Double Trouble - The prevalence of concomitant traumatic brain injury in patients with spinal cord injury and its impact on functional outcomes: a systematic review.

Keziah Skein[1], Rebecca George[1], Ryan L. O'Hare Doig[,3], Frances Corrigan[1*], Anna Leonard[1*a]

1 Translational Neuropathology Laboratory, School of Biomedicine, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, The University of Adelaide□□□ ‘

2 Adelaide Medical School, The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, SA 5005, Australia

3 Neil Sachse Centre for Spinal Cord Research, Lifelong Health Theme, South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute, Adelaide, SA 5000, Australia

*Co-senior authors

*Correspondence: anna.leonard@adelaide.edu.au

Abstract

This systematic review examines the prevalence, diagnostic challenges, and functional impact of concomitant traumatic brain injury (TBI) in patients with traumatic spinal cord injury (SCI). PubMed, Embase, Scopus, and PsycINFO databases were searched with a search strategy containing key search terms for TBI, SCI and concomitant. Original research articles reporting on prevalence and/or functional outcomes following a TBI at the time of SCI in adult populations were included. Forty studies met the inclusion criteria, with 32 providing a prevalence estimate of the incidence and 18 information on functional outcomes. Reported prevalence rates of concomitant TBI varied widely (30–50%) across studies, largely due to inconsistent diagnostic criteria, retrospective data collection, and reliance on incomplete medical records or ICD coding. The identification of mild TBI (mTBI) is particularly problematic, given the lack of definitive diagnostic criteria. Motor vehicle accidents were the most common mechanism of concomitant injury, accounting for ~80% of moderate–severe TBI cases, but TBI occurrence was not consistently associated with a specific SCI level. Moderate–severe TBI significantly increased in hospital mortality and complications like pneumonia, sepsis, but had minimal effects on rehabilitation trajectory or length of stay once patients with very low initial GCS were excluded. Functional outcomes, particularly motor and sensory recovery, were generally unaffected by concomitant injury, though subtle cognitive deficits were observed in moderate to severe TBI cases during rehabilitation. Few studies examined outcomes beyond one year post injury. Overall, current evidence suggests that concomitant TBI is common in SCI patients, but its long term functional and cognitive impact remains underexplored. Future research should employ standardized diagnostic criteria, prospective data collection, and long term follow up to clarify the role of concomitant TBI in SCI recovery and guide targeted rehabilitation strategies.

Introduction

Spinal cord injury (SCI) is a global issue with national incidences varying from 8 to 83 per million people annually, affecting 250 to 906 per million people total[1]. Following SCI, neuronal loss at the injury site results in either a complete or partial motor control deficit below the level of injury, as well as a loss of sensory input to the brain from areas below the injury level[2–4]. Additionally, damage to neurons at the injury site disrupts the entire autonomic nervous system[2,5], manifesting predominantly as impairments in thermoregulation, bladder control, and bowel function[2,4].

Beyond the symptoms associated with direct disruption of motor and sensory pathways SCI is also linked to an impairment in cognitive function, the development of neuropathic pain, and mood changes. Cognitive function impairment has been observed in both clinical and pre-clinical research[6], with SCI patients exhibiting significantly lower cognitive performance compared to healthy controls when assessed for attention, memory, executive function, visuoconstructive ability, and language[7]. This impairment is seen shortly after the SCI and persists for at least 1 year following the injury[8,9]. Additionally, SCI causes diminished information processing capabilities[10], and patients report significantly elevated chronic fatigue levels after engaging in cognitive tasks[11]. SCI is also associated with the development of neuropathic pain in 35-41%[12,13] of patients, resulting in the experience of severe sharp, shooting, and burning sensations in response to stimuli that previously was either innocuous (allodynia) or minorly noxious (hyperalgesia)[14]. This in part relates to alterations in the pain signalling pathways, including not just the spinal cord, but also regions of the brain responsible for pain regulation[14–16]. Indeed, SCI is associated with increased incidence of other neurological conditions including depression and anxiety[11,17], with the incidence increasing significantly over the first six months post-rehabilitation discharge[7].

One confounding factor that may play a role in recovery following an SCI, is the presence of a concomitant traumatic brain injury (TBI). The biomechanics of the types of insults that cause SCI are like those related to TBI, like falls and motor vehicle accidents (MVAs). A concomitant TBI may exacerbate SCI associated neurological deficits, with TBI also leading to severity-dependent motor symptoms like paresis, ataxia, or postural instability[18], cognitive symptoms like information processing[19], recognition memory[20], episodic memory[21], or verbal learning and memory[22], and the development of neuropathic pain[23]. This may be driven by a concomitant TBI influencing the pathological response to the SCI. Both TBI and SCI are characterised by a primary insult, the direct physical injury, followed by a prolonged secondary injury phase[24]. The secondary injury phase involves a robust neuroinflammatory response, characterised by activation of resident cells, migration and recruitment of leukocytes and the release of inflammatory mediators[25]. Inflammation is not localised to the site of injury with release of mediators including TNFα, IL-10, CCL2 and IL-8 within the CSF and serum[26–28]. Given the widespread release, a local inflammatory response within the brain may influence that within the spinal cord and vice versa. In support of this, mild TBI has been shown to induce inflammatory changes with neuronal loss within the remote spinal cord[24,29] and thoracic SCI was associated with microglial changes chronically throughout the brain with neuronal loss[16,30], and the later development of cognitive deficits[30].

However, it is difficult to determine the impact of a TBI on SCI recovery, given that reports of the incidence of concomitant TBI vary widely from 7.4-74.2%[31], with little known about what

drives this disparity across different studies. Additionally, up to 60% of TBI diagnoses may be missed in SCI patients in emergency care[32,33]. As such this systematic review aimed to examine prevalence of concomitant SCI and TBI, factors influencing the differences in reported prevalence between studies, and whether concomitant injury influenced functional recovery post-SCI. This builds upon previous reviews[34,35], by integrating evaluation of incidence of DDx, methods for screening of co-occurring TBI and potential impacts of DDx on functional outcomes.

Methods

Search Strategy

The Preferred Reporting Items for Systemic Reviews and Meta-Analysis (PRISMA) guidelines were used. A comprehensive search was initially performed in November 2022 and updated in April 2023 and October 2024, using the electronic databases Medline via PubMed, EMBASE, and Scopus to identify relevant publications. The search strategy was developed in consultation with a health and medical sciences librarian and used the terms “Traumatic brain injury”, “Spinal cord injury” and “Concomitant” and related synonyms (Supplementary material S1). Additional searching of reference lists was also performed to identify further relevant studies.

Selection Criteria

Following the database search, all citations were collated and uploaded into EndNote (EndNote™ X9) and then imported into Covidence systematic review software (Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia). Duplicates were identified, removed and cross checked.

The title and abstracts of the resulting publications were screened and included if they included reference to both TBI and SCI in a clinical population. For articles that passed this preliminary assessment, the full text article was retried and screened for eligibility against the inclusion and exclusion criteria as assessed by two independent reviewers, with conflicts resolved by a third reviewer. A flow chart with reasons for exclusion of studies is displayed in Fig. 1.

Inclusion criteria

The following inclusion criteria were utilised:

i): An original research article published in English

ii) Investigated a predominantly adult population, 16 years or older

iii) TBI occurred at the time of the SCI

iv) Provided information on the incidence of DDx and/or information on the influence of DDx on functional recovery

v) Published in the last 40 years

Exclusion criteria

i) Did not state when the TBI occurred relative to the SCI

ii) Did not include both a DDx and a SCI group

iii) Study did not differentiate between spinal and spinal cord injury

iv) Studies only focused on a subpopulation of SCI patients (ie cervical injury only)

v) SCI population was a mix of non-traumatic and traumatic causes

vi) Studies were single case reports/expert opinions

vii) Studies were review articles or conference abstracts.

viii) Full-text unavailable

iv) Pre-clinical study only

Data Extraction

A data collection spreadsheet was then developed to extract the relevant information from the included articles. Data extracted included study characteristics (author, year of publication, study design, location), participant characteristics (sample size, age, sex, time-point measured post-injury, mechanism of injury, severity of SCI, severity of TBI, criteria used to diagnose TBI) and functional outcome information where available (test/s used, time-point, time in hospital, time in rehabilitation). Given the diversity of functional outcomes examined, these were classified as cognitive, autonomic, motor, psychological or other where they did not fit in any of these categories.

Assessment of methodological quality

Articles included in the study were assessed for methodological quality by one reviewer (FC), with confirmation provided by a second reviewer (RG), by using an adapted version of the National Institutes of Health quality assessment tool (Supplementary)[36]. A study was deemed to be of high quality if it scored greater than 70%, moderate quality with scores between 50 and 70% and low quality when scoring below 50.

Results

Search results

Electronic searches of PubMed, Embase and Scopus databases produced a total of 1067 titles. 454 duplicates were removed leaving 613 titles. On reviewing titles and abstracts, a further 395 records were excluded, with 218 articles sought for retrieval. 18, were unable to be obtained, with review of the remaining articles identifying a further 6 articles via citation analysis., leaving 206 articles to be assessed for eligibility. Full-text review excluded a further 166 articles, which did not meet the inclusion criteria leaving 40 articles meeting the inclusion criteria. Details of this process are described in the PRISMA diagram (Figure 1).



Fig 1: PRIMSA flow diagram outlining the article selection and screening process and subsequent data management

Characteristics of included studies

Of the relevant studies 32 provided a prevalence estimate of the incidence of DDx in SCI patients and 18 information on functional outcomes. The majority (26/40) had the primary aim of investigating DDx, while in 14 papers information on DDx was presented as one of several outcomes reported. The majority were cross-sectional (n=21) or cohort designs (n=14), with an even mix of prospective (n=18) and retrospective (n=23) population recruitment. Most of the studies were conducted in North America, in the US (n=17) and Canada (n=7), with other studies were conducted in Europe (n=10), Asia (n=2), Oceania (n=3) and South America (n=1). Sample sizes were generally small, with six studies with less than 50 participants, six with 50-100 participants, seven with 101-500 participants, five with 501-1000, four with 1001-2000 and only three with more than 10,000 participants.

Methodological quality

A summary of the methodological quality assessment for the included articles is provided in Fig. 2 and Supplementary Table 2. Sixteen (40%) studies were of high quality, five (12.5%) of moderate quality and 19 (47.5%) of low quality, with sample size justification,

consideration of the severity of TBI, identification of TBI and statistical analyses the main domains of concern.



Fig 2: Assessment of methodological quality presented as the number of studies exhibiting each attribute.

Diagnostic criteria

As identified within the methodological analysis, studies varied in how the presence of a concomitant TBI was identified, with the majority relying on retrospective analyses, utilising predominantly hospital medical records (n=26), but also national trauma data banks (n=4), clinical study data (n=1) or rehabilitation admission records (n=1), with one study not specifying the source of information[37] (Table 1). Four of these studies also specified the inclusion of emergency medical service, surgical and acute rehabilitation records alongside their hospital medical record review to increase the likelihood of finding relevant information [32,38–40]. Of the studies that utilised a prospective TBI diagnosis, in two studies this occurred at admission to hospital[41,42], and in five at admission to rehabilitation[8,9,43–45]. A further four studies used both retrospective record review and prospective clinical examination encompassing neuroimaging[33], the step 2 TBI-4 Self Report interview[46] or neuropsychological testing[45,47].

The information used to diagnose a TBI also varied widely between studies, with 5 studies not specifying the criteria used at all[48–52]. In a further 6 studies TBI was diagnosed using only ICD billing codes[31,53–57], with 3 of these studies not specifying the codes used[31,54,56]. An additional 2 studies utilised ICD billing codes alongside examination of medical records for terms associated with brain injury like head trauma[58] or for complications associated with TBI including contusions[59]. In other studies TBI was diagnosed via the presence of post-traumatic amnesia (PTA)[32,33,37,39,40,42,44–46,46,47,60–64], loss of consciousness[8,9,9,33,37,42,44–

[47,59,60,62,63,65–67], Glasgow Coma Score (GCS)[8,32,33,37,39–42,45–47,60,61,63–69], the presence of focal neurological deficits[37,45,46,62,64–67,70], cognitive changes[46,47,63,64,71] or positive neuroimaging[32,33,39,40,43,45–47,60–65,67]. How this information was used varied, two studies required the presence of two indicators of head injury[33,47], while in the majority of studies (n=20) only one indicator of TBI was required for a diagnosis to be made. In most studies this required the presence of one criterion from a predetermined list, typically encompassing one of PTA, an indicator of loss of consciousness or abnormal neuroimaging[32,33,37,40,42,44,45,47,60,63–67]. However, in 8 studies only one criterion was assessed, most commonly a decreased GCS[9,41,68,69], but studies also diagnosed TBI based solely on abnormalities on neuroimaging[43], a clinical presentation suggestive of TBI[70 3,15,29–32,36] and the presence of cognitive deficits[71].

Sixteen studies then investigated the severity of the TBI associated with an SCI[8,32,37–42,45,46,60,61,63,64,66,69]. In five studies this was based only on length of loss of consciousness/GCS [8,41,60,63,69], but more commonly studies incorporated other measures including length of PTA[32,38–40,42,61,64], neuroimaging findings[32,39,40,45,46,60,61,64] and severity of neurological and cognitive deficits[37,45,64,66] to differentiate TBI severity. However, given that many studies only required one indicator of TBI for a diagnosis to be made, severity may have also been based solely off this information[37,38,45,60,61,66].

Incidence/prevalence

Having identified DDx, 34 studies provided information regarding the incidence of DDx, with incidence ranging from 7.4% in a US hospital-based population[31] and 74.2% in a Finnish study which specifically examined patients for indication of prior TBI on admission to rehabilitation and then retrospectively analysed medical records[45] (Table 2). Overall, twelve studies reported an incidence of DDx of less than 30%[31,37,41,48,53,54,56,58,64,68–70], seventeen studies between 30-50%[8,9,38,40,42–44,47,49–52,55,57,59,65,66] and three >50%[32,45,63]. In addition two studies demonstrated that the incidence of DDx depended on the criteria used, Bombardier *et al* reported an incidence of 33% using retrospective review of medical records, but 62% with self-report via the step 2 TBI-4 Self Report interview[46], although they reported that the interview lacked specificity. Budisin *et* al had a different approach, examining the effect of including or excluding ambiguous cases. Definitive positive TBI required two of the presence of PTA< a period of loss of consciousness, a GCS at admission of 14 or below or positive neuroimaging, whilst ambiguous cases only had one indicator, with this changing the incidence from 39.5 vs 58%[33].

Indeed, how the TBI was identified may influence the prevalence reported in these studies. The reports where DDx was reported as less than 30% tended to rely on less information to identify the presence of a TBI, including ICD codes in five studies[31,53,54,56,58], only GCS in three studies[41,68,69], non-specified symptoms and signs in one study[70] with another not specifying how TBI was classified at all[48]. Only two studies with an estimated incidence of <30% examined multiple criteria including post-traumatic amnesia, Glasgow Coma Score and clinical presentation[37,64]. In contrast those studies reporting an incidence of 30-50% tended to use more information, with half utilising more than one criteria to assess whether a head injury had occurred[33,38,40,42,44,46,59,65,66], although four of the studies, including two from the same research group, did not specify how a head injury was classified[49–52]. The studies that identified an incidence of >50% all used multiple criteria including reference to post-traumatic amnesia[32,45,46,63], decreased Glasgow Coma Score or presence of loss of consciousness[32,45,46,63], neuroimaging[32,45,63] and TBI related symptoms[45,46,63], with two

specifically examining hospital medical, emergency medical services, surgical and acute rehabilitation records to increase the likelihood of identifying information suggesting the presence of head injury[32,45].

Prevalence of DDx may also have been influenced by the cohort sizes examined. The studies with the highest incidence also had low cohort sizes ranging from 31-198[32,45,46,63], whilst those with the lowest incidence included the studies with the largest cohorts including two papers with 10000-15000 participants[53,69] and two papers with 1000-5000 participants[31,54], alongside a further three with a cohort size of 500-1000[48,56,68]

Characteristics of DDx compared to SCI alone

Alongside examining the incidence of DDx, investigation of whether injury characteristics differed between SCI alone and DDx were also examined (Table 3). In the 13 papers differentiating age and/or sex at injury in DDx patients compared to SCI alone, none reported a meaningful difference in age at injury[32,33,38,40,42–44,53,57,58,63,66,68]. There were mixed reports on whether DDx differentially affected one sex. Five papers reported a similar proportion of males affected by SCI alone compared to DDx [42,53,57,58,68], three papers slightly more females in the DDx group, with an increase in the %females within the DDx cohort of 10-24%[33,43,63] and four slightly more males [38–40,66]. Two of these papers found that this was severity dependent- with more males in the severe DDx group in the Hagen *et al* paper[66], and more males in the mild DDx group in the Garlanger et al paper[38].

When comparing DDx to SCI alone, the mechanism of injury differed with DDx linked to higher rates of MVAs compared to SCI alone in 12/13 studies[33,38–40,42–44,53,57,63,66,68] (34-74% vs 21-52%), with a similar rate of MVA, but slightly more falls in the other study[58]. Where severity of TBI was considered, MVA was more common with increasing severity of TBI[38,66], increasing from the mechanism of injury in 35-56% of cases in mTBI to 79-84.5% with mod-sevTBI[38,66].

When looking at severity of TBI in DDx patients, mild TBI was the most common severity in 11/13 studies reporting this characteristic[32,37,40–42,46,53,63,66,68,69], although the reported % of DDx patients with a mild TBI varied widely between these from 94% to 48% of DDx cases. Only one paper reported higher rates of moderate TBI, at 42% of cases compared to 19% mild and 28% severe[64] and another a relatively even split between the three severities of TBI (26:35:29%). It should be noted in this Tolonen *et al* paper the moderate TBI patients were classified based on length of PTA and LOC, rather than GCS, which was typically still 14-15 and would have been rated as mild according to criteria of other studies[45].

DDx did not appear to consistently affect the location of the SCI, which was reported as either via anatomical level (cervical, thoracic, lumbar) or as presenting as para or tetraplegia. Four papers reported that DDx patients had similar ratios of the spinal cord injury location compared to SCI alone[33,38,58,66], four that DDx patients had higher rates of cervical injury (52-86 vs 29-65%)[39,40,63,72] or tetraplegia (69% vs 58%)[42] and two lower rates of cervical injury in DDx patients[43,45], although these studies had small sample sizes of 22-23 participants.

SCI severity was assessed as complete/incomplete in 4 studies and as ASIA score in 7 studies that provided information on DDx patients compared to SCI alone. Where TBI severity was not considered, rates of complete SCI were reported as slightly higher than DDx in two studies (43-66% vs 33-46.5%)[43,72] and slightly lower in another study (31 vs 46.5%)[58] This is potentially TBI severity dependent, with Hagen *et al* finding that with mild or

moderate TBI the rates of incomplete SCI were greater than SCI alone, but with severe TBI the rates of complete SCI were greater than SCI alone[66]. Where ASIA scores were reported for each level from A-D, DDx had a slightly higher proportion of patients scoring A in 3/4 studies[33,38,63], with this not affected by TBI severity[38]. In two papers A-C scores were grouped together with one paper finding more A-C patients with DDx[40] and another similar proportions between DDx and SCI alone patients[32].

Patient outcomes

18 of the 40 studies included information on whether concomitant injury affected recovery when compared to SCI alone. Measures included within these studies included length of hospital stay and rehabilitation length, alongside more specific measures to evaluate motor, cognitive, autonomic or psychological outcomes.

Hospital and rehabilitation outcomes

Acutely, a DDx was found to increase in hospital complications including respiratory infections, pressure ulcers and sepsis[49,57], with longer stays in intensive care[57] and an increase in mortality during hospital admission[31,57,69], although this increase in mortality was lost when patients with GCS <10 on arrival were excluded[68]. However, despite the increase in complications only 1[65] of 5[38,46,60,62,67] studies reported an increase in length of hospital stay, with Nott *et al* finding that DDx patients spent a mean difference of 21 days longer in hospital than patients with an SCI alone. TBI, may also differentially affect SCI patients, with paraplegic, but not tetraplegic DDx patients having a longer length of stay in both hospital and rehabilitation than patients with a SCI alone[61]. By the time of rehabilitation admission, however all 8 studies reporting this outcome found no difference in time spent in rehabilitation between DDx and SCI only patients[38,46,60–63,65,67]. During rehabilitation, a DDx was associated with a higher rate of spontaneous recovery with more patients converting to ASIA A to ASIA B[64].

Motor and sensory outcomes

10 of the 17 studies investigated motor outcomes, and only one sensory and pain scores[68]. For motor outcomes 8 used the motor portion of the Functional Independence Measure (FIM)[38,46,60–63,65,67,68], 1 using the Spinal Cord Independence Measure (SCIM III)[51] and 1 the National Acute Spinal Cord Injury Study motor score by assessing motor function in 14 segments[68]. Sensory function was also assessed by the National Acute Spinal Cord Injury Study test, with sensory function examined via pinprick and light touch sensation for C2-S5, with pain also assessed in six regions[68].

Motor function assessed by raw FIM scores found no differences at admission to or discharge from rehabilitation in 3 of the 6 studies investigating this time point post-injury[46,60,65]. Of the three studies that reported significantly lower FIM motor scores on rehabilitation admission and discharge, two only reported this effect in a subpopulation of patients: paraplegic rather than tetraplegic patients[61] and moderate/severe but not mild TBI[38]. Only Sikka *et al* found an overall effect of concomitant injury on raw FIM motor scores regardless of severity of TBI or level of SCI, although notably this paper had one of the highest reported rates of concomitant injury, at 65%[63].

Effects of concomitant injury on motor outcome during rehabilitation were also presented as FIM gain, the change in score from admission to discharge, or FIM efficiency, this being the change in score considering the length of stay. Macciocchi *et al* found a significant decrease

in FIM gain with concomitant injury[60], although this was not seen in another study that evaluated this measure[63]. Garlanger *et al*, but not Sikka *et al* found a significantly lower FIM efficiency with concomitant injury, although the Garlanger *et al* study only found this in patients with a moderate/severe, but not mild TBI suggesting a TBI severity effect[38,63].

Furlan *et al* examined motor and sensory function using the National Acute Spinal Cord Injury Study tests at 3 days, 6 weeks, 6 months and 1 year and found that although DDx patients scored significantly worse than SCI alone at all time-points via Mann-Whitney U-test, this was found to be no longer significant when confounding factors were taken into account via multiple regression analysis[68]. Indeed, four other studies investigated longer time points for motor function, out to 3.5 years post-injury, utilising either the motor FIM score or SCIM III, with no study finding significant change in functional motor outcome with concomitant injury compared to SCI alone[46,51,62,65].

Cognitive outcomes

10 studies investigated cognitive outcomes with the most common tool the cognitive portion of the FIM task. Two studies reported significant differences in raw FIM scores at rehabilitation and discharge in all DDx patients[60,63]. However, Nott *et al* found no differences during rehabilitation[65] and Garlanger *et al*[38] and Macciocchi *et al* (2008)[32] only found this was severity dependent, with significant differences only moderate to severe TBI DDx patients compared to SCI alone. Macciocchi *et al* (2012) examined the specific cognitive subdomains of the FIM task, with all DDx patients performing significantly worse in comprehension, problem solving and memory at admission compared to SCI alone[61]. However, whilst DDx paraplegic patients were still significantly different on all domains compared to paraplegic SCI patients at rehabilitation discharge, DDx tetraplegic patients were only significantly different in memory[61].

Two studies utilised a broader array of cognitive assessments during rehabilitation which included the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-3rd edition Digit Span (WAIS-3 DS), WAIS-3 Letter-Number Sequencing (WAIS-3 LNS), Hopkins Verbal Learning Test (HLVT) with total and delayed recall subsections, and the Symbol Digit Modalities Test (SMDT). One study with only mild TBI DDx patients found no significant differences[39] whilst Macciocchi *et al* (2012) found significant differences when level of SCI was taken into account in DDx patients with varying severity of TBI[61]. Tetraplegic DDx patients were significantly worse on the WAIS-DS and WAIS-3 LNS, but not HVLT or SMDT compared to tetraplegic SCI patients, whereas paraplegic DDx patients were the opposite with significant differences in the HLVT delayed and total recall and SDMT, but not WAIS-DS or WAIS-3 LNS compared to paraplegic SCI patients[61].

Four studies investigated time-points beyond rehabilitation, with no significant difference in cognitive FIM scores to 6 months post-injury[62,65,67] or in the Halstead Category Test at 3 months post-injury[44]. However, a more comprehensive battery assessing broader cognitive domains including attention, verbal and visual memory and executive function, found significant differences in the Stroop test, California Verbal Learning test (CLVT) and Digit Span backwards test at 2-6 months post-injury, but not in Digit-span forwards, the Wechsler Memory Scale-3rd edition (WMS-III), Hooper visual orientation, matrix reasoning or Wisconsin Card Sort Test (WCST) in DDx compared to SCI alone[62].

Other outcomes

Post-hospital stay DDx did not affect the rate of pressure ulcers[46], pain[65,68] or urinary tract infections[65], nor overall survival[68], although DDx was associated with an increase in behavioural incidents to six months post-injury in DDx patients[62]. Two studies also specifically investigated autonomic functions, looking at the effects of DDx from 3 months[67] to six years post-injury[65]. No significant difference at 3 months was found in sexual function using the Sexuality after Spinal Injury Questionnaire (SASIQ)[67], with an interview also identifying no significant differences in sexual, bladder, and bowel function up to six years post-injury[65]. Similarly, two studies investigated whether a DDx affected psychological outcomes up to six years post-injury. No significant effects of a DDx compared to SCI alone on depression or anxiety were found utilising the Patient Health Questionnaire-2 at one-year post-injury[46], or on the DASS-21 questionnaire at 3-6 years post-injury[65].

Discussion

This systematic review summarises the clinical evidence to date on the prevalence of concomitant TBI in patients with traumatic SCI, the barriers to identifying TBI in SCI patients and its influence on functional outcomes. It is difficult to determine the prevalence of concomitant TBI, as the criteria for assessing TBI differ between studies, and the clinical information required to make a diagnosis are not always collected. Nonetheless, even with these limitations the majority of papers reported an incidence of 30-50% suggesting that concomitant injury is common in the SCI cohort. The effect of concomitant TBI on functional recovery following SCI was also examined, with the articles reviewed here finding little difference in functional recovery. A moderate-severe TBI was associated with an increase in in-hospital mortality and complications, but overall concomitant injury had minimal effects on recovery trajectory during rehabilitation. Notably few studies have examined the long-term effects of concomitant injury, particularly on cognition, with subtle cognitive deficits detected at six months post-injury in the DDx group, but no later time-points examined. These findings highlight the need for prospectively designed studies to capture the presence of a TBI at the time of SCI, and to follow these patients chronically, to fully understand the impact of a concomitant TBI on the recovery from SCI.

The prevalence of reported concomitant TBI with SCI varies widely between studies and seems to be most influenced by the criteria used to diagnose the TBI rather than differences in injury characteristics. Of the studies providing details on how diagnosis was made, 80% utilised clinical indices including PTA, loss of consciousness/GCS, neurological symptoms and alterations in neuroimaging. Neuroimaging is most useful in diagnosing moderate-severe TBI, with mTBI only showing abnormalities on neuroimaging in ~10-20% of cases presenting to the emergency department[3–75]. Indeed, diagnosing mTBI has become increasingly controversial, as there is no universal consensus on a definition. It is generally characterised by a head injury disrupting brain function as evidenced by altered mental status (e.g. confusion and disorientation), loss of consciousness of less than <30 min, PTA of less than an hour, and/or transient neurological dysfunction (e.g. headache and dizziness PTA[76–78], but even then LOC may only be found in 8[79] – 13%[80] of cases. Beyond this, even with more severe TBI, given that most studies utilised retrospective analysis of medical records there are inherent limitations to being able to identify whether a TBI occurred,

including absent or inaccurate documentation. Indeed, two of the studies reporting an incidence of DDx in >50% of SCI patients, specifically examined hospital medical, emergency medical services, surgical and acute rehabilitation records to increase the likelihood of identifying relevant information[32,40]. Furthermore level of consciousness cannot always be assessed, particularly in patients with pre-injury intoxication, reported in ~30% at time of SCI[81,82] or those that require sedation and intubation, particularly common in higher cervical SCI injuries[83]. Indeed, only two studies reported assessing for confounds, Tolonen *et al* including intoxication, hypoxia, medication and other medical conditions [45], and Macciocchi *et al*, for intubation only[32]. Other retrospective analyses relied only on ICD codes, rather than specific clinical indices, and these typically reported the lowest incidence of concomitant TBI. This may reflect difficulty in capturing the incidence of TBI via this method, with multiple diagnostic codes used to denote TBI, with no consensus on which constitute the best practice[84,85]. Indeed, no research to date has investigated whether care providers in different medical settings use appropriate or consistent codes for TBI[86]. This can be seen by the differing ICD codes included across the studies incorporating this measure. Even in prospective studies identification of mTBI is difficult, with up to 50% of mTBI diagnoses missed in the emergency department setting even in patients presenting without an SCI[87–89]. Given the difficulties in capturing the presence of TBI in SCI patients, and the poor quality of many of the papers included within the study, it is difficult to conclude what the incidence of concomitant TBI is in SCI patients, highlighting the need to develop consistent methods to accurately diagnose TBI in this cohort.

With the caveat that the studies included herein may thus include concomitant TBI patients in their SCI only cohort, this study also examined whether DDx patients differed in presentation to SCI only patients. No differences in age or sex were found, but concomitant TBI was more likely when the mechanism of injury was a motor vehicle accident, accounting for ~ 80% of moderate severe TBI cases associated with an SCI injury. MVAs generally result in greater impact velocities than other injury mechanisms and lead to head and spinal injuries due to blunt impact and/or inertial loading[90]. Globally, MVAs are the leading cause of both SCI[91,92] and TBI[93] Surprisingly unlike previous reports where DDx was associated primarily with cervical injury [32,48,94,95], DDx was not consistently associated with a specific injury location in the studies included here, with roughly half supporting an increase in head injury in cervical SCI patients [39,40,42,63,72] and half finding either no difference or a decrease in cervical injury[33,38,58,66]. These studies did not consistently differ in geographic location, mechanism of injury or demographic attributes of included participants making it unclear what may drive the difference in injury location between studies. Nonetheless it highlights the need to maintain a clinical suspicion of the potential for a concomitant TBI, regardless of SCI injury location, particularly in high velocity injuries.

Unsurprisingly a concomitant moderate-severe TBI was associated with higher in hospital mortality compared to SCI alone[31,57,69]. This was TBI severity dependent with, Tachino *et al* reporting a mortality rate of 25% in severe TBI (GCS 3-8) compared to 3% in mild TBI (GCS 13-15) DDx cases, with a 10.8% mortality in SCI only patients[69]. Indeed, when patients arriving with a GCS < 10 were excluded from analysis no difference in in-hospital mortality was found between SCI only and DDx patients[72]. This supports previous reports suggesting an in-hospital mortality rate for isolated moderate to severe TBI as 15-31%[96,97] compared to 3-13% for isolated SCI[98–100]. Thus, the increased in-hospital mortality appears to be a

consequence purely of the head injury, and not an interaction between the two. The isolated effects of a moderate-severe head injury would also account for the increase in in-hospital complications like pneumonia and sepsis[49,57] and longer times in ICU. Isolated TBI causes non-neurological complications in approximately 37% of patients[101] compared to ~24% of SCI only patients[57], with respiratory problems are the most common[102]. This did not however, lead to significant increases in hospital stay length, or time in rehabilitation in most of the studies. Only Nott *et al* found a significant increase in hospital stay length in all DDx patients, and this small study had more cervical SCI cases in the DDx group, with higher level of injury itself associated with longer time in hospital[103,104] . This may explain why Macciocchi *et al* found that the effects of concomitant TBI may be more evident in paraplegic patients, with only this subgroup and not, tetraplegic patients having longer length of stay in hospital and rehabilitation .

The effect of concomitant TBI on functional outcomes following SCI were also assessed. Overall concomitant TBI had minimal effects on motor or sensory outcomes either acutely or chronically. Notably motor outcome was assessed with the motor potion of the FIM in 9/10 studies, which assesses activities like eating, grooming, bathing, dressing, toileting, transfers and mobility are scored on a 7-point scale[105,106]. The FIM was developed primarily to assess disability and requirements for burden of care[107], with ceiling and floor effects for differing lesion levels whereby the scale cannot detect changes in response. For example in paraplegia a ceiling effect is seen in the bed transfer category, whereby no further improvements can be noted, with a floor effect in tetraplegia, where no further deterioration in function can be detected[108]. Indeed overall the FIM has been found to be less sensitive than other tests, in that it is less sensitive to improvement than the quadriplegia index of function [109], less able to detect changes in walking than the walking index for spinal cord injury [110] and less sensitive to functional changes than the SCIM[111,112]. Nonetheless given that SCI disrupts conduction of sensory and motor signals across the site of the lesion[113], any additional effects of a disruption of central motor pathways by TBI will be difficult to detect. Indeed, the studies surveyed here suggested that a TBI only worsened acute motor recovery, when the TBI was moderate-severe[38,65] or in paraplegic patients[61] where disruption of upper motor function caused by the TBI would be more evident. Indeed, motor symptoms are minimal with isolated mild TBI, the most common severity noted with concomitant injury. Following mTBI subtle acute[114,115] and chronic alterations[116,117] are found in postural stability, with no effect on gross motor function[118], which is therefore unlikely to alter FIM motor scores.

Unlike motor function, the cognitive portion of the FIM, evaluating comprehension, expression, social interaction, problem solving and memory on a 7 point scale was able to detect differences between concomitant and SCI only patients during rehabilitation, but only in those with moderate-severe TBI, not a mild injury[38,39,60,61,63]. This is not surprising given that TBI is associated with severity dependent cognitive deficits, particularly in attention and executive function[119,120]. Indeed, although mTBI is associated with measurable impairment in various cognitive domains including executive function, learning/memory, attention, processing speed, the deficits are subtle and likely to require more sensitive neuropsychological testing[121]. Even with more severe injury,, ceiling effects were observed

when the cognitive portion of the FIM was used at later time-points beyond three months post-injury[62,65,67] with Bradbury *et al* finding that 90% of their cohort had reached the highest score of 35, with no capacity to differentiate between DDx and SCI only patients. When more sensitive neuropsychological tests were used in this cohort, cognitive performance was worse in DDx patients compared to SCI alone, with impairments on the Stroop test, CLVT and Digit span backwards[62], suggesting attention and learning and memory difficulties. To date these tools are yet to be used beyond six months post-injury making it difficult to determine if a TBI at the time of SCI causes long-term cognitive impairments. SCI has been associated with cognitive impairment in domains such as attention, concentration, abstract reasoning, verbal learning, new learning and memory and processing speed in up to 40% of patients[122]. For example Cohen *et al* found that individuals with an SCI at least one year prior were worse in in fluid composite scores (a measure of executive function), psychomotor speed, and episodic memory[123], with Craig e*t al* similarly finding that SCI was associated with impaired attention, visoconstructional skills, memory, executive functioning, and language[124]. Although concomitant TBI is commonly proposed as a potential mechanism driving the development of chronic cognitive deficits following SCI[125,126], as can be seen here, there have been no specific studies to date investigating this topic. Given that SCI alone may also impair cognition, due to factors including autonomic dysfunction driving cerebral blood flow impairment, spread of inflammation to key cognitive areas like the hippocampus[127], alongside the use of medications including sedatives, anxiolytics, antispasmodics, serotoninergic agents, narcotics, anticonvulsants, tricyclic antidepressants, and skeletal muscle relaxants which are prescribed more often in those with SCIs to the general population[123,128], this is an important topic that requires further investigation.

Other notable findings here were a differing in the profile of cognitive deficits observed in tetraplegic vs paraplegic DDx patients, at least during rehabilitation, with impaired working memory in DDx tetraplegic patients and learning and memory in paraplegic DDx patients compared to SCI alone. This aligns with reports specifically investigating the effects of SCI on cognition at least one year post-injury, with significantly poorer new learning and memory noted in those with paraplegia and impaired processing speed in those with tetraplegia[129], suggesting that a concomitant TBI may exacerbate or accelerate underlying SCI induced deficits. Why spinal injury level may affect different cognitive domains is not yet understood, higher thoracic/cervical injuries are associated with autonomic dysfunction that can reduce blood pressure[130] and also impair neurovascular coupling, impairing the matching of blood flow to regional metabolic demands particularly in high demand tasks like cognitive processing[131]. In contrast paraplegic patients have been suggested to have increased cerebral vascular resistance[132], with the two differing cardiovascular risk factors potentially affecting different brain regions and thus affecting different cognitive domains[133]. Given that TBI also decreases neurovascular coupling[134,135] and increases cerebral vascular resistance[136,137], it may act to exacerbate these changes.

Like the paucity of studies investigating chronic effects on cognition, there is a similar lack of studies looking at the effect of concomitant TBI beyond one-year post-SCI on other outcomes, with only Nott *et al* examining out to 3 years post-injury. Nott *et al* found no differences in autonomic dysfunction, anxiety, depression or sleep in a small case-matched sample of SCI to DDx patients[65], with Bombardier *et al* similarly finding no difference in rates of depression at one-year post-injury[46]. Although these studies used screening tools to

assess depression and anxiety, which are not diagnostic, in the Patient Health Questionaire-2[46] and Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale[65], they been shown to be valid in both SCI[138] and TBI populations[139] Both TBI and SCI have been associated with increased rates of psychiatric disease. Depression affects approximately 19–26% of individuals living with SCI with this figure approximately three times greater than that reported in the general population[124,140]. Similarly, longitudinal studies show that up to 62% of those who suffer moderate-to-severe TBI are diagnosed with one or more psychiatric illnesses within five years post-injury, of which depression and anxiety disorders are most common[141]. Prevalence of affective disorders is also higher following mTBI relative to population base rates[142]. Indeed, recent meta-analyses have found that individuals with a history of TBI are 1.9 times as likely to experience clinical anxiety[143], and over twice as likely to experience depression[144]. However here, no synergistic effect between TBI and SCI were found, although larger studies looking at more chronic time-points may be required.

This review of the clinical prevalence of concomitant TBI in SCI patients identified several barriers to the diagnosis of DDx. Moderate-severe TBI had the greatest impact on in hospital recovery, with increased mortality and complications, with minimal effects of concomitant injury detected during rehabilitation, or to three years post-injury. However given the difficulty of detecting TBI at the time of SCI, these results may be influenced by inclusion of concomitant injury patients in the SCI group. Furthermore, only a small number of studies to date have been conducted, with half of poor quality, highlighting the need for larger studies, over longer time periods to fully understand the implications of the impact of concomitant TBI on the recovery of SCI and how these patients can best be supported through their recovery.

References

1. Singh A, Tetreault L, Kalsi-Ryan S, et al. Global prevalence and incidence of traumatic spinal cord injury. Clin Epidemiol 2014;6:309–331; doi: 10.2147/CLEP.S68889.

2. Sutherland TC, Mathews KJ, Mao Y, et al. Differences in the Cellular Response to Acute Spinal Cord Injury between Developing and Mature Rats Highlights the Potential Significance of the Inflammatory Response. Front Cell Neurosci 2016;10:310; doi: 10.3389/fncel.2016.00310.

3. Ronaghi M, Erceg S, Moreno-Manzano V, et al. Challenges of Stem Cell Therapy for Spinal Cord Injury: Human Embryonic Stem Cells, Endogenous Neural Stem Cells, or Induced Pluripotent Stem Cells? Stem Cells 2010;28(1):93–99; doi: 10.1002/stem.253.

4. Karlsson A-K. Autonomic dysfunction in spinal cord injury: clinical presentation of symptoms and signs. Prog Brain Res 2006;152:1–8; doi: 10.1016/S0079-6123(05)52034-X.

5. Bloom O, Herman PE, Spungen AM. Systemic inflammation in traumatic spinal cord injury. Exp Neurol 2020;325:113143; doi: 10.1016/j.expneurol.2019.113143.

6. Wu J, Zhao Z, Sabirzhanov B, et al. Spinal cord injury causes brain inflammation associated with cognitive and affective changes: role of cell cycle pathways. J Neurosci 2014;34(33):10989–11006; doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.5110-13.2014.

7. Craig A, Guest R, Tran Y, et al. Cognitive Impairment and Mood States after Spinal Cord Injury. Journal of Neurotrauma 2017;34(6):1156–1163; doi: 10.1089/neu.2016.4632.

8. Roth E, Davidoff G, Thomas P, et al. A controlled study of neuropsychological deficits in acute spinal cord injury patients. Spinal Cord 1989;27(6):480–489; doi: 10.1038/sc.1989.75.

9. Richards JS, Brown L, Hagglund K, et al. Spinal cord injury and concomitant traumatic brain injury. Results of a longitudinal investigation. Am J Phys Med Rehabil 1988;67(5):211–216; doi: 10.1097/00002060-198810000-00005.

10. Lazzaro I, Tran Y, Wijesuriya N, et al. Central Correlates of Impaired Information Processing in People with Spinal Cord Injury. Journal of Clinical Neurophysiology 2013;30(1):59; doi: 10.1097/WNP.0b013e31827edb0c.

11. Craig A, Tran Y, Wijesuriya N, et al. Fatigue and tiredness in people with spinal cord injury. Journal of Psychosomatic Research 2012;73(3):205–210; doi: 10.1016/j.jpsychores.2012.07.005.

12. Siddall PJ, McClelland JM, Rutkowski SB, et al. A longitudinal study of the prevalence and characteristics of pain in the first 5 years following spinal cord injury. PAIN 2003;103(3):249; doi: 10.1016/S0304-3959(02)00452-9.

13. Werhagen L, Budh CN, Hultling C, et al. Neuropathic pain after traumatic spinal cord injury – relations to gender, spinal level, completeness, and age at the time of injury. Spinal Cord 2004;42(12):665–673; doi: 10.1038/sj.sc.3101641.

14. Masri R, Keller A. Chronic Pain Following Spinal Cord Injury. Advances in experimental medicine and biology 2012;760:74–88; doi: 10.1007/978-1-4614-4090-1_5.

15. Hains BC, Waxman SG. Activated microglia contribute to the maintenance of chronic pain after spinal cord injury. J Neurosci 2006;26(16):4308–4317; doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0003-06.2006.

16. Wu J, Raver C, Piao C, et al. Cell cycle activation contributes to increased neuronal activity in the posterior thalamic nucleus and associated chronic hyperesthesia after rat spinal cord contusion. Neurotherapeutics 2013;10(3):520–538; doi: 10.1007/s13311-013-0198-1.

17. Mokhtari T, Uludag K. Role of NLRP3 Inflammasome in Post-Spinal-Cord-Injury Anxiety and Depression: Molecular Mechanisms and Therapeutic Implications. ACS Chem Neurosci 2024;15(1):56–70; doi: 10.1021/acschemneuro.3c00596.

18. Walker WC, Pickett TC. Motor impairment after severe traumatic brain injury: A longitudinal multicenter study. Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development 2007;44(7):975–82.

19. Azouvi P, Arnould A, Dromer E, et al. Neuropsychology of traumatic brain injury: An expert overview. Rev Neurol (Paris) 2017;173(7–8):461–472; doi: 10.1016/j.neurol.2017.07.006.

20. Brooks DN. Recognition memory, and head injury. Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry 1974;37(7):794–801; doi: 10.1136/jnnp.37.7.794.

21. Russell KC, Arenth ,Patricia M., Scanlon ,Joelle M., et al. A functional magnetic resonance imaging investigation of episodic memory after traumatic brain injury. Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology 2011;33(5):538–547; doi: 10.1080/13803395.2010.537253.

22. Clark JMR, Mahmood Z, Jak AJ, et al. Neuropsychological Performance and Functional Capacity Following Mild Traumatic Brain Injury in Veterans. The Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation 2022;37(6):E488; doi: 10.1097/HTR.0000000000000748.

23. Ashina H, Al-Khazali HM, Iljazi A, et al. Total tenderness score and pressure pain thresholds in persistent post-traumatic headache attributed to mild traumatic brain injury. J Headache Pain 2022;23(1):96; doi: 10.1186/s10194-022-01457-1.

24. Irvine K-A, Sahbaie P, Ferguson AR, et al. Enhanced descending pain facilitation in acute traumatic brain injury. Exp Neurol 2019;320:112976; doi: 10.1016/j.expneurol.2019.112976.

25. Ziebell JM, Morganti-Kossmann MC. Involvement of pro- and anti-inflammatory cytokines and chemokines in the pathophysiology of traumatic brain injury. Neurotherapeutics 2010;7(1):22–30; doi: 10.1016/j.nurt.2009.10.016.

26. Csuka E, Morganti-Kossmann MC, Lenzlinger PM, et al. IL-10 levels in cerebrospinal fluid and serum of patients with severe traumatic brain injury: relationship to IL-6, TNF-alpha, TGF-beta1 and blood-brain barrier function. J Neuroimmunol 1999;101(2):211–221; doi: 10.1016/s0165-5728(99)00148-4.

27. Morganti-Kossman MC, Lenzlinger PM, Hans V, et al. Production of cytokines following brain injury: beneficial and deleterious for the damaged tissue. Mol Psychiatry 1997;2(2):133–136; doi: 10.1038/sj.mp.4000227.

28. Semple BD, Bye N, Rancan M, et al. Role of CCL2 (MCP-1) in traumatic brain injury (TBI): evidence from severe TBI patients and CCL2-/- mice. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab 2010;30(4):769–782; doi: 10.1038/jcbfm.2009.262.

29. Sahbaie P, Irvine K-A, Liang D-Y, et al. Mild Traumatic Brain Injury Causes Nociceptive Sensitization through Spinal Chemokine Upregulation. Sci Rep 2019;9(1):19500; doi: 10.1038/s41598-019-55739-x.

30. Faden AI, Wu J, Stoica BA, et al. Progressive inflammation-mediated neurodegeneration after traumatic brain or spinal cord injury. British journal of pharmacology 2016;173(4):681–691.

31. Varma A, Hill EG, Nicholas J, et al. Predictors of early mortality after traumatic spinal cord injury: a population-based study. Spine (Phila Pa 1976) 2010;35(7):778–783; doi: 10.1097/brs.0b013e3181ba1359.

32. Macciocchi S, Seel RT, Thompson N, et al. Spinal Cord Injury and Co-Occurring Traumatic Brain Injury: Assessment and Incidence. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation 2008;89(7):1350–1357; doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2007.11.055.

33. Budisin B, Bradbury CCLB, Sharma B, et al. Traumatic Brain Injury in Spinal Cord Injury: Frequency and Risk Factors. J Head Trauma Rehabil 2016;31(4):E33-42; doi: 10.1097/HTR.0000000000000153.

34. Snell DL, Wynands P, Dunn J, et al. Screening and outcomes of co-occurring traumatic brain injury among people with spinal cord injury: a scoping review. Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine 2025;57:jrm41897–jrm41897; doi: 10.2340/jrm.v57.41897.

35. Pandrich MJ, Demetriades AK. Prevalence of concomitant traumatic cranio-spinal injury: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Neurosurg Rev 2020;43(1):69–77; doi: 10.1007/s10143-018-0988-3.

36. Anonymous. Study Quality Assessment Tools | NHLBI, NIH. n.d. Available from: https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/study-quality-assessment-tools [Last accessed: 2/25/2025].

37. Ramamurthy P, Kumar N, Osman A. Epidemiology, neurological and functional outcome of concomitant traumatic brain and spinal cord injury: An Oswestry experience. Trauma 2017;19(1_suppl):30–32; doi: 10.1177/1460408617718868.

38. Garlanger KL, Beck LA, Cheville AL. Functional outcomes in patients with co-occurring traumatic brain injury and spinal cord injury from an inpatient rehabilitation facility's perspective. J Spinal Cord Med 2018;41(6):718–730; doi: 10.1080/10790268.2018.1465744.

39. Macciocchi SN, Seel RT, Thompson N. The impact of mild traumatic brain injury on cognitive functioning following co-occurring spinal cord injury. Arch Clin Neuropsychol 2013;28(7):684–691; doi: 10.1093/arclin/act049.

40. Snell DL, Johns J, Dunn JA, et al. Difficulties capturing co-occurring traumatic brain injury among people with traumatic spinal cord injury: a population-based study. Spinal Cord 2023;61(1):22–26; doi: 10.1038/s41393-022-00851-5.

41. Melo-Neto JS de, Vidotto LEL, Gomes F de C, et al. Characteristics and clinical aspects of patients with spinal cord injury undergoing surgery. Rev Bras Ortop 2016;52(4):479–490; doi: 10.1016/j.rboe.2016.07.003.

42. Dionne A, Briand M-M, Richard-Denis A, et al. Determining the incidence of concomitant traumatic brain injury in patients with acute spinal cord injury: a ten-year cross-sectional study. Am J Phys Med Rehabil 2025; doi: 10.1097/PHM.0000000000002708.

43. Wei CW, Tharmakulasingam J, Crawley A, et al. Use of diffusion-tensor imaging in traumatic spinal cord injury to identify concomitant traumatic brain injury. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2008;89(12 Suppl):S85-91; doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2008.07.005.

44. Davidoff G, Morris J, Roth E, et al. Cognitive dysfunction and mild closed head injury in traumatic spinal cord injury. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 1985;66(8):489–491.

45. Tolonen A, Turkka J, Salonen O, et al. Traumatic brain injury is under-diagnosed in patients with spinal cord injury. J Rehabil Med 2007;39(8):622–626; doi: 10.2340/16501977-0101.

46. Bombardier CH, Adams LM, Fann JR, et al. Depression Trajectories During the First Year After Spinal Cord Injury. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2016;97(2):196–203; doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2015.10.083.

47. Sharma B, Bradbury C, Mikulis D, et al. Missed diagnosis of traumatic brain injury in patients with traumatic spinal cord injury. J Rehabil Med 2014;46(4):370–373; doi: 10.2340/16501977-1261.

48. Saboe LA, Reid DC, Davis LA, et al. Spine Trauma and Associated Injuries. Journal of Trauma and Acute Care Surgery 1991;31(1):43.

49. Mirzaeva L, Lobzin S, Tcinzerling N, et al. Complications and mortality after acute traumatic spinal cord injury in Saint Petersburg, Russia. Spinal Cord 2020;58(9):970–979; doi: 10.1038/s41393-020-0458-y.

50. Mirzaeva L, Gilhus NE, Lobzin S, et al. Incidence of adult traumatic spinal cord injury in Saint Petersburg, Russia. Spinal Cord 2019;57(8):692–699; doi: 10.1038/s41393-019-0266-4.

51. Kaminski L, Cordemans V, Cernat E, et al. Functional Outcome Prediction after Traumatic Spinal Cord Injury Based on Acute Clinical Factors. J Neurotrauma 2017;34(12):2027–2033; doi: 10.1089/neu.2016.4955.

52. Pagni CA, Massaro F. Concomitant cranio-cerebral and vertebro-medullary injuries. Analysis of 121 cases. Acta neurochir 1991;111(1):1–10; doi: 10.1007/BF01402506.

53. Azad TD, Raj D, Ran KR, et al. Concomitant Traumatic Brain Injury Delays Surgery in Patients With Traumatic Spinal Cord Injury. Neurosurgery 2024;94(6):1246; doi: 10.1227/neu.0000000000002816.

54. Dvorak MF, Evaniew N, Chen M, et al. Impact of Specialized Versus Non-Specialized Acute Hospital Care on Survival Among Patients With Acute Incomplete Traumatic Spinal Cord Injuries: A Population-Based Observational Study from British Columbia, Canada. J Neurotrauma 2023;40(23–24):2638–2647; doi: 10.1089/neu.2022.0496.

55. Mirzaeva L, Lobzin S, Gilhus NE, et al. Influence of age on acute traumatic spinal cord injury in Saint Petersburg, Russia. Spinal Cord Ser Cases 2022;8(1):16; doi: 10.1038/s41394-022-00484-z.

56. Brougham R, David DS, Adornato V, et al. Speech-language pathology treatment time during inpatient spinal cord injury rehabilitation: the SCIRehab project. J Spinal Cord Med 2011;34(2):186–195; doi: 10.1179/107902611X12971826988174.

57. Mansfield K, Meyer K, Ugiliweneza B, et al. Traumatic Spinal Cord Injury with Concomitant Brain Injury: In-hospital Complication Rates and Resource Utilization. 2014.

58. Creasey GH, Lateva ZC, Schüssler-Fiorenza Rose SM, et al. Traumatic brain injury in U.S. Veterans with traumatic spinal cord injury. J Rehabil Res Dev 2015;52(6):669–676; doi: 10.1682/JRRD.2014.11.0291.

59. Gordan W, Gerber D, David DS, et al. Relationship of speech-language pathology inpatient rehabilitation interventions and patient characteristics to outcomes following spinal cord injury: the SCIRehab project. J Spinal Cord Med 2012;35(6):565–577; doi: 10.1179/2045772312Y.0000000063.

60. Macciocchi SN, Bowman B, Coker J, et al. Effect of co-morbid traumatic brain injury on functional outcome of persons with spinal cord injuries. Am J Phys Med Rehabil 2004;83(1):22–26; doi: 10.1097/01.PHM.0000104661.86307.91.

61. Macciocchi S, Seel RT, Warshowsky A, et al. Co-occurring traumatic brain injury and acute spinal cord injury rehabilitation outcomes. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2012;93(10):1788–1794; doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2012.01.022.

62. Bradbury CL, Wodchis WP, Mikulis DJ, et al. Traumatic brain injury in patients with traumatic spinal cord injury: clinical and economic consequences. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2008;89(12 Suppl):S77-84; doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2008.07.008.

63. Sikka S, Vrooman A, Callender L, et al. Inconsistencies with screening for traumatic brain injury in spinal cord injury across the continuum of care. J Spinal Cord Med 2019;42(1):51–56; doi: 10.1080/10790268.2017.1357105.

64. Yang TW, Yoo DH, Huh S, et al. Epidemiology and Assessment of Traumatic Spinal Cord Injury With Concomitant Brain Injury: An Observational Study in a Regional Trauma Center. Ann Rehabil Med 2023;47(5):385–392; doi: 10.5535/arm.23054.

65. Nott MT, Baguley IJ, Heriseanu R, et al. Effects of concomitant spinal cord injury and brain injury on medical and functional outcomes and community participation. Top Spinal Cord Inj Rehabil 2014;20(3):225–235; doi: 10.1310/sci2003-225.

66. Hagen EM, Eide GE, Rekand T, et al. Traumatic spinal cord injury and concomitant brain injury: a cohort study. Acta Neurologica Scandinavica 2010;122(s190):51–57; doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0404.2010.01376.x.

67. Baguley IJ, Barden HL, Nott MT. Altered sexual function after central neurological system trauma is reflective of region of injury; brain vs spinal cord. Brain Inj 2020;34(13–14):1732–1740; doi: 10.1080/02699052.2020.1832258.

68. Furlan J. The Influence of Concomitant Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI) on the Survival, and Neurological and Functional Recovery after Traumatic Spinal Cord Injury (SCI):

Analysis of a Cohort of 499 cases from the Third National Spinal Cord Injury Study. (105). Neurology 2021;96(15_supplement):105; doi: 10.1212/WNL.96.15_supplement.105.

69. Tachino J, Demetriades AK, Peul W, et al. Effects of Concomitant Traumatic Spinal Cord and Brain Injury on In-Hospital Mortality: A Retrospective Analysis of a Nationwide Trauma Registry in Japan. Journal of Neurotrauma 2024;41(17–18):2101–2113; doi: 10.1089/neu.2024.0168.

70. Strubreither W, Hackbusch B, Hermann-Gruber M, et al. Neuropsychological aspects of the rehabilitation of patients with paralysis from a spinal injury who also have a brain injury. Spinal Cord 1997;35(8):487–492; doi: 10.1038/sj.sc.3100495.

71. Brady S, Miserendino R, Statkus D, et al. Predictors to Dysphagia and Recovery After Cervical Spinal Cord Injury During Acute Rehabilitation. | EBSCOhost. 2004. Available from: https://openurl.ebsco.com/contentitem/gcd:12903847?sid=ebsco:plink:crawler&id=ebsco:gcd:12903847 [Last accessed: 3/4/2025].

72. Furlan JC. Concomitant traumatic brain injury as a determinant of survival, and neurological and functional outcomes after traumatic spinal cord injury: A retrospective cohort study. PM R 2024;16(8):804–814; doi: 10.1002/pmrj.13123.

73. Jeret JS, Mandell M, Anziska B, et al. Clinical predictors of abnormality disclosed by computed tomography after mild head trauma. Neurosurgery 1993;32(1):9–15; discussion 15-16; doi: 10.1227/00006123-199301000-00002.

74. Hamrah H, Mehrvarz S, Mirghassemi AM. The Frequency of Brain CT-Scan Findings in Patients with Scalp Lacerations Following Mild Traumatic Brain Injury; A Cross-Sectional Study. Bull Emerg Trauma 2018;6(1):54–58; doi: 10.29252/beat-060108.

75. Lee B, Newberg A. Neuroimaging in Traumatic Brain Imaging. NeuroRx 2005;2(2):372–383; doi: 10.1602/neurorx.2.2.372.

76. Brown AM, Twomey DM, Shee AW. Evaluating mild traumatic brain injury management at a regional emergency department. Injury Prevention 2018;24(5):390–394; doi: 10.1136/injuryprev-2018-042865.

77. Chung S, Wang X, Fieremans E, et al. Altered Relationship between Working Memory and Brain Microstructure after Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol 2019;40(9):1438–1444; doi: 10.3174/ajnr.A6146.

78. Pozzato I, Meares S, Kifley A, et al. Challenges in the acute identification of mild traumatic brain injuries: results from an emergency department surveillance study. BMJ Open 2020;10(2):e034494; doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-034494.

79. Schulz MR, Marshall SW, Mueller FO, et al. Incidence and risk factors for concussion in high school athletes, North Carolina, 1996-1999. Am J Epidemiol 2004;160(10):937–944; doi: 10.1093/aje/kwh304.

80. Collins MW, Iverson GL, Lovell MR, et al. On-field predictors of neuropsychological and symptom deficit following sports-related concussion. Clin J Sport Med 2003;13(4):222–229; doi: 10.1097/00042752-200307000-00005.

81. Tétrault M, Courtois F. Use of psychoactive substances in persons with spinal cord injury: A literature review. Annals of Physical and Rehabilitation Medicine 2014;57(9):684–695; doi: 10.1016/j.rehab.2014.10.002.

82. Forchheimer M, Cunningham RM, Gater DR, et al. The Relationship of Blood Alcohol Concentration to Impairment Severity in Spinal Cord Injury. J Spinal Cord Med 2005;28(4):303–307; doi: 10.1080/10790268.2005.11753824.

83. Yonemitsu T, Kinoshita A, Nagata K, et al. Timely intubation with early prediction of respiratory exacerbation in acute traumatic cervical spinal cord injury. BMC Emergency Medicine 2021;21(1):136; doi: 10.1186/s12873-021-00530-3.

84. Adams RS, Hoover P, Forster JE, et al. Traumatic Brain Injury Classification Variability During the Afghanistan/Iraq Conflicts: Surveillance, Clinical, Research, and Policy Implications. J Head Trauma Rehabil 2022;37(6):361–370; doi: 10.1097/HTR.0000000000000775.

85. Korley FK, Kelen GD, Jones CM, et al. Emergency Department Evaluation of Traumatic Brain Injury in the United States, 2009-2010. J Head Trauma Rehabil 2016;31(6):379–387; doi: 10.1097/HTR.0000000000000187.

86. Corrigan JD, Alosco ML, van der Naalt J, et al. Retrospective Identification and Characterization of Traumatic Brain Injury—Recommendations from the 2024 National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke Traumatic Brain Injury Classification and Nomenclature Initiative Retrospective Classification Working Group. Journal of Neurotrauma 2025; doi: 10.1089/neu.2024.0590.

87. Pettengill J, Carreras A, Miller S, et al. 426 Missed Diagnosis of Mild Traumatic Brain Injury: Retrospective Study in an Urban Emergency Department. Annals of Emergency Medicine 2024;84(4):S191; doi: 10.1016/j.annemergmed.2024.08.424.

88. Powell JM, Ferraro JV, Dikmen SS, et al. Accuracy of mild traumatic brain injury diagnosis. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2008;89(8):1550–1555; doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2007.12.035.

89. Zangi M, Pickering JW, Theadom A, et al. Mild and moderate traumatic brain injury: Screening, documentation, and referral to concussion services. Australasian Emergency Care 2025; doi: 10.1016/j.auec.2025.03.007.

90. Ivancic PC. Mechanisms and Mitigation of Head and Spinal Injuries Due to Motor Vehicle Crashes. J Orthop Sports Phys Ther 2016;46(10):826–833; doi: 10.2519/jospt.2016.6716.

91. Ackery A, Tator C, Krassioukov A. A global perspective on spinal cord injury epidemiology. J Neurotrauma 2004;21(10):1355–1370; doi: 10.1089/neu.2004.21.1355.

92. van den Berg MEL, Castellote JM, Mahillo-Fernandez I, et al. Incidence of spinal cord injury worldwide: a systematic review. Neuroepidemiology 2010;34(3):184–192; discussion 192; doi: 10.1159/000279335.

93. Maas AIR, Menon DK, Adelson PD, et al. Traumatic brain injury: integrated approaches to improve prevention, clinical care, and research. Lancet Neurol 2017;16(12):987–1048; doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(17)30371-X.

94. Shrago GG. Cervical spine injuries: association with head trauma. A review of 50 patients. Am J Roentgenol Radium Ther Nucl Med 1973;118(3):670–673; doi: 10.2214/ajr.118.3.670.

95. Tang A, Gambhir N, Menken LG, et al. Identification of concomitant injuries associated with specific spine level fractures in polytrauma patients. Injury 2022;53(3):1068–1072; doi: 10.1016/j.injury.2021.12.005.

96. Niemeyer M, Jochems D, Houwert R, et al. Mortality in polytrauma patients with moderate to severe TBI on par with isolated TBI patients: TBI as last frontier in polytrauma patients. Injury 2022;53(4):1443–1448; doi: 10.1016/j.injury.2022.01.009.

97. Rosyidi RM, Priyanto B, Laraswati NKP, et al. Characteristics and clinical outcome of traumatic brain injury in Lombok, Indonesia. Interdisciplinary Neurosurgery 2019;18:100470; doi: 10.1016/j.inat.2019.04.015.

98. Chamberlain JD, Meier S, Mader L, et al. Mortality and Longevity after a Spinal Cord Injury: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. n.d.

99. Fallah N, Noonan VK, Waheed Z, et al. Development of a machine learning algorithm for predicting in-hospital and 1-year mortality after traumatic spinal cord injury. Spine J 2022;22(2):329–336; doi: 10.1016/j.spinee.2021.08.003.

100. Lenehan B, Street J, Kwon BK, et al. The Epidemiology of Traumatic Spinal Cord Injury in British Columbia, Canada. Spine 2012;37(4):321; doi: 10.1097/BRS.0b013e31822e5ff8.

101. Omar M, Moore L, Lauzier F, et al. Complications following hospital admission for traumatic brain injury: A multicenter cohort study. J Crit Care 2017;41:1–8; doi: 10.1016/j.jcrc.2017.04.031.

102. Goyal K, Hazarika A, Khandelwal A, et al. Non- Neurological Complications after Traumatic Brain Injury: A Prospective Observational Study. Indian J Crit Care Med 2018;22(9):632–638; doi: 10.4103/ijccm.IJCCM_156_18.

103. García-Rudolph A, Devilleneuve EA, Wright MA, et al. Optimizing length of hospital stay among inpatients with spinal cord injury: An observational study. J Healthc Qual Res 2025;40(2):79–88; doi: 10.1016/j.jhqr.2024.11.001.

104. Hess DW, Kolakowsky-Hayner SA, Cifu DX, et al. A comparative study of outcomes and expenses following tetraplegia and paraplegia. J Spinal Cord Med 2000;23(4):228–233; doi: 10.1080/10790268.2000.11753530.

105. Keith RA, Granger CV, Hamilton BB, et al. The functional independence measure: a new tool for rehabilitation. Adv Clin Rehabil 1987;1:6–18.

106. Torres A. Capturing Functional Independence Measure (FIM®) Ratings. Rehabil Nurs 2018;43(1):3–11; doi: 10.1002/rnj.284.

107. Stineman MG, Shea JA, Jette A, et al. The Functional Independence Measure: tests of scaling assumptions, structure, and reliability across 20 diverse impairment categories. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 1996;77(11):1101–1108; doi: 10.1016/s0003-9993(96)90130-6.

108. Middleton JW, Harvey LA, Batty J, et al. Five additional mobility and locomotor items to improve responsiveness of the FIM in wheelchair-dependent individuals with spinal cord injury. Spinal Cord 2006;44(8):495–504; doi: 10.1038/sj.sc.3101872.

109. Yavuz MS, Asirdizer M, Cetin G, et al. The correlation between skull fractures and intracranial lesions due to traffic accidents. Am J Forensic Med Pathol 2003;24(4):339–345; doi: 10.1097/01.paf.0000103011.14578.c3.

110. Morganti B, Scivoletto G, Ditunno P, et al. Walking index for spinal cord injury (WISCI): criterion validation. Spinal Cord 2005;43(1):27–33; doi: 10.1038/sj.sc.3101658.

111. Catz A, Itzkovich M, Agranov E, et al. The spinal cord independence measure (SCIM): sensitivity to functional changes in subgroups of spinal cord lesion patients. Spinal Cord 2001;39(2):97–100; doi: 10.1038/sj.sc.3101118.

112. Catz A, Itzkovich M, Agranov E, et al. SCIM--spinal cord independence measure: a new disability scale for patients with spinal cord lesions. Spinal Cord 1997;35(12):850–856; doi: 10.1038/sj.sc.3100504.

113. Eckert MJ, Martin MJ. Trauma: Spinal Cord Injury. Surg Clin North Am 2017;97(5):1031–1045; doi: 10.1016/j.suc.2017.06.008.

114. Guskiewicz KM, Riemann BL, Perrin DH, et al. Alternative approaches to the assessment of mild head injury in athletes. Med Sci Sports Exerc 1997;29(7 Suppl):S213-221; doi: 10.1097/00005768-199707001-00003.

115. Guskiewicz KM, Perrin DH, Gansneder BM. Effect of mild head injury on postural stability in athletes. J Athl Train 1996;31(4):300–306.

116. Geurts ACH, Knoop JA, van Limbeek J. Is postural control associated with mental functioning in the persistent postconcussion syndrome? Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation 1999;80(2):144–149; doi: 10.1016/S0003-9993(99)90111-9.

117. Pan T, Liao K, Roenigk K, et al. Static and dynamic postural stability in veterans with combat-related mild traumatic brain injury. Gait Posture 2015;42(4):550–557; doi: 10.1016/j.gaitpost.2015.08.012.

118. Kunker K, Peters DM, Mohapatra S. Long-term impact of mild traumatic brain injury on postural stability and executive function. Neurol Sci 2020;41(7):1899–1907; doi: 10.1007/s10072-020-04300-0.

119. Brett BL, Temkin N, Barber JK, et al. Long-term Multidomain Patterns of Change After Traumatic Brain Injury. Neurology 2023;101(7):e740–e753; doi: 10.1212/WNL.0000000000207501.

120. Broglio SP, Puetz TW. The Effect of Sport Concussion on Neurocognitive Function, Self-Report Symptoms and Postural Control. Sports Med 2008;38(1):53–67; doi: 10.2165/00007256-200838010-00005.

121. Mavroudis I, Ciobica A, Bejenariu AC, et al. Cognitive Impairment following Mild Traumatic Brain Injury (mTBI): A Review. Medicina 2024;60(3):380; doi: 10.3390/medicina60030380.

122. Hess DW, Marwitz JH, Kreutzer JS. Neuropsychological impairments after spinal cord injury: A comparative study with mild traumatic brain injury. Rehabilitation Psychology 2003;48(3):151–156; doi: 10.1037/0090-5550.48.3.151.

123. Cohen ML, Tulsky DS, Holdnack JA, et al. Cognition among community-dwelling individuals with spinal cord injury. Rehabil Psychol 2017;62(4):425–434; doi: 10.1037/rep0000140.

124. Craig A, Guest R, Tran Y, et al. Cognitive Impairment and Mood States after Spinal Cord Injury. J Neurotrauma 2017;34(6):1156–1163; doi: 10.1089/neu.2016.4632.

125. Alcántar-Garibay OV, Incontri-Abraham D, Ibarra A. Spinal cord injury-induced cognitive impairment: a narrative review. Neural Regeneration Research 2022;17(12):2649; doi: 10.4103/1673-5374.339475.

126. Sachdeva R, Gao F, Chan CCH, et al. Cognitive function after spinal cord injury: A systematic review. Neurology 2018;91(13):611–621; doi: 10.1212/WNL.0000000000006244.

127. Delarue Q, Robac A, Semprez F, et al. Brain inflammation and cognitive decline induced by spinal cord injury can be reversed by spinal cord cell transplants. Brain Behav Immun 2025;125:388–397; doi: 10.1016/j.bbi.2025.01.014.

128. Carlozzi NE, Troost JP, Singhal N, et al. The association between medication use and cognitive performance in people with SCI. Rehabilitation Psychology 2021;66(4):541–549; doi: 10.1037/rep0000412.

129. Chiaravalloti ND, Weber ,Erica, Wylie ,Glenn, et al. Patterns of cognitive deficits in persons with spinal cord injury as compared with both age-matched and older individuals without spinal cord injury. The Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine 2020;43(1):88–97; doi: 10.1080/10790268.2018.1543103.

130. Jegede AB, Rosado-Rivera D, Bauman WA, et al. Cognitive performance in hypotensive persons with spinal cord injury. Clin Auton Res 2010;20(1):3–9; doi: 10.1007/s10286-009-0036-z.

131. Phillips AA, Warburton DER, Ainslie PN, et al. Regional neurovascular coupling and cognitive performance in those with low blood pressure secondary to high-level spinal cord injury: improved by alpha-1 agonist midodrine hydrochloride. J Cereb Blood Flow Metab 2014;34(5):794–801; doi: 10.1038/jcbfm.2014.3.

132. Wecht JM, Bauman WA. Decentralized cardiovascular autonomic control and cognitive deficits in persons with spinal cord injury. J Spinal Cord Med 2013;36(2):74–81; doi: 10.1179/2045772312Y.0000000056.

133. Chiaravalloti ND, Weber ,Erica, Wylie ,Glenn, et al. The impact of level of injury on patterns of cognitive dysfunction in individuals with spinal cord injury. The Journal of Spinal Cord Medicine 2020;43(5):633–641; doi: 10.1080/10790268.2019.1696076.

134. Magyar-Sumegi ZD, Csendes M, Lendvai-Emmert D, et al. Chronic impairment of neurovascular coupling and cognitive decline in young survivors of severe traumatic brain injury. Geroscience 2025; doi: 10.1007/s11357-025-01683-w.

135. Sharma A, Hind K, Hume P, et al. Neurovascular Coupling by Functional Near Infra-Red Spectroscopy and Sport-Related Concussion in Retired Rugby Players: The UK Rugby Health Project. Front Hum Neurosci 2020;14; doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2020.00042.

136. Rodriguez UA, Zeng Y, Deyo D, et al. Effects of Mild Blast Traumatic Brain Injury on Cerebral Vascular, Histopathological, and Behavioral Outcomes in Rats. J Neurotrauma 2018;35(2):375–392; doi: 10.1089/neu.2017.5256.

137. Toth P, Szarka N, Farkas E, et al. Traumatic brain injury-induced autoregulatory dysfunction and spreading depression-related neurovascular uncoupling: Pathomechanisms, perspectives, and therapeutic implications. Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol 2016;311(5):H1118–H1131; doi: 10.1152/ajpheart.00267.2016.

138. Titman R, Liang J, Craven BC. Diagnostic accuracy and feasibility of depression screening in spinal cord injury: A systematic review. J Spinal Cord Med 2019;42(Suppl 1):99–107; doi: 10.1080/10790268.2019.1606556.

139. Gitaari M, Mikolić A, Panenka WJ, et al. Diagnostic Accuracy of Mental Health Screening Tools After Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. JAMA Netw Open 2024;7(7):e2424076; doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.24076.

140. Williams R, Murray A. Prevalence of depression after spinal cord injury: a meta-analysis. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2015;96(1):133–140; doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2014.08.016.

141. Alway Y, Gould KR, Johnston L, et al. A prospective examination of Axis I psychiatric disorders in the first 5 years following moderate to severe traumatic brain injury. Psychol Med 2016;46(6):1331–1341; doi: 10.1017/S0033291715002986.

142. Ponsford J, Alway Y, Gould KR. Epidemiology and Natural History of Psychiatric Disorders After TBI. J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci 2018;30(4):262–270; doi: 10.1176/appi.neuropsych.18040093.

143. Dehbozorgi M, Maghsoudi MR, Mohammadi I, et al. Incidence of anxiety after traumatic brain injury: a systematic review and meta-analysis. BMC Neurology 2024;24(1):293; doi: 10.1186/s12883-024-03791-0.

144. Dehbozorgi M, Maghsoudi MR, Rajai S, et al. Depression after traumatic brain injury: A systematic review and Meta-analysis. The American Journal of Emergency Medicine 2024;86:21–29; doi: 10.1016/j.ajem.2024.08.039.

Table 1: Diagnostic criteria utlised to identify the presence of concomitant TBI. Data is presented from lowest to highest incidence in the prevalence studies, with studies grouped as an incidence <30% (green) 30-50% (blue) or >50% (orange).

	Diagnostic criteria							Determination	Data source
	PTA	LOC	GCS	Neuroimaging	Symptoms/signs	Billing codes	Other		
Prevalence/Incidence studies									
Varma, 2010						ICD-9 (not specified)			Retrospective, hospital medical records
Ramamurthy, 2017	Present	Mild < 5mins Mod:5-24h Sev:>24h	Mild: 14-15 Mod: 9-14 Severe: 3-8		Mild: - focal neurological deficits Mod/Sev: +ve Focal neurological deficits			Only one criterion required for diagnosis	Retrospective, hospital medical records
Azad, 2024						ICD-9, 10 (700, 801, 803, 804, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, S02.0, S02.1, S02.91, S04.02, S04.03, S04.04, S06, S07.1)			Retrospective, National Trauma Data Bank
Furlan, 2023			<15						Retrospective, NASCIS 3 study
Melo Nelo, 2014			Mild: 13-15 Mod:9-12 Sev:3-8						Prospective, Hospital admission
Dvorak, 2023						ICD-10 (not specified)			Retrospective, Spinal Cord/Trauma registry
Strubreither, 1997					Not specified				Retrospective rehab admission records
Tachino, 2024			Mild: 13-15 Mod:9-12 Sev:3-8						Retrospective, Japan trauma bank
Creasey, 2015						ICD-9 (not specified)	Reference to `TBI', `brain injury', `brain trauma', `head injury', ` head trauma' or `LOC'		Retrospective, hospital medical records
Saboe 1990									Retrospective, hospital medical records
Yang, 2023	Mild <24h Mod 1-7d Sev >7d		Mild: 13-15 Mod:9-12 Sev:3-8	Mod:sev +ve	Mild: MoCA>18 Mod: MoCA 14-18 Sev MoCA <14			Either PTA or LOC	Retrospective, hospital medical records
Brougham, 2011						ICD-9 (not specified)			Retrospective, hospital medical records
Wei, 2008				MRI +ve					Prospective, rehab centre

Bombardier, 2016	Present		Mild:13-15 Mod:9-12 Sev:3-8	CT+ve	Mental status change		Resident/attending diagnosis	GCS<15 = always TBI If GCS=15 need +CT or PTA	Retrospective, hospital medical records
Mansfield, 2014						ICD-9: 800.0-804.99, 850.0-854.19, 959.0			Retrospective, US trauma bank
Mirzaeva, 2022						ICD-10, code S06			Retrospective, hospital medical records
Budisin, 2016	Present	Present	Present	Positive				Require 2 of PTA, LOC and GCS of 14 or below OR positive neuroimaging.	Retrospective, hospital medical records Prospective: Neuroimaging
Davidoff, 1985	Present	Present						Only one of the criteria needed for diagnosis	Prospective, interview on admission to rehab
Nott, 2014		Present	<15	Abnormal	Positive			Only one of the criteria needed for diagnosis	Retrospective, hospital medical records
Mirzaeva, 2019									Retrospective, hospital records
Mirzaeva, 2020									Retrospective, hospital medical records
Garlanger, 2018	Mild: <24h Mod/Sev: >24h	Mild <30 mins Mod/Sev: >30 mins	Mild: 13-15 Mod/Sev: <13	Evidence of Skull fracture, intracranial haematoma, contusion				Only one of the criteria needed for diagnosis	Retrospective, hospital records, neuroimaging, neuropsychology notes and rehabilitation notes
Gordan, 2012		Present				ICD-9: 800–801.99, 803–804.99, 850–854.19, 873.0–873.1, 873.8–873.9, 905.0, 907.0, 959.01	Reported brain injury complication e.g SAH contusion, concussion	Only one of the criteria needed for diagnosis	Retrospective, hospital medical records
Roth, 1989		Mild <20 mins	Mild: 13-15						Prospective, interview on admission to rehab
Sharma, 2014	Present	Present	<13	Positive (CT, MRI)	IQ testing			Require 2 of PTA, LOC and GCS of 13 or below OR positive neuroimaging. OR change in pre-morbid IQ	Prospective neurological examinations Retrospective, hospital medical record review.
Kaminksi, 2017									Retrospective, unknown
Hagen, 2010		Mild < 5mins Mod:5-24h	Mild: 14-15 Mod: 9-14 Severe: 3-8		Mild: No focal neurological deficits Mod: Focal neurological deficits			Require one of GCS <15 or LOC for TBI	Retrospective, hospital medical records
Dionne, 2025	Mild <24h Mod:1-6d Sev: >7d	Present	Mild:13-15 Mod:9-12 Sev:3-8					Only one of PTA, LOC or +ve neuroimaging required	Prospective, neurosurgeon evaluation on admission to hospital
Pagni, 1991									Retrospective, hospital medical records
Snell, 2023	Mild <24h		Mild: 13-15	CT or MRI*				Neuroimaging only used to	Retrospective, hospital

	Mod:1-6d Sev: >7d		Mod:9-12 Sev:3-8					separate mild (negative) from mild complicated, mod-sev (present)	medical, emergency medical services, surgical and acute rehabilitation records.
Richards, 1988		Present							Prospective, interview rehab admission
Macciocchi, 2008	Mild <24h Mod:1-6d Sev: >7d		Mild: 13-15 Mod:9-12 Sev:3-8	CT or MRI*				Either PTA or +ve neuroimaging required	Retrospective, hospital medical, emergency medical services, surgical and acute rehabilitation records.
Sikka, 2019	Present	Present	Mild:13-14 Mod:9-12 Sev:3-8	Positive	Cognitive deficits	ICD-9 (not specified)		One of PTA, LOC or +ve neuroimaging required	Retrospective, hospital medical records
Bombardier 2016	Present	Mild <30min, Mod:30min-24h, Sev: >24h			Mental status change			Improbable TBI = no LOC/mental status change Possible TBI = mentals status, no LOC TBI = LOC	Prospective, interview at rehab admission, *(Step 2 of the TBI-4 Self report)*
Tolonen, 2009	Mild <24h Mod 1-7d Sev >7d	Mild <30 mins Mod: 30 mins= 6h Severe > 6h	Mild: 13-15 Mod:9-12 Sev:3-8	Mild: None Mod: +ve Sev +ve, operated	Mild: No symptoms Mod: Transient Sev: Permanent deficit			Only one of the criteria needed for diagnosis	Prospective, interview at rehab admission Retrospective hospital record review
Case-matched studies									
Baguley, 2019		Present	<15	Positive	Positive			Only one of the criteria needed for diagnosis	Retrospective, hospital admission records
Bradbury, 2008	Present	Present		+ve CT (acute care) +ve MRI# (2-6m)	Positive			Required +ve neuroimaging for diagnosis	Retrospective, hospital admission records
Macciocchi, 2004	Present	Present	Mild:13-15 Mod:9-12 Severe:3-8	CT imaging				Either LOC or PTA required	Retrospective, hospital admission records
Macciocchi, 2012	Mild <24h Mod:1-6d Sev: >7d		Mild: 13-15 Mod:9-12 Sev:3-8	CT or MRI*				Either PTA or +ve neuroimaging required	Retrospective, hospital admission records
Macciocchi 2013	Mild: PTA <24h			CT negative				Either PTA or GCS<15 required	Retrospective, hospital medical, emergency medical services, surgical and acute rehabilitation records.

Table 2: Reported incidence of concomitant TBI with SCI

Study	Location	Population	Sample size	% Concomitant injury
Azad, 2024	USA	Hospital	SCI:12,520 DDx:2444	16%
Bombardier, 2016	USA	Rehabilitation centre	SCI: 70 DDx: 35	33% (medical records) 63% (self-report)
Brougham, 2011	USA	Rehabilitation centre	SCI: 424 DDx: 176	29%
Budisin, 2016	Canada	Rehabilitation centre	SCI: 55/26 DDx: 36	39.5% (inc ambiguous) 58% (w/o ambiguous)
Creasey, 2015	USA	Veterans Affairs program	SCI: 310 DDx: 99	24%
Davidoff, 1985	USA	Rehabilitation centre	SCI: 18 DDx: 12	40%
Dionne, 2025	Canada	Hospital	SCI:250 DDx:226	47%
Dvorak, 2023	Canada	Hospital	SCI: 1,603 DDx: 317	17%
Furlan,2021	USA	Hospital	SCI:413 DDx:86	17%
Garlanger, 2018	USA	Rehabilitation centre	SCI: 152 DDx: 104	40.5%
Gordan, 2012	USA	Rehabilitation centre	SCI: 602 DDx: 430	42%
Hagen, 2010	Norway	Hospital	SCI: 179 DDx: 157	47%
Kaminski, 2017	Canada	Hospital	SCI: 41 DDx: 35	46%
Macciocchi, 2008	USA	Rehabilitation centre	SCI: 79 DDx: 119	60%
Mansfield, 2014	USA	National Trauma Data Bank	SCI:10609 DDx:5968	36%
Melo Neto, 2014	Brazil	Hospital	SCI:269 DDx:52	16%
Mirzaeva, 2019	Russia	Hospital	SCI: 322 DDx: 130	40%
Mirzaeva, 2020	Russia	Hospital	SCI: 188 DDx: 123	40%
Mirzaeva, 2022	Russia	Hospital	SCI:220 DDx:123	36%
Nott, 2014	Australia	Rehabilitation centre	SCI:131 DDx:37	37%
Pagni and Massaro, 1991	Italy	Hospital	SCI:104 DDx:121	54%
Ramamurthy, 2017	England	Rehabilitation centre	SCI: 242 DDx: 27	10%
Roth,1989	England	Rehabilitation centre	SCI:46 DDx:35	44%
Richards, 1988	USA	Rehabilitation centre	SCI:62 DDx:88	58.5%
Saboe, 1990	Canada	Hospital	SCI:375 DDx:133	26%
Sharma, 2014	Canada	Rehabilitation centre	SCI: 51 DDx: 41	44.5%
Sikka, 2019	USA	Hospital	SCI: 17 DDx: 32	65%
Snell, 2023	New Zealand	Hospital	SCI: 31/23 DDx: 20/28	39% 55% (inc probable)
Strubreither, 1997	Austria	Rehabilitation centre	SCI:275 DDx:47	17%
Tachino, 2024	Japan	Hospital	SCI:9590 DDx 2954	24%
Tolonen, 2007	Finland	Rehabilitation centre	SCI: 8 DDx: 23	74%
Varma, 2010	USA	Hospital	SCI: 1,857 DDx: 138	7.5%
Wei, 2008	Canada	Rehabilitation centre	SCI: 15 DDx: 7	32%
Yang, 2023	Korea	Hospital	SCI:289 DDx:74	26%

Table 3: Injury characteristics of SCI and DDx patients

Paper	Age				Sex (%male)				Mechanism of injury				TBI severity	SCI severity				SCI level			
	SCI	DDX			SCI	DDX			SCI	DDx				SCI	DDx			SCI	DDx		
Azad, 2024	49.0 (32-62)	50 (31-62)			75%	76%			MVA:38% Fall:50.5%	MVA:52% Fall:38%			Mild:80.5% Moderate:5% Sev:14.5%								
Bombardier 2016													Mild:94% Moderate:6%								
Budisin, 2016	38.5 (19-55)	36 (18-55)			67%	43%			MVA: 25.5% Falls: 47% Sport: 20% Assault: 8%	MVA: 53% Falls: 33% Sport: 11% Assault: 3%				A: 22% B: 16% C: 20% D: 42%	A: 44.5% B: 5.5% C: 22% D: 28%			C: 58% T: 33% L: 9%	C: 50% T: 36% L: 5.5%		
Creasey, 2015	20-39: 6.5% 40-59: 31.3% 60+: 62.3%	20-39: 17% 40-59: 37% 60+: 45.5%			99%	95%			MVA: 52% Falls: 16% Sport: 14% Assault: 14%	MVA: 59% Falls: 24% Sport: 12% Assault: 2%				C: 46.5% I: 53.5%	C: 31% I: 69%			Para: 48% Tetra: 52%	Para: 43.5% Tetra: 56.5%		
Dionne, 2025	>65 : 64 (26)%	>65 : 65(29)%			81%	81%			MVA:21% Falls:51%	MVA:35% Falls:42%			Mld:94% Moderate:3% Severe:3%	A:27% B:9% C:16% D:48%	A:26% B:10% C:18% D:37%			Para: 42% Tetra:58%	Para:31% Tetra:69%		
Davidoff, 1985	34(32)	32(24)							MVA:17%	MVA:69%											
Furlan, 2021	35.8±0.08	39.8±1.17			84%	87%			MVA:43% Fall:29% Sport:7%	MVA:53% Fall:18.5% Sport:10.5%			Mild:53% Mod:43%	C:46.5% I:45%	C:66% I: 29.5%			C:65% T/L:35%	C:82% T/L:18%		
Garlanger, 2018	48.1 (±20.4)	Mild 45.8 (±21)	Mod-sev: 41.5 (±17)		72%	Mild: 81%	Mod-sev: 71%		MVA: 37.5% Falls: 39.5% Sport: 8%	Mild: MVA: 56% Falls: 29% Sport: 10%	Mod-sev MVA: 84.5% Falls: 13% Sport: 2%		Mild:57% Mod/sev:43%	A: 27% B: 9% C: 20% D: 36% E: 4%	Mild: A: 37% B: 8.5% C: 11.9% D: 37% E: 4%	Mod-sev: A: 36% B: 4% C: 20% D: 33% E: 4%		C: 57% T: 26% L/S: 18%	Mild: C: 66% T: 32% L/S: 2%	Mod: C: 55.5% T: 26.5% L/S: 18%	
Hagen, 2010	43.9 (±20.7)	Mild 45.1 ±23.1	Mod 40.9 ±20.2	Sev 25.7 ±18.6	82%	Mild 81%	Mod 84%	Sev 95%	MVA: 27% Falls: 50% Sport: 10% Assault: 3%	Mild: MVA: 35% Falls: 44.5% Sport: 10% Assault: 0%	Mod MVA: 43% Falls: 43% Sport: 3% Assault: 0%	Sev MVA: 79% Falls: 21% Sport: 0% Assault: 0%	Mild: 64% Mod: 24% Sev: 12%	C: 65.5% I: 34.5%	Mild C: 40% I: 60%	Mod C: 57% I: 43%	Sev C: 79% I: 21%	C: 48% T: 28.5% L/S: 23.5%	Mild C: 59% T: 27% L/S: 14%	Mod C: 59.5% T: 32% L/S: 8%	Sev C: 42% T: 47% L/S: 10.5%
Mansfield, 2014	41 (20)	42(20)			76%	73.5%			MVA:46% Fall:28%	MVA:61% FAll:22%											
Macciocchi, 2008													Mild: 73% Moderate: 10% Sev: 17%								
Melo Nelo 2014													Mild:65% Moderate:8% Severe:27%								
Ramamurthy													Mild: 48% Moderate: 33%								

2017							Sev: 19%						
Sikka, 2019	38 ±17.2	39.9 ±18.7	88% :	78%	MVA: 24% Falls: 18% Sport: 12% Gunshot: 47%	MVA: 34% Falls: 34% Sport: 6% Gunshot: 22%	Mild: 56% Mod: 9% Sev: 34%	A: 24% B: 12% C: 41% D: 24%	A: 31% B: 9% C: 16% D: 41%	C: 29% T: 35% L: 35%	C: 56% T: 34% L: 18%		
Snell, 2023	49.8 ±20.1 (16-91)	48.2 ±20.4 (16-83)	61%	82%	MVA: 26% Falls: 30.5% Sport: 30.5% Assault: 0%	MVA: 39% Falls: 25% Sport: 28.5% Assault: 3.5%	Mild: 82% Mod: 7% Sev: 11%	A-C: 52% D: 48%	A-C: 93% D: 7%	C: 26% T-S: 26%	C: 64% T-S:29%		
Tolonen, 2007										C: 63% T2-7: 12.5% T7+: 25%	Mild C: 33% T2-7: 33% T7+: 33%	Mod C: 50% T2-7: 25% T7+: 25%	Sev C: 44% T2-7: 33% T7+:22%
Tachino, 2024							Mild:81% Mod:8% Sev:11%						
Wei, 2008	35.7 ±11.1	31.6 ±12.0	86.5% :	71.5%	MVA: 33% Falls: 47% Sport: 20%	MVA: 57% Falls: 43% Sport: 0%		C: 33% I: 67%	C: 43% I: 57%	C: 53% T: 40% L: 7%	C: 43% T: 43% L: 14%		
Macciocchi, 2013	28.7±9.8	26.8±9.9	77%	89%	MVA:39% Falls:5% Sport:20% Assault:36%	MVA:74% Falls:15% Sport:7.5% Assault:4%		A-C:86% D:14%	A-C:83% D:17%	C:42% T-S:58%%	C:52% T-S:48%		

Table 4: Patient outcomes in DDx compared to SCI alone

Study	Type	Population	Group size	Time-frame assessed	Length of Hospital stay	Length of rehabilitation stay	Test used	Motor	Cognitive	Autonomic	Psychological	Other
Baguley, 2020	Case-matched	Rehab centre	SCI: 24 DDx: 28	3 months	ns	ns	FIM	ns	ns			
							Sexual Function: SASIQ			ns		
Bombardier, 2016	Cohort	Rehab centre	SCI: 70 DDx: 35	Rehab admit – 1 year	ns	ns	FIM	ns (admit)				No effect on pressure ulcers, UTIs
								ns (discharge)				
								ns (1-year post-injury)				
							Patient Health Questionnaire-2				ns	
Bradbury, 2008	Case-matched	Rehab centre	SCI: 10 DDx: 10	2-6 months	ns		Digit span forwards		ns			Increased behavioural incidents
							Stroop		*			
							WMS-II		ns			
							CLVT		*			
							WMS-II		ns			
							Hooper visual orientation		ns			
							Matrix reasoning		ns			
							Digit span backwards		*			
							WCST		ns			
							FIM	ns	ns			
Davidoff, 1985	Cohort	Rehab centre	SCI: 18 DDx: 12	8-12 weeks			HCT		ns			
Furlan, 2023	Cohort	Hospital	SCI:413 DDx:86	3 weeks-1 year			NASCIS motor, pain and sensory score	- 3d, 6w, 6m, 1 yr				No effect on survival, pain and sensory scores from 3d to 1y.
							FIM	- 6w, 6m, 1y				
Garlanger, 2018	Cohort	Rehab centre	SCI: 152 DDx (mild):59 DDx (mod/sev): 45	Rehab admit	ns	ns	FIM	ns (m+m/s TBI) (admission)	* (m+m/s TBI) (admission)			
								ns (m+m/s TBI) (discharge)	ns (mTBI) ** (mod/s TBI) (discharge)			
								ns (mTBI) * (mod/s TBI) (efficiency)	ns (m+m/s TBI) (efficiency)			
Kaminski, 2017	Cohort	Hospital	SCI: 41 DDx: 35	1-year			SCIM III	ns				
Macciocchi, 2004	Cohort	Hospital	SCI: 41 DDx: 34	Rehab admit	ns		FIM	ns (admission)	* (admission)			
								ns (discharge)	* (discharge)			
								* (gain)	ns (gain)			
Macciocchi, 2008	Cohort	Rehab centre	SCI: 79 DDx: 119	Rehab admit			FIM		* (only when mod or sev TBI)			
Macciocchi, 2012	Cohort	Rehab centre	Tetraplegia SCI: 35 DDx: 59	Rehab admit	ns	ns	FIM (motor)	ns				
							FIM (comprehension)		* (admission)			
									ns			

									(discharge)			
							FIM (problem solving)		* (admission)			
									ns (discharge)			
							FIM (memory)		* (admission)			
									* (discharge)			
							WAIS 3-Digit		*			
							WAIS 3 L-N Seq		*			
							HLVT Recall		ns			
							HLVT Del Recall		ns			
							SDMT-Oral		ns			
			Paraplegia SCI: 42 DDx: 51	Rehab admit	***	**	FIM (motor)	* (admission)				
								** (discharge)				
							FIM (comprehension)		*** (admission)			
									*** (discharge)			
							FIM (problem solving)		*** (admission)			
									** (discharge)			
							FIM (memory)		*** (admission)			
									** (discharge)			
							WAIS 3-Digit		ns			
							WAIS 3 L-N Seq		ns			
							HLVT Recall		**			
							HLVT Del Recall		*			
							SDMT-Oral		***			
Macciocchi, 2013	Case-matched	Rehab centre	SCI: 64 DDx: 53	Rehab admit			HVLT Delayed		ns			
							HVLT Total		ns			
							WAIS-3 DS		ns			
							WAIS-3 LNS		ns			
							SCAT		ns			
							CVMT Total		ns			
							SDMT Oral		ns			
Mansfield, 2014	Cohort	National Trauma Bank		Hospital stay								Increased time in ICU, increased risk of in-hospital complications (DVT, infection, pneumonia) and increased mortality
Mirzaeva, 2020	Cohort	Hospital	SCI: 123 DDx: 188	Rehab admit								Increased complications during hospital stay (respiratory, pressure ulcers, sepsis).
Nott, 2014	Case-matched	Hospital / Rehab	SCI: 30 DDx: 30	3.6 years	*	ns	FIM	ns (admission)	ns (admission)			No difference in pain, UTI or sleep.
								ns (discharge)	ns (discharge)			
								ns	ns			

								(time of interview)	(time of interview)			
							Interview			ns (sexual dysfunction, bladder, bowel)		
							DASS-21				ns (anxiety)	
											ns (depression)	
Sikka, 2019	Cohort	Hospital	SCI: 17 DDx: 32	Rehab admit		ns	FIM	* (admission)	* (admission)			
								* (discharge)	* (discharge)			
								ns (gain)	ns (gain)			
								ns (efficiency)	ns (efficiency)			
Tachino, 2024	Cohort	Hospital/Rehab	SCI:9590 DDx 2954									Increased mortality during hospital admission in a TBI severity dependent manner.
Varma, 2010	Cohort	Hospital	SCI: 1,857 DDx: 138									Increased mortality during hospital admission
Yang 2023	Cohort	Hospital Korea	SCI:289 DDx:74	11-43 days								Increased conversion from ASIA A to ASIA B