

1 **Improved mTBI outcomes with a BCI Amplified CRT Training: A retrospective chart**  
2 **review**

3 *C.T. Cripe,<sup>1,2</sup> P. Mikulecky<sup>3</sup>, Rebecca Cooper<sup>2</sup>, T. Eagan<sup>3</sup>*

4 *1-Fordham University – Visiting Scholar, 2- NTLGroup, Inc, 3-Neurologics, Inc.*

5 *Corresponding author contact info: Peter Mikulecky – 858.539.9529: [licere@hotmail.com](mailto:licere@hotmail.com)*

6

7 **Abstract** This study is a retrospective chart review of 200 clients who participated in a non-  
8 verbal restorative Cognitive Remediation Training (*r*CRT) program. The program was applied to  
9 effect proper neural functional remodeling needed to support resilient, flexible and adaptable  
10 behaviors after encountering a mild to medium closed head traumatic brain injury (mTBI). The  
11 *r*CRT training program focused on improving functional performance in executive cognitive  
12 control networks as defined by fMRI studies. All *r*CRT training activities were delivered in a  
13 semi-game-like manner, incorporating a Brain Computer Interface (BCI) that provided *in-the-*  
14 *moment* neural network performance integrity metrics (nPIMs) used to adjust the level of play  
15 required to properly engage long-term potentiation (LTP) and long term depreciation (LTD)  
16 network learning rules.

17

18 This study reports on t-test and Reliable Change Index (RCI) changes found within cognitive  
19 abilities' performance metrics derived from the Woodcock Johnson Cognitive Abilities III Test.  
20 We compared pre and post scores from seven cognitive abilities considered dependent on  
21 executive cognitive control networks against seven non-executive control abilities. We observed  
22 significant improvements (*p* values  $10^{-4}$  to  $10^{-22}$ ) with large Cohen's *d* effect sizes (0.78-1.20)  
23 across thirteen cognitive ability domains with a medium effect size (.49) on the remaining. The  
24 mean percent change for pooled trained domain was double that observed for pooled untrained

25 domain, at 17.2% versus 8.3%, respectively. To further adjust for practice effects, practice effect  
26 RCI values were computed and further supported the effectiveness of the rCRT training (RCI-  
27 trained 1.4 - 4.8; untrained RCI 0.08-0.75).

28

29 **1.0 Introduction** Mild to acute TBIs can lead to lingering changes in an individual's neurologic  
30 performance, resulting in debilitating and far-reaching consequences in adaptive cognitive  
31 functioning. Annually, as many as 5.3 million people in the U.S. are thought to face challenges  
32 due to TBI-related disabilities [1]. However, the actual number of chronic TBI (> 6 months post-  
33 injury time) may be greater. This is due to limited testing sensitivity of typical testing methods  
34 for TBI based on conventional neuropsychological measures and/or conventional clinical  
35 imaging methods (e.g., CT, MRI scanning) coupled with a lack of public awareness with regard  
36 to mTBI symptoms [2,3].

37

38 Concussions represent 80% of the traumatic brain injuries (TBI) occurring each year in the  
39 United States [4-8]. Concussions are often related to sports injuries, but the bulk of concussions  
40 are due to motor vehicle accidents, falls, and situations involving sudden acceleration and/or  
41 deceleration of the head [4-8]. TBIs have been long considered an injury with little recourse, but  
42 recent awareness of the long-term effects of concussion has led to a renewed emphasis on  
43 treating TBI and concussions. If not treated properly, an instantaneous insult can be the  
44 beginning of a chronic disease process rather than just an isolated event. This disease process  
45 occurs across all levels of initial injury severity, from mild to severe [5-8]. For example, TBIs  
46 are implicated as a risk factor for cognitive impairments, reduced social functioning, psychiatric  
47 disorders, and chronic traumatic encephalopathy [9-13].

48 TBI Cognitive Deficits Cognitive deficits are some of the most common and undermining after-  
49 effects of a TBI. Such deficits may drastically interfere with an individual's adaptive resiliency  
50 or ability to adapt to social and vocational collaborations, especially under mild stress conditions  
51 [14,15]. After a TBI, many major cognitive disruptions are triggered due to impaired gray matter  
52 or white-matter connections, often incurred by diffuse axonal injuries (DAI) [16]. DAIs foster  
53 multi-focal disturbances to axons that provide the structural basis of spatially distributed brain  
54 networks [17-21]. Consequently, a DAI often leads to interruptions in brain network  
55 connectivities, where these interruptions can be reflected in behavioral performance [17-21]. In  
56 the context of rehabilitation, both active brain network performance and resting state functional  
57 connectivity (rsFC) metrics (measured using EEG or fMRI methods) are promising tools to  
58 measure neuroplasticity changes within an injured brain after injury [22-37]. These metrics can  
59 also provide evidence for experience-induced neuroplasticity changes acquired using rCRT  
60 methods [17-37].

61 Brain network performance deficits and/or DAI dysfunctions are often rooted in neural networks  
62 that sub-serve communications between larger networks. These larger networks support  
63 foundational neurobehaviors such as attention, memory, and executive functioning. White matter  
64 (WM) substructures of these networks and the efficiency of neural network hub connections  
65 (nodal connections within neural networks) demonstrate significant relationships with behavioral  
66 performance scores on intelligence testing [38-44]. Higher IQ scores correlate with higher  
67 nodal efficiency in the right anterior insula (AI) and dorsal anterior cingulate cortex (dACC),  
68 two hub regions within the salience network, with both regions shown to be vulnerable to  
69 mTBIs [38-44] and implicated in various mental health conditions [45-51]. Likewise, higher  
70 scores are linked to *lower nodal efficiency* in the left temporo-parietal junction area (TPJ).

71 Disruptions or lack of resiliency within these foundational neurobehaviors can impact various  
72 cognitive functions and emotional regulation abilities [17-21]. Spontaneous neural network  
73 reorganization resulting in a partial motor and cognitive recovery is commonly thought to occur  
74 in the first 3 to 6 months postinjury [52]. However, recent studies indicate that many deficits  
75 linger and are present years later [53-56]. Equally important, EEG performance studies indicate  
76 that the brain remodels or reorganizes to achieve a more normal behavioral performance; the  
77 remodeling may or may not have long term negative impact, depending on how the remodeling  
78 occurs [22-37]. Cognitive rehabilitation studies suggest that significant proper remodeling can be  
79 achieved by using cognitive rehabilitation exercises to reduce the cognitive and behavioral  
80 consequences of a mTBI [54-56]. Such exercises are the subject of this paper.

81 *Restorative Cognitive Rehabilitation Training (rCRT)* Cognitive rehabilitation training (CRT)  
82 methods are an organized, functionally oriented set of therapeutic activities based on a neural  
83 assessment. CRT treatments target the patient's cognitive and behavioral deficits [54-56].  
84 Fundamental to the CRT process is the brain's ability to be remodeled through behavioral  
85 experience via neural plasticity changes, or the brain's ability to reorganize and relearn, by  
86 redirecting maladaptive plasticity towards a more functional neural growth state [14-22]. CRT  
87 methods divide into restorative interventions (*rCRT*) and compensatory methods (*cCRT*). *rCRT*  
88 principally intervenes in cognitive disturbances or disrupted neural performance caused by brain  
89 impairment or disrupted function to promote brain performance normalization. *cCRT* seeks to  
90 establish alternative patterns of cognitive activity or create new patterns of movement through  
91 external support devices (e.g., adaptive aids, prosthesis) to improve the patient's quality of life  
92 [54-56].

93 *rCRT Remediation Change Markers – Reliable Change Index, Cognitive Abilities and Resilience*

94 Intelligence (cognitive ability) characterizes the ability to solve problems unrelated to previously  
95 learned knowledge, an essential element in resilient behavioural expressions [57]. These abilities  
96 underwrite encoding and use of new information with its efficient manipulation, representing a  
97 critical component of human cognition [39-45;58,59]. Equally, these abilities strongly predict  
98 educational and professional success [59], making the neural networks that support these  
99 operations obvious training targets. Cognitive neuroscience research supports this choice. For  
100 example, Santarnecchi et al. (2015) documented the association between individual intelligence  
101 quotients (IQ) and brain resilience by simulating targeted (specific network nodes) and random  
102 attacks using resting-state fMRI and graph analysis methods (n= 102 healthy individuals). The  
103 authors found enhanced brain resilience to targeted attacks (TA) were correlated with higher IQs  
104 in networks belonging to language and memory processing regions, whereas regions related to  
105 emotional processing were mostly supported in lower IQ individuals. These results suggest that  
106 both pre and post changes in IQ scores may be useful training predictors for recovery.

107 *Retrospective Chart Review Study* This study reviewed 200 clients who participated in a *rCRT*-  
108 based program to promote proper remodeling of neural function after a TBI. The approach  
109 employed the NeuroCoach® Training System, an automated *rCRT* activity/brain-computer  
110 interface system that develops targeted neural circuit responses towards resilient, flexible and  
111 adaptable behaviors. The approach applies algorithmically leveled brain training activities to  
112 support psychological resilience.

113 **2.0 Methods** The study design employed a retrospective chart review to formulate results  
114 derived from participants who had previously participated in a BCI-augmented CRT program as

115 a post-conventional treatment follow-on component of their mTBI recovery program. Our study  
116 protocol, 20-NEUR-101, was determined by an independent Institutional Review Board to be  
117 Exempt according to FDA 21 CFR 56.104 and 45CFR46.104(b)(4). Our use of data was  
118 retrospective, and data were processed for analysis in a manner which precluded identification of  
119 individuals. Informed consent was obtained in writing from all participants. To explore treatment  
120 effects, this study used a battery of Woodcock Johnson III (WJIIIICA) assessments. Participant  
121 testing record results obtained from WJIIIICA testing were structured with dependent pre- and  
122 post-test sampling using the same evaluation methods in both pre and post testing. Each  
123 participant received an individualized program designed to address neurobehavioral imbalances  
124 in their executive function and emotional regulation. Targeted treatment variables focused on  
125 remediating deficiencies observed in participants' cognitive control, memory, attention, and  
126 executive function. Neurobehavioral imbalances were addressed using an advanced form of a  
127 CRT employing a BCI method to influence CRT training activities based on the cognitive  
128 information processing strength of each imbalance in real time [60-62]. Collection of data and  
129 subsequent analyses of those data were conducted by different persons, which helped both to  
130 ensure confidentiality and preclude bias from analysis.

131 Participants The TBI treatment group was composed of 200 participant records (n=200: 110  
132 males and 90 females). The following training inclusion criteria were used: (1) mTBI derived  
133 from Sports, MVA, work related, and or recreational activity related; (2)>180 days post injury;  
134 (3) no histories of schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, eating or obsessive-compulsive disorder. Each  
135 group received the same pretest and posttest. Adult participants (aged 18 or older) previously  
136 classified with a closed head injury TBI were recruited from outpatient programs and private  
137 practices. The mean age of participants was 31.3 years. All records were de-identified using

138 standard safe-harbor methods to protect the anonymity of individual health information.

139 Participants volunteered for pre- and post-testing with treatment based on a deliberate self-  
140 selection convenient sample method. Volunteering did not affect the type of treatment received;  
141 specifically, those who did not volunteer or qualify for the study received the same BCI  
142 Amplified CRT Training as those who did. The treatment group was tested before treatment and  
143 upon treatment completion. All participants paid identical fees for treatment.

144 Pre- and Post-Test Measures This study employed neurophysiological performance,  
145 neurocognitive behavioral and psychometric measurements. The neurophysiological  
146 performance metrics were derived from resting and active state neuroelectric imaging methods,  
147 classic cognitive abilities task measures and from the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale. Pre  
148 and post behavioral (classic task scores) and neural performance markers (age-normed Power  
149 Spectral Density (PSD) from resting state and event-related potentials) were obtained during the  
150 evaluation. Resting state neurometrics were derived from two FDA-registered databases  
151 (BrainDx, Neuroguide), using a z-score method to evaluate neurophysiological performance  
152 metrics. Active event-related potential neurometrics and z-score decision training metrics were  
153 obtained using a non-published proprietary database compiled from previous clinical and non-  
154 clinical cases (developed by the lead author). Access to the proprietary database for conducting  
155 neurometrics can be obtained by arrangement with the lead author at NTLGroup, Inc.

156 Figure 1 depicts the ten dependent (i.e., treatment) measures chosen from the Woodcock Johnson  
157 Cognitive Abilities III Assessment Battery (WJIII) [65] and five additional neurocognitive task  
158 measures derived from neurophysiological performance metrics. These measures were used to  
159 aid in *rCRT* exercise selection and in evaluating post training effectiveness. The WJIII battery is a

160 set of cognitive ability sub-tests based on the Cattell-Horn-Carroll (CHC) theory of cognitive  
161 abilities. The CHC theory provides a comprehensive framework for understanding the structure  
162 of cognitive information processing and the cognitive abilities required to support proper  
163 function. Five neurophysiological tasks were chosen to illuminate source-reconstructed neural  
164 network metric performance. These tasks included eyes-closed and eyes-open resting states,  
165 Flanker Task, Sternberg Working Memory Task and an Auditory Event Potential Task [66-72].

166 Neurophysical/NeuroCognitive (NeuroCodex<sup>®</sup>) Pre-Post Evaluation To obtain behavioral and  
167 temporal neural performance metrics, CHC tasks were presented to participants by the EventID  
168 task management program. Participants were seated in front of a computer screen and performed  
169 a battery of tasks derived from the WJIII battery. Each participant performed the cognitive  
170 battery while attached to a 19-channel EEG monitor (impedance below 5 kOhms) to record  
171 neuroelectric measures of EEG during the testing activities. After artifact rejection was  
172 performed on the EEG, behavioral and temporal neural metric measures were computed using  
173 classical ICA/PCA methods to obtain metrics for each test listed in Figure 1. The testing  
174 procedure began with a resting state eyes-closed and eyes-open condition as a baseline measure.  
175 Classical age-normed neurometrics were obtained based on standardized resting state  
176 quantitative EEG (qEEG) measures. These age-normed measures were included as baselines,  
177 compared against active ERP task measures as outlined in Figure 1.

178 To further support changes in resilient function, neural metric performance measures were  
179 obtained from five key source-reconstructed canonical networks that are considered to fine-tune  
180 behavior under variable environmental conditions. These networks are implicated in maintaining  
181 proper task performance and in general mental health preservation [67-73]. The program uses the  
182 Gordon et al [69] description of three distinct sets of connector hubs which integrate brain

183 functional activities to model neurofunctional interactions. These three are Control-Default hubs,  
184 Cross-Control Connector hubs and Control-Processing hubs.

185 The five key networks include: *Working Memory* - the primary network that supports reasoning,  
186 expanded thought, and awareness by providing the mind a conscious workspace for information  
187 [69,70]; *Cognitive Control Networks (CCN)* - cognitive control incorporates processes involved  
188 in producing and preserving appropriate task goals, including suppressing irrelevant mental and  
189 physical activities that distract from achieving the desired set of task [69,70]; *CCN Subdivisions:*  
190 (1) *The Frontal-Parietal Network (FPN)* provides active online control, allowing it to adaptively  
191 initiate and adjust control [69,70]; (2) the *Cingulate-Opercular Network (CON)* provides stable  
192 'set-maintenance' (state maintenance) over the entire task epoch or behavioral strategy[69,70];  
193 (3) the *Saliency Network (SN, the Attention Networks plus Insula Network)* is involved in rapid  
194 detection of goal-relevant events and facilitation of access to appropriate cognitive resources by  
195 interacting with multiple functional systems, thereby supporting a wide range of cognitive  
196 processes[69,70]. The *Default Mode Network (DMN)* is implicated in the brain's default resting  
197 state conditions and in its ability to sustain task performance. The DMN is composed of  
198 functionally specialized subsystems, with the anterior DMN (i.e., medial Prefrontal Cortex  
199 (PFC)) associated with identifying stimuli as self-salient, whereas the posterior DMN region  
200 (with the parahippocampal gyrus) is involved in autobiographical search and memory retrieval.  
201 Mechanisms within the DMN are implicated in regulating emotional reactivity and may play a  
202 key role in the empathic process by establishing a distinction between other- and self- related  
203 feelings [69-73]. Regarding congruent cognitive/behavioral health performance, a close  
204 relationship exists between empathy and executive regulatory mechanisms. Sluggish and/or poor  
205 (dis)engagement of the DMN is a noted biomarker within several mental health conditions,

206 including depression and attention deficit disorders [69,73]. The opposing relationship between  
207 DMN and cognitive control networks may influence the ability to exert cognitive control [69,73]  
208 and play an important role in the regulation of mind-wandering and rumination that impacts task  
209 performance [73].

210 Fig 1. Neurocognitive Functions of Interest and Canonical Networks

211 Training Procedure Immediately after initial evaluation, participants used the NeuroCoach®  
212 Training System three times per week for twelve weeks (approximately 30–40 minutes per  
213 session); participants were then reassessed. All participants completed a non-verbal cognitive  
214 enhancement/neuro-remodeling treatment program that monitors and evaluates a user’s defined  
215 neural networks system performance status in real-time. Between 48 and 80 sessions of  
216 extensive training (approximately 30–40 minutes per session) were completed before final re-  
217 evaluations were completed. The training system is rooted in modern *r*CRT methods,  
218 incorporating a neural network BCI monitoring interface. The BCI provides neural network  
219 performance integrity metrics (*n*PIMs), originated from one or more of the three control  
220 connector hub systems. The *n*PIMs inform the leveling training algorithm as it adjusts program  
221 training intensity levels. The BCI adjusts the difficulty level for each training activity based on  
222 *in-the-moment* brain performance metrics. Individual *n*PIMs are derived from the neural network  
223 systems that support various cognitive functions being trained and are user-selectable. The *r*CRT  
224 methodology is implemented through a selectable set of computer activities specific to individual  
225 needs and engages the desired brain network systems and cognitive functions. Each activity is  
226 based on classic neuroscience paradigms [60-69]. The BCI interface informs the trainer, the user,  
227 the *r*CRT activity in real time the current neural network performance integrity status based on  
228 the user’s present *n*PIMs state.

229 Each *r*CRT activity incorporates a performance leveling algorithm (PLA) to adjust the intensity  
230 of the activity by rendering the pursuit to be either more or less intense. Unique in our method is  
231 that the PLA encompasses both *n*PIMs and behavioral responses (e.g., response times, accuracy)  
232 to adjust the level of intensity of the activity. This adjustment is based on the real-time  
233 performance ability of the user, and targets the intensity required to properly engage long-term  
234 potentiation (LTP) and long-term depreciation (LTD) network learning rules [75-83]. Difficulty  
235 is adjusted based upon current responses, with the goal of a proper ratio of neurocircuit  
236 engagement as opposed to a certain level of correct responses. The intention of the performance-  
237 leveling algorithm is to adjust the level of pursuit play to a comfortable level, allowing the user  
238 to progress through the activity successfully while simultaneously focusing on developing and/or  
239 strengthening the performance integrity of the neural system being trained.

240 *NeuroCoach® Training Module Example and Description. The Split-Attention* application (a  
241 NeuroCoach® training module) is an adaptive process-based, nonverbal training technique  
242 designed to aid in re-setting/enhancing the attention (ATN), working memory (WMN), frontal  
243 parietal (FPN) and salience networks (SN). Split-Attention uses a relaxation and restorative  
244 framework that allows the trained networks to regain or obtain a natural homeostatic balance  
245 needed to maintain a desired level of performance as it drives the user towards increased  
246 capacity, neural efficiency and performance resilience. Neurobehaviorally, the application  
247 focuses on training the useful field of view (visual attention), working memory, cognitive speed,  
248 task switching, and multiple attention abilities, all in one application.

249  
250 The lead author has used this application clinically for ten years with brain-injured and learning-  
251 disabled populations. The application promotes a relaxed sustained attentional focus in

252 professional athletes and supports restorative cognitive enhancement. The Split-Attention  
253 exercise satisfies The Institute of Medicine’s Checklist criteria for brain training [ 39].

254  
255 *Analysis of Pre- and Post-rCRT Scores* Scoring data for all participants were pooled within a  
256 Pandas data frame and analyzed as a batch for means, standard deviations and pre/post rCRT  
257 changes by means of a Python script. P-values comparing pre/post rCRT subject scores were  
258 calculated from entire population distributions by using the two-sided Kolmogorov-Smirnov  
259 algorithm within SciPy. This method consistently produced more conservative (i.e., larger) p-  
260 values than other methods which consider only population means and standard deviations.

261  
262 *Analysis of Practice Effects - RCI Calculations.* The RCI technique used to correct for practice  
263 effects and measurement error is defined as  $((X_2 - X_1) - (M_2 - M_1)) / SDD$  [74,75] where  $X_1$  is the  
264 measured pretest score,  $X_2$  the post-test score, SDD the standard deviation of the group test-  
265 retest difference,  $M_1$  the control group mean pretest score, and  $M_2$  the control group mean post-  
266 test score. As a retrospective chart review, the study did not use control subjects and therefore  
267 obtaining measures of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are not directly available. However, several studies have  
268 determined that the estimated change in cognitive test retest scores range between .25 and .33 of  
269 a typical standard deviation [74-76]. Applied to standard scores,  $M_1$ ,  $M_2$  values would range  
270 between 3.75 and 5.0. Table 2 presents results for the 14 Woodcock Johnson Variables and the  
271 RCI results from all tests.

272

### 273 **3.0 Results**

274

275 Subjects completed identical Woodcock Johnson III assessments before and after *r*CRT  
276 treatment. The battery included fourteen assessments in the following areas: General Intellectual  
277 Ability (GIA), Thinking Efficiency, Concept Formation, Working Memory, Numbers Reversed,  
278 Visual Auditory Learning, Visual Audio Delayed, Verbal Ability, Phonemic Awareness, Verbal  
279 Comprehension, Incomplete Words, Sound Blending, Spatial Relations and Visual Matching.  
280 *r*CRT treatment explicitly targeted development in neurocircuits related to the first seven of  
281 these areas but did not explicitly target development in the second seven areas. Given the  
282 absence of a control group in this retrospective chart review study, measuring performance in  
283 both targeted and untargeted areas provided some assessment of the magnitude of specific  
284 treatment effects.

285  
286 Table 2 summarizes the pre- and post-treatment results across all Woodcock Johnson III  
287 assessments. Histograms of pre- and post-training scores for individual areas are available in  
288 Supplementary Materials (Figures S1-S14). Notably, we observed significant improvements (p  
289 values ranged from  $10^{-4}$  to  $10^{-22}$ ) across all Woodcock Johnson III areas, as might be expected  
290 after many sessions of intensive *r*CRT. To assess the differential impact of explicitly targeting an  
291 area within the *r*CRT program, we adjusted these observed improvements to reflect the percent  
292 change within each area, and compared the pooled percent changes observed in trained areas  
293 against those observed for untrained areas. Figure 1 displays histograms for these pooled  
294 changes. The mean percent change for trained areas was double that observed for untrained  
295 areas, at 17.2% versus 8.3%, respectively. Figure 2 shows percent changes observed across each  
296 area, ranked by magnitude, and highlights how consistently trained areas received a greater  
297 percent change than those observed for untrained areas.

298

299 Table 1. Summary of the Pre- and Post-treatment Training Results

300

<b><i>Trained</i></b>	<b>Pre-Mean (SD)</b>	<b>Post-Mean (SD)</b>	<b>Change (SD)</b>	<b>t Stat</b>	<b><math>P_{2tail}</math></b>	<b>Cohen's <i>d</i></b>	<b>RCI pe3.75</b>	<b>RCI pe5.00</b>
<i>General Intellectual Ability</i>	100.35 (12.73)	115.64 (12.78)	15.29 (7.67)	28.13	<.01	1.2	3.14	2.8
<i>Thinking Efficiency</i>	100.05 (15.32)	113.42 (14.89)	13.37 (10.03)	18.86	<.01	1.04	1.92	1.67
<i>Concept Formation</i>	102.42 (15.74)	113.17 (12.16)	10.75 (7.79)	13.41	<.01	1.18	1.36	1.12
<i>Working Memory</i>	102.08 (17.49)	117.21 (17.80)	15.13 (12.64)	16.94	<.01	1.04	1.8	1.67
<i>Numbers Reversed</i>	101.46 (19.60)	119.54 (19.01)	18.08 (15.20)	15.78	<.01	1.13	1.88	1.72
<i>Visual Auditory Learning</i>	95.63 (18.52)	113.96 (19.05)	25.24 (25.31)	16.91	<.01	1.21	2.23	2.03
<i>Visual Audio Delayed</i>	74.4 (33.62)	103.65 (31.81)	29.25 (15.32)	16.91	<.01	1.11	4.83	4.6
<b><i>UnTrained</i></b>	<b>Pre-Mean (SD)</b>	<b>Post-Mean (SD)</b>	<b>Change (SD)</b>	<b>t Stat</b>	<b><math>P_{2tail}</math></b>	<b>Cohen's <i>d</i></b>	<b>RCI pe3.75</b>	<b>RCI pe5.00</b>

<i>Verbal Ability</i>	97.62 (9.74)	105.135 (11.05)	7.52 (7.02)	15.13	<.01	0.76	0.63	0.42
<i>Phonemic Awareness</i>	104.93 (13.00)	114.83 (13.53)	9.9 (8.74)	16.01	<.01	0.87	0.66	0.52
<i>Verbal Comprehension</i>	97.59 (9.76)	105.25 (11.08)	7.66 (7.33)	14.78	<.01	0.85	0.65	0.44
<i>Incomplete Words</i>	101.16 (18.00)	113.14 (18.94)	11.99 (14.27)	11.88	<.01	0.92	0.88	0.75
<i>Sound Blending</i>	106.28 (11.82)	113.47 (11.31)	7.19 (7.90)	12.87	<.01	0.78	0.48	0.31
<i>Spatial Relations</i>	103.70 (12.74)	112.22 (11.38)	8.52 (9.78)	12.32	<.01	1	0.52	0.38
<i>Visual Matching</i>	98.73 (12.12)	104.22 (12.88)	5.49 (8.06)	9.64	<.01	0.49	0.27	0.08

301

302

303 We observed no significant correlation in pre-training, post-training or change scores as a  
 304 function of subject sex or age, regardless of the area assessed (Supplementary Materials, Figures  
 305 S1-S14).

306

307

308 Fig 2. Histogram of Pooled Changes

309

310 Fig 3. Percent Changes Observed Across each Area

311

312 **4.0 Discussion**

313

314 Previous mTBI CRT program meta-analyses report medium effect size training improvements  
315 [75-77]. As such, the study authors recommend CRT methods as a viable method for treating  
316 mTBIs [75-77]. Traditional mTBI treatment programs generally begin with neuropsychological  
317 behavioral testing that do not include a neuroimaging exam. As a result, training is focused on  
318 behavioral deficits found within attentional, memory, or other executive domains, without  
319 considering possible neural network performance interruptions nor possible reduced neural  
320 integrative effects. In contrast, this study explored possible neural network performance  
321 interruptions by choosing training targets based on possible neural network performance  
322 interruptions based on a standardized cognitive task-based neuroimaging exam. Additionally, to  
323 support optimal network remodeling during *r*CRT training, each training activity was guided by  
324 network performance nPIMs provided by a BCI interface in support of proper neural functional  
325 remodeling needed to support resilient, flexible and adaptable behaviors. More expressly, the  
326 *r*CRT training program focused on improving neural network functional performance to support  
327 long-term potentiation (LTP) and long-term depreciation (LTD) network learning rules during  
328 the training process.

329

330 Group level t-test and practice effect RCI value changes support significant positive changes  
331 within important cognitive abilities' performance metrics known to support executive cognitive  
332 control abilities needed in resilient, flexible and adaptable behavioral expressions. *r*CRT training  
333 target selection focused on cognitive control training activities. We anticipated a positive training

334 effect to occur in the all measured cognitive domains due to general cognitive improvement in  
335 cognitive network efficiency. However, we further expected a greater improvement in the  
336 executive function metrics due to the focus in the training. Pre and post scores from seven  
337 cognitive abilities considered dependent on executive cognitive control networks were compared  
338 against seven non-executive control abilities and supported our expectations. We observed  
339 significant improvements ( $p$  values  $10^{-4}$  to  $10^{-22}$ ) with large Cohen's  $d$  effect sizes (.78-1.20)  
340 across thirteen cognitive ability domains with a medium effect size (.49) on the remaining. The  
341 mean percent change for pooled trained domain was double that observed for pooled untrained  
342 domain, at 17.2% versus 8.3%, respectively. To further adjust for practice effects, practice effect  
343 RCI values (based upon literature known adjustments) were computed and further supported the  
344 effectiveness of the  $r$ CRT training (RCI- trained 1.4 - 4.8; untrained RCI .08-.75) on the  
345 executive control networks.

346

347 In summary, this mTBI study demonstrates a strong possible increase in training effects over  
348 conventional  $r$ CRT methods. This was achieved by first using a neuroelectric imaging exam  
349 based on EEG source reconstructed neural network methods used in  $r$ CRT training target  
350 selection. Second, we augmented individual  $r$ CRT activities with a BCI interface to monitor and  
351 compute *in-the-moment* neural network performance integrity metrics (nPIMs) needed to align  
352 the level of activity engagement. Activity level computations were required to properly manage  
353 cognitive loads and to properly engage long-term potentiation (LTP) and long-term depreciation  
354 (LTD) network learning rules. From our experience, this automated approach to classical  $r$ CRT  
355 methods offers two extensions over traditional pen and pencil, or computer game CRT  
356 approaches: 1) tailoring the selection of the  $r$ CRT training procedures based on neural network

357 performance metrics derived from EEG source reconstruction neuroelectric imaging evaluations  
358 to isolate underlying neural network disruptions; 2) amplifying neural network regional training  
359 by means of BCI treatment amplification.

360

361 In general, the training program assumes that coupling key, resilience-supporting neural circuits  
362 with proper problem-solving skills promotes the emergence of resilient, adaptive behaviors.

363 Based upon program participant subjective reports, we found that in the context of daily living,  
364 this emergence means proper brain based behavioral health expressions that allow return to  
365 productive work, social reintegration and improvement in one's quality of life. In other contexts,  
366 such as in sports, this emergence means increased sports performance for both injured and non-  
367 injured athletes.

368

369 This retrospective chart review was limited by the lack of a control group, although comparing  
370 explicitly trained versus untrained cognitive areas provided some measure of the effect of  
371 treatment. Future work will further "mine" retrospective data to inform the design and focus of  
372 controlled, prospective studies. In addition, customized individual rCRT programs will benefit  
373 from the insights gleaned from analysis of our database of retrospective data.

374

## 375 **References**

- 376 1. Frieden, T.R., Houry, D., Baldwin, G., 2015. Report to Congress on Traumatic Brain  
377 Injury in the United States: Epidemiology and Rehabilitation. Centers for Disease Control  
378 and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control; Division of  
379 Unintentional Injury Prevention, Atlanta, GA.

- 380 2. Katz, D.I., Alexander, M.P., 1994. Traumatic brain injury: predicting course of recovery  
381 and outcome for patients admitted to rehabilitation. *Arch. Neurol.* 51, 661–670.
- 382 3. Tellier, A., Marshall, S.C., Wilson, K.G., Smith, A., Perugini, M., Stiell, I.G., 2009. The  
383 heterogeneity of mild traumatic brain injury: where do we stand? *Brain Inj.* 23, 879–887.
- 384 4. Faul, M., Xu, L., Wald, M.M., Coronado, V.G., 2010. Traumatic Brain Injury in the  
385 United States: Emergency Department Visits, Hospitalizations, and Deaths. Centers for  
386 Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control,  
387 Atlanta, GA.
- 388 5. Corrigan, J.D., Cuthbert, J.P., Harrison-Felix, C., Whiteneck, G.G., Bell, J.M., Miller,  
389 A.C., Coronado, V.G., Pretz, C.R., 2014. Us population estimates of health and social  
390 outcomes 5 years after rehabilitation for traumatic brain injury. *J. Head Trauma Rehabil.*  
391 29, E1–E9.
- 392 6. Masel, B.E., DeWitt, D.S., 2010. Traumatic brain injury: a disease process, not an event.  
393 *J. Neurotrauma* 27, 1529–1540.
- 394 7. Whitnall, L., McMilan, T.M., Murray, G.D., Teasdale, G.M., 2006. Disability in young  
395 people and adults after head injury: 5–7 year follow up of a prospective cohort study. *J.*  
396 *Neurol. Neurosurg. Psychiatry* 77, 640–645.
- 397 8. Masel, B.E., DeWitt, D.S., 2010. Traumatic brain injury: a disease process, not an event.  
398 *J. Neurotrauma* 27, 1529–1540.
- 399 9. Arciniegas, D.B., Held, K., Wagner, P., 2002. Cognitive impairment following traumatic  
400 brain injury. *Curr. Treat. Options Neurol.* 4, 43–57.
- 401 10. Rabinowitz, A.R., Levin, H.S., 2014. Cognitive sequelae of traumatic brain injury.  
402 *Psychiatr. Clin. N. Am.* 37, 1–11.

- 403 11. Temkin, N.R., Corrigan, J.D., Dikmen, S.S., Machamer, J., 2009. Social functioning after  
404 traumatic brain injury. *J. Head Trauma Rehabil.* 24, 460–467.
- 405 12. Hesdorffer, D.C., Rauch, S.L., Tamminga, C.A., 2009. Long-term psychiatric outcomes  
406 following traumatic brain injury: a review of the literature. *J. Head Trauma Rehabil.* 24,  
407 452–459.
- 408 13. McKee, A.C., Stein, T.D., Nowinski, C.J., Stern, R.A., Daneshvar, D.H., Alvarez, V.E.,  
409 Lee, H.-S., Hall, G., Wojtowicz, S.M., Baugh, C.M., Riley, D.O., Kubilus, C.A.,  
410 Cormier, K.A., Jacobs, M.A., Martin, B.R., Abraham, C.R., Ikezu, T., Reichard, R.R.,  
411 Wolozin, B.L., Budson, A.E., Goldstein, L.E., Kowall, N.W., Cantu, R.C., 2013. The  
412 spectrum of disease in chronic traumatic encephalopathy. *Brain* 136, 43–64.
- 413 14. Laatsch L, Little D, Thulborn K. Changes in fMRI follow- ing cognitive rehabilitation in  
414 severe traumatic brain injury: a case study. *Rehabil Psychol.* 2004;49:262-267.
- 415 15. Voelbel GT, Genova HM, Chiaravalotti ND, Hoptman MJ. Diffusion tensor imaging of  
416 traumatic brain injury review: implications for neurorehabilitation. *NeuroRehabilitation.*  
417 2012;31:281-293.
- 418 16. Kou Z, Iraj A. Imaging brain plasticity after trauma. *Neural Regen Res.* 2014;9:693-700.
- 419 17. Whyte J, Polansky M, Fleming M, Coslett HB, Cavallucci C. Sustained arousal and  
420 attention after traumatic brain injury. *Neuropsychologia.* 1995;33:797-813.
- 421 18. McAvinue L, O’Keeffe F, McMackin D, Robertson IH. Impaired sustained attention and  
422 error awareness in traumatic brain injury: implications for insight. *Neuropsychol Rehabil.*  
423 2005;15:569-587.
- 424 19. Ziino C, Ponsford J. Selective attention deficits and subjective fatigue following  
425 traumatic brain injury. *Neuropsychology.* 2006;20:383-390.

- 426 20. Vakil E. The effect of moderate to severe traumatic brain injury (TBI) on different  
427 aspects of memory: a selective review. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol*. 2005;27:977-1021.
- 428 21. Kennedy MR, Coelho C, Turkstra L, et al. Intervention for executive functions after  
429 traumatic brain injury: a systematic review, meta-analysis and clinical recommendations.  
430 *Neuropsychol Rehabil*. 2008;18:257-299.
- 431 22. Amen DG, Wu JC, Taylor D, Willeumier K. Reversing brain damage in former NFL  
432 players: implications for traumatic brain injury and substance abuse rehabilitation. *J*  
433 *Psychoactive Drugs*. 2011;43:1-5.
- 434 23. Ianof, J. N., & Anghinah, R. (2017). Traumatic brain injury: An EEG point of view.  
435 *Dementia & Neuropsychologia*, 11(1), 3–5.
- 436 24. Lewine, J. D., Plis, S., Ulloa, A., Williams, C., Spitz, M., Foley, J., ... Weaver, L. (2019).  
437 Quantitative EEG Biomarkers for Mild Traumatic Brain Injury: *Journal of Clinical*  
438 *Neurophysiology*, 36(4), 298–305.
- 439 25. McNerney, M. W., Hobday, T., Cole, B., Ganong, R., Winans, N., Matthews, D., ...  
440 Lane, S. (2019). Objective Classification of mTBI Using Machine Learning on a  
441 Combination of Frontopolar Electroencephalography Measurements and Self-reported  
442 Symptoms. *Sports Medicine - Open*, 5(1).
- 443 26. Ledwidge, P. S., & Molfese, D. L. (2016). Long-Term Effects of Concussion on  
444 Electrophysiological Indices of Attention in Varsity College Athletes: An Event-Related  
445 Potential and Standardized Low-Resolution Brain Electromagnetic Tomography  
446 Approach. *Journal of Neurotrauma*, 33(23), 2081–2090.

- 447 27. Zhang, Y., Ma, Y., Chen, S., Liu, X., Kang, H. J., Nelson, S., & Bell, S. (2019). Long-  
448 Term Cognitive Performance of Retired Athletes with Sport-Related Concussion: A  
449 Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Brain Sciences*, 9(8), 199.
- 450 28. Hudac, C. M., Cortesa, C. S., Ledwidge, P. S., & Molfese, D. L. (2018). History of  
451 concussion impacts electrophysiological correlates of working memory. *International*  
452 *Journal of Psychophysiology*, 132, 135–144.
- 453 29. Mayer, A. R., Mannell, M. V., Ling, J., Gasparovic, C., & Yeo, R. A. (2011). Functional  
454 connectivity in mild traumatic brain injury. *Human Brain Mapping*, 32(11), 1825–1835.
- 455 30. Slobounov, S. M., Zhang, K., Pennell, D., Ray, W., Johnson, B., & Sebastianelli, W.  
456 (2010). Functional abnormalities in normally appearing athletes following mild traumatic  
457 brain injury: a functional MRI study. *Experimental Brain Research*, 202(2), 341–354.
- 458 31. Papathanasiou, E. S., Cronin, T., Seemungal, B., & Sandhu, J. (2018).  
459 Electrophysiological testing in concussion: A guide to clinical applications. *Journal of*  
460 *Concussion*, 2, 205970021881263.
- 461 32. Urakami, Y. (2013). Electrophysiologic Evaluation of Diffuse Axonal Injury after  
462 Traumatic Brain Injury. *Journal of Neurology & Neurophysiology*, 04(03).
- 463 33. Thompson, J. W. (2006). EEG changes and balance deficits following concussion: one  
464 piece of the puzzle. In *Foundations of sport-related brain injuries* (pp. 341–374).  
465 Springer.
- 466 34. Dunkley, B. T., Urban, K., Da Costa, L., Wong, S. M., Pang, E. W., & Taylor, M. J.  
467 (2018). Default Mode Network Oscillatory Coupling Is Increased Following Concussion.  
468 *Frontiers in Neurology*, 9.

- 469 35. Cao, C., & Slobounov, S. (2010). Alteration of Cortical Functional Connectivity as a  
470 Result of Traumatic Brain Injury Revealed by Graph Theory, ICA, and sLORETA  
471 Analyses of EEG Signals. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Systems and Rehabilitation*  
472 *Engineering*, 18(1), 11–19.
- 473 36. Olson, R. L., Brush, C. J., Ehmann, P. J., Buckman, J. F., & Alderman, B. L. (2018). A  
474 history of sport-related concussion is associated with sustained deficits in conflict and  
475 error monitoring. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 132, 145–154.
- 476 37. Zhu, D. C., Covassin, T., Nogle, S., Doyle, S., Russell, D., Pearson, R. L., ... Kaufman,  
477 D. I. (2015). A Potential Biomarker in Sports-Related Concussion: Brain Functional  
478 Connectivity Alteration of the Default-Mode Network Measured with Longitudinal  
479 Resting-State fMRI over Thirty Days. *Journal of Neurotrauma*, 32(5), 327–341.
- 480 38. Chen, T., Cai, W., Ryali, S., Supekar, K., & Menon, V. (2016). Distinct global brain  
481 dynamics and spatiotemporal organization of the salience network. *PLoS Biology*, 14(6),  
482 e1002469.
- 483 39. Institute of Medicine (2015) *Cognitive Aging: Progress in Understanding and*  
484 *Opportunities for Action*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- 485 40. Cattell, R. B., & Cattell, R. B. (1987). *Intelligence: its structure, growth, and action*.  
486 Amsterdam; New York: New York: North-Holland; Sole distributors for the U.S.A.  
487 and Canada, Elsevier Science Pub. Co.
- 488 41. Deary, I. (2008). Why do intelligent people live longer? *Nature*, 456(7219), 175–  
489 176. doi:10.1038/456175a

- 490 42. Li, Yonghui, Yong Liu, Jun Li, Wen Qin, Kuncheng Li, Chunshui Yu, and Tianzi Jiang.  
491 “Brain Anatomical Network and Intelligence.” Edited by Olaf Sporns. PLoS  
492 Computational Biology 5, no. 5 (May 29, 2009): e1000395.
- 493 43. Santarnecchi, Emiliano, Alexandra Emmendorfer, and Alvaro Pascual-Leone.  
494 “Dissecting the Parieto-Frontal Correlates of Fluid Intelligence: A Comprehensive ALE  
495 Meta-Analysis Study.” *Intelligence* 63 (July 2017): 9–28.
- 496 44. Marsman, Anouk, René C. W. Mandl, Dennis W. J. Klomp, Wiepke Cahn, René S. Kahn,  
497 Peter R. Luijten, and Hilleke E. Hulshoff Pol. “Intelligence and Brain Efficiency:  
498 Investigating the Association between Working Memory Performance, Glutamate, and  
499 GABA.” *Frontiers in Psychiatry* 8 (September 15, 2017).
- 500 45. Hilger, Kirsten, Matthias Ekman, Christian J. Fiebach, and Ulrike Basten. “Efficient  
501 Hubs in the Intelligent Brain: Nodal Efficiency of Hub Regions in the Salience Network  
502 Is Associated with General Intelligence.” *Intelligence* 60 (January 2017): 10–25.
- 503 46. Sha, Z., Wager, T. D., Mechelli, A., & He, Y. (2019). Common Dysfunction of Large-  
504 Scale Neurocognitive Networks Across Psychiatric Disorders. *Biological Psychiatry*,  
505 85(5), 379–388.
- 506 47. Redish, A. D., & Gordon, J. A. (Eds.). (2016). *Computational psychiatry: new  
507 perspectives on mental illness*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- 508 48. da Silva, A. G., Malloy-Diniz, L. F., Garcia, M. S., Figueiredo, C. G. S., Figueiredo, R.  
509 N., Diaz, A. P., & Palha, A. P. (2018). Cognition As a Therapeutic Target in the Suicidal  
510 Patient Approach. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 9.


- 511 49. Kesler, S., Hadi Hosseini, S. M., Heckler, C., Janelins, M., Palesh, O., Mustian, K., &  
512 Morrow, G. (2013). Cognitive Training for Improving Executive Function in  
513 Chemotherapy-Treated Breast Cancer Survivors. *Clinical Breast Cancer*, 13(4), 299–306.
- 514 50. Copersino, M. L. (2017). Cognitive mechanisms and therapeutic targets of addiction.  
515 *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 13, 91–98.
- 516 51. Vinogradov, S., Fisher, M., & de Villers-Sidani, E. (2012). Cognitive Training for  
517 Impaired Neural Systems in Neuropsychiatric Illness. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 37(1),  
518 43–76.
- 519 52. Chen AJW, D’Esposito M. Traumatic brain injury: from bench to bedside to society.  
520 *Neuron*. 2010;66:11-14.
- 521 53. Tomaszczyk JC, Green NL, Frasca D, et al. Negative neuro- plasticity in chronic  
522 traumatic brain injury and implications for neurorehabilitation. *Neuropsychol Rev*.  
523 2014;24:409-427.
- 524 54. Chiaravalloti ND, Dobryakova E, Wylie GR, DeLuca J. Examining the efficacy of the  
525 modified story memory technique resonance imaging (fMRI): the TBI-MEM trial. *J Head*  
526 *Trauma Rehabil*. 2015;30:261-269.
- 527 55. Cicerone KD, Dahlberg C, Kalmar K, et al. Evidence-based cognitive rehabilitation:  
528 recommendations for clinical practice. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2000;81:1596-1615.
- 529 56. Laatsch LK, Thulborn KR, Krisky CM, Shobat DM, Sweeney JA. Investigating the  
530 neurobiological basis of cognitive rehabilitation therapy with fMRI. *Brain Inj*.  
531 2004;18:957-974.

- 532 57. Dosenbach, N. U. F., Fair, D. A., Cohen, A. L., Schlaggar, B. L., & Petersen, S. E.  
533 (2008). A dual-networks architecture of top-down control. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*,  
534 12(3), 99–105
- 535 58. Chen, T., Cai, W., Ryali, S., Supekar, K., & Menon, V. (2016). Distinct global brain  
536 dynamics and spatiotemporal organization of the salience network. *PLoS Biology*, 14(6),  
537 e1002469.
- 538 59. Bathelt, J., G. Scerif, A.C. Nobre, and D.E. Astle. “Whole-Brain White Matter  
539 Organization, Intelligence, and Educational Attainment.” *Trends in Neuroscience and*  
540 *Education* 15 (June 2019): 38–47.
- 541 60. Cripe, C. (in review) Improved Sobriety Rates after Brain-computer Interface-based  
542 Cognitive Remediation Training
- 543 61. Cripe C. Neuroengineering: brain recovery methods-applied to substance abuse recovery.  
544 In *Psychology's New Design Science: Theory and Research*. Imholz S, Sachter J, eds.  
545 Common Ground Publishing, 2014; 100-135.
- 546 62. Wykes T, Brammer M, Mellers J, Bray P, Reeder C, Williams C, Corner J. Effects on the  
547 brain of a psychological treatment: Effects on the brain of a psychological treatment:  
548 cognitive remediation therapy cognitive remediation therapy. *British Journal of*  
549 *Psychiatry* (2002) 144-152
- 550 63. Wykes T, Spaulding WD. Thinking about the future cognitive remediation therapy-what  
551 works, and could we do better? *Schizophr Bull* 2011;37(2):S80-90.
- 552 64. Gunkelman J, Cripe C. Clinical outcomes in addiction: a neurofeedback case series.  
553 *Biofeedback* 2008;36(4):152-156.


- 554 65. Woodcock, R. W.; McGrew, K. S.; Mather, N (2001). Woodcock Johnson III. Itasca, IL:  
555 Riverside
- 556 66. Prichep, L. S., & John, E. R. (1992). QEEG profiles of psychiatric disorders. *Brain*  
557 *Topography*, 4(4), 249–257.
- 558 67. Cole, M., Repovs, G., & Anticevic, A. (2014). The frontoparietal control system: A  
559 central role in mental health. *The Neuroscientist*, 1–13.
- 560 68. Gratton, G. (2018). Brain reflections: A circuit-based framework for understanding  
561 information processing and cognitive control. *Psychophysiology*, 55(3), e13038.  
562 <https://doi.org/10.1111/psyp.13038>
- 563 69. Gordon, Evan M., Charles J. Lynch, Caterina Gratton, Timothy O. Laumann, Adrian W.  
564 Gilmore, Deanna J. Greene, Mario Ortega, Annie L. Nguyen, Bradley L. Schlaggar, and  
565 Steven E. Petersen. “Three Distinct Sets of Connector Hubs Integrate Human Brain  
566 Function.” *Cell Reports* 24, no. 7 (2018): 1687–1695
- 567 70. Cai, W., Chen, T., Ryali, S., Kochalka, J., Li, C.-S. R., & Menon, V. (2016). Causal  
568 Interactions Within a Frontal-Cingulate-Parietal Network During Cognitive Control:  
569 Convergent Evidence from a Multisite–Multitask Investigation. *Cerebral Cortex*, 26(5),  
570 2140–2153. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhv046>
- 571 71. Sternberg, S. (1965). High Speed Scanning in Human Memory. *J. Comp. Physiol.*  
572 *Psychol*, 59, 439.
- 573 72. Siemann, J., Herrmann, M., & Galashan, D. (2018). The effect of feature-based attention  
574 on flanker interference processing: An fMRI-constrained source analysis. *Scientific*  
575 *Reports*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-20049-1>

- 576 73. Braboszcz, C., & Delorme, A. (2011). Lost in thoughts: Neural markers of low alertness  
577 during mind wandering. *NeuroImage*, 54(4), 3040–3047.
- 578 74. Roitsch, J., Redman, R., Michalek, A. M. P., Johnson, R. K., & Raymer, A. M. (2019).  
579 Quality Appraisal of Systematic Reviews for Behavioral Treatments of Attention  
580 Disorders in Traumatic Brain Injury: *Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation*, 34(4), E42–  
581 E50.
- 582 75. Kennedy MR, Coelho C. Self-regulation after traumatic brain injury: a framework for  
583 intervention of memory and problem solving. *Semin Speech Lang*. 2005;26(4):242–55.  
584 doi:10.1055/s-2005-922103.
- 585 76. Hallock H, Collins D, Lampit A, Deol K, Fleming J, Valenzuela M. Cognitive training  
586 for post-acute traumatic brain injury: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front Hum*  
587 *Neurosci*. 2016;10:537. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2016.00537.
- 588 77. Cooper DB, Bunner AE, Kennedy JE, Balldin V, Tate DF, Eapen BC, Jaramillo CA.  
589 Treatment of persistent post-concussive symptoms after mild traumatic brain injury: a  
590 systematic review of cognitive rehabilitation and behavioral health interventions in  
591 military service members and veterans. *Brain Imaging Behav*.

Neurocognitive functions of interest	Probative task to assess changes	Canonical network(s) measured	ERP / ERSF feature(s) measured
Cognitive control (response inhibition, conflict/error monitoring)	Flanker	CON; FPN	ERN
Bottom-up attention	SAPO	SN; CON; FPN	P300; MMN
Working Memory	Sternberg	WM; CON; FPN	FMT
Long term memory/Stress	Arrest reaction	DMN	Alpha power
Sustained top-down attention	SAPO	DMN; FPN	Alpha and theta power



**Table 1.** Large-scale intrinsic and task-evoked circuits identified in published work. **Fronto-parietal network (FPN) [31]:** DLPFC = dorsolateral prefrontal cortex; IPL = inferior parietal lobule; DFC = dorsal frontal cortex; IPS = intraparietal sulcus; Precuneus; MCC = middle cingulate cortex. **Cingulo-opercular network (CON) [31]:** APFC = anterior prefrontal cortex; AI/FO = anterior insula/frontal operculum; dACC/MSFC = dorsal anterior cingulate cortex and medial superior frontal cortex; Thalamus\*. **Salience network (SN) [32]:** dACC = dorsal anterior cingulate cortex; al = anterior insula; TP=temporal pole; SLEA = sublenticular extended amygdala\*. **Default mode network (DMN) [40]:** aMPFC = anterior medial prefrontal cortex; AG = angular gyrus; PCC=posterior cingulate cortex (includes precuneus). **Working memory network (WM) [39]:** SPL = superior parietal lobule; DLPFC = dorsolateral prefrontal cortex; MPFC medial prefrontal cortex; VAC = ventral anterior cingulate area; AR = agranular retrolimbic area; DPC = dorsal posterior cingulate area; dACC = dorsal anterior cingulate cortex; Preg. = pregenual area (ACC); SG = supramarginal gyrus; Hip = Hippocampus\*. Subcortical areas denoted by (\*) are unlikely to be reliably measured using EEG, and may be excluded from our analysis.



# Percent Changes Across WJIII Areas

