumab treatment: multivariate analyses. ePosters. *Eur J Neurol.* (2022) 29:374–837.

42. Vollmer B, Declusin A, Nair K, Sillau S, Corboy J, Vollmer T, et al. Ocrelizumab real-world safety and effectiveness in the two years of treatment in multiple sclerosis. MSVirtual 2020—poster abstracts. *Mult Scler J*. (2020) 26:118–659. doi: 10.1212/WNL.96.15_supplement.4796

43. Vollmer B, Vollmer T, Corboy J, Alvarez E. Risk factors for developing lymphopenia and hypogammaglobulinemia in anti-CD20 treated patients with multiple sclerosis. *Neurology*. (2020) 94:5218. doi: 10.1212/WNL.94.15_supplement.5218

44. Vollmer BL, Wallach AI, Corboy JR, Dubovskaya K, Alvarez E, Kister I. Serious safety events in rituximab-treated multiple sclerosis and related disorders. *Ann Clin Transl Neurol.* (2020) 7:1477–87. doi: 10.1002/acn3.51136

45. Vollmer B, Ijadi N, Declusin A, Nair K, Sillau S, Corboy J, et al. Two-year realworld experience with ocrelizumab in the treatment of patients with multiple sclerosis. ECTRIMS 2021—ePoster. *Mult Scler J.* (2021) 27:134–740. doi: 10.1177/13524585211044667 46. Wiendl H, De Seze J, Bar-Or A, Correale J, Cross AH, Kappos L, et al. Serum immunoglobulin levels and infection risk in the phase 3 trials of ofatumumab in relapsing multiple sclerosis. MSVirtual 2020—poster abstracts. *Mult Scler J*. (2020) 26:118–659.

47. Zoehner G, Miclea A, Salmen A, Kamber N, Diem L, Friedli C, et al. Reduced serum immunoglobulin G concentrations in multiple sclerosis: prevalence and association with disease-modifying therapy and disease course. *Ther Adv Neurol Disord.* (2019) 12:175628641987834. doi: 10.1177/1756286419878340

48. Xavier B, Lafaurie M, Treiner E, Walter O, Pugnet G, Martin-Blondel G, et al. POS1178 prescribing rituximab in patients with auto-immune diseases and acquired hypogammaglobulinemia: description of the risk of severe infection in 121 patients before the SARS-CoV2 era. *Ann Rheum Dis.* (2022) 81:917.1–917.91917. doi: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2022-eular.1194

49. Wiendl H, De Seze J, Bar-Or A, Correale J, Cross AH, Kappos L, et al. Effect of ofatumumab on serum immunoglobulin levels and infection risk in patients with relapsing multiple sclerosis over 3.5 years, poster presented at ECTRIMS 2021 congress. (2021) 27:134–740. doi: 10.1177/13524585211044667

50. Salzer J, Svenningsson R, Alping P, Novakova L, Björck A, Fink K, et al. Rituximab in multiple sclerosis: a retrospective observational study on safety and efficacy. *Neurology.* (2016) 87:2074–81. doi: 10.1212/WNL.00000000003331

51. Montalban X, Hauser SL, Kappos L, Arnold DL, Bar-Or A, Comi G, et al. Ocrelizumab versus placebo in primary progressive multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med.* (2017) 376:209–20. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1606468

52. López Ruiz R, Eichau S, Guerra Hiraldo JD, Dotor García-Soto J, Ruiz De Arcos M, Ruiz-Peña . Real world data on the use of ocrelizumab. Incidence of lymphopenia, B-cell and immunoglobulins evolution, ECTRIMS 2021—ePoster. *Mult Scler J.* (2021) 27:134–740. doi: 10.1177/13524585211044667

53. Klein A, Flaskamp M, Berthele A, Held F, Muratovic H, Hemmer B. The impact of disease-modifying therapies on immunoglobulin blood levels in patients with multiple sclerosis: a retrospective cross-sectional study. *Ther Adv Neurol Disord.* (2023) 16:175628642311626. doi: 10.1177/17562864231162661

54. Alvarez E, Longbrake EE, Rammohan KW, Stankiewicz J, Hersh CM. Secondary hypogammaglobulinemia in patients with multiple sclerosis on anti-CD20 therapy: pathogenesis, risk of infection, and disease management. *Mult Scler Relat Disord*. (2023) 79:105009. doi: 10.1016/j.msard.2023.105009

55. Hauser SL, Cree BAC. Treatment of multiple sclerosis: a review. Am J Med. (2020) 133:1380–1390.e2. doi: 10.1016/j.amjmed.2020.05.049

56. Gassman AL, Nguyen CP, Joffe HV. FDA regulation of prescription drugs. N Engl J Med. (2017) 376:674–82. doi: 10.1056/NEJMra1602972

57. Hauser SL, Waubant E, Arnold DL, Vollmer T, Antel J, Fox RJ, et al. B-cell depletion with rituximab in relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med.* (2008) 358:676–88. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa0706383

58. Luna G, Alping P, Burman J, Fink K, Fogdell-Hahn A, Gunnarsson M, et al. Infection risks among patients with multiple sclerosis treated with fingolimod, natalizumab, rituximab, and injectable therapies. *JAMA Neurol.* (2020) 77:184–91. doi: 10.1001/jamaneurol.2019.3365

59. Steinman L, Fox E, Hartung HP, Alvarez E, Qian P, Wray S, et al. Ublituximab versus teriflunomide in relapsing multiple sclerosis. *N Engl J Med.* (2022) 387:704–14. doi: 10.1056/NEJM0a2201904

60. De La Torre I, Leandro MJ, Valor L, Becerra E, Edwards JCW, Cambridge G. Total serum immunoglobulin levels in patients with RA after multiple B-cell depletion cycles based on rituximab: relationship with B-cell kinetics. *Rheumatology.* (2012) 51:833–40. doi: 10.1093/rheumatology/ker417

61. Nishio M, Fujimoto K, Yamamoto S, Endo T, Sakai T, Obara M, et al. Delayed redistribution of CD27, CD40 and CD80 positive B cells and the impaired *in vitro* immunoglobulin production in patients with non-Hodgkin lymphoma after rituximab treatment as an adjuvant to autologous stem cell transplantation. *Br J Haematol.* (2007) 137:349–54. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2141.2007.06584.x

62. Colucci M, Carsetti R, Serafinelli J, Rocca S, Massella L, Gargiulo A, et al. Prolonged impairment of immunological memory after anti-CD20 treatment in pediatric idiopathic nephrotic syndrome. *Front Immunol.* (2019) 10:1653. doi: 10.3389/ fimmu.2019.01653

63. Margoni M, Preziosa P, Filippi M, Rocca MA. Anti-CD20 therapies for multiple sclerosis: current status and future perspectives. *J Neurol.* (2022) 269:1316–34. doi: 10.1007/s00415-021-10744-x

64. Tellier J, Nutt SL. Plasma cells: the programming of an antibody-secreting machine. *Eur J Immunol.* (2019) 49:30–7. doi: 10.1002/eji.201847517

65. Saidha S, Bell J, Harold S, Belisario JM, Hawe E, Shao Q, et al. Systematic literature review of immunoglobulin trends for anti-CD20 monoclonal antibodies in multiple sclerosis. *Neurol Sci.* (2023) 44:1515–32. doi: 10.1007/s10072-022-06582-y

66. Barmettler S, Ong MS, Farmer JR, Choi H, Walter J. Association of immunoglobulin levels, infectious risk, and mortality with rituximab and hypogammaglobulinemia. *JAMA Netw Open.* (2018) 1:e184169. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2018.4169

67. Otani IM, Lehman HK, Jongco AM, Tsao LR, Azar AE, Tarrant TK, et al. Practical guidance for the diagnosis and management of secondary hypogammaglobulinemia: a work group report of the AAAAI primary immunodeficiency and altered immune response committees. *J Allergy Clin Immunol.* (2022) 149:1525–60. doi: 10.1016/j. jaci.2022.01.025

68. Zabalza A, Cárdenas-Robledo S, Tagliani P, Arrambide G, Otero-Romero S, Carbonell-Mirabent P, et al. COVID-19 in multiple sclerosis patients: susceptibility, severity risk factors and serological response. *Eur J Neurol.* (2021) 28:3384–95. doi: 10.1111/ene.14690