Invited review

Routine and quantitative EEG in mild traumatic brain injury

Marc R. Nuwer[a,b,*], David A. Hovda[c], Lara M. Schrader[a,b], Paul M. Vespa[a,b,c]

[a]*Department of Neurology, University of California Los Angeles School of Medicine, Los Angeles, CA, USA*
[b]*Department of Clinical Neurophysiology, UCLA Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA, USA*
[c]*Division of Neurosurgery, University of California Los Angeles School of Medicine, Los Angeles, CA, USA*

Abstract

This article reviews the pathophysiology of mild traumatic brain injury, and the findings from EEG and quantitative EEG (QEEG) testing after such an injury.

Research on the clinical presentation and pathophysiology of mild traumatic brain injury is reviewed with an emphasis on details that may pertain to EEG or QEEG and their interpretation. Research reports on EEG and QEEG in mild traumatic brain injury are reviewed in this setting, and conclusions are drawn about general diagnostic results that can be determined using these tests. QEEG strengths and weaknesses are reviewed in the context of factors used to determine the clinical usefulness of proposed diagnostic tests.

Clinical signs, symptoms, and the pathophysiologic axonal injury and cytotoxicity tend to clear over weeks or months after a mild head injury. Loss of consciousness might be similar to a non-convulsive seizure and accompanied subsequently by postictal-like symptoms. EEG shows slowing of the posterior dominant rhythm and increased diffuse theta slowing, which may revert to normal within hours or may clear more slowly over many weeks. There are no clear EEG or QEEG features unique to mild traumatic brain injury. Late after head injury, the correspondence is poor between electrophysiologic findings and clinical symptoms. Complicating factors are reviewed for the proposed commercial uses of QEEG as a diagnostic test for brain injury after concussion or mild traumatic brain injury.

The pathophysiology, clinical symptoms and electrophysiological features tend to clear over time after mild traumatic brain injury. There are no proven pathognomonic signatures useful for identifying head injury as the cause of signs and symptoms, especially late after the injury.

1. Introduction

Mild traumatic brain injury (MTBI) is a medical problem commonly encountered today in the general community. Some patients complain of persistent cognitive difficulties after such an injury. Quantitative EEG (QEEG) has been proposed as a clinical diagnostic test to identify, confirm, measure and localize brain injury among those patients.

This report reviews the physiology of MTBI, as well as the literature on traditional EEG abnormalities among patients. QEEG reports are discussed in that context.

Techniques reviewed here include both QEEG discriminant analysis and the numerical tables of frequency analysis with normative database comparison.

This report generally avoids covering severe head injury, except where needed to understand better the findings in minor head injury. Nor does this report cover evoked potentials, event-related potentials, or recordings during cognitive activation tasks.

2. Concussion and mild traumatic brain injury

2.1. Terminology

Several terms are in common use to describe MTBI. The term *concussion* is an older terminology that still is often

* Corresponding author. Address: Reed Neurological Research Center, 710 Westwood Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA. Tel.: +1 310 206 3093; fax: +1 310 267 1157.
  E-mail address: MRN@ucla.edu (M.R. Nuwer).

used in discussions with the public. Mild closed head injury (CHI) and mild traumatic head injury are similar terms.

The terms are used somewhat interchangeably here. The preferred scientific term, mild traumatic brain injury (MTBI), will be used usually in this report.

The terminology as used here does not necessarily imply that every head injury is accompanied by brain damage. Some sequellae of head injuries are transient disruptions of brain function. Some symptoms are caused by injury to other head structures such as the inner ear, or head and neck muscles and ligaments.

2.2. Epidemiology

Minor head injuries are common health problems. A US Census Bureau 1991 National Health Interview Survey estimated the annual incidence as 618 injuries per 100,000 persons (Sosin et al., 1996). Nearly, half were caused either by motor vehicle accidents (28%) or by sports and physical activity injuries (20%).

Extrapolating from these figures, we see that more than one-third of the population is expected to suffer a MTBI at some time during their life.

The Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reported that each year 1.4 million Americans suffered a head injury that brought them to medical attention (Langlois et al., 2004). Among those, 79% (1.1 million) were seen at an emergency department and then released home. The most common causes of those traumatic head injuries were falls, which were seen most frequently among persons below age 5 and above age 74 years. The annual incidence for adults varied from 400 per 100,000 for young adults and the elderly, to 200 per 100,000 for adults ages 55–75.

2.3. Early symptoms

MTBI produces symptoms of varying types and degrees (Alexander, 1995). The most well known immediate symptom is a brief loss of consciousness lasting seconds to minutes. Some mild injuries cause no unconsciousness (Kelly and Rosenberg, 1997). Some patients experience just a brief period of feeling and appearing dazed. Others suffer from confusion and a post-traumatic amnesia that may last for minutes to hours. Many patients have no focal neurologic signs on examination and have negative neuroimaging studies. When tested, the Glasgow coma scale (GCS) is scored at 13–15.

Other immediate features of concussion include:

- Vacant stare.
- Delayed verbal or motor responses.
- Inability to focus attention.
- Disorientation.
- Slurred or incoherent speech.
- Gross observable incoordination.

- Emotionality out of proportion to the circumstances.
- Memory deficits.

Patients commonly exhibit the following in the first minutes to hours:

- Headache.
- Dizziness or vertigo.
- Lack of awareness of surroundings.
- Nausea and vomiting.

2.4. Early recovery symptoms

Post-concussion syndrome (PCS) is commonly experienced during the recovery from a MTBI. Common immediate symptoms are attention and memory deficits seen on tests of divided attention and working memory, which may last for weeks. Older patients may take longer to clear. Patients with demanding vocations or certain personalities may be aware of deficits longer (Alexander, 1995). Over the subsequent days or weeks, PCS patients often experience symptoms that include (Kelly and Rosenberg, 1997):

- Persistent low-grade headache.
- Light-headedness.
- Poor attention and concentration.
- Memory dysfunction.
- Easy fatigability.
- Irritability and low frustration tolerance.
- Intolerance of bright lights or difficulty focusing vision.
- Intolerance of loud noises, sometimes ringing in the ears.
- Anxiety and depressed mood.
- Sleep disturbance.

2.5. Longer term and chronic symptoms

2.5.1. Recovery over weeks to months

For most patients, symptoms resolve within weeks or a few months. The shorter the period of prominent symptoms, the better the chances of complete long term improvement (Levin et al., 1979). Cognitive and neurologic impairment is greater among patients who have had multiple head injuries over time (Gronwall and Wrightson, 1975). Depth and duration of unconsciousness and duration of post-traumatic amnesia have been proposed as the best guides for estimating head injury severity (Alexander, 1995), and those factors are generally favorable in mild head injury.

Three months after MTBI, some patients still experience symptoms such as headache, irritability, anxiety, dizziness, fatigue and impaired concentration. In one study (Ingebrigtsen et al., 1998), 62% reported at least one symptom and 40% reported three or more. The incidence of common symptoms 3 months after injury were 42%

headaches, 36% forgetfulness, 30% fatigue, 28% irritability, 26% dizziness, 25% decrease concentration, 23% impatience, and 20% disturbed sleep. There was no association between age, gender, cause, severity, duration of amnesia and overall symptoms.

By 6 months after a mild traumatic head injury, about one-third of patients still report at least one symptom (de Kruijk et al., 2002; Hofman et al., 2001), most often headache, dizziness or drowsiness. Complaints of headache, dizziness or nausea at the emergency room (ER) after mild head injury was associated with symptom severity at 6 months. The fewer the symptoms at the ER, the better the long-term outcome. Patients who had abnormal magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) at the time of injury often had some cerebral atrophy when retested 6 months later (Hofman et al., 2001), but these findings did not correspond to performance on cognitive testing. Imaging abnormalities also were reported using single photon emission computed tomography (SPECT), but again these lacked correspondence to cognitive signs or symptoms (Hofman et al., 2001; Kant et al., 1997).

2.5.2. Persistent post-concussive syndrome

After a year, 10–15% of MTBI patients still reported significant symptoms (Alexander, 1995). The other 85–90% of patients effectively had recovered, although some still had mild symptoms. The term *permanent symptomatic persistent post-concussive syndrome* (PPCS) refers to the patients who still have significant symptoms a year after injury. Those symptoms most often are dizziness, headache, light and sound sensitivity, as well as cognitive and emotional complaints. The cognitive problems most often found are inattention, poor memory and reduced executive function. The emotional symptoms most often reported are irritability, depression, nervousness, discouragement and anger.

PPCS patients studied by Ettlin et al. (1992) nearly always had concomitant chronic pain and depression. A pre-morbid psychiatric diagnosis was present in nearly 30% of PPCS patients. At follow-up after injury, nearly 70% had at least one psychiatric diagnosis, most often depression, anxiety, panic disorder, or phobias. The mild head injury may well cause stress after the accident, leading to depression, anxiety and social disruption soon thereafter. If the secondary stress of the injury (e.g., job loss, finances, and family strain) overwhelms symptomatic treatment of PCS, the PPCS begins to emerge. The earliest signs maybe the onset of depression and worsening of symptoms—particularly headache. The injured person may become overprotected, 'the disabled person'. There is no traditional reliable biologic measure for, or organic basis of, PPCS (Alexander, 1995; Ettlin et al., 1992).

2.6. Sports injuries

Sports are a common setting for head injuries, more notably in soccer (Tysvaer et al., 1989; Lindsay et al., 1980),

American football (Saunders and Harbaugh, 1984), boxing (Jordan and Zimmerman, 1990; Mawdsley and Ferguson, 1963) and horseback riding (Forster et al., 1976). Half of a professional soccer team complained of protracted and persistent symptoms commonly attributed to PCS including headache, irritability, dizziness, lack of concentration and impaired memory (Tysvaer et al., 1989). This was attributed to the cumulative effect of repeatedly heading the ball.

Second head injuries increase the risk for neurological sequellae when the second impact occurs within a few days after the first. That second impact syndrome may lead to malignant edema and a markedly increased intracranial pressure from cerebral vascular congestion or loss of autoregulation (Giza and Hovda, 2001; Kelly and Rosenberg, 1997). An otherwise unsuspected cerebral contusion from head injury can have grave consequences if a second minimal head injury is sustained (Saunders and Harbaugh, 1984).

Boxers can develop dementia and impaired motor control after years in the sport (Mawdsley and Ferguson, 1963). Second injury syndrome may be an important part of this process in boxers. Some governments have established regulations for certain sports, such as boxing, to lessen the long-term risk and severity of neurological injury.

2.7. Psychiatric components

There is a major overlap between the symptoms of PPSC and depression. This makes it difficult to distinguish between these entities (Satz et al., 1999). Some investigators have wondered whether there are any cognitive symptoms attributable to mild head injury alone. Beyond depression, Gaetz (2004) also discusses other factors that complicate the assessment of mild head injury including chronic pain, anxiety, litigation, and stress.

Lishman (1988) believes that the PPCS starts as an organic problem, but its long-term persistence is psychologically driven. Jacobson (1995) holds a contrasting viewpoint. He believes that the chronic state is multifactorial throughout its course, involving both organic and psychosocial components. He cites the Belfast studies to support his view (Fenton et al., 1993; McClelland et al., 1994; Montgomery et al., 1991). According to the Jacobson model, cerebral dysfunction is the chief mechanism immediately after mild head injury followed by anxiety and depression. Thereafter, selective attention to PPCS and secondary gain are more important in maintaining symptoms. Effective treatments include education, antidepressant medication and cognitive restructuring.

If PPCS is more so due to disordered behavioral function rather than a biological injury, we may expect that EEG and QEEG are insensitive to detecting the disorder.

2.8. Pathology and the processes of injury

2.8.1. Injury and forces

The primary mechanism of traumatic brain injury involves biomechanical forces (Gennarelli, 1994, 1993). Extensive research with computer models and animal studies models identified three basic biomechanical forces as important causes of closed head injury. These are acceleration, deceleration and rotation. Moving the head violently forward-and-back or side-to-side result in the brain being accelerated and then, when subsequently stopped, decelerated. The anterior, middle and posterior fossa of the human skull presents ridges and other bony physical restrictions to the base of the brain, particularly the temporal poles, which may damage the base of the brain during severe trauma.

Acceleration–deceleration injury can produce contusions and lacerations at the base of the brain, and also can cause tissue deformation. Tissues deformation is most pronounced when the head is exposed to violent rotational forces that cause brain tissue stretching. This biomechanical distortion results in shear stress, eventually leading to massive cell death associated with severe head injury and neuronal dysfunction in MTBI.

2.8.2. Massive discharge

At the moment of head injury, neurons discharge resulting in an extensive release of neurotransmitters followed by neuronal suppression (Walker et al., 1944; Yoshino et al., 1991, 1992). This discharge, in addition to the cell membrane's biomechanical stress, produce a massive ionic flux dramatically changing the intra- and extra-cellular environment (Katayama et al., 1990). Among the many neurotransmitters released at the time of injury, the ones capturing the most scientific attention have been the excitatory amino acids—particularly glutamate (Faden et al., 1989; Katayama et al., 1990). The flood of glutamate opens the pathophysiologic pathway to secondary cell death associated with excitotoxicity and the impaired cognitive functions that frequently following severe traumatic brain injury.

2.8.3. Excitotoxicity

In the first few moments after injury, the released glutamate binds its receptors and causes increased intracellular calcium (Ca^{++}) and sodium (Na^+) (Fineman et al., 1993; Osteen et al., 2001, 2004). As Na^+ enters the cell, the change in osmolality results in the cell taking up water. Affecting primarily the glial cells, this results in cytocellular edema and is the primary mechanism behind brain swelling after injury. Along with the increase in intracellular Ca^{++} and Na^+, glutamate activation results in the release of potassium (K^+) thereby depolarizing the cell membrane (resembling 'spreading depression') and activating Na^+/K^+ (ATPase) pumps (Katayama et al., 1990; Strong et al., 2002). The activation of these pumps, in order to restore ionic homeostasis, increases the cellular demand for energy (ATP) (Bergsneider et al., 1997, 2000; DeSalles et al., 1986; Kawamata et al., 1992, 1995; Yoshino et al., 1991, 1992). Unfortunately, increasing the production of ATP is challenging for cells that survive the initial insult, especially since increased intracellular Ca^{++} disrupts ordinary mitochondrial respiration. This, along with the well described loss of the ability of the injured brain to increase cerebral blood flow to meet metabolic demands (Ginsberg et al., 1997), can place cells into a state of energy crisis (Andersen and Marmarou, 1992).

2.8.4. Combined effects as a process

These neurochemical and neurometabolic events unfold in various regions, some of which last from weeks to months following injury (for details, see Giza and Hovda, 2001). Consequently, traumatic brain injury should be viewed as 'a process, not an event' (Gennarelli and Graham, 1998). In MTBI, events generally lead to eventual cellular and tissue recovery, whereas in more severe injury the events often lead to regions of widespread cell death.

2.8.5. Diffuse axonal injury

In addition to a potential state of energy crisis, the above described injury-induced ionic cascade can induced the formation of oxygen free radicals thereby destroying cell membranes through a process of lipid peroxidation (Hall, 1993). Such a scenario can result in secondary cell death (necrosis or apoptosis). However, it has most recently been thought to be responsible for the development of diffuse axonal injury (DAI) typically seen following severe head injury.

In earlier studies, investigators thought that DAI following trauma was due to the shear stress forces imposed on the brain by the biomechanical insult discussed above. This concept gained popularity from experimental models in the 1940s and 1950s with Holbourn (1943) and Strich (1956, 1961) suggesting that rotational forces sheared axons and blood vessels by stretching them beyond their tolerances. This conclusion was supported by the examination of postmortem material from patients who had suffered severe head injury (Hume Adams et al., 1989). Some argued that histological evidence for DAI in the cerebellum, brainstem, corpus callosum and other white matter tracks represented damage from small hemorrhages from small penetrating vessels, but, contrary to that hypothesis, clear evidence of axonal bulb formations were present. These post-traumatic axon bulbs are consistent with specific damage to axons, and their formation is due primarily to accumulation of intracellular material transported via axoplasmic flow becoming impeded within the proximal damaged axon. With post-traumatic axonal swelling taking up to 12–18 h to develop, it was not surprising that microglia clusters along with long tract degeneration was evident in autopsy from head injured patients who had survived for longer periods of time.

The findings of DAI following human traumatic brain injury are now not in question, but the mechanism has been revisited. Shearing injuries can occur in the brain during the most severe trauma, but this alone cannot explain all forms of DAI. Axons can tolerate being stretched up to 65% above their original size without breaking (Smith et al., 1999). Along with the temporal parameters associated with the formation of axonal bulbs discussed above, this suggests a more protracted process. As described by Povlishock and his colleagues (Maxwell et al., 1997, 2003; Povlishock and Christman, 1995; Povlishock and Jenkins, 1995; Povlishock et al., 1983), the same ionic cascade associated with the cell soma following injury also occurs within the axon. The membrane stretching at the time of injury instigates the axonal ionic flux. This injury-induced stretching of axons, although insufficient to cause shearing, results in a marked increase in intracellular Ca^{++} contributing to neurofilament compaction and ultimate disconnection. Lesser degrees of injury-induced Ca^{++} flux cause temporary injury, whereas greater degrees result in permanent damage. Gennarelli (1996) proposed four stages or degrees of such injury, with progressively greater degrees of ionic imbalance, impaired axoplasmic flow, and eventually irreversible Ca^{++} influx. Upon closer examination of histological specimens, injury-induced axonal damage is most prevalent in regions where biomechanical strains associated with injury are the most prominent. Consequently, these regions of axonal damage are more patchy, variable, multi-focal, or localized than once thought—resulting in suggestions that the term diffusion axonal injury might be changed to traumatic axonal injury (Gaetz, 2004).

2.8.6. Hemorrhage and ischemia

In more severe degrees of trauma, cells also are exposed to ischemia and toxicity from extravasated blood from vascular injury. Focal contusions, when present, typically appear at gyral apices as punctuate hemorrhages or hemorrhagic streaks (Gaetz, 2004). They appear predominantly within the frontal and temporal poles as well as the orbital frontal, inferolateral temporal, and suprasylvian cortex (Gennarelli and Graham, 1998). Focal areas of ischemia can develop exposing regions of the injured brain to reductions in oxygen. Trauma can compromise the integrity of the blood–brain barrier, exposing cells to blood products contributing to the formation of free radicals and subsequent lipid peroxidation. Focal areas of transient blood–brain barrier breakdown may be responsible for PCS syndromes (Korn et al., 2005). Finally, traumatic brain injury results in the loss of vasoreactivity, which, if significant, can produce vasogenic edema contributing to the increase in intracranial pressure induced by cell swelling and the presence of mass lesions (e.g. subdural hemotoma).

2.8.7. Mild brain injury

All of the above described cell and tissue consequences of human traumatic brain injury can contribute to neurological deficits in more severe degrees of trauma. However, placing these mechanisms of cellular disruption and potential vulnerability in the context of MTBI is challenging. Even the most seemingly straightforward neurological finding, that of unconsciousness, is difficult to explain when it occurs following MTBI.

2.8.8. Unconsciousness

Shaw (2002) recently reviewed five hypotheses about why a patient loses consciousness from a concussion. These are the vascular, reticular, centripetal, pontine cholinergic, and the convulsive hypothesis. Each has its supportive evidence and proponents. Shaw supports the convulsive hypothesis, in which the massive neuronal discharge interrupts consciousness like an epileptic seizure.

2.9. Injury and the EEG

Overall, many mechanisms of injury have been described especially for major head injury. The particular role of some processes in mild head injury may be subtler, transient, or may not occur at all in many patients. Modern models of head injury pathophysiology suggest that the process of injury can unfold over hours or possibly days. Many of these processes are reversible and not accompanied by permanent structural damage, corresponding to symptom resolution over days or weeks. Immediate symptoms may be similar to a post-ictal state or due to a spreading depression. Early post-concussive symptoms may be due to cellular injury from disrupted axoplasmic flow, or transient cellular impairment from oxidative stress or disrupted cytoplasmic homeostasis. Models also show processes through which irreversible injury can take place. Locations of injury may be difficult to predict. Many factors could tip the balance between complete resolution and persistent residual impairment. The second injury syndrome seems to show that the healing brain is in a temporarily vulnerable state.

What lessons can carry over to the study of EEG and QEEG after concussion or mild head injury? Several can be seen. The injuries and its biological sequelae occur in the first hours or possibly days. There is no clear basis for biological deterioration months or years later. There is no reason to expect concussion or mild head injury to cause EEG deterioration months or years later. Healing occurs over days to months. EEG improvement also is expected over days to months. The sites of injury vary. Even the more severe of injuries are often patchy, multi-focal, and variable. There is no special pathognomonic location. The site for finding EEG abnormalities is expected to vary among patients. There is no special biological process that would likely produce pathognomonic kinds of EEG changes. The EEG changes in MTBI are likely to be similar to those seen in many other congenital or acquired brain disorders.

3. EEG in mild traumatic brain injury

Many decades of research and clinical experience with routine EEG carry with them important lessons for clinical interpretation of studies on patients after MTBI. These are needed not only for clinical interpretation of the routine EEG, but also for our QEEG discussion below. After all, QEEG is just measurements made on the EEG.

3.1. EEG immediately after mild traumatic brain injury

There are no published studies of human EEG during a blow to the head sufficient to cause a lapse of consciousness. To understand better the immediate pathophysiology of human minor head injury, one must rely on animal research reports about EEG during experimental head injury. Immediate EEG changes in animal models often included *initial epileptiform activity* described variously as a high amplitude shape wave (Walker et al., 1994), low amplitude high frequency discharges (Hayes et al., 1988; Meyer, 1970), epileptiform discharges (Dixon et al., 1987; Meyer and Denny-Brown, 1955; Marmarou et al., 1994), or generalized high voltage spiking (Nilsson et al., 1994). This is followed quickly in all the experimental models by a period of *suppressed cortical activity*, often appearing nearly iso-electric (Denny-Brown and Russell, 1941; Dixon et al., 1987; Dow et al., 1945; Foltz et al., 1953; Hayes et al., 1988; Meyer, 1970; Meyer and Denny-Brown, 1955; Marmarou et al., 1994; Nilsson et al., 1994; Walker et al., 1944; Ward and Clark, 1948; Williams and Denny-Brown, 1941). Generalized EEG suppression lasted for ten seconds to several minutes, typically for 1–2 min. Shaw also reported major cortical suppression in somatosensory evoked potential cortical peaks for several minutes after a blow to the head (Shaw, 2002). Following the EEG suppression is a period of generalized slowing, gradually improving to a normal baseline EEG over 10 min to 1 h.

Human acute EEG recordings after concussion have been conducted in boxers and industrial injuries (Dow et al., 1944; Kaplan and Browder, 1954; Larsson et al., 1954; Pampus and Grote, 1956). The Dow study in a shipyard recorded EEG as quickly as 10–15 min after closed head injuries. Many of Dow's subjects showed little or no noticeable alteration in their EEG. Others had diffuse slowing, seen especially in those recordings made the soonest after injury. The slowing resolved quickly, e.g. within an hour. In some patients with a well-documented concussion, the EEG was normal even at 15 min after the injury. Boxers showed a reduced EEG amplitude and increased irregular theta activity within 15–30 min of a fight, more so after being knocked out (Larsson et al., 1954; Pampus and Grote, 1956).

Overall, immediately following a MTBI, the preponderance of evidence favors an EEG evolution from epileptiform, to suppressed (perhaps post-ictal), to diffusely slow, and then to normal, all in a very short time frame after the injury.

3.2. EEG changes hours to months after mild traumatic brain injury

Even from the time of Williams (1941a) full report on EEG in head injury, investigators appreciated that the EEG is often normal even just a few hours after mild head injury. The most common EEG changes seen after mild head injury are attenuated posterior alpha (Jung, 1950) and focal irregular slow wave activity with a preponderance of theta waves in the temporal region (Courjon and Scherzer, 1972; Schneider and Hubach, 1962).

Within 24 h of a MTBI, an EEG often is normal or close to normal (Dow et al., 1944; Meyer-Mickeleit, 1953; Scherzer, 1965; Williams, 1941a). Any focal EEG abnormality tends to disappear within 6 months (Koufen and Dichgans, 1978) to a few years (Meyer-Mickeleit, 1953) in a vast majority of cases. Posterior focal slowing may evolve into slight alpha asymmetry before disappearing (Courjon and Scherzer, 1972; Jung, 1953; Meyer-Mickeleit, 1953). However, such a minor alpha asymmetry is of dubious diagnostic value because such a change frequently occurs among normal people (Radermecker, 1964).

Within several weeks or months of a mild head injury, serial EEGs often show gradually increases in alpha frequency, e.g. from 9.0 Hz eventually to 10.0 Hz. This is presumed to be a gradual return to the patient's original dominant alpha frequency (Jung, 1953; Koufen and Dichgans, 1978; Meyer-Mickeleit, 1953; Scherzer, 1965). Mild diffuse theta disappears (Fenton, 1996). The Koufen and Dichgans (1978) study provides a good survey of these and other EEG changes. In that study, 344 adults with head injury were tested from 3 days to 1 year after injury. Overall, 51% of these MTBI patients showed an initial EEG abnormality three days after injury. In 40% of their patients, slowing was detectable only retrospectively after repeated testing. For example, an initially 9 Hz alpha gradually increased to 10 Hz, the presumed pre-injury baseline. Yet, 9 Hz is well within the normal alpha frequency for the general population. They saw generalized slowing in 43% of initial EEGs and focal slowing in 32%. Thirty percent of focal changes were contralateral to the impact. The majority of EEG abnormalities resolved within 3 months, and about 90% resolved within 1 year.

Among 31 patients tested within 24 h of minor head injury, von Bierbrauer et al. (1992) found that 50% had EEG changes. They followed 23 of those patients over the next 2 months. Among those patients, 82% showed abnormalities within 24 h, 73% at 1 week, 50% at 3 weeks and 32% at 2 months. The alpha frequency was 9 Hz immediately after the injury and gradually increased by about 1 Hz over 2 months. By the end of 2 months, most EEG abnormalities were intermittent dysrhythmias.

A low voltage EEG with attenuated alpha originally was suspected of being a sign of trauma (Courjon and Scherzer, 1972). But when this observation was evaluated further, the higher incidence of low voltage EEGs in subjects

undergoing medical expert examinations was shown to be due to anxiety and a tense expectancy, also termed 'psychogenic suppression of the alpha rhythm' (Scherzer, 1966). Jung (1953) and Meyer-Mickeleit (1953) reported that an attenuated alpha, low voltage EEG record occurs no more often after head injury than in the normal healthy population. Vogel (1963) found that the low-voltage EEG is usually an inherited variant of electric cerebral activity. Drowsiness, pain and other factors also can lead to alpha-poor records. Courjon and Scherzer (1972) concluded that a low voltage, low alpha EEG could not be considered a sign of an organic post-concussion syndrome.

At 6 months after a MTBI, Torres and Shapiro (1961) saw epileptiform EEG abnormalities no more often than among persons who had sustained only a whiplash injury. Post-traumatic epileptiform EEG abnormalities increased over time, whereas non-epileptiform EEG abnormalities did not.

Overall, within hours or days of a head injury, an EEG shows subtle to mild slowing in a majority of patients—at least when judged against the patients' eventual follow-up baseline. Changes include decreased alpha frequency as well as generalized and focal slowing. Those changes often are subtle, even still within the range of normal findings in the general population. Some patients have a clinically normal initial EEG even as early as 15 min after a concussion. EEG abnormalities often resolve completely within months. At months or years after a mild head injury, a low voltage alpha EEG pattern is more a sign of anxiety rather than head injury.

3.3. Correspondence between EEG changes and clinical symptoms

In initial months after injury, abnormalities are seen more often in the EEG than in the clinical exam, especially among patients who had few or no symptoms (Kelly and Rosenberg, 1997; Rumpl, 2005). EEG abnormalities were more common than clinical signs. Relatively few (23%) abnormal EEGs were accompanied by abnormal neurologic exam signs. At the same time, most patients (86%) with abnormal neurologic exam signs had an abnormal EEG (Koufen and Dichgans, 1978). EEG abnormalities corresponded to prolonged post-traumatic amnesia (Koufen and Dichgans, 1978). Patients with amnesia lasting more than 8 h invariably had an abnormal EEG. Most patients without amnesia had a normal EEG. EEG abnormalities did not correspond to post-traumatic vertigo, dizziness or nystagmus (Scherzer, 1966).

Therefore, even in these initial months, EEG is more often shows an abnormality than does the physical examination. Many of these EEG abnormalities are subclinical, e.g. they are laboratory findings that are not accompanied by any detectable clinical problems.

As time goes on, the correspondence is poor between EEG and clinical signs and symptoms (Courjon and Scherzer, 1972; Jung, 1953; Meyer-Mickeleit, 1953; Mifka and Scherzer, 1962; Radermecker, 1964). Some clinical deficits persist despite a normal EEG. Some EEG abnormalities persist despite a normal clinical presentation (Courjon and Scherzer, 1972; Mifka and Scherzer, 1962). Torres and Shapiro (1961) noted in whiplash patients that, 'Correlation between severity of clinical symptoms and degree of EEG abnormality was poor in most cases, especially when either the electrical or the clinical abnormality was more than mild'.

Correspondence was poorer between EEG and neuro-imaging tests. EEG did not correspond well to the presence or location of MRI, CT or SPECT abnormalities (Kant et al., 1997; Kelly and Rosenberg, 1997; Rumpl, 2005).

Boxers' EEGs and symptoms were studied by Pampus and Grote (1956) and by Haglund and Persson (1990). EEGs were more often abnormal among young professional boxers who fought more fights, although such a relationship was not seen among amateur boxers. EEGs also were abnormal more often after a career with frequent fights. There was no correlation between EEG changes and the number of bouts, lost fights, or boxing career length. Abnormal EEGs did not predict clinical impairment. EEG abnormalities showed no correspondence to neurological findings (Roberts, 1969).

Boxers repeatedly knocked out can develop a chronic progressive post-traumatic encephalopathy, sometimes referred to as the punch-drunk state (Martland, 1928). Critchley (1957) found more EEG abnormalities among these boxers compared to more successful boxers, but found no correlation between the degree of chronic encephalopathy and any specific EEG change. Similar findings were reported by Johnson (1969) and Mawdsley and Ferguson (1963). The EEG may help assess the severity of trauma shortly after a bout, but it is not helpful in assessing subsequent or chronic clinical symptoms. There was no clinical correlation between EEG abnormalities and psychometric tests (Johnson, 1969).

Soccer or track and field athletes had fewer EEG abnormalities than boxers. Professional soccer players' EEGs sometimes showed slight focal slow activity or a posterior dominant rhythm below 8 Hz (Tysvaer et al., 1989). There was no correlation between EEG changes and frequency of heading the ball.

All this has led some authors to consider that the EEG is of very little practical value in follow up after head injury (Claes, 1961; LeBlanc, 1999; Meyer-Mickeleit, 1953; Muller, 1955; Mueller, 1957; Radermecker, 1964). PCS symptoms can be neither proven nor denied by any kind of EEG (Caveness, 1966; Courjon, 1962; Kugler, 1966).

A normal EEG long after a head injury does not allow for any conclusion about the severity of the original trauma (Courjon and Scherzer, 1972). Normalization of the EEG cannot be considered evidence of lack of initial anatomical injury. Even severe head injury can have a normal EEG at a later date. Brain electrical activity often returns to normal

long after mild or severe head injury, even though patients may continue to complain of headache, dizziness, etc.

Conversely, an EEG abnormality is not apt for proving an organic basis for a patient's complaints. Kugler (1966) and Radermecker (1961) warned against any attempt to 'objectivate' post-traumatic symptoms by means of an EEG recording. Even substantial EEG abnormalities are not necessarily correlated with PCS symptoms (Courjon and Scherzer, 1972). Nor do EEG abnormalities predict the onset of PPCS (Ettlin et al., 1992).

Following EEG changes over time may be helpful (Courjon and Scherzer, 1972; Koufen and Dichgans, 1978). Post-traumatic EEG abnormalities tend to improve over months. If an EEG is unchanged throughout the entire posttraumatic period, it is probably not related to the trauma (Bickford and Klass, 1966 and Radermecker, 1964). Sometimes the EEG returns to normal even when neurologic or cognitive impairment persists, and in that case its normality is a sign of poor prognosis for subsequent clinical improvement (Lücking et al., 1977; Walter et al., 1948; Williams, 1941b; Strnad and Strnadová, 1987).

Low voltage alpha EEGs are seen in late post-traumatic syndrome and these seem largely to be due to anxiety (Scherzer, 1966). Many other normal situations, technical factors and other clinical conditions also can produce a low-amplitude alpha EEG. At any rate, a low voltage EEG should not be considered proof of the presence of an organic post-traumatic syndrome.

Overall, EEG abnormalities are more common than clinical symptoms in the initial months after a MTBI. Patients with an abnormal exam generally have an abnormal EEG, although many more EEG abnormalities are sub-clinical. Later after the injury, there is poor correspondence between EEG and clinical signs, symptoms, imaging results or psychometric tests. EEG abnormalities are seen with some sports injuries, but those findings do not usually correspond to clinical findings. Decreased posterior alpha long after injury is more likely due to anxiety rather than brain damage. EEG does not predict, confirm or measure PCS or PPCS, nor should mild EEG abnormality be used to substantiate an objective clinical brain injury. Nor can a normal EEG exclude an initial significant brain injury.

3.4. More serious head injuries

EEG findings in post-traumatic coma are beyond the scope of this review. Yet, the characteristics of EEG after severe injury have some bearing on the kinds of EEG changes expected after a MTBI. For that reason they are described here briefly.

EEG correlates well with the depth of post-traumatic coma (Arfel, 1972; Bricolo and Turella, 1973; Chatrian et al., 1963; Rumpl, 1979; Silverman, 1963; Stone et al., 1988; Synek, 1990). After a severe head injury, EEG findings range from increased slow activity to amplitude suppression with greater injuries (Rumpl, 1979, 2005).

Post-traumatic coma also can show features more typical of sleep or various sharply contoured discharges, epileptic spikes, periodic lateralized epileptiform discharges (PLEDs), and triphasic waves. Reactivity and typical sleep features are more common among patients who make a good recovery (Rumpl et al., 1983).

Long after major closed or penetrating injuries, EEGs showed a wide variety of dysrhythmias, focal or generalized suppression, focal slowing, frontal alpha, and epileptiform discharges (Dawson et al., 1951; Jabbari et al., 1986; Ruijs et al., 1994; Lücking et al., 1977). Clinical improvement occurred faster than EEG improvement. Patients had more favorable outcomes when they more quickly progressed from slowing to normal alpha activity. Focal slowing or epileptiform discharges were seen more often among patients who had persistent clinical problems. The site of focal EEG features correlated poorly with the site of trauma. A severely abnormal EEG at the time of injury predicted more severe long-term neurologic sequellae, but mild to moderate EEG abnormalities did not help to predict clinical outcome. No prognostic or diagnostic significance could be deduced from factors such as generalized decreased amplitude.

ICU monitoring can add prognostic clues (Nuwer, 1994). Non-reactive and poorly variable EEGs predict a poorer outcome (Vespa et al., 2002). Such EEG changes accompanied by metabolic derangements predict particularly poor outcomes (Glenn et al., 2003; Vespa et al., 2003). Those metabolic markers show that the pathophysiology of moderate to severe head injury differs from that of MTBI.

Koufen et al. (1987) followed over 2 years a series of 100 patients who were delirious for more than 1 week after injury. EEG showed generalized slowing. By 3 months after the injury, the EEG was normal in half of the patients. Slowing rarely lasted longer than 6 months. Later, generalized abnormalities were seen in 70% of patients, and focal changes in 95%. Half of the patients with focal EEG abnormalities had focal neurological signs or symptoms. Generalized slowing took longer than focal to resolve, but disappeared more completely. Focal slowing persisted more than 2 years in 22%, mostly in those patients who had developed post-traumatic epilepsy.

Overall, several lessons carry over to the study of MTBI. A wide variety of abnormal EEG patterns are seen after severe trauma, none of which are pathognomonic of trauma per se. Mild EEG abnormalities did not predict neurologic outcome. EEGs gradually renormalized in many severe head injury patients, more quickly and completely for generalized slowing than for focal slowing.

3.5. Problems using EEG for diagnosis and prognosis after mild traumatic brain injury

The two prominent French and Austrian neurologists and neurophysiologists J. Courjon and E. Scherzer warned long ago about problematic or misleading use of EEG.

Table 1
On the use of EEG after mild traumatic head injury, Courjon and Scherzer (1972) noted

- EEG changes are not specific to a particular cause
- At a late stage after an injury, an EEG record is of little diagnostic or prognostic value
- Many different types of illness, injury or developmental problems can lead to the same EEG result
- Many normal processes can lead to EEG findings that can be mistaken for abnormality
- Normal EEG results do not ensure that a patient does not have brain injury from a mild head injury
- Abnormal EEG results do not ensure that a patient does have a brain injury from a mild head injury
- No conclusion can be drawn from the EEG as to the degree of working capacity, post-concussion syndrome, or neurological deficit
- Low amplitude alpha should not be considered indicative of head injury, but is commonly due to anxiety of other non-specific, non-diagnostic factors
- A non-expert often draws incorrect conclusions
- Fallaciously oversimplified EEG results are a disservice to legal proceedings

These concerns were published in the *Handbook of Electroencephalography and Clinical Neurophysiology* (Courjon and Scherzer, 1972). See Table 1 for a summary of their comments. These warnings apply especially to MTBI. Although originally penned for routine EEG, their comments apply well too to QEEG. They noted, 'The implications drawn from a detailed EEG report can never be absolute and imperative, apart from very rare exceptions. The electroencephalographer has to enumerate all the etiological possibilities of a certain EEG picture and give the degree of their probability in accordance with the clinical data'. Many laypersons and non-experts entertain 'mystical ideas about what exceptional insights into brain function an EEG investigation can provide'. These comments are as valid now as they were three decades ago.

Regarding misleading and oversimplified interpretations of EEG in medical–legal settings, Courjon and Scherzer warned, 'Either it is deduced from a pathological EEG that traumatic brain damage has occurred which may be the cause of subjective symptoms, or from a normal EEG it is deduced that no traumatic brain damage could have occurred and that no subjective symptoms should be present. Both conclusions are obviously fallacious'.

These issues and warnings about routine traditional EEG should be kept in mind when reviewing QEEG studies and claims.

4. QEEG in mild traumatic brain injury

Before discussing QEEG in MTBI, several background issues need to be reviewed. These include QEEG terminology and general problems encountered with QEEG testing for clinical disorders. In addition, there are general issues to be considered for how one assesses the clinical usefulness of a diagnostic test. With this background we best can discuss the clinical utility of QEEG for MTBI.

4.1. QEEG techniques and terminology

The following is a brief overview of QEEG terms, especially those used in the literature review further below. More extensive discussion of terms and techniques is found in Nuwer (1988).

Digital EEG is paperless recording, storage and display with many advantages over traditional paper recordings. *Quantitative EEG* (QEEG) is any mathematical or statistical analysis along with the various graphical displays made from digital EEG (Nuwer, 1988).

There are many varied QEEG techniques. *Automated event detection* uses mathematical algorithms to detect or identify interesting events such as possible epileptic spikes or non-convulsive seizures. Much false identification occurs, so human expert review is needed. *Monitoring and trending* of EEG uses mathematical algorithms to extract simple measurements from the EEG. Trending highlights EEG changes over hours or days in the intensive care unit or during surgery. That trending identifies changes that warn of possible complications. *Source analysis* tries to identify the brain location that generates certain brain waves. Scalp voltage distribution is compared to the distribution expected if the voltages were generated by a single dipole at specific intracranial site. This approximation is subject to failure in its assumptions that result in erroneous localization. All these techniques require expert human review at each stage of EEG processing to try to minimize error rates.

Frequency analysis converts the EEG into its frequency content, estimating how much energy occurred in each frequency band. This is expressed either in a few traditional EEG frequency bands, or as a continuous graph of frequency content from 0 to 30 Hz. It may be measured as power, or as the square root of power that usually is referred to as EEG amplitude.

Coherence analysis measures EEG at two separate sites, and scores how much that activity rises and falls synchronously. It usually is measured within each frequency band. Short distance coherence is made from adjacent scalp electrode sites (e.g. F3 and C3), as opposed to long distance coherence from recording sites farther apart.

EEG brain maps are graphical displays that typically illustrate the scalp distribution of EEG features. They can aid communication with non-specialists about the presence and location of certain EEG features. These stylized maps superficially resemble brain MRI or CT images, but that resemblance is purely superficial. EEG brain maps actually have relatively few real data points, so most of the image is just an extrapolation among those few real points. EEG brain maps often use color-coding to represent intensities of some feature e.g., scalp locations of EEG slow waves.

Normative statistical analysis compares a patient's EEG features to those from a group of normal subjects. Such comparisons may use frequency analysis or other EEG features. Typical measurements are expressed in terms of standard deviations away from a normal mean value, usually referred to as the *Z-score* for the feature. Statistical analysis can be displayed as numerical tables or as EEG brain maps of Z-scores. Numerical tables composed of hundreds or thousands of Z-scores are referred to here as *QEEG panels*.

Diagnostic discriminant analysis compares EEG features from a patient to those from a group of patients with a particular disorder. This tries to match a patient's EEG Z-scores to the pattern typical for a particular disorder. The results are expressed in terms of a diagnostic likelihood such as, 'This patient's findings are consistent with mild head injury with a probability of $P < 0.05$'.

It is important to distinguish between panels and discriminants. The two have been confused repeatedly in published discussions. To further complicate the picture, both panels and discriminants come in a variety of different forms that must be evaluated separately. For example, consider Tests A and B that are run with different measurements and different calculations on different machines using different normative databases. Just because Test A can achieve a certain result does not prove that Test B can do the same. Instead, Test B needs its own evaluation and validation. To claim that Test B should be accepted, just because test A has been shown to work, is erroneous. Such an error occurs frequently in QEEG discussions.

Commercial vendors market specific combinations of QEEG techniques under commercial trade names such as *Neurometrics*. Typically these include QEEG panels of normative statistical frequency and coherence analysis. EEG brain maps and diagnostic discriminants often accompany Z-score tables. Commercial discriminants and QEEG panels are advertised to diagnose MTBI as well as alcoholism, substance abuse, dementia, depression, learning disorders, and many other medical problems.

4.2. Assessing QEEG as a diagnostic test

4.2.1. Assessing diagnostic tests

What is a diagnostic test? How do physicians determine a diagnostic test's acceptance for use?

A *diagnosis* is a professional opinion about the presence, absence, type, severity, or location of an illness, injury, or medical condition of a patient. A *differential diagnosis* is a group of diagnoses, among which is the likely cause of a patient's condition. A *diagnostic interpretation* is a diagnosis or differential diagnosis based on a test's findings. A *diagnostic test* is one on which such a diagnostic interpretation is based.

When used this way, QEEG is a diagnostic test and its interpretation is a diagnostic interpretation. That interpretation often will mention a diagnosis or differential diagnosis of disorders that could cause such test results. In most

regions, making a diagnosis is part of the practice of medicine, and any person making diagnoses must do so within their licensed scope of practice for medicine or other limited-license health profession as regulated by their region's legal business and professions code. Sometimes QEEG is used instead as a research tool, which is beyond the scope of this review. Research tests are subject to their own regulations, institutional review boards, and informed consent forms.

Physicians use tests to narrow or prioritize a differential diagnosis. Test findings are useful when they are consistent with some possibilities but not with others, or strongly suggest some while only weakly supporting other diagnoses. If test results are consistent with one and only one diagnosis, the finding is considered *pathognomonic*. Medical tests rarely produce such a specific result.

Most neurological diagnoses are established through the history and physical examination. Diagnostic tests are used to confirm a diagnosis when there remains some doubt, or to narrow the differential diagnosis when the diagnosis remains unclear. Physicians have an armamentarium of available tests.

How do physicians decide when a new diagnostic test is valuable or effective in patient care? In practical terms, *medical usefulness* of a new diagnostic test is determined by the extent to which it can:

- Reduce the morbidity or mortality of a disease, by clarifying which medication, surgery, or other treatment is most likely to be effective, or by substituting a test with less risk for one with higher risks.
- Reduce the overall cost of the medical evaluation e.g., by replacing an inpatient procedure with an outpatient procedure.
- Substantially improve the patient's or family's understanding of the situation, leading to improved behavior or more accurate expectations.

Not all new information is clinically useful. Sometimes new information brings nothing of value to the care of the patient (Nuwer, 1990, 1992). Some is redundant, too non-specific, too confusing, too risky, or too costly to obtain. This kind of problem is encountered in QEEG, where some proponents argue that any information is useful. That is an erroneous generalization that states, 'Some types of information are useful. This test provides information. Therefore, this information is useful'.

4.2.2. Assessing QEEG as a diagnostic test

Assessment of clinical usefulness includes several factors (Nuwer, 1992). The primary factor in the assessment is peer-reviewed published studies. Factors to consider in the literature review in general are presented in Table 2.

4.2.2.1. Cause and age of injury.
The differential diagnosis for the cognitive complaints of post-concussion syndrome

Table 2
Factors to consider in evaluating QEEG literature

For review of diagnostic tests
- The published studies' quality
- What conclusions can be drawn from each study
- Whether those conclusions show medical usefulness
- The techniques' limitations and weaknesses
- The authors' conflicts of interest

Characteristics of quality studies
- The criteria for test 'abnormality' is defined clearly and prospectively
- Testing and interpretation is conducted blindly
- Patients and controls evaluated should be different from those used to create the test or database
- Patients should be representative of the diagnosis sought, e.g. mild traumatic brain injury
- Control patients should have other disorders from the same differential diagnosis
- Various assessments of validity should be measured, e.g. sensitivity, specificity
- Results should be compared to findings from history, physical exam, and other routine test results, e.g. EEG and neuro-imaging
- Studies should be conducted by impartial investigators independent from the companies or individuals with commercial interests

or mild head injury includes side effects of medication, depression and bipolar disorder, anxiety, panic attacks, post-traumatic stress disorder, insomnia and other sleep disorders, pre-existing mild brain disorders, early dementia, and other conditions. Drowsiness, anxiety and medications, including benzodiazepines and antidepressants, affect the EEG. If a QEEG shows 'abnormalities', what do those changes mean? How can those QEEG findings help to narrow the differential diagnosis?

How sensitive are mild head injury QEEG diagnostic discriminants to common injuries, such as striking a person's head on a cabinet door or slipping on an icy sidewalk? QEEG discriminants are marketed as sensitive to MTBI without an associated loss of consciousness and even injuries that are decades old. But, can they separate a recent injury from one long ago?

4.2.2.2. Value. One considers what clinical conclusions can be drawn. How does this help the patient? Simply providing information is not a demonstration that the information provided is useful. Sometimes this point has been difficult for non-clinicians to grasp. If a test brings little or no new information for narrowing the differential diagnosis, but does bring additional false-positive problems, potential for confusion, and added costs, then the new test will generally be judged to be medically not useful (Nuwer, 1998).

QEEG panels and discriminants often seem indiscriminant. QEEG panels provide hundreds or thousands of pieces of information e.g., measurements of many EEG features. Too often, no compelling rationale is presented for how the information is to be used to fulfill the clinical mission or effectiveness as discussed above. This is a major short-coming of QEEG in MTBI patients.

4.2.3. Credibility threshold problems

Some factors make it more difficult to accept a study's conclusions. These are seen in many QEEG studies. One can speak of a threshold of credibility—the higher that threshold, the more difficult it is to get over that threshold and accept the study's conclusions. Several such factors are mentioned below. These should be considered as we assess the conclusions that can be drawn from QEEG studies.

Conflicts of interest, financial or otherwise, raise the possibility that the results have been contaminated during the research process. Many ways are possible for a researcher to affect a study's outcome. Such effects may be subtle, and do not necessarily imply any unethical or malicious behavior on the researcher's part. Nevertheless, a higher threshold needs to be achieved before accepting a study's results when the investigators are involved in commercialization and marketing of the study's product.

Notable past failures of QEEG's diagnostic capabilities raise concerns. QEEG has had problems. For example, one QEEG technique was reported and later marketed as an effective way to diagnose learning disabilities in school children (Ahn et al., 1980; Kaye et al., 1981). Yingling et al. (1986) disconfirmed this claim for children with dyslexia, the most common specific learning disability. Another report described a patient whose QEEG discriminant diagnosed schizophrenia as a cause for his complaints. Later, he turned out to have a brain tumor as the real cause (Nuwer and Hauser, 1994).

Black box techniques are ones for which the full methodological details are not published, often because they are considered proprietary business secrets. Complex black box techniques are difficult to verify. One must simply to accept them as they are. Some QEEG techniques are black box. That raises the threshold needed before accepting claims about them.

Spilt-half replication and jack-knife studies sometimes are claimed to be prospective studies. These studies collect their data before setting the normal limits used to interpret the results. This design leaves open the possibility that the collected data influence the normal limits that later were used to score the same data. These are more correctly categorized as retrospective trials because the methodology was not fully established until after the data was collected. A truly prospective study would have fully set forth detailed methods, normal limits, and process for determining results before collecting the data. Some QEEG studies use the split-half and jack-knife design. Those designs raise the threshold before accepting the studies' claims.

Confirmatory studies have much more credibility than exploratory studies. *Exploratory* studies make observations about interesting relationships in large data sets, but many of those detected relationships are just chance events. Confirmatory studies set forth specific hypotheses and methods in advance, and then test those hypotheses. Those hypotheses are falsifiable i.e., the hypothesis can be confirmed or not. Well-designed confirmatory studies have

considerable credibility. Exploratory studies are considered interesting but need subsequent confirmation. Many QEEG studies are exploratory, and that substantially raises the threshold before accepting their findings.

Discriminant analysis is a technique to search for possible relationships in a large data set. Discriminant analysis is an exploratory technique that always finds some relationships. Many are irreproducible chance events. Some statisticians refer to discriminant analysis pejoratively as fishing expeditions. The high frequency of false positive relationships gives the discriminant analysis poor credibility. Two tactics have been proposed for overcoming the false positive problem. First, discriminant analysis can be used as an exploratory technique, and then follow up focused confirmatory testing is used to corroborate or disconfirm specific findings. Second, discriminant analysis should involve 10 times as many subjects as the number of features evaluated. QEEG easily produces hundreds or thousands of measured features. Many QEEG studies use discriminant analysis but fail to follow those precautions. That causes a great credibility problem for accepting their findings.

Independent replication has two possible meanings. First, it can refer to a second data set collected by the original investigators. For example in routine evoked potentials testing, a technician runs the test twice to see if it can be replicated. A different, second meaning of the term refers to a study's corroboration by separate, impartial investigators. When an investigator is commercially involved in a product under study, it is preferable to have others independently corroborate the claims—others without a commercial conflict or interest. Absence of such an independent corroboration raises the threshold before accepting the claims. Investigators with commercial conflicts of interest have published many QEEG reports. Without subsequent corroboration by impartial investigators, those claims have a credibility problem. Many QEEG claims about MTBI have such a problem.

Counterintuitive claims run contrary to well-established knowledge and theory. Such claims are difficult to understand and accept. For example, it is very unexpected that a QEEG mild head injury diagnostic discriminant's test accuracy is affected neither by drowsiness, nor sleep, nor by medications well known to affect EEGs (Thatcher et al., 1989, 1999). Most scientific advances move gradually from the known into the unknown. Incremental advances are more easily accepted, whereas novel unexpected leaps take a greater degree of demonstration. Counterintuitive claims substantially raise the credibility threshold before accepting those findings.

Marketing claims for QEEG diagnostic testing include its purported use as a diagnostic test for senile dementia, Alzheimer's disease, multi-infarct dementia, alcoholism, drug abuse, depression, bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, bulimia, violent behavior, headache, migraine, dyslexia, learning disorders, attention deficit disorder, Tourette's syndrome, Parkinson's disease, and sleep disorders. The community view of such promotions is one of skepticism. Separating the valid from the fanciful claim is needed. Indiscriminant marketing claims raise the credibility threshold.

Altogether, many QEEG claims are based on studies that have multiple drawbacks as mentioned above. Commercial QEEG marketing seems to have more difficulties than other areas of clinical neurophysiology. When assessing the claims that QEEG panels and discriminant analysis can diagnose brain injury from post-concussion syndrome and mild head injuries, one needs to be aware of the extent to which those studies have problems. Those problems need to be weighed when deciding how much credibility to give to the studies' conclusions.

4.2.4. Reproducibility and reliability

Reliability is defined by Thatcher et al. (2003b) as *reproducibility* or, 'the extent to which any measuring procedure yields the same results on repeated trials'. They note several studies that show repeatability of QEEG measurements. There is an important semantic issue here.

Reliability, as used in medical circles, is a very different from reproducibility. Physicians consider a diagnostic test as reliable when it usually gives a correct diagnostic result. Medically, a diagnostic test that, over and over again, gives the same erroneous or irrelevant result is reproducible but is not reliable.

Assessment of a test's reliability begins with the question, 'Reliable for what?' The reliability of a mild head injury QEEG panel or discriminant should be assessed among patients from the typical differential diagnosis of PCS complaints. To evaluate whether a test does reliably differentiate between depression and PCS, one would study several sets of patients with and without those disorders. This would be done also for other disorders on the differential diagnosis.

As an example of the latter issue, let us consider measurements of height. Growth hormone-producing pituitary tumors can cause people to grow tall. Let us assume that we have a tool that measures height with good accuracy and reproducibility. Does that mean that the tool reliably detects pituitary tumors? No, it does not. Some people are tall normally. Most tall people do not have a tumor. No matter how accurately and reproducibly one measures height, it is a poorly reliable predictor of pituitary tumors. Measurement reproducibility and diagnostic reliability are different.

Let us evaluate the literature on QEEG measurement reproducibility, particularly those reports that have been cited as evidence for QEEG's reliability as a diagnostic test for mild head injury.

Burgess and Gruzelier (1993) assessed topographic maps over a 40 min session. Topographic maps were difficult to reproduce especially in the delta band. The authors conclude that, '…the results indicate that reliability is insufficient to

allow topographic comparisons for a single individual…' They suggest that comparing one group to another group may be more reliable than for testing individuals. This study does not support the use of QEEG as a diagnostic test for MTBI.

Several studies mentioned below confirm that an individual's EEG absolute amplitude features remain reasonably stable over time when controlled well for the patient's state of alertness. These studies report that subjects with a tall alpha tended to have a tall alpha when tested again, and subjects with a small alpha tended still to have a small alpha, and such findings were reproducible over time.

Corsi-Cabrera et al. (1997) tested nine subjects during 11 sessions over 1 month. They used eight electrodes with bipolar reconstructions, and collected 10 two-second epochs per session, i.e. 20 s total per session. The median correlation coefficient across the 11 sessions was 0.94 for absolute amplitudes. Variability was greater for alpha and beta bands.

Lund et al. (1995) found that eight artifact-free eight-second epochs were sufficient to give a correlation coefficient around 0.9 for absolute power among 49 normal subjects and 44 schizophrenic patients.

Gasser et al. (1985) tested 26 children in 120 s recordings using 20 s epochs. The investigators measured absolute and relative power and autoregressive spectral peak parameters. Comparing two sessions run 10 months apart, EEG band correlation coefficients typically averaged 0.68. Results were similar for 20, 40 or 60 s EEG samples. These correlation coefficients show that slightly less than 50% of the typical QEEG measurements' variance is explained by within-subject reproducibility.

Salinsky et al. (1991) found absolute and relative power correlation coefficients of 0.84 between recordings made 12–16 weeks apart among 25 normal subjects. Absolute power was more reproducible than relative power, and total samples of 60 s were marginally more reproducible than 20 or 40 s.

Pollock et al. (1991) evaluated test–retest reproducibility of QEEG measurements in 46 normal controls. Retesting was at 20 weeks. For absolute amplitudes in theta, alpha and beta-1, correlation coefficients exceeded 0.6 at most electrode sites. Beta-2 correlations were somewhat lower. Delta did very poorly with almost no correlation coefficient above 0.60. For relative amplitudes, the correspondences were not so high, with only about 3/4 of the electrode sites exceeding 0.60 for theta, alpha and beta. Delta again did very poorly. The authors recommend using absolute amplitude rather than relative amplitude for clinical QEEG research.

These five studies show modest or good reproducibility for the simple absolute power or amplitude measurements when run by experts under controlled situations. The studies showed that absolute power or amplitude was more reproducible than relative power or amplitude measurements. Delta was the least reproducible band. Roughly half of the measurement variance was reproducible within subjects. The irreproducible half of the variance was due presumably to the usual normal moment-to-moment EEG fluctuations or technique variation between sittings.

Harmony and colleagues (Harmony et al., 1993; Fernández et al., 1993) assessed coherence in six subjects at rest and during cognitive tasks. Good correlation of the measurements was found between conditions within sessions. But between sessions the correlations were much lower even within subject within condition. Resting absolute and relative power measurements were more variable than coherences. Despite their baseline variability, they concluded that certain cognitive tasks, such as calculations, produced similar effects across subjects.

Arruda et al. (1996) applied principal components analysis (PCA) and factor analysis to QEEG recordings from 102 normal subjects during an auditory continuous performance task. The PCA solution was validated independently on 106 subjects. Seven components could account for 60–77% of the total experimental variance. This study differs from most QEEG or discriminant analysis paradigms, because in it involved only normal subjects, used principal components analysis and factor analysis, used an auditory performance paradigm. This is a theoretical study illustrating how such a mathematical technique might be applied to EEG. It does not test any research hypothesis or demonstrate usefulness for any clinical care issue.

QEEG clinical interpretation is plagued by false positives. Hamilton-Bruce et al. (1991) asked three different QEEG readers to process the same EEGs from 10 normal subjects. Each reader, or operator, selected 48 epochs, calculated a QEEG panel, and ran a general diagnostic discriminant. They found modest reproducibility among the QEEG panel measurements. They noted, however, '…between any two operators… there were a considerable number of statistically significant differences in the values for absolute power'. For the diagnostic discriminants, all three operators scored as 'normal' only two of 10 normal subjects. All three operators scored as 'abnormal' another two of 10 normal subjects. The other six normal subjects were given mixed or intermediate results. This discriminant result is an important one to keep in mind when assessing the accuracy of diagnostic discriminants in clinical care. Many false positive results occurred.

Some authors have suggested that these studies prove the reliability of QEEG panels and diagnostic discriminants. Those arguments are incorrect for several reasons. Many of these studies evaluated simple features like absolute amplitude, not the more complex ones usually included in QEEG. QEEG panels often employ more advanced features such as the ratios of amplitudes between sites, coherence, phase relationships, and complex combinations of features. Those are not well evaluated in the reproducibility studies mentioned above. Where they were assessed in these studies, the diagnostic discriminant faired poorly with far too many erroneous results.

Overall, these studies show measurement reproducibility, but they did not assess the QEEG's medical reliability as a diagnostic test. They do not show medical diagnostic reliability because they did not assess whether the measurements give correct medical diagnoses.

4.3. Problems with QEEG statistical normative comparisons

Many types of problems interfere with QEEG, especially for statistical normative comparison testing. The non-linear, often abstruse nature of this process obscures many obvious errors, which then masquerade as possible abnormal results. Subtleties of these effects are difficult to understand even for persons who are experts in this field, and thus those not expert in EEG and QEEG clinical interpretation are easily led astray (Duffy et al., 1994; Nuwer, 1988, 1990, 1996).

Common problems are described below along with their potential impact on the use of QEEG for MTBI patients. See Table 3.

4.3.1. Artifacts, medications, state, and technical factors

Artifact contamination, drowsiness, anxiety, medication and technical factors can make a QEEG appear falsely abnormal.

Artifacts readily contaminate any EEG recording. Eyes, muscles, sweat, nearby equipment, poorly connected scalp electrodes, and many other sources generate these undesired signals. In QEEGs, they readily cause confusing patterns (Nuwer, 1987, 1988). Traditional artifact removal tactics can be insufficient for several reasons, such as artifact prevalence and subtlety, insufficient 'expert' training, failure to crosscheck findings, and recording too little EEG. Many QEEG recordings merge EEG and these contaminants, causing spurious results in frequency

Table 3
Factors that can lead to QEEG interpretation errors when using statistical normative comparisons

Technical
- Artifact contamination
- Drowsiness contamination
- Medication effects
- Filter changes
- Changes in electrode placement

Patient
- Drowsiness
- Anxiety
- Medication effects

Interpretation
- 'Different from average' does not necessarily mean 'diseased'
- Changes are not specific for particular disorders
- Some unusual EEG features are well known to have no clinical significance

Procedure
- Use of technicians to read the record and choose epochs
- Lack of safeguards and standards to prevent errors

analysis, normative comparisons, discriminant analysis, and brain map findings.

Drowsiness occurs frequently in EEG recordings. Its decreased posterior alpha and generalized increased theta mimics brain damage. Slow rolling eye movements are important early signs of drowsiness (Santamaria and Chiappa, 1987). But many QEEG recordings fail to include the eye movement recording channels or 0.1 Hz low filter settings needed to detect those signs of early drowsiness. As a result, QEEGs can confuse early drowsiness with signs of brain damage.

Anxiety interferes with the resting state needed for the posterior alpha. Alpha biofeedback is used to train anxious patients to relax. The better they relax, the better their alpha amplitude.

Medications can change the EEG substantially. Benzodiazepines and barbiturates increase fast activity. Other medications cause slowing. Compared to control subjects on no medication, a patient on medications can have QEEG Z-score 'abnormalities' just due to medication effects. Such medications invalidate normative comparison techniques.

Electrode caps can be skewed or tilted, and cause an artificial asymmetry. Low filter settings can alter the EEG delta content. Such technical changes produce false abnormalities.

In routine traditional EEG reading, the professional reader is trained to identify and not to over-read these factors. These effects easily can be lost in the analysis of more abstract data in QEEG panels, brain maps and discriminant scores.

Overall, the effects of artifact contamination, drowsiness, medications, and unintended technical variations interfere with using statistical databases to detect EEG abnormalities.

4.3.2. Meaningless and non-specific changes

'Different' is not the same as 'diseased.' Computers can measure how one patient's EEG differs from an ideal average patient, but such a difference may be benign and of no medical significance. Metaphorically, some people are taller than average, other people are shorter than average, but this height difference is not necessarily due to a disease or a disorder. In QEEG measurements, this kind of a confusion frequently is seen. Some QEEG readers erroneously assume that any difference from average is due to disease. Really, though, different people often are simply different from each other.

Normal people have many QEEG statistical 'abnormalities,' so the concept of QEEG 'abnormality' becomes somewhat meaningless. QEEG panels measures hundreds or thousands of individual EEG features, each statistically transformed and tested. Statistics meant to test a few features are applied to enormous numbers of features, leading to many false positive 'abnormalities'. And these statistics have their own chance events; normal individuals may have a 2 to 18% false positive rate (Dolisi et al., 1990).

Table 4
QEEG panel reproducibility

# Features tested in each test panel	613
# Features abnormal in at least one test	237
# Abnormal features that were	
Abnormal in 1 of 4 tests	148/237(62%)
Abnormal in 2 of 4 tests	52/237(22%)
Abnormal in 3 of 4 tests	29/237(12%)
Abnormal in all 4 tests	8/237(3%)

A patient had the same QEEG panel performed on four separate occasions after a possible mild traumatic brain injury. The normal and abnormal features were counted for each of the four tests, and were compared across the tests. The data showed that most flagged abnormalities were not reproducible across the four tests. This illustrates the QEEG panel's reproducibility or lack thereof.

The QEEG, when measuring thousands of features, always flags some features as outside the normal range even in a normal healthy person.

Even an individual's results change over time. Table 4 presents the reproducibility of one patient's QEEG panel when tested on four occasions. While many features show up as 'abnormal' on these tests, the specific features vary considerably from test to test. That example shows how the detailed test results are more random or irreproducible.

Particular QEEG changes are non-specific. There are no pathognomonic changes. A variety of disorders can cause the same results (Coutin-Churchman et al., 2003; Mies et al., 1984). QEEG does not differentiate among diagnoses. A serious, common reading error is to attribute QEEG changes to a single specific diagnosis. Most real EEG or QEEG changes are non-specific.

Normal variants occur commonly in EEGs. Some occur rarely among normal people, but have no diagnostic significance. Available normative databases are insufficient for capturing the breadth of these non-diagnostic features.

In normative comparisons patient must be compared to his or her own age group, because EEG frequency content varies considerably with age. Consider a database with 625 normal subjects from age 2 months to 82 years (Thatcher et al., 2003a). Most of those subjects were children. Among adults, 24 subjects were 18–21 years old, 21 were 21–25 years old, 22 subjects in the group averaging 30 years of age, and 32 subjects in the older group averaging 57 years of age. This means that EEGs for most adults are compared to 21–32 normal control subjects of their own age group. That number is insufficient to account for the breadth of normal EEG patterns and known normal variant waveforms. Metaphorically, consider how accurately would the faces of two dozen people represent the breadth and variety of normal faces, especially if a thousand features were measured on each face.

Overall, meaninglessness or non-specific changes frequently occur, which interferes with using statistical databases to detect EEG abnormalities.

4.3.3. Who reviews the EEG and selects the epochs for analysis?

The QEEG user chooses epochs, or EEG segments, for analysis. The choice is critically important. Usually several dozen epochs are chosen, each several seconds long. Often about a minute of EEG is processed, sometimes representing 10% or less of the recorded EEG. Subjective selection can be very biased in choosing epochs, and this can highly influence the analysis. Widely varying findings result from different people processing from the identical EEGs (Hamilton-Bruce et al., 1991). 'Abnormal' results can be produced on normal person by selection bias. Truly abnormal findings can be missed by selectively eliminating them.

The skill, knowledge, ability, training, and experience of the person selecting epochs are very important. Unfortunately, even some well known labs leave the selection task to technicians. The senior lab professional does not examine the whole EEG from which the data were extracted (E. R. John, personal communication). Such a technician becomes the 'expert' who must identify artifacts and drowsiness, and choose features to include or exclude. But many technicians are insufficiently trained in the necessary neurological medical, diagnostic, and EEG interpretation skills. There are no standards in the field to prevent such procedures from creating erroneous results.

Sometimes, the professional clinician using QEEG is a speech pathologist, clinical psychologist, other allied health professional, or an unlicensed person. Such users generally lack sufficient skills, knowledge, ability, training, and experience needed to be expert in the necessary neurological medical, diagnostic, and EEG interpretation issues.

There are no generally accepted standards for QEEG processing. Proposed guidelines (Duffy et al., 1994) often are not followed and are not generally accepted. There are no clear safeguards against erroneous results. A variety of practitioners use these tools, some of whom have little or no training in EEG. Some QEEG labs fail to meet community standards for running and interpreting any EEG (American Electroencephalographic Society, 1994a,b,c,d). For example, too little EEG is recorded.

Even when careful processing has been carried out, there are no clear rules about interpretation. How many statistical hits are needed to deduce that something is truly abnormal? Does a reader really have to read the EEG tracing too? When do changes imply a particular diagnosis? What significance is attached to 'abnormal' results? These open questions have not been sufficiently answered.

Overall, a highly trained professional EEG reader should review the entire EEG record, select epochs, supervise the data processing, and provide the medical interpretations. The lack of accepted standards and safeguards leaves this field open to erroneous results.

4.4. Reports using QEEG in mild traumatic brain injury

4.4.1. QEEG features and panels

Several studies have evaluated QEEG panels in MTBI.

Von Bierbrauer et al. (1992) studied 31 patients within 24 h of a mild head injury. Reversible post-traumatic changes were found, with similar changes seen both in routine EEG and QEEG. They found abnormalities in 82% of patients at 24 h, 73% at 1 week, 50% at 3 weeks, and 32% at 2 months. Routine EEG alpha frequency increased from 9 to 10 Hz during the 2 months after the MTBI. QEEG show a similar increase from 9.3 to 10.0 Hz over those 2 months. See Fig. 1. The QEEG theta/alpha ratio dropped from 0.8 to 0.63 during this time. By 2 months most abnormalities were intermittent dysrhythmias, which were seen only in the routine EEG. This study after mild head injury show QEEG changes that resolved over several months. The most prominent change was a 0.7 Hz improvement in alpha peak frequency.

Watson et al. (1995) recorded QEEG in 26 young men admitted for mild closed-head injury. They were retested 10 days and 6 weeks later. QEEG theta–alpha ratios improved significantly in the first 10 days, and were


Fig. 1. Changes in EEG and QEEG were seen among 31 patients during the 2 months after a MTBI. (A) In routine EEG, the posterior dominant alpha frequency gradually increases and the amount of intermixed slowing gradually decreases. (B) In QEEG, the median posterior alpha frequency increases and the theta/alpha ratio decreases. Adapted from von Bierbrauer et al. (1992).

considered normal at 6 weeks. Slower QEEG improvement corresponded to greater the residual symptoms at 6 weeks. Residual left temporal EEG changes corresponded to complaints of cognitive symptoms 1 year after injury.

Tebano et al. (1988) assessed frequency analysis in 18 minor head injury patients compared to controls. They reported increased slow alpha (8–10 Hz) accompanied by reduced fast alpha (10–12 Hz) and reduced fast beta. They reported no change in total alpha, but they did see a decreased alpha mean frequency.

The Belfast head injury study also reported transient post-concussive increased theta frequency activity (Fenton et al., 1993; Montgomery et al., 1991; McClelland et al., 1994). That slowing disappeared over 6 weeks (Fenton, 1996) paralleling symptom resolution.

Coutin-Churchman et al. (2003) conducted QEEG panels in 67 normal subjects and 340 patients. Most had psychiatric disorders, such as depression or substance abuse. Others had migraine, closed head injury, or other various diagnoses. QEEG was read as abnormal in 83% of patients and 12% of the normal subjects. The most frequent abnormality was relatively decreased slow activity, which corresponded to MRI evidence of cortical atrophy. Increased beta was found with medications such as benzodiazepines. No QEEG features or patterns could differentiate among various diagnoses.

Korn et al. (2005) studied 17 patients with post-concussion syndrome. Many had suffered a mild closed head injury. Three had small intracerebral hemorrhagic contusions, and another had an epidural hematoma. QEEG showed increased slowing and decreased alpha. Brain CT and MRI revealed no focal abnormality. SPECT showed focal perfusion reduction in 85% of patients, and blood brain barrier breakdown in 73%. QEEG abnormalities were focal and varied in location. QEEG abnormality location corresponded to SPECT evidence of blood brain barrier breakdown. In eight patients with persistent post-concussion syndrome, focal EEG and SPECT abnormalities were in similar locations. In one patient the clinical syndrome, EEG and SPECT resolved in parallel. At least some PCS patients, the focal cortical impairment after head injury may be due to focal blood–brain barrier breakdown.

Haglund and Persson (1990) studied 47 former amateur boxers. Among them 22 had fought many matches and 25 had fought few matches. Investigators compared them to 25 soccer players plus 25 track and field athletes. There were more mild or moderate routine EEG changes among boxers than for other athletes. QEEG did not significantly differ among the groups.

Several other reports have been published about QEEG and mild head injury. Some are anecdotes (Mas et al., 1993). Others describe quantitative analysis of MRI T2 relaxation times (Thatcher et al., 1998a,b, 2001a). The latter are not demonstrations of clinical usefulness of QEEG in head injury, but this MRI work has made several interesting basic scientific observations. White matter T2 relaxation time

Table 5
QEEG findings after mild traumatic brain injury

Immediate reduction alpha mean frequency
Immediate increased theta/alpha ratio
Changes resolved over weeks to months
Improvement was associated with symptom resolution
Left temporal slowing or decrease fast activity may correspond to residual cognitive symptoms
Coherence did not correspond to outcome, disability, or diffuse axonal injury
Focal EEG changes may be accompanied by focal blood brain barrier breakdown
No consistent differences were seen between head injury, depression, or other diagnoses

correlated with increased frontal polar delta. Grey matter T2 relaxation time correlated with increased slow frequencies, a well-defined alpha peak frequency, and decreased left temporal alpha and beta amplitude. Longer T2 relaxation times corresponded to decreased EEG coherence for short interelectrode distances, and increased EEG coherence for long interelectrode distances. Changes in cognitive function corresponded to some of these findings.

Overall, several QEEG studies have been reported in MTBI. Their findings are listed in Table 5. QEEG may be useful as a research technique in the hands of highly expert users. But its high rate of false positive findings and the lack of diagnostic specificity preclude routine clinical usefulness.

4.4.2. Severe traumatic brain injury

Two studies of more severe head injuries deserve mention here because they provide background useful for the discussion of MTBI. Wirsén et al. (1992) recorded QEEG in 18 frontal trauma patients. Most had severe injuries. Neuroimaging tests showed obvious damage. Slowing seen in QEEG and routine EEG corresponded in general to lesion size, severity, regional blood flow, neuropsychological function, and outcome among the severe head trauma patients. The QEEG had localizing information among severe head injury patients, but it was the same information already available in standard neuroimaging techniques.

Kane et al. (1998) recorded QEEG in 60 comatose patients after severe closed head injury. Left central-temporal fast activity correlated with outcome and disability. Coherence did not correspond to outcome or disability. Diffuse axonal injury (DAI) at autopsy did not correspond to coherence measures. Interhemispheric coherence was significantly reduced during coma in general, except in the beta band. QEEG was no better as a prognostic tool than routine EEG reading. The lack of correlation between DAI and coherence for severe head injury raises caution about trying to relate coherence changes to DAI for MTBI.

4.4.3. Diagnostic discriminants

Diagnostic discriminants have been called highly sensitive, accurate tests for the diagnosis of PCS (Duff, 2004). Several studies have been cited to support that position as described below.

Thatcher et al. (1989) developed a head injury diagnostic discriminant. A diagnostic discriminant was derived based upon 264 mildly head injured patients and 83 controls. Twenty EEG features were identified, listed in Table 6. Fifteen of the 20 elements making up the discriminant are decreased posterior alpha and beta. They tested 608 mild head trauma patients and 108 normal subjects. Most patients were tested in a split-half replication that classified correctly about 90% of the patients. A false-positive rate around 10% was reported for normal controls. Some patients were tested several times, most with similar results upon retesting. In a follow-up study of 70 head injured patients at a separate site, over 90% of the patients were correctly classified. Effect of medications was considered not significant, but that assessment included all kinds of medications—not just those known to affect EEGs.

The role of short distance coherence remains to be clarified. The 1989 mild head injury discriminant reported that three short-distance coherence measures, the top three items in Table 6, were positively correlated head injury. In contrast, a follow up study (Thatcher et al., 1998b) indicated that short-distance EEG coherence was negatively correlated with its marker for head injury (lengthened MRI T2

Table 6
List of the 20 EEG features used in a mild head injury diagnostic discriminant function (Thatcher et al., 1989)

EEG feature	Correlation
Theta coherence between Fp1 and F3	0.3366
Beta coherence between T3 and T5	0.2598
Beta coherence between C3 and P3	0.3915
Beta phase lag between Fp2 and F4	−0.4658
Beta phase lag between F3 and F4	−0.4537
Alpha amplitude difference between F4 and T6	0.3298
Alpha amplitude difference between F8 and T6	0.3129
Alpha amplitude difference between F4 and T6	0.2886
Alpha amplitude difference between F8 and T6	0.2921
Alpha amplitude difference between F3 and O1	0.2939
Alpha amplitude difference between F4 and O2	0.3241
Alpha amplitude difference between F7 and O1	0.2944
Alpha amplitude difference between F4 and O2	0.2722
Alpha relative power for P3	−0.2612
Alpha relative power for P4	−0.2544
Alpha relative power for O1	−0.3532
Alpha relative power for O2	−0.3529
Alpha relative power for T4	−0.2390
Alpha relative power for T5	−0.2851
Alpha relative power for T6	−0.2832

Note this mild head injury diagnostic discriminant's heavy reliance on posterior alpha amplitude. Correlations show the direction and relative magnitude relationship between each feature and the discriminant function. For each listing of an alpha feature, a smaller posterior alpha corresponds to the discriminant function's diagnosis of head injury.

relaxation time) and reduced cognitive function. The two studies' opposite coherence results remain to be explained.

Thatcher also has noted that, 'the Department of Defense and Veterans Administrations specifically tested the effects of drowsiness even to the extent that patients were allowed to sleep and the QEEG discriminant function was not significantly affected' (R.W. Thatcher, personal communication). This counterintuitive point deserves further corroboration and publication of results.

Further questions and concerns remain. Corroboration would be helpful in light of the general shortcomings of discriminant analysis, especially given the split-half replication and subsequent commercialization. It is counterintuitive that the discriminant is unaffected by benzodiazepine medications. It remains to be tested on other disorders that cause cognitive complaints. How well does it apply to older or younger subjects? If indeed it is sensitive to decades-old mild head injuries, then how specific is it to the particular recent head injury in question? Can technicians identify useable EEG epochs in place of skilled professional electroencephalographers? The published study did not validate using a technician to choose epochs. The discriminant is based heavily on low amplitude posterior alpha, but that was shown previously in routine EEG to be a non-specific sign, often due just to anxiety, and not a reliable sign of mild head injury. Can the discriminant really diagnose mild head injury, or is it just a non-specific measure of low posterior alpha? Many of these issues were discussed at greater length above.

One good way to judge such a tool is to see how accurately it works in the hands of others. Two studies have assessed the Thatcher diagnostic discriminant. Trudeau et al. (1998) evaluated the Thatcher diagnostic discriminant in 43 veterans. One group had suffered from military blast concussions severe enough that others near them were killed or severely injured. Another group had non-military head injuries. The Thatcher discriminant was abnormal in 88% of those with military blast concussion injuries, but abnormal only in 25% of patients without a military blast injury. However, it showed no difference between persons with non-military head injuries and those without such injuries. Trudeau noted the small size of their study, and recommended further study to validate their findings. These investigators criticized the Thatcher et al. (1989) report in that it failed to control for the effects of psychoactive drugs.

Thornton (1999) tested the Thatcher head injury discriminant on 39 head injury patients and in normal subjects. It was positive in 81% of patients who had no significant loss of consciousness, and in 71% patients who did have a significant loss of consciousness. However, the Thatcher discriminant had a false positive rate of 52% on prospectively tested normal subjects. Such a high false positive rate raises serious questions about the diagnostic accuracy of this head injury discriminant.

Based on the available literature, and considering the remaining unresolved questions and problems about the Thatcher discriminant, one can reasonably conclude that more work is needed before considering it as a credible diagnostic tool. Contrary to marketing claims, it is reasonable to predict that the tool is actually sensitive to a variety of confounding factors, that it is abnormal also in other medical conditions, and that it has problems with false positives. Meanwhile, we should await corroboration from well-controlled clinical trials conducted by impartial investigators.

Other discriminant functions also have been described in the literature, but they too have not been corroborated. Von Bierbrauer et al. (1992) described their own new discriminant using 31 head injury patients. This retrospective jack-knife discriminant evaluation included 26 QEEG features such as alpha median frequency and relative theta. There has been no prospective validation of this discriminant.

Thornton (1999) also recorded a QEEG panel in 32 with mild brain injury and 52 normal subjects. He carried out a retrospective split-half assessment of his own high frequency frontal coherence head injury discriminant. The author recognized that use of 2945 variables could cause discriminant false positive problems, so that the study results were considered exploratory, preliminary and not definitive. Thornton (2003) tested a different 2945 feature QEEG panel in 56 normal subjects and 85 patients at 17 days to 27 years after mild head injury. Some patients and normal subjects were on medications. Subjects read and performed others tasks during recordings. This retrospective search found increased global or focal theta, decreased alpha, decreased coherences, and increased asymmetries in head injury patients. They looked for but did not confirm the increased coherence reported previously in head injury by Thatcher et al. (1989).

Thatcher et al. (2001a,b) report on a new EEG severity index for traumatic brain injury. The original 1989 Thatcher head injury diagnostic discriminant was not re-evaluated. The new severity index was developed using discriminant analysis among 40 patients with mild, 25 with moderate, and 43 with severe mild head injury at 15 days to 4 years after injury. An EEG discriminant score was given as a number 1 through 10. This severity index accurately separated mild from severe head injury patients among their evaluation group. Results were validated in 503 patients. No normal subjects were tested. Patients were on a variety of medications, which was reported as having no effect on the results. However, drugs known to affect EEG were not singled out for testing.

Commercial firms market diagnostic discriminants for MTBI. Some are based on the published studies mentioned above. Other different, unpublished proprietary software also have been marketed as tools to diagnose MTBI.

Overall, the discriminant functions described so far are interesting. But such complex formulas and studies still will

need better corroboration. Several of these reports are retrospective and exploratory. The Thatcher mild head injury discriminant makes counterintuitive claims and is commercially marketed, but not yet corroborated. It failed to show good accuracy when evaluated by Thornton, or when tested for civilian injuries by Trudeau. It is unknown what it shows in other disorders on the differential diagnosis. Issues remain unresolved.

4.4.4. QEEG panels and discriminants for diagnosis after mild traumatic brain injury?

What can we conclude? What QEEG measures are markers for MTBI? How specific are they for that diagnosis?

Is low amplitude alpha a marker for brain injury from MTBI? Several prominent QEEG studies use decreased posterior dominant rhythm amplitude as a marker for brain damage after mild head injury. But from routine EEG studies, we know that many factors cause low amplitude alpha, e.g. drowsiness and anxiety. Long ago Meyer-Mickeleit (1953) and Jung (1953) showed that low-voltage alpha EEG occurs in chronic head injury patients no more often than in the normal, healthy population. A higher incidence of low-voltage EEGs in subjects undergoing medical expert examinations was shown to be due to a state of anxiety and tense expectancy, also termed 'psychogenic suppression of the alpha rhythm' (Scherzer, 1966). More recently in mild head injury, Tebano et al. (1988) found a decrease in fast alpha (10–12 Hz) plus increase in slow alpha (8–10 Hz) resulting in no net change in total posterior alpha. As such, low amplitude posterior alpha remains an unverified hypothetical diagnostic marker for brain injury after a MTBI. The low amplitude alpha reported in some studies is more likely to be non-specific.

Are coherence changes markers for brain injury from MTBI? Short-distance coherences were reported as increased (Thatcher et al., 1989) or at other times decreased (Thatcher et al., 1998b) with mild head injury. Some studies suggested that certain coherence changes accompany diffuse axonal injury (DAI). Overall, no consistent set of coherence bands, changes, or sites of change has been specified as the sequellae from MTBI. One study found no relationship between coherence measurements and confirmed DAI patients (Kane et al., 1998). As such, coherence changes remain an unverified hypothetical diagnostic marker for brain injury after a MTBI. The coherence changes reported in some studies may be non-specific.

Accepted EEG changes after MTBI include slowing of the alpha frequency and increased theta. These changes usually disappear over several weeks to months after mild head injury (Fenton et al., 1993; Koufen and Dichgans, 1978; McClelland et al., 1994; Montgomery et al., 1991; von Bierbrauer et al., 1992; Watson et al., 1995). Over longer times, most of changes were intermittent dysrhythmias (von Bierbrauer et al., 1992) and epileptic spikes

(Torres and Shapiro, 1961), kinds of abnormalities that are not detected well by QEEG.

Several published reviews, opinion, and editorials (Hughes and John, 1999; Hoffman et al., 1999; Thatcher et al., 1999, 2003b) advocate for the diagnostic value and reliability of QEEG panels and diagnostic discriminants for diagnosis of MTBI. Their published reasons for supporting the diagnostic value of QEEG include:

- Studies show independent validation of results.
- Studies show QEEG's reliability.
- QEEG is accepted as a test for organicity.
- QEEG is accepted for use in some conditions, therefore, it should be considered useful in mild head injury.
- The clinician makes the diagnosis, not the test.
- A good clinician can assure clean data.
- New literature shows QEEG's usefulness.
- Investigators' conflicts of interest should not be considered.
- Because the critics do not conduct this testing on patients, they are not in a position to criticize it.
- QEEG critics have not published research studies to show that QEEG is not useful.

The issues of independent validation and reliability are discussed above. There is a lack of prospective corroboration by impartial investigators, and many points have failed corroboration. Reliability and reproducibility are different; evidence of test–retest reproducibility does not prove reliability as a diagnostic tool. The other reasons concern the following issues:

4.4.4.1. QEEG is accepted as a test for organicity.
Organicity refers to the biological changes in brain function that accompany or underlie brain disorders, sometimes referred to as organic brain damage. Routine EEG is a traditional method to detect organic brain damage, e.g. to separate depression from dementia. Certain QEEG techniques can aid in that differentiation especially for severe cases (Brenner et al., 1986). But one cannot generalize from EEG's use for dementia to all other clinical scenarios and techniques. Different circumstances, such as the MTBI discussed here, and different techniques require their own evaluation.

4.4.4.2. The clinician makes the diagnosis, not the test.
Diagnostic discriminants distort the clinical diagnostic process when they make automated statements such as, 'These results support the diagnosis of MTBI with a probability more than 95%'. Such a statement skews the process of diagnosis by inappropriately emphasizing one hypothesis and failing to acknowledge the flaws and non-specific nature of QEEG results. Also, too often QEEG users claim to have made the diagnosis because that is what the test found. In that way, users treat the test results as if it makes a diagnosis.

4.4.4.3. A good clinician can assure clean data. A trained EEG professional can prevent or can be aware of the introduction of drowsiness, artifact or other problems into a QEEG. But this is defeated when the clinical QEEG record review and epoch selection is delegated to a technician.

4.4.4.4. New literature shows QEEG's usefulness. The literature of research reports in peer-reviewed journals is reviewed above. A number of reports are retrospective or exploratory techniques without prospective validation. Others are conducted by investigators with financial conflicts of interest and not corroborated by impartial investigators. Other publications cited as supportive of QEEG's clinical usefulness in MTBI patients are just abstracts, anecdotes, opinions, reviews, methodology descriptions, or studies on severe head injury (for example, Hoffman et al., 1995, 1996a,b, 1999; Hughes and John, 1999; Mas et al., 1993; Sullivan et al., 1994; Thatcher et al., 1999).

4.4.4.5. Investigators' conflicts of interest should not be considered. Because the critics do not conduct this testing on patients, they are not in a position to criticize it. The medical community does consider financial conflicts of interest and a tool's reputation among the clinical community as important issues to be considered in deciding a study's credibility and a technique's utility. Physicians have a healthy skepticism for vendors and their spokespersons who promote new techniques or medications. Training programs teach young physicians to evaluate carefully claims of usefulness. This is rooted in the physicians' responsibility to be a careful steward of health care resources, and to use medications and diagnostics that are safe and effective. QEEG should not be granted an exception to careful professional assessment.

4.4.4.6. QEEG critics have not published research studies to show that QEEG is not useful. The burden is on the technique's proposers to show that their techniques are useful, not on the general community to disprove each claim.

4.4.4.7. How can we go forward from here?. Overall, QEEG still needs corroboration of its diagnostic usefulness. Corroboration should include rigorous, well-designed, well-controlled, prospective trials corroborating the existing proposals, and run by investigators without a commercial conflict of interest. Such a trial should include patients with other diagnoses from the differential of cognitive complaints seen after MTBI, and should run controlled studies of the effects of benzodiazepines, other medications, drowsiness and sleep on the diagnostic accuracy of the proposed tool. This common standard is used widely to evaluate proposed new drugs.

The proposed use of QEEG as a diagnostic test for MTBI should meet the same standards.

5. Summary

MTBI is encountered commonly today in the general population. Various theories have attempted to explain the loss of consciousness. A massive neuronal discharge might produce a clinical state analogous to a non-convulsive epileptic seizure with post-ictal confusion. Mechanical forces produce two types of cellular damage. Ion leaks through cell membranes produce a temporary biochemical imbalance, which can trigger a spreading depression that could cause early amnesia or cognitive disturbances. Intracellular neurofilaments are misaligned which disrupts axoplasmic flow. Either process could cause long-term impairment and secondary injury. Some patients complain of persistent cognitive difficulties for weeks to months after such an injury. About 15% of patients continue to complain of symptoms a year after their injury. The nature of those persistent complaints is unclear.

EEG immediately shows initial epileptiform activity, followed by suppressed cortical activity lasting from seconds to about a minute. Many patients' EEGs return to normal within an hour. Others continue to show focal or generalized slowing that may last for weeks to a few months. The posterior alpha frequency is slower by an average of 0.7 Hz, gradually returning to baseline frequency over weeks to a few months. By 2 months, any residual EEG abnormality usually was an intermittent slowing. In the long run, the only EEG abnormalities that increased over time were epileptic spikes. Many EEG changes were subtle, often within the broad range of findings in the normal population.

EEG abnormalities are more common than clinical symptoms in the initial months after a MTBI. Patients with an abnormal exam generally have an abnormal EEG, although many more EEG abnormalities are subclinical. Later after the injury, there is poor correspondence between EEG and clinical signs, symptoms, imaging results or psychometric tests. EEG abnormalities are seen with some sports injuries, but those findings do not usually correspond to clinical findings. Decreased posterior alpha long after injury is more likely due to anxiety rather than brain damage. EEG does not predict, confirm, or measure PCS or PPCS, nor should mild EEG abnormality be used to substantiate an objective clinical brain injury. Nor can a normal EEG exclude an initial significant brain injury.

QEEG testing also shows the immediate reduction in alpha mean frequency and increase in theta slow activity, changes that usually resolved over weeks to months. Improvement was associated with symptom resolution. Left temporal slowing or decrease fast activity corresponded to residual cognitive symptoms in one study. Coherence did not correspond to outcome, disability, or diffuse axonal injury. No consistent differences separated

head injury from depression or other diagnoses. The low amplitude alpha and coherence changes, as reported in some QEEG panels and diagnostic discriminants, may be non-specific findings attributable to many possible causes.

QEEG diagnostic discriminant testing reports and commercial marketing make claims that they can identify MTBI. The Thatcher mild head injury discriminant makes counterintuitive claims that the EEG changes are unaffected by drowsiness, sleep, or medications well known to affect EEG. That diagnostic discriminant failed to show good accuracy when evaluated by Thornton or in civilian injuries tested by Trudeau. Other diagnostic discriminants have been reported, but have not been prospectively verified. It is unknown what these various diagnostic discriminants will show when used on patients with other disorders on the differential diagnosis of cognitive or emotional problems. These claims still need impartial corroboration and prospective validation.

QEEG panels and diagnostic discriminants still have many unresolved problems. These include the effects of artifact contamination, drowsiness, medications, and technical changes. Some 'abnormalities' actually are meaningless and non-specific distinctions from normal. False positive rates can be high, even greater than 50% among normal persons. Unqualified individuals sometimes analyze the records, select portions for review, or even render the professional interpretation. There are no generally accepted safeguards and standards. Some investigators had a financial conflict of interest. This and other factors raise the credibility threshold for accepting the results. Other factors include notable past failures of QEEG diagnostic testing, suboptimal study design (e.g. discriminant analysis, split-half replications, jack-knifing), failure to follow up with prospective validation, counterintuitive changes, and over-marketing of QEEG's usefulness.

Overall, the disadvantages of QEEG panels and diagnostic discriminants presently outweigh the advantages of those studies for the diagnosis of MTBI. More well designed prospective studies are needed. Diagnostic QEEG users need to remedy the procedural shortcomings.

EEG studies, quantitative or routine, remain a good physiological research tool for a better scientific understanding of MTBI. By continuing to improve our understanding of the pathophysiology of mild head injury, one can hope to identify the critical causes of injury, especially any secondary causes of injury that may unfold over days or weeks. These may lead to better future treatments for concussion to reduce PCS and reduce the likelihood of PPCS. Already, the knowledge and tentative scientific understanding of the second injury syndrome helps to guide public policy for prevention of subsequent greater injury. Further scientific work still is needed to pursue these goals of understanding better the pathophysiology, as well as to clarify how EEG can assist in the care of patients who have sustained a MTBI.

References

Alexander MP. Mild traumatic brain injury: pathophysiology, natural history, and clinical management. Neurology 1995;45:1253–60.

Ahn H, Prichep L, John ER, Baird H, Trepetin M, Kaye H. Developmental equations reflect brain dysfunction. Science 1980;210:1259–62.

American Electroencephalographic Society. Guidelines for recording clinical EEG on digital media. J Clin Neurophysiol 1994a;11:114–5.

American Electroencephalographic Society. Minimum technical requirements for performing clinical electroencephalography. J Clin Neurophysiol 1994b;11:2–5.

American Electroencephalographic Society. Minimum technical standards for pediatric electroencephalography. J Clin Neurophysiol 1994c;11:6–9.

American Electroencephalographic Society. Standards for practice in clinical electroencephalography. J Clin Neurophysiol 1994d;11:14–15.

Andersen BJ, Marmarou A. Post-traumatic selective stimulation of glycolysis. Brain Res 1992;585:184–9.

Arfel G. Introduction to clinical and EEG studies in coma. In: Remond A, Harner R, Naquet R, editors. Handbook of electroencephalography and clinical neurophysiology. Clinical EEG, II, vol. 12. Amsterdam: Elsevier; 1972. p. 5–23.

Arruda JE, Weiler MD, Valentino D, Willis WG, Rossi JS, Stern RA, Gold SM, Costa L. A guide for applying principal-components analysis and confirmatory factor analysis to quantitative electroencephalogram data. Int J Psychophysiol 1996;23:63–81.

Bergsneider M, Hovda DA, Shalmon E, Kelly DF, Vespa PM, Martin NA, Phelps ME, McArthur DL, Caron MJ, Kraus JF, Becker DP. Cerebral hyperglycolysis following severe human traumatic brain injury in humans: a positron emission tomography study. J Neurosurg 1997;86:241–51.

Bergsneider M, Hovda DA, Lee SM, Kelly DF, McArthur DL, Vespa PM, Lee JH, Huang SC, Martin NA, Phelps ME, Becker DP. Dissociation of cerebral glucose metabolism and level of consciousness during the period of metabolic depression following human traumatic brain injury. J Neurotrauma 2000;17:389–401.

Bickford RG, Klass DW. Acute and chronic EEG findings after head injury. In: Caveness WF, Walker AE, editors. Head injury. Philadelphia: Lippincott; 1966. p. 63–8.

Brenner RP, Ulrich RF, Spiker DG, Sclabassi RJ, Reynolds CF, Marin RS, Boller F. Computerized EEG spectral analysis in elderly normal, demented and depressed subjects. Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol 1986;64:483–92.

Bricolo A, Turella G. Electroencephalographic patterns of acute traumatic coma: diagnostic and prognostic vcalue. J Neurosurg Sci 1973;17:278–85.

Burgess A, Gruzelier J. Individual reliability of amplitude distribution in topographical mapping of EEG. Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol 1993;86:219–23.

Caveness WF. Posttraumatic sequellae. In: Caveness WF, Walker AE, editors. Head injury. Philadelphia: Lippincott; 1966. p. 209–19.

Chatrian GE, White JR, Daly P. Electroencephalographic patterns resembling those of sleep in certain comatose states after injuries to the head. Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol 1963;15:272–80.

Claes C. La valeur medico-legale de l'électroencéphalographie dans les sequelles des traumatismes cerebraux fermes. Acta Neurol Belg 1961; 61:426–45.

Corsi-Cabrera M, Solis-Ortiz S, Guevara MA. Stability of EEG inter-and intrahemispheric correlation in women. Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol 1997;102:248–55.

Courjon J. La place de l'électroencéphalographie en traumatologie crânienne. Cah Méd Lyon 1962;38:315–7.

Courjon J, Scherzer E. Traumatic disorders. In: Remond A, Magnus O, Courjon J, editors. Handbook of electroencephalography and clinical neurophysiology. Clinical EEG, IV, Traumatic disorders, vol. 14B. Amsterdam: Elsevier; 1972. p. 1–104.

Coutin-Churchman P, Añez Y, Uzcátegui M, Alvarez L, Vergara F, Mendez L, Fleitas R. Quantitativee spectral analysis of EEG in psychiatry revisited: drawing signs out of numbers in a clinical setting. Clin Neurophysiol 2003;114:2294–306.

Critchley M. Medical aspects of boxing, particularly from a neurological standpoint. Br Med J 1957;1:357–62.

Dawson RE, Webster JE, Gurdjian ES. Serial electroencephalography in acute head injuries. J Neurosurg 1951;8:613–30.

de Kruijk JR, Leffers P, Menheere PPCA, Meerhoff S, Rutten J, Twijnstra A. Prediction of post-traumatic complaints after mild traumatic brain injury: early symptoms and biochemical markers. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 2002;73:727–32.

Denny-Brown D, Russell WR. Experimental cerebral concussion. Brain 1941;64:93–164.

DeSalles AA, Kontos HA, Becker DP, Yang MS, Ward JD, Moulton R, Gruemer HD, Lutz H, Maset AL, Jenkins L, Marmarou A, Muizelaar P. Prognostic significance of ventricular CSF lactic acidosis in severe head injury. J Neurosurg 1986;65:615–24.

Dixon CE, Lyeth BG, Povlishock JT, Findling RL, Hamm RJ, Marmarou A, Young HF, Hayes RL. A fluid percussion model of experimental brain injury in the rat. J Neurosurg 1987;67:110–9.

Dolisi C, Suisse G, Delpont E. Quantitative EEG abnormalities and asymmetries in patients with intracranial tumors. Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol 1990;76:13–18.

Dow RS, Ulett G, Raaf J. Electroencephalographic studies immediately following head injury. Am J Psychiatry 1944;101:174–83.

Dow RS, Ulett G, Tunturi A. Electroencephalographic changes following head injury in dogs. J Neurophysiol 1945;8:161–72.

Duff J. The usefulness of quantitative EEG (QEEG) and neurotherapy in the assessment and treatment of post-concussion syndrome. Clin Electroencephalogr 2004;35:198–209.

Duffy FH, Hughes JR, Miranda F, Bernad P, Cook P. Status of quantitative EEG (QEEG) in clinical practice. Clin Electroencephalogr 1994;25: vi–xxii.

Ettlin TM, Kischka U, Reichmann S, Radii EW, Heim S, Wengen D, Benson DF. Cerebral symptoms after whiplash injury of the neck: a prospective clinical and neuropsychological study of whiplash injury. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 1992;55:943–8.

Faden AI, Demediuk P, Panter SS, Vink R. The role of excitatory amino acids and NMDA receptors in traumatic brain injury. Science 1989;244: 798–800.

Fenton G. The postconcussional syndrome reappraised. Clin Electroencephalogr 1996;27:174–82.

Fenton G, McClelland R, Montgomery A, MacFlynn G, Rutherford W. The postconcussional syndrome: social antecedents and psychological sequelae. Br J Psychiatry 1993;162:493–7.

Fernández T, Harmony T, Rodríguez M, Reyes A, Marosi E, Bernal J. Test–retest reliability of EEG spectral parameters during cognitive tasks: I, absolute and relative power. Int J Neurosci 1993;68:255–61.

Fineman I, Hovda DA, Smith M, Yoshino A, Becker DP. Concussive brain injury is associated with a prolonged accumulation of calcium: a ^{45}Ca autoradiographic study. Brain Res 1993;624:94–102.

Foltz EL, Jenker FL, Ward AA. Experimental cerebral concussion. J Neurosurg 1953;10:342–52.

Forster JB, Leiguarda R, Tilley PJB. Brain damage in national hunt jockeys. Lancet 1976;1:981–7.

Gaetz M. The neurophysiology of brain injury. Clin Neurophysiol 2004; 115:4–18.

Gasser T, Bacher P, Steinberg H. Test–retest reliability of spectral parameters of the EEG. Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol 1985; 60:312–9.

Gennarelli TA. Mechanisms of brain injury. J Emerg Med 1993; 11 Suppl 1:5–11.

Gennarelli TA. Animate models of human head injury. J Neurotrauma 1994;11:357–68.

Gennarelli TA. The spectrum of traumatic injury. Neuropathol Appl Neurobiol 1996;22:509–13.

Gennarelli TA, Graham DI. Neuropathology of head injuries. Semin Clin Neuropsychiat 1998;3:160–75.

Ginsberg MD, Zhao W, Alonso OF, Loor-Estades JY, Dietrich WD, Busto R. Uncoupling of local cerebral glucose metabolism and blood flow after acute fluid-percussion injury in rats. Am J Physiol 1997;272: H2859–H68.

Giza CC, Hovda DA. The neurometabolic cascade of concussion. J Athletic Training 2001;36:228–35.

Glenn TC, Kelly DF, Boscardin WJ, McArthur DL, Vespa P, Oertel M, Hovda DA, Bergsneider M, Hillered L, Martin NA. Energy dysfunction as a predictor of outcome after moderate or severe head injury: indices of oxygen, glucose, and lactate metabolism. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab 2003;23:1239–50.

Gronwall DMA, Wrightson P. Cumulative effects of concussion. Lancet 1975;2:995–7.

Haglund Y, Persson HE. Does Swedish amateur boxing lead to chronic brain damage? 3. A retrospective clinical neurophysiological study Acta Neurol Scand 1990;82:353–60.

Hall ED. Lipid antioxidants in acute central nervous system injury. Ann Emerg Med 1993;22:1022–7.

Hamilton-Bruce MA, Boundy KL, Purdie GH. Interoperator variability in quantitative electroencephalography. Clin Exp Neurol 1991;28:219–24.

Harmony T, Fernández T, Rodríguez M, Reyes A, Marosi E, Bernal J. Test–retest reliability of EEG spectral parameters during cognitive tasks: II, coherence. Int J Neursci 1993;68:263–71.

Hayes RL, Katayama Y, Young HF, Dunbar JG. Coma associated with flaccidity produced by fluid-percussion in the cat. Part 1: is it due to depression of activity within the brainstem reticular formation? Brain Inj 1988;2:31–49.

Holbourn AHS. Mechanisms of head injury. Lancet 1943;2:438–41.

Hoffman DA, Stockdale S, Hicks LL, Schwaninger JE. Diagnosis and treatment of head injury. J Neurotherapy 1995;1:14–21.

Hoffman DA, Stockdale S, Van Egeren L, Franklin D, Schwaninger J, Bermea A, Graap K, Coolidge F. Symptom changes in the treatment of mild traumatic brain injury using EEG neurofeedback. Clin Electroencephalogr 1996a;27:164.

Hoffman DA, Stockdale S, Van Egeren L, Franklin D, Schwaninger J, Bermea A, Graap K. EEG neurofeedback and the treatment of mild traumatic brain injury. Clin Electroencephalogr 1996b;27:105.

Hoffman DA, Lubar JF, Thatcher RW, Sterman MB, Rosenfeld PJ, Striefel S, Trudeau D, Stockdale S. Limitation of the American Academy of Neurology and American Clinical Neurophysiology Society paper on QEEG. J Neuropsychiat Clin Neurosci 1999;11: 401–7.

Hofman PAM, Stapert SZ, van Kroonenburgh MJPG, Jolles J, de Kruijk J, Wilmink JT. MR imaging, single-photon emission CT, and neurocognitive performance after mild traumatic brain injury. Am J Neuroradiol 2001;22:441–9.

Hughes JR, John ER. Conventional and quantitative electroencephalography in psychiatry. J Neuropsychiat Clin Neurosci 1999;11:190–208.

Hume Adams J, Doyle D, Ford I, Gennareli TA, Graham DI, McLellan DR. Diffuse axonal injury in head injury: definition, diagnosis and grading. Histopathology 1989;15:49–59.

Ingebrigtsen T, Waterloo K, Marup-Jensen S, Attner E, Romner B. Quantification of post-concussion symptoms 3 months after minor head injury in 100 consecutive patients. J Neurol 1998;245:609–12.

Jabbari B, Vengrow MI, Salazar AM, Harper MG, Smutok MA, Amin D. Clinical and radiological correlates of EEG in the late phase of head injury: a study of 515 Vietnam veterans. Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol 1986;64:285–93.

Jacobson RR. The post-concussional syndrome: physiogenesis, psychogenesis and malingering, an integrative model. J Psychosom Res 1995;39: 675–93.

Johnson J. The EEG in the traumatic encephalopathy of boxers. Psychiatr Clin 1969;2:204–11.

Jordan BD, Zimmerman RD. Computed tomography and magnetic resonance imaging comparisons in boxers. J Am Med Assoc 1990; 263:1670–4.

Jung R. Die praktische Anwendung des Elektroencephalogramms in Neurologie und Psychiatrie: Ein Überblick über 12 Jahre EEG und Klinik. Med Klin 1950;9:257–66 and 10:289–295.

Jung R. Neurophysiologische Untersuchungsmethoden. In: Bergmann G, Frey W, Schwieg K, editors. Handbuch der Inneren Medizin V, vol. 1. Berlin: Springer; 1953. p. 1286–93.

Kane NM, Moss TH, Curry SH, Butler SR. Quantitative electroencephalographic evaluation of non-fatal and fatal traumatic coma. Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol 1998;106:244–50.

Kant R, Smith-Seemiller L, Isaac G, Duffy J. Tc-HMPAO SPECT in persistent post-concussion syndrome after mild head injury: comparison with MRI/CT. Brain Inj 1997;11:115–24.

Katayama Y, Becker DP, Tamura T, Hovda DA. Massive increases in extracellular potassium and the indiscriminate release of glutamate following concussive brain injury. J Neurosurg 1990;73:889–900.

Kaye H, John ER, Ahn H, Prichep L. Neurometric evaluation of learning disabled children. Int J Neurosci 1981;13:15–23.

Kaplan HA, Browder J. Observations on the clinical and brain wave patterns of professional boxers. J Am Med Assoc 1954;156:1138–44.

Kawamata T, Katayama Y, Hovda DA, Yoshino A, Becker DP. Administration of excitatory amino acid antagonists via microdialysis attenuates the increase in glucose utilization seen following concussive brain injury. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab 1992;12:12–24.

Kawamata T, Katayama Y, Hovda DA, Yoshino A, Becker DP. Lactate accumulation following concussive brain injury: the role of ionic fluxes induced by excitatory amino acids. Brain Res 1995;674:196–204.

Kelly JP, Rosenberg JH. Diagnosis and management of concussion in sports. Neurology 1997;48:575–80.

Korn A, Golan H, Melamed I, Pascual-Marqui R, Friedman A. Focal cortical dysfunction and blood–brain barrier disruption in patients with post-concussion syndrome. J Clin Neurophysiol 2005;22:1–9.

Koufen H, Dichgans J. Häufigkeit und Ablauf von traumatischen EEG-Veränderungen und ihre klinischen Korrelationen: systematische verlaufsuntersuchungen bei 344 Erwachsenen. Fortschr Neurol Psychiatr 1978;46:165–77.

Koufen H, Hagel KH. Systematic EEG follow-up study of traumatic psychosis. Eur Arch Psychiatr Neurol Sci 1987;237:2–7.

Kugler J. Elektroenzephalographie in Klinik und Praxis. vol. 2. Aufl. Stuttgart: Thieme; 1966 p. 203.

Langlois JA, Rutland-Brown W, Thomas KE. Traumatic brain injury in the United States: emergency department visits, hospitalizations, and deaths. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control; 2004.

Larsson LE, Melin KA, Nordström-Öhrberg BO, Silfverskiold BP, Öhrberg K. Acute head injuries in boxers. Acta Psychiatr Scand 1954;95:1–42.

LeBlanc KE. Concussion in sport: diagnosis, management, return to competition. Comp Ther 1999;25:39–44.

Levin HS, Grossman RG, Rose JE, Teasdale G. Long-term neuropsychological outcome of closed-head injury. Cortex 1979;12:175–82.

Lindsay KW, McLatchie G, Jennett R. Serious head injury in sport. Br Med J 1980;281:789–91.

Lishman WA. Physiogenesis and psychogenesis in the postconcussional syndrome. Br J Psychiat 1988;153:460–9.

Lücking CH, Müllner E, Pateisky K, Gerstenbrand F. Electroencephalographic findings in the apallic syndrome. In: Dalle Ore G, Gerstenbrand F, Lücking CH, Peters G, Peters UH, editors. The Apallic syndrome. Berlin: Springer; 1977. p. 144–54.

Lund TR, Sponheim SR, Iacono WG, Clementz BA. Internal consistency reliability of resting EEG power spectra in schizophrenic and normal subjects. Psychophysiology 1995;32:66–71.

Marmarou A, Adb-Elfattah Foda MA, Brink WVD, Campbell J, Demetriadou K. A new model of diffuse brain injury in rats. Part I. Pathophysiology and biomechanics. J Neurosurg 1994;80:291–300.

Martland HS. Punch drunk. J Am Med Assoc 1928;91:1103–7.

Mas F, Prichep LS, Alper K. Treatment resistant depression in a case of minor head injury: an electrophysiological hypothesis. Clin Electroencephalogr 1993;24:118–22.

Mawdsley C, Ferguson FR. Neurological disease in boxers. Lancet 1963;2: 795–801.

Maxwell WL, Povlishock JT, Graham DL. A mechanistic analysis of nondisruptive axonal injury: a review. J Neurotrauma 1997;14:419–40.

Maxwell WL, Domleo A, McColl G, Jafari SS, Graham DI. Post-acute alterations in the axonal cytoskeleton after traumatic axonal injury. J Neurotrauma 2003;20:151–68.

McClelland RJ, Fenton GW, Rutherford W. The post-concussional syndrome revisited. J R Soc Med 1994;87:508–10.

Meyer JS, Kondo A, Nomura F, Sakamoto K, Teraura T. Cerebral hemodynamics and metabolism following experimental head injury. J Neurosurg 1970;32:304–19.

Meyer JS, Denny-Brown D. Studies of cerebral circulation in brain injury, II: cerebral concussion. Electroenceph Clin Neurophysiol 1955;7: 529–44.

Meyer-Mickeleit RW. Das Electroencephalogramm nach gedeckten Kopfverletzungen. Dtsch Med Wschr 1953;1:480–4.

Mies G, Hoppe G, Hossmann KA. Limitations of EEG frequency analysis in the diagnosis of intracerebral diseases. In: Pfurtscheller G, Jonkman EJ, Lopes da Silva FH, editors. Progress in brain research. Brain ischemia: quantitative EEG and imaging techniques, vol. 62. Amsterdam: Elsevier; 1984. p. 85–103.

Mifka P, Scherzer E. Uber die Wertigkeit des EEG in Spatstadium der Gehirnverletzung. Wien Klin Wschr 1962;74:573–6.

Montgomery EA, Fenton GW, McClelland RJ, MacFlynn G, Rutherford WH. The psychobiology of minor head injury. Psychol Med 1991;21:375–84.

Mueller E. Die hirnelektrische Untersuchung beim Kopftrauma. Elektromedizin 1957;2:38–42.

Muller R. Correlations electroencephalographiques et cliniques dans les anciens traumatismes craniocerebraux fermes avec foyer de contusion corticale en EEG. Electroenceph Clin Neurophysiol 1955;7:75–84.

Nilsson P, Ronne-Engstrom E, Flink R, Ungerstedt U, Carlson H, Hillered L. Epileptic seizure activity in the acute phase following cortical impact trauma. Brain Res 1994;637:227–32.

Nuwer MR. The centrifugal effect and other spatial artifacts of topographic EEG mapping. J Clin Neurophysiol 1987;4:321–6.

Nuwer MR. Quantitative EEG: I. Techniques and problems of frequency analysis and topographic mapping. J Clin Neurophysiol 1988;5:1–43.

Nuwer MR. On the controversies about clinical use of EEG brain mapping. Brain Topogr 1990;3:103–11.

Nuwer MR. On the process for evaluating proposed new diagnostic EEG tests. Brain Topogr 1992;4:243–7.

Nuwer MR. Electroencephalograms and evoked potentials: monitoring cerebral function in the neurosurgical intensive care unit. In: Martin NA, editor. Neurosurg Clin Neurosurg Intensive Care, 5, 1994. p. 647–59.

Nuwer MR. Quantitative analysis in clinical settings. Brain Topogr 1996;8: 201–8.

Nuwer MR. Assessing digital and quantitative EEG in clinical settings. J Clin Neurophysiol 1998;15:458–63.

Nuwer MR, Hauser HH. Erroneous diagnosis using EEG discriminant analysis. Neurology 1994;44:1998–2000.

Osteen CL, Moore AH, Prins ML, Hovda DA. Age-dependency of ^{45}calcium accumulation following lateral fluid percussion: acute and delayed patterns. J Neurotrauma 2001;18:141–62.

Osteen CL, Giza CC, Hovda DA. Injury-induced alterations in *N*-methyl-D-aspartate receptor subunit composition contribute to prolonged ^{45}calcium accumulation following lateral fluid percussion. Neurosci 2004;128:305–22.

Pampus E, Grote W. Electroencephalographische und klinische Befunde bei Boxern und ihre Bedeutung fur die Pathophysioloogie der traumattischern Hirnschädigung. Arch Psychiatr Nervenkr 1956;194: 152–78.

Pollock VE, Schneider LS, Lyness SA. Reliability of topographic quantitative EEG amplitude in healthy late-middle-aged and elderly subjects. Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol 1991;79:20–6.

Povlishock JT, Christman CW. The pathobiology of traumatically induced axonal injury in animals and humans: a review of current thoughts. J Neurotrauma 1995;12:555–64.

Povlishock JT, Jenkins LW. Are the pathological changes evoked by traumatic brain injury immediate and irreversible? Brain Pathol 1995;5: 415–26.

Povlishock JT, Becker DP, Cheng CL, Vaughan GW. Axonal change in minor head injury. J Neuropathol Exp Neurol 1983;42:225–42.

Radermecker J. La valeur medico-légale de l'électroencéphalographie dans les séquelles sujectives des traumas crânio-cérébraux fermés, synthése et conclusions. Acta Neurol Belg 1961;61:468–76.

Radermecker J. Das EEG bei gedeckten Hirnschaden und seine Beziehungen zu den subjektiven Beschwerden. Munch Med Wschr 1964;106:1315–22.

Roberts AH. Brain damage in boxers. London: Pitman; 1969.

Ruijs MB, Gabreels FJ, Thijssen HM. The utility of electroencephalography and cerebral computed tomography in children with mild and moderately severe closed head injuries. Neuropediatrics 1994;25:73–7.

Rumpl E. Elektro-neurologische Korrelationen in den frühen Phasen des posttraumatischen Komas, I: Das EEG in den verschiedenen Phasen des akuten traumatischen sekundären, Mittelhirnund Bulbrhirnsyndroms. Z EEG EMG 1979;10:148–57.

Rumpl E. Craniocerebral trauma. In: Niedermeyer E, Lopes da Silva F, editors. Electroencephalography. 5th ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams Wilkins; 2005. p. 415–38.

Rumpl E, Prugger M, Bauer G, Gerstenbrand F, Hackl JM, Pallua A. Incidence and prognostic value of spindles in posttraumatic coma. Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol 1983;56:420–9.

Salinsky MC, Oken BS, Morehead L. Test–retest reliability in EEG frequency analysis. Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol 1991;79: 382–92.

Santamaria J, Chiappa KH, The EEG. The EEG of drowsiness. New York: Demos; 1987.

Satz P, Alfano MS, Light R, Morgenstern H, Zaucha K, Asarnow RF, Newton S. Persistent post-concussive syndrome: a proposed methodology and literature review to determine the effects, if any, of mild head and other bodily injury. J Clin Exp Neuropsychol 1999;21:620–8.

Saunders RL, Harbaugh RE. The second impact in catastrophic contact-sports head trauma. J Am Med Assoc 1984;252:538–9.

Scherzer E. Wert der Electroenzephalographie beim Schädeltrauma. Wien Klin Wschr 1965;77:543–7.

Scherzer E. Das flache EEG als bioelektrischer Ausdruck der Erwartungsspannung (psychogene Alphareduktion). Psychiat et Neurol (Basel) 1966;152:207–12.

Schneider E, Hubach H. Das EEG der traumatischen Psychosen. Dtsch Z Nervenheilk 1962;183:600–27.

Shaw NA. The neurophysiology of concussion. Prog Neurobiol 2002;67: 281–344.

Silverman D. Retrospective study of EEG in coma. Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol 1963;15:486–503.

Smith DH, Wolf JA, Lusardi TA, Lee VM-Y, Meaney DF. High tolerance and delayed elastic response of cultured axons to dynamic stretch injury. J Neurosci 1999;19:4263–9.

Sosin DM, Sniezek JE, Thurman DJ. Incidence of mild and moderate brain injury in the United States, 1991. Brain Inj 1996;10:47–54.

Stone JL, Ghaly RF, Hughes JR. Electroencephalography in acute head injury. J Clin Neurophysiol 1988;5:125–33.

Strich S. Diffuse degeneration of the cerebral white matter in severe dementia following head injury. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatr 1956;19: 163–85.

Strich S. Shearing of nerve fibers as a cause of brain damage due to head injury. Lancet 1961;2:443–8.

Strnad P, Strnadová V. Long-term follow-up EEG studies in patients with traumatic apallic syndrome. Eur Neurol 1987;26:84–9.

Strong AJ, Fabricius M, Boutelle MG, Hibbins SJ, Hopwood SE, Jones R, Parkin MC, Lauritzen M. Spreading and synchronous depressions of cortical activity in acutely injured human brain. Stroke 2002;33: 2738–43.

Sullivan TE, Schefft BK, Warm JS, Dember WN. Closed head injury assessment and research methodology. J Neurosci Nurs 1994;26: 24–9.

Synek VM. Revised EEG coma scale in diffuse acute head injuries in adults. Clin Exp Neurol 1990;27:99–111.

Tebano MT, Cameroni M, Gallozzi G, Loizzo A, Palazzino G, Pezzini G, Ricci GF. EEG spectral analysis after minor head injury in man. Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol 1988;70:185–9.

Thatcher RW, Walker RA, Gerson I, Geisler FH. EEG discriminant analyses of mild head trauma. Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol 1989;73:94–106.

Thatcher RW, Biver C, McAlaster R, Camacho M, Salazar A. Biophysical linkage between MRI and EEG amplitude in closed head injury. NeuroImage 1998a;7:352–67.

Thatcher RW, Biver C, McAlaster R, Salazar A. Biophysical linkage between MRI and EEG coherence in closed head injury. NeuroImage 1998b;8:307–26.

Thatcher RW, Moore N, John ER, Duffy F, Hughes J, Krieger M. QEEG and traumatic brain injury: rebuttal of the American Academy of Neurology 1997 Report by the EEG and Clinical Neuroscience Society. Clin Electroencephalogr 1999;30:94–8.

Thatcher RW, Biver CL, Gomez JF, North D, Curtin R, Walker RA, Salazar S. Estimation of the EEG power spectrum by MRI T2 relaxation time in traumatic brain injury. Clin Neurophysiol 2001a;112: 1729–45.

Thatcher RW, North DM, Curtin RT, Walker RA, Biver CJ, Gomez JF, Salazar AM. An EEG severity index of traumatic brain injury. J Neuropsychiat Clin Neurosci 2001b;13:77–87.

Thatcher RW, Walker RA, Biver CJ, North DN, Curtin R. Quantitative EEG normative databases: validation and clinical correlation. J Neurotherapy 2003a;7:87–121.

Thatcher RW, Biver CJ, North DM. Quantitative EEG and the Frye and Daubert standards of admissibility. Clin Electroencephalogr 2003b;34: 39–53.

Thornton KE. Exploratory investigation into mild brain injury and discriminant analysis with high frequency bands (32–64 Hz). Brain Inj 1999;13:477–88.

Thornton KE. The electrophysiological effects of a brain injury on auditory memory functioning: the QEEG correlates of impaired memory. Arch Clin Neuropsychol 2003;18:363–78.

Torres F, Shapiro SK. Electroencephalograms in whiplash injury. Arch Neurol 1961;5:28–35.

Trudeau DL, Anderson J, Hansen LM, Shagalov DN, Schmoller DN, Nugent S, Barton S. Findings of mild traumatic brain injury in combat veterans with PTSD and a history of blast concussion. J Neuropsychiat Clin Neurosci 1998;10:308–13.

Tysvaer AT, Storli OV, Bachen NI. Soccer injuries to the brain. A neurologic and electroencephalographic study of former players. Acta Neurol Scand 1989;80:151–6.

Vespa PM, Boscardin WJ, Hovda DA, McArthur DL, Nuwer MR, Martin NA, Nenov V, Glenn TC, Bergsneider M, Kelly DF, Becker DP. Early and persistent impaired percent alpha variability on continuous electroencephalography monitoring as a predictive of poor outcome after traumatic brain injury. J Neurosurg 2002;97:84–92.

Vespa PM, McArthur DL, O'Phelan K, Glenn TC, Etchepare M, Kelly D, Bergsneider M, Martin NA, Hovda DA. Persistently low extracellular glucose correlates with poor outcome 6 months after human traumatic brain injury despite a lack of increased lactate: a microdialysis study. J Cerebr Blood Flow Metab 2003;23:865–77.

Vogel F. Genetische Aspecke des Electroenzephalogramms. Dtschj Med Wschr 1963;88:1748–59.

von Bierbrauer A, Weissenborn K, Hinrichs H, Scholz M, Künkel H. Die automatische (computergestützte) EEG-Analyse im Vergleich zur visuellen EEG—Analyse bei Patienten nach leichtem Schädelhirntrauma (verlaufsuntersuchung). EEG EMG Z 1992;23:151–7.

Walker AE, Kollros JJ, Case TJ. The physiological basis of concussion. J Neurosurg 1944;1:103–16.

Walter WG, Hill D, Williams D. Discussion of the electroencephalogram in organic cerebral disease. Proc Soc Med Lond 1948;41:237–50.

Ward AA, Clark SL. The electroencephalogram in experimental concussion and related conditions. J Neurosurg 1948;11:59–74.

Watson MR, Fenton GW, McClelland RJ, Lumsden J, Headley M, Rutherford WH. The post-concussional state: neurophysiological aspects. Br J Psychiat 1995;167:514–21.

Wirsén A, Stenberg G, Rosén I, Ingvar DH. Quantified EEG and cortical evoked responses in patients with chronic traumatic frontal lesions. Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol 1992;84:127–38.

Williams D. The electro-encephalogram in acute head injuries. J Neurol Psychiatr 1941a;4:107–30.

Williams D. The electro-encephalogram in chronic post-traumatic states. J Neurol Psychiat 1941b;4:131–46.

Williams D, Denny-Brown D. Cerebral electrical changes in experimental concussion. Brain 1941;64:223–38.

Yingling CD, Galin D, Fein G, Peltzman D, Davenport L. Neurometrics does not detect pure dyslexics. Electroencephalogr Clin Neurophysiol 1986;63:426–30.

Yoshino A, Hovda DA, Kawamata T, Katayama Y, Becker DP. Dynamic changes in local cerebral glucose utilization following cerebral concussion in rats: evidence of a hyper- and subsequent hypometabolic state. Brain Res 1991;561:106–19.

Yoshino A, Hovda DA, Katayama Y, Kawamata T, Becker DP. Hippocampal CA3 lesion prevents postconcussive metabolic dysfunction in CA1. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab 1992;12:996–1006.