

# Functional Neuroimaging Distinguishes Posttraumatic Stress Disorder from Traumatic Brain Injury in Focused and Large Community Datasets

Daniel G. Amen , Cyrus A. Raji , Kristen Willeumier , Derek Taylor , Robert Tarzwell , Andrew Newberg , Theodore A. Henderson



- Published: July 1, 2015
- DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0129659

<http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0129659>

## Abstract

### Background

Traumatic brain injury (TBI) and posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) are highly heterogeneous and often present with overlapping symptomology, providing challenges in reliable classification and treatment. Single photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) may be advantageous in the diagnostic separation of these disorders when comorbid or clinically indistinct.

### Methods

Subjects were selected from a multisite database, where rest and on-task SPECT scans were obtained on a large group of neuropsychiatric patients. Two groups were analyzed: Group 1 with TBI (n=104), PTSD (n=104) or both (n=73) closely matched for demographics and comorbidity, compared to each other and healthy controls (N=116); Group 2 with TBI (n=7,505), PTSD (n=1,077) or both (n=1,017) compared to n=11,147 without either. ROIs and visual readings (VRs) were analyzed using a binary logistic regression model with predicted probabilities inputted into a Receiver Operating Characteristic analysis to identify sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy. One-way ANOVA identified the most diagnostically significant regions of increased perfusion in PTSD compared to TBI. Analysis included a 10-fold cross validation of the protocol in the larger community sample (Group 2).

### Results

For Group 1, baseline and on-task ROIs and VRs showed a high level of accuracy in differentiating PTSD, TBI and PTSD+TBI conditions. This carefully matched group separated with 100% sensitivity, specificity and accuracy for the ROI analysis and at 89% or above for VRs. Group 2 had lower sensitivity, specificity and accuracy, but still in a clinically relevant range. Compared to subjects with TBI, PTSD showed increases in the limbic regions, cingulum, basal ganglia, insula, thalamus, prefrontal cortex and temporal lobes.


## Conclusions

This study demonstrates the ability to separate PTSD and TBI from healthy controls, from each other, and detect their co-occurrence, even in highly comorbid samples, using SPECT. This modality may offer a clinical option for aiding diagnosis and treatment of these conditions.

## Figures


Group 2 ROC Analysis (%)	TBI from PTSD		Confidence Intervals		Within CI	
	ROC	VR	ROC	VR	ROI	VR
Accuracy on-Task	0.34	0.02	(-0.79,0.77)	(-0.85,0.82)	Y	Y
Accuracy at Rest	0.34	-0.01	(-0.80,0.76)	(-0.87,0.84)	Y	Y

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.g011



Variable	PTSD (n = 104)	TBI (n = 104)	Both PTSD and TBI (n = 72)	Healthy (n = 116)
Age	36.7 ± 12.9	37.2 ± 12.9	40.7 ± 13.8	41.4 ± 17.9
Gender(M/F)	65/39	65/39	36/37	46/70
Race% Caucasian	57	67	66	64
Dementia%	4	5	4	0
Depression%	41	41	41	0
Bipolar%	6	6	6	0
Epilepsy%	5	4	6	0
Schizophrenia%	3	1	3	0
Substance Abuser%	16	16	16	0
ADHD%	58	58	58	0

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.g011



Severity	Type of Injury	Mode of Injury	Number of Patients
Mild	blunt	accident	18
	blunt	assault	5
	blunt	fall	14
	blunt	sports	17
	penetrating	accident	2
Moderate	unknown	unknown	9
	blunt	accident	4
	blunt	assault	1
	blunt	fall	5
Severe	blunt	sports	1
	blunt	accident	13
	blunt	assault	1
Unknown Severity	blunt	fall	2
	blunt	sports	2
	blunt	accident	1
	blunt	assault	1
	blunt	fall	2
	blunt	sports	1
	unknown	unknown	5


doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.g012

Severity	Type of Injury	Mode of Injury	Number of Patients
Mild	blunt	accident	20
	blunt	assault	5
	blunt	fall	8
	blunt	sports	8
	blunt	unknown	1
	unknown	accident	1
Moderate	unknown	unknown	4
	blunt	accident	3
	blunt	assault	1
	blunt	fall	1
	blunt	sports	2
Severe	blunt	sports	2
	penetrating	assault	1
	blunt	accident	5
	blunt	assault	1
Unknown Severity	blunt	fall	1
	blunt	sports	1
	blunt	accident	3
	blunt	assault	2
	blunt	fall	1
	blunt	sports	2
	unknown	accident	1
	unknown	unknown	1

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0126659.t003

Variable	PTSD (n = 1877)	TBI (n = 7505)	Both PTSD and TBI (n = 1017)	Neither PTSD or TBI (n = 11147)
Age	40.7 ± 13.9	40.5 ± 15.6	41.9 ± 13.7	40.6 ± 16.5
Gender% Male	35	66	46	46
Race% Caucasian	69	68	73	65
Depression%	51	31	40	42
Bipolar%	12	7	13	8
Epilepsy%	1	1	2	1
Schizophrenia%	2	3	2	2
Drug abuse%	5	19	23	16
ADHD%	50	58	59	45

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0126659.t004



Group 1 ROC Analysis (ROW VR) (%)	TBI from PTSD	PTSD from Co-Occurrence	TBI from Co-Occurrence	PTSD from Control	TBI from Control	Co-Occurrence from Control
Sensitivity on-Task	100/100	100/84	100/100	100/100	100/100	100/100
Sensitivity at Rest	100/86	100/82	100/84	100/100	100/100	100/100
Specificity on-Task	100/100	100/80	100/100	100/100	100/100	100/100
Specificity at Rest	100/81	100/80	100/76	100/100	100/100	100/100
Accuracy on-Task	100/100*	100/90	100/100*	100/100*	100/100*	100/100*
	(p-value, 95% C.I.)	.00, .85-.95				
Accuracy at Rest	100/94	100/92	100/89	100/100*	100/100*	100/100*
	(p-value, 95% C.I.)	.00, .89-.97	.00, .83-.93			

Comparison of Quantitative ROCs with Visual Readings (VR) in Distinguishing TBI from PTSD

\* p < .005, 95% C.I. = [1-4]

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0126659.t005

Group 2 ROC Analysis (ROW VR) (%)	TBI from PTSD	PTSD from Co-Occurrence	TBI from Co-Occurrence	PTSD from Control	TBI from Control	Co-Occurrence from Control
Sensitivity on-Task	82/80	70/70	70/70	70/70	70/67	70/70
Sensitivity at Rest	80/80	70/70	70/70	70/70	70/70	70/70
Specificity on-Task	60/61	61/61	55/56	58/55	54/58	58/57
Specificity at Rest	62/60	60/62	55/56	54/54	54/54	60/58
Accuracy on-Task	78/78	73/71	66/69	68/67	66/66	70/69
	(p-value, 95% C.I.)	.00, .76-.80	.00, .71-.75	.00, .66-.70	.00, .65-.69	.00, .66-.70
		.00, .77-.80	.74	.67-.71	.66-.70	.65-.67
Accuracy at Rest	78/77	73/71	68/68	67/65	67/68	70/69
	(p-value, 95% C.I.)	.00, .77-.80	.00, .69-.74	.00, .66-.70	.00, .65-.69	.00, .66-.69
		.00, .75-.79	.74	.66-.70	.65-.68	.65-.67

Comparison Quantitative ROCs with Visual Readings (VR) in Distinguishing TBI from PTSD

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0126659.t006

Brain Region	Group 1: TBI vs PTSD At Rest	Group 1: TBI vs PTSD On-Task	Group 2: TBI vs PTSD At Rest	Group 2: TBI vs PTSD On-Task
Limbic	Amygdala	Amygdala	Amygdala	Amygdala
	Hippocampus	Hippocampus	Hippocampus	Hippocampus
	Ant Cingulum	Ant Cingulum	Ant Cingulum	Ant Cingulum
	Mid Cingulum	Mid Cingulum	Mid Cingulum	Mid Cingulum
	Post Cingulum	Post Cingulum	Post Cingulum	Post Cingulum
Basal Ganglia	Thalamus	Thalamus	Thalamus	Thalamus
	Caudate	Caudate	Caudate	Caudate
	Pulvinar	Pulvinar	Pulvinar	Pulvinar
Insula	Insula	Insula	Insula	Insula
	Inferior Orbita	Inferior Orbita	Inferior Orbita	Inferior Orbita
Prefrontal Cortex	Operculum	Operculum	Operculum	Operculum
Temporal Lobes	Middle Temporal Lobe	Middle Temporal Lobe	Middle Temporal Lobe	Middle Temporal Lobe
	Superior Temporal Lobe	Superior Temporal Lobe	Superior Temporal Lobe	Superior Temporal Lobe
	Temporal Poles	Temporal Poles	Temporal Poles	Temporal Poles
Cerebellum	Anterior Cerebellum	Anterior Cerebellum	Anterior Cerebellum	Anterior Cerebellum

PTSD shows increased rCBF in the limbic centers, basal ganglia, insula, prefrontal cortex, temporal lobes, cerebellum, occipital lobe and parietal lobe as compared to TBI both at rest and during a concentration task in Groups 1 and 2 using ROI analysis. Legend for Abbreviations: Ant = Anterior; Mid = Middle; Post = Posterior; Sup = Superior.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t007

Brain Region	Group 1: TBI vs PTSD At Rest	Group 1: TBI vs PTSD On-Task	Group 2: TBI vs PTSD At Rest	Group 2: TBI vs PTSD On-Task
Limbic	Amygdala	Amygdala	Amygdala	Amygdala
	Hippocampus	Hippocampus	Hippocampus	Hippocampus
	Ant Cingulum	Ant Cingulum	Ant Cingulum	Ant Cingulum
	Mid Cingulum	Mid Cingulum	Mid Cingulum	Mid Cingulum
	Thalamus	Thalamus	Thalamus	Thalamus
Basal Ganglia	Caudate	Caudate	Caudate	Caudate
	Insula	Insula	Insula	Insula
Prefrontal Cortex	Inferior Orbita	Inferior Orbita	Inferior Orbita	Inferior Orbita
	Ant Lateral Prefrontal Cortex			
Temporal Lobes	Temporal Poles	Temporal Poles	Pole prefrontal cortex	Pole prefrontal cortex
	Ant Lateral Temporal Lobe			
			Mid Lateral Temporal Lobe	Mid Lateral Temporal Lobe
Cerebellum	Cerebellum	Cerebellum	Post Lateral Temporal Lobe	Post Lateral Temporal Lobe
			Cerebellum	Cerebellum
Occipital Lobe			Occipital Lobe	Occipital Lobe
Parietal Lobe			Parietal Lobe	Parietal Lobe

PTSD shows increased rCBF in the limbic centers, basal ganglia, insula (Group 1 at rest only), prefrontal cortex, temporal lobes, cerebellum, occipital lobe and parietal lobe as compared to TBI both at rest and during a concentration task in Groups 1 and 2 using visual readings. Legend for Abbreviations: Ant = Anterior; Lat = Lateral; Mid = Middle; Post = Posterior.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t008

Brain Level	Brain Area	TBI		PTSD		Statistics		
		Mean	STDEV	Mean	STDEV	F	Sig	
Cerebellum	Cerebellum 3 Left	53.11	7.23	55.64	7.5	2.53	0.054481	
	Vermis 1 2	52.74	7.66	55.36	8.01	2.64	0.050529	
Frontal Lobe	Rectus Left	52.25	6.93	54.1	7.53	1.85	0.000794	
	Rectus Right	51.74	6.75	53.64	7.36	1.9	0.047795	
Insula	Insula Left	56.67	7.45	59.56	8.01	2.89	0.009615	
	Insula Right	57.18	7.61	60.01	8.24	2.83	0.020702	
Limbic	Amygdala Left	51.83	8.93	54.03	7.8	2.9	0.000598	
	Amygdala Right	51.76	7.25	54.43	7.36	2.66	0.000303	
	Cingulum Ant Left	55.26	8.08	58.59	8.48	3.33	0.000048	
	Cingulum Ant Right	51.82	7.54	55.05	7.92	3.23	0.000052	
	Cingulum Mid Left	57.19	7.6	60.17	8.32	2.98	0.000004	
	Cingulum Mid Right	55.1	7.5	58.01	7.9	2.9	0.010155	
	Cingulum Post Left	56.29	8.38	59.32	8.89	3.03	0.000046	
	Hippocampus Left	51.31	6.94	53.96	7.25	2.67	0.044481	
	Hippocampus Right	51.42	7.25	54.3	7.47	2.86	0.018775	
	Parahippocampal Left	48.88	5.75	49.19	6.23	2.31	0.000007	
	Parahippocampal Right	50.57	6.42	52.97	6.75	2.39	0.000098	
	Olfactory	Olfactory Left	52.43	7.1	55.26	7.54	2.83	0.001748
		Olfactory Right	53.65	7.54	56.21	7.57	2.76	0.000115
	Parietal	Precuneus Left	48.71	6.36	50.78	6.37	2.07	0.000363
		Frontal Inf Op Left	47.88	5.95	49.45	6.27	1.57	0.000963
	Prefrontal Cortex	Frontal Inf Op Right	44.45	5.03	45.64	5.97	1.19	0.018079
		Fusiform Left	52.62	6.31	54.98	6.72	2.05	0.020103
Temporal Lobes	Fusiform Right	51.67	6.27	53.66	6.57	1.99	0.042155	
	Heath Left	58.21	8.03	61.15	8.5	2.95	0.001883	
	Temporal Inf Mid Left	44.24	5.69	45.21	5.96	0.97	0.000746	
	Temporal Inf Mid Right	40.03	5.47	40.51	5.73	0.49	0.047952	
	Temporal Mid Ant Left	49.55	6.22	51.28	6.69	1.74	0.012982	
	Temporal Mid Mid Left	51.54	6.5	53.55	6.79	2.01	0.000794	
	Temporal Pole Sup Left	45.13	5.3	48.82	5.76	1.69	0.001137	
	Temporal Pole Sup Right	42.19	5.08	43.54	5.91	1.35	0.000803	
	Temporal Sup Ant Left	53.35	6.99	56.01	7.43	2.66	0.000274	
	Temporal Sup Mid Left	56.02	7.49	58.81	7.8	2.79	0.010179	

Analysis of variance between shows higher cerebral blood flow in subjects with PTSD compared to TBI patients in the cerebellum, frontal lobes, insular cortex, limbic system, olfactory and parietal lobes, prefrontal cortex, and temporal lobes. Significance is shown by F statistic, difference of the means and p value (all areas with  $p < 0.05$ ). Legend for Abbreviations: Ant = Anterior; Inf = Inferior; Lat = Lateral; Mid = Middle; Op = Orbital; Post = Posterior; Sup = Superior.



doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t009

Group 2 ROC Analysis (%)	TBI from PTSD			
	ROI	VR	ROI	VR
Δ Sensitivity on-Task	-0.29			<0.01
Δ Sensitivity at Rest	-0.29			<0.01
Δ Specificity on-Task	-0.78			<0.01
Δ Specificity at Rest	-1.37			0.11

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t010

Group 2 ROC Analysis (%)	TBI from PTSD		Confidence Intervals		Within CI	
	ROI	VR	ROI	VR	ROI	VR
Δ Accuracy on-Task	-0.34	0.02	(-0.79, 0.77)	(-0.85, 0.82)	Y	Y
Δ Accuracy at Rest	-0.34	-0.01	(-0.80, 0.76)	(-0.87, 0.84)	Y	Y

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t011



Severity	Type of Injury	Mode of Injury	Number of Patients
Mild	blunt	accident	18
	blunt	assault	5
	blunt	fall	14
	blunt	sports	17
	penetrating	accident	2
	unknown	unknown	9
Moderate	blunt	accident	4
	blunt	assault	1
	blunt	fall	5
	blunt	sports	1
Severe	blunt	accident	13
	blunt	assault	1
	blunt	fall	2
Unknown Severity	blunt	sports	2
	blunt	accident	1
	blunt	assault	1
	blunt	fall	2
	blunt	sports	1
	unknown	unknown	5

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.g002

**Citation:** Amen DG, Raji CA, Willeumier K, Taylor D, Tarzwell R, Newberg A, et al. (2015) Functional Neuroimaging Distinguishes Posttraumatic Stress Disorder from Traumatic Brain Injury in Focused and Large Community Datasets. PLoS ONE 10(7): e0129659. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659

**Academic Editor:** Jon D. Elhai, Univ of Toledo, UNITED STATES

**Received:** December 10, 2014; **Accepted:** May 12, 2015; **Published:** July 1, 2015

**Copyright:** © 2015 Amen et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited

**Data Availability:** All relevant data are within the paper.

**Funding:** The authors received no specific funding for this work. Author TH is President and owner of The Synaptic Space, Dr. Theodore Henderson, Inc. and co-owner of Neuro-Luminance Corp. The Synaptic Space, Dr. Theodore Henderson, Inc. and Neuro-Luminance Corp. did not play a role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. The specific role of this author is articulated in the “author contributions” section. Author DA is the owner of Amen Clinics, Inc. Authors KW and DT are employed by Amen Clinics, Inc. Amen Clinics, Inc. provided support in the form of salaries for authors DA, KW and DT, but did not have any additional role in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. The specific roles of these authors are articulated in the “author contributions” section.

**Competing interests:** The authors have the following interests: Author TH is President and owner of Dr. Theodore Henderson, Inc. and The Synaptic Space and co-owner of Neuro-Luminance Corp., which are clinical service or consulting corporations with no research funding. Author DA is the owner of Amen Clinics, Inc. Authors KW and DT are employed by Amen Clinics, Inc. There are no patents, products in development or marketed products to declare. This does not alter our adherence to all the PLoS ONE policies on sharing data and materials.

## Introduction

Traumatic brain injury (TBI) and posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) are complex, commonly comorbid disorders in which clinical symptoms often overlap, creating challenges in diagnosis and treatment [1–3]. Advanced neuroimaging techniques are providing insights into underlying pathological and physiological changes, and biomarker studies offer the potential to differentiate these disorders at acute stages, when interventions have the greatest potential to yield effective outcomes [4, 5]. Structural imaging in acute TBI is indicated for the identification of skull fractures, contusions and bleeds, but computed tomography (CT) or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) typically do not demonstrate the subtle abnormalities associated with TBI including perfusion deficits, diffuse axonal injury and alterations in functional anatomical connections [6]. As mild TBI often goes undetected using conventional structural imaging [7], the use of functional imaging techniques, including single photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) have demonstrated a greater sensitivity and specificity for identifying mild TBI [8]. The most commonly observed regions affected are the orbitofrontal cortex, temporal poles, and anterior cingulum [8], which correlate with cognitive and psychiatric symptomology. In contrast, imaging of PTSD has revealed volumetric and perfusion changes in the amygdala [9], corpus callosum [10], insula [11], anterior cingulum [12–14] and hippocampus [15, 16]. Given the overlapping symptomology between TBI and PTSD and the high prevalence of these disorders within our active duty and post-deployment U.S. military personnel [17, 18] and civilian population [19, 20], there is a need to identify diagnostic tools that can clearly distinguish these disorders, so patients may be directed toward appropriate treatment. Research into the use of

SPECT has demonstrated its clinical utility for both the improved detection of TBI [8, 21–23] and the delineation of the neural circuitry underlying PTSD [24–31], offering the potential of this modality to identify functional biomarkers useful in differential diagnosis. The question remains as to whether SPECT can distinguish PTSD from TBI or the comorbid presence of both. The ability to address this question is complicated by the differences between these conditions in military versus general populations which may be due to mechanisms of injury in addition to other factors.

## **TBI and PTSD in Military Personnel**

Traumatic brain injury (TBI), especially from blast and blunt force trauma, has been designated as the “signature wound” of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars [32, 33]. The prevalence of these brain disorders in active duty U.S. military personnel is on the rise, with the Department of Defense reporting 307,283 diagnosed cases of TBI from 2000–2014 [17] and the Congressional Research Service reporting 103,792 diagnosed cases of PTSD from 2000–2012 [18]. The economic costs to society for treatment of PTSD and TBI are significant, with the Rand Corporation estimating an annual cost for TBI between \$591 and \$910 million. Within the first two years after returning from deployment, they estimate that costs associated with PTSD and major depression for 1.6 million service members range between \$4.0 to \$6.2 billion [34].

The co-occurrence of these two disorders among military personnel also is quite frequent. Service members exposed to TBI have been shown to have a higher incidence of PTSD [35–37]. An observational study by Taylor et al. reported 73% of service members met the criteria for PTSD [38]. The RAND survey of returning combat veterans also reported that 50% had witnessed the death or injury of a friend, 10% had been injured themselves, and over 19% had symptoms consistent with PTSD [34]. Hoge et al. found that 90% of combatants had experienced a traumatizing event [35]. Soldiers who experience blast-related TBI are at greater than double the risk for developing PTSD [36]. Over 400,000 military personnel and veterans have been diagnosed with PTSD or TBI since 2001 [17, 18], and many have been diagnosed with both. Indeed, the overlap of these two populations has been estimated at 33% [34, 35] to 42% [39] among veterans.

## **TBI and PTSD in Civilians**

Among the U.S. civilian population, approximately 7.7 million suffer from PTSD [19]. TBI is also quite prevalent, with 2.5 million annual visits to emergency rooms for suspected TBI [40]. Research suggests that long-term consequences of seemingly innocuous head injuries may be significant [41, 42], and it is now understood that repetitive TBI, as occurs in sport, can lead to long-term morbidity [43–48].

The co-occurrence of TBI and PTSD in civilian populations is less clearly delineated. Studies among civilians with TBI indicate that 49% develop a new psychiatric illness in the year subsequent to injury [49–51]. Victims of head injury from motor vehicle accidents also have a higher rate of PTSD compared to those with orthopedic injuries. Bombardier and colleagues reported that 44% of victims of TBI related to assault progressed to meeting diagnostic criteria for PTSD, but that among a cohort of civilians with TBI from any cause only 11% developed

PTSD [52]. Research on the co-occurrence of these two disorders is scant with a PubMed search revealing only five references on the topic.

## **Biomarkers to Differentiate TBI from PTSD**

Given 1) the heterogeneous nature of TBI, 2) the fact that mild TBI, which is most common, is less likely to yield obvious, specific chronic symptoms, 3) the reliance of diagnosis on self-report, and 4) the overlap of physical and psychological symptoms between PTSD and TBI, biomarkers to accurately diagnose these disorders would be a welcome adjunct to clinical acumen. Moreover, while TBI symptoms can resolve over time, a significant proportion of cases develop a persistent post-concussive syndrome (PCS) [3]. Some symptoms of PCS [53, 54] overlap with those of PTSD and can include: headache, dizziness, irritability, memory impairment, slowed reaction time, fatigue, sleep disturbances, sensitivity to light and noise, impulsivity, anxiety and depressive symptoms [2, 3, 39, 46–48, 55–60]. Accurately distinguishing TBI from PTSD can regularly be a clinical challenge. Recollection of traumatic events, particularly if assessment occurs after significant time has elapsed, can be inconsistent [61, 62]. The treatments for PTSD and TBI/PCS are different, therefore, reliably separating them, as well as identifying cases in which both are present, emerges as a genuine diagnostic need [56, 59, 63]. To our knowledge, no widely accepted biomarker to distinguish TBI from PTSD has been reported.

## **Neuroimaging in TBI**

There are a variety of neuroimaging modalities available which provide significant clinical utility in the context of TBI and PTSD. CT and MRI are used to measure changes in anatomical or physiological parameters of TBI (hemorrhage, edema, vascular injury, intracranial pressure), but for most cases of mild TBI, CT and MRI often show no abnormalities [7]. Diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) has been used to detect axonal injury for mild to moderate TBI, but results are inconsistent, highly dependent upon technique, and require further investigation [36]. Functional MRI (fMRI) is often used to differentiate TBI from control groups [64] and has been used to study activation patterns in patients with TBI [65]. Fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography (FDG-PET) measures glucose uptake and metabolism and is used to detect subtle changes in brain function from TBI that are not observed with structural imaging modalities like CT or MRI [66].

Brain perfusion SPECT is used to measure cerebral blood flow and activity patterns and is indicated for the evaluation of TBI in the absence of anatomical findings [67]. A recent review of three decades of research by Raji and colleagues concluded that perfusion SPECT for TBI 1) has improved lesion detection compared to CT/MRI; 2) helps to predict clinical outcomes; and 3) can help direct treatment. Based on their review, the authors suggest that SPECT should be part of a clinical evaluation in the diagnosis and management of TBI [8]. This review cited 19 longitudinal studies that demonstrated Level II A evidence (i.e., evidence from at least one controlled trial without randomization) for perfusion SPECT in identifying lesions in the clinical setting of TBI [8, 68–71]. SPECT has high sensitivity in TBI cases [21–23, 68]. Jacobs et al. found a 91% sensitivity < 3 months after injury and 100% thereafter and strong (96% to 100%)

negative predictive value, thus indicating that a negative perfusion SPECT scan is a reliable indicator of a positive outcome for head injury [68].

## Neuroimaging in PTSD

Brain activation studies have been performed to identify the underlying circuits in PTSD using PET, fMRI and SPECT [24–27, 72–74]. A recent meta-analysis of 19 imaging studies using a symptom provocation paradigm showed that PTSD patients have significant activation of the mid-line retrosplenial cortex and precuneus when presented with trauma-related stimuli [75]. Furthermore, the relationship between TBI and PTSD has been studied with functional imaging using FDG-PET in veterans with mild TBI and/or PTSD compared to community volunteers [76].

Network-based studies of PTSD using fMRI reviewed by Peterson report a positive association between default mode network (DMN) activity and PTSD severity [77]. This correlation was also reported by Lanius [78]. The DMN is postulated as a circuit active during the resting state, involving the inferior orbital frontal cortex, anterior and posterior cingulum, hippocampus, precuneus, superior parietal lobe, and the angular gyrus [79]. If a hyperactive DMN is causal in severe PTSD, this may reflect a failure of DMN regulation which manifests clinically as diminished affect regulation.

Perfusion SPECT also has been investigated in the evaluation of PTSD, and preliminary data suggest it has a potential role in distinguishing PTSD from TBI [25–28]. For example, increased perfusion of the caudate has been associated with PTSD [28]. A small study using both perfusion SPECT and FDG PET showed that women with PTSD had significant decreases in perfusion in the left hippocampus and in the basal ganglia, and lower cerebral glucose metabolism in the left hippocampus and the superior temporal and precentral gyri than in the control group [80]. Another SPECT study showed that compared to controls, PTSD patients had increased cerebral blood flow in the limbic regions along with decreased perfusion in the superior frontal, parietal, and temporal regions [81].

## Neuroimaging to Differentiate TBI, PTSD and the Comorbid Condition

While previous studies have explored the relationship between PTSD and TBI using neuroimaging [5, 76, 82, 83], to the best of our knowledge, no study has identified imaging biomarkers differentiating PTSD from TBI using brain SPECT imaging. In addition, one barrier to identifying neuroimaging biomarkers for psychiatric disorders has been the lack of sufficiently large-scale studies [84]. In this retrospective study, two groups were analyzed; i) a small, well-defined group with the diagnosis of TBI and/or PTSD at one clinical site closely matched for demographics and comorbidity compared to a healthy dataset, and ii) a large, generalized group of all TBI and/or PTSD patients regardless of comorbidity across multiple-sites which were also compared to healthy controls. Both region of interest (ROI) and visual readings (VRs) were analyzed to assess the diagnostic accuracy in using SPECT to better assess and diagnose these conditions.

## Methods

## Study Subjects

This study was conducted in accordance with the STARD guidelines (<http://www.stard-statement.org/>). All subjects were obtained for retrospective analysis from a large multisite psychiatric database, involving 20,746 patients who came for evaluation of psychiatric and/or neurological conditions to one of nine outpatient clinics (Newport Beach, Costa Mesa, Fairfield, and Brisbane, CA, Tacoma and Bellevue, WA, Reston, VA, Atlanta, GA and New York, NY) from 1995–2014. Diagnoses were made by board certified or eligible psychiatrists, using all of the data available to them, including detailed clinical history, mental status examination and DSM-IV or V criteria, consistent with the current standard of care.

The retrospective data analysis for this study was approved by the IRB IntegReview (<http://www.integreview.com/>) (IRB #004) and the healthy subjects were obtained in a separate study as approved by the Western Institutional Review Board (WIRB # 20021714). Written informed consent was obtained from all healthy subjects and data mining of anonymous clinical data was sanctioned in accordance with 45 CFR 46.101(b)(4).

Included in the database are n = 116 healthy adult volunteers who had resting state and on-task SPECT studies. The exclusion criteria for the healthy subjects were: 1) current or past evidence of psychiatric illnesses as determined by clinical history, mental status examinations, and the Structured Clinical Interview for Diagnosis for DSM-IV; 2) current reported medical illnesses or medication; 3) history of brain trauma; 4) current or past drug or alcohol abuse; 5) first degree relative with a psychiatric illness.

Two groups were extracted from the larger database for analysis. Group 1 (n = 397) is described in [Table 1](#) and [Fig 1](#).

Variable	PTSD (n = 104)	TBI (n = 104)	Both PTSD and TBI (n = 72)	Healthy (n = 116)
Age	36.7 ± 12.9	37.2 ± 12.9	40.7 ± 13.8	41.4 ± 17.9
Gender(M/F)	65/39	65/39	36/37	46/70
Race% Caucasian	57	67	66	64
Bipolar%	4	5	4	0
Depression%	41	41	41	0
Bipolar%	6	6	6	0
Epilepsy%	5	4	6	0
Schizophrenia%	3	1	3	0
Substance Abuse%	16	16	16	0
ADHD%	58	58	58	0

Table 1. Subject Demographics for Group 1.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t001




Fig 1. Proportional Demographics for Group 1.

Demographics of Group 1 with number of patients, number of males, number of females and age expressed in absolute numbers, and all other values expressed as percentages.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.g001

Group 1 represents a select cohort from the Newport Beach site matched closely by demographics and co-morbidities, including the healthy cohort. In this group, variance due to comorbid diagnoses was minimized and Ns were matched closely (n = 104 for TBI or PTSD, n = 73 for TBI + PTSD, n = 116 for controls) as the main inclusion criteria. The primary selection criterion for TBI in clinical trials is the GCS, which is used to assess the level of consciousness following a TBI [85]. It rates a patient’s level of consciousness based on the ability to open his or her eyes, talk and move. As this was a retrospective chart review and subjects were not assessed for TBI at the time of injury, we were unable to use the GCS as an assessment of injury severity. Therefore, subjects were classified according to injury severity categories of mild, moderate or severe based on the Department of Defense Clinical Practice Guidelines [86]. Further classification included type of injury (blunt, penetrating, unknown) and mode of injury (accident, assault, fall, sport, accident, unknown) as shown in Tables 2 and 3.

Severity	Type of Injury	Mode of Injury	Number of Patients
Mild	blunt	accident	18
	blunt	assault	5
	blunt	fall	14
	blunt	sports	17
	penetrating	accident	2
Moderate	unknown	unknown	9
	blunt	accident	4
	blunt	assault	1
	blunt	fall	5
	blunt	sports	1
Severe	blunt	accident	13
	blunt	assault	1
	blunt	fall	2
	blunt	sports	2
Unknown Severity	blunt	accident	1
	blunt	assault	1
	blunt	fall	2
	blunt	sports	1
	unknown	unknown	5

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t002

Table 2. TBI Classification for Group 1.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t002

Severity	Type of Injury	Mode of Injury	Number of Patients
Mild	blunt	accident	20
	blunt	assault	5
	blunt	fall	8
	blunt	sports	8
	blunt	unknown	1
	unknown	accident	1
Moderate	unknown	unknown	4
	blunt	accident	3
	blunt	assault	1
	blunt	fall	1
	blunt	sports	2
	penetrating	assault	1
Severe	blunt	accident	5
	blunt	assault	1
	blunt	fall	1
Unknown Severity	blunt	sports	1
	blunt	accident	3
	blunt	assault	2
	blunt	fall	1
	blunt	sports	2
	unknown	accident	1
	unknown	unknown	1

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t003

Table 3. TBI Classification with Comorbid PTSD for Group 1.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t003

Of the 104 patients with TBI only, 65 were classified as mild, 11 moderate and 18 severe based on neuroimaging data and clinical interview. Ten patients could not be categorized based on information provided in the chart. Of these 10 patients, 8 showed abnormal findings on SPECT scans indicating trauma: four subjects were diagnosed with temporal lobe dysfunction; one subject with prefrontal lobe dysfunction and temporal lobe dysfunction; one subject with cerebellar dysfunction, parietal lobe dysfunction and temporal dysfunction; one subject with frontal lobe syndrome and prefrontal lobe dysfunction; and one subject with post-concussion syndrome. Of the 73 patients with TBI+PTSD, 47 were classified as mild, 8 moderate and 8 severe. Ten patients could not be categorized based on information provided in the chart. Of these 10 subjects, 6 had abnormal findings on SPECT scans indicating trauma: one patient showed frontal lobe syndrome, limbic system dysfunction, parietal lobe dysfunction and temporal dysfunction; one subject was diagnosed with post-concussion syndrome; one subject showed occipital lobe hyperperfusion, parietal lobe dysfunction and temporal dysfunction; one subject showed prefrontal lobe and temporal dysfunction; and two subjects showed frontal lobe syndrome and temporal dysfunction.

The patients in the TBI group had a chart diagnosis of intracranial injury with a brief or extended loss of consciousness (n = 62) or concussion (n = 42). The patients with PTSD met the DSM-IV criteria. Patients in the subgroup with TBI were compared to those with PTSD, those with TBI+PTSD, and to healthy controls. Similarly, each of the other subgroups was compared to the remaining subgroups in the method described below.

Group 2 consists of a generalized group with much larger cohorts of patients in each diagnostic area, but unmatched for demographics or comorbidity across all sites. The patients in the TBI and PTSD groups both had a chart diagnosis for their specific disorders. Group 2 reflects the full range of psychiatric co-morbidities across the larger cohorts (n = 7,505 for TBI, n = 1,077 for PTSD, n = 1,017 for TBI+PTSD, n = 11,147 which do not include TBI or PTSD). Group 2 is described in [Table 4](#) and [Fig 2](#). Each subgroup was compared to the other subgroups as described below.

Variable	PTSD (n = 1077)	TBI (n = 7505)	Both PTSD and TBI (n = 1017)	Neither PTSD or TBI (n = 11147)
Age	40.7 ± 13.9	40.5 ± 15.6	41.9 ± 13.7	40.6 ± 16.5
Gender% Male	35	66	46	46
Race% Caucasian	69	68	73	65
Depression%	51	31	40	42
Bipolar%	12	7	13	8
Epilepsy%	1	1	2	1
Schizophrenia%	2	3	2	2
Drug abuse%	5	19	23	16
ADHD%	50	58	59	45

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t004

Table 4. Subject Demographics for Group 2.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t004




Fig 2. Proportional Demographics for Group 2.

Demographics of Group 2 with number of patients with age expressed in years and all other numbers expressed as percentages.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.g002

## SPECT Imaging Acquisition

All SPECT scans were performed using a high resolution Picker (Philips) Prism XP 3000 triple-headed gamma camera (Picker Int. Inc., Ohio Nuclear Medicine Division, Bedford Hills, OH, USA) with low energy high resolution fan beam collimators. SPECT was performed as previously described [87, 88]. For each procedure, an age- and weight-appropriate dose of  $^{99m}\text{Tc}$ -hexamethylpropyleneamine oxime (HMPAO) SPECT was administered intravenously at rest and while performing a cognitive task. For the rest scans, patients were injected while they sat in a dimly lit room with eyes open. Patients were scanned approximately 30 minutes after injection. For the on-task scans, patients were injected three minutes after starting the Conners Continuous Performance Test (Conners Continuous Performance Test, CCPT-II, Multi-Health Systems, Toronto, Ontario). Approximately 30 minutes after the injection, subjects were scanned. Data was acquired in  $128 \times 128$  matrices, yielding 120 images per scan with each image separated by three degrees spanning 360 degrees. The original image matrix obtained at  $128 \times 128 \times 29$  with voxel sizes of  $2.16\text{mm} \times 2.16\text{mm} \times 6.48\text{mm}$  were transformed and resliced to a  $79 \times 95 \times 68$  matrix with voxel sizes of  $2\text{mm} \times 2\text{mm} \times 2\text{mm}$  consistent with the MNI template. Images were smoothed using an 8mm FWHM isotropic Gaussian kernel. The slice thickness was 6mm. A low pass filter was applied with a high cutoff. Chang attenuation correction was performed [89]. Transaxial slices oriented horizontal to the AC-PC line were created along with coronal and sagittal images (6.6mm apart, unsmoothed).

## SPECT Region of Interest Analysis

ROI counts were derived from the anatomical regions in the AAL atlas [90]. These quantitative ROI metrics were in no way used to aid in the clinical diagnosis of PTSD or TBI. To account for outliers, T-score derived ROI count measurements were derived using trimmed means [91] that are calculated using all scores within the 98% confidence interval ( $-2.58 < Z < 2.58$ ). The ROI mean for each subject and the trimmed mean for the sample are used to calculate T with the

following formula:  $T = 10 * ((\text{subject ROI\_mean} - \text{trimmed regional\_avg}) / \text{trimmed regional\_stdev}) + 50$ .

## SPECT Visual Reading Analysis

All scans were read visually by experienced SPECT readers (6–23 years of experience). Methods for visual readings have been fully described in previously published work [87, 88]. Briefly, 14 cortical regions of interest (ROIs) in orthogonal planes were visually inspected and rated using the Mai Atlas of the Human Brain [92]: left and right prefrontal poles; left and right inferior orbits; left and right anterior/lateral PFC; left and right midlateral PFC; left and right posterior frontal region; left and right parietal lobes; and left and right occipital lobes. In like manner, the left and right cerebellar hemispheres and vermis were rated. In addition, subcortical regions were rated, including the dorsal, genu and ventral aspect of the anterior cingulate gyrus; middle and posterior cingulate; left and right insula; left and right caudate nuclei; and left and right putamen. Raters did not have access to detailed clinical information, but did know age, gender, medications, and primary presenting symptoms (ex. depressive symptoms, apathy, etc.). The following nonlinear scheme was used to visually rate rCBF: activity rated above the top 95% was assigned a score of 4+; 91%-95% was scored 3+; 86%-90% was scored 2+; 81%-85% was scored 1+; 61%-80% was scored 0; 56%-60% was scored -1; 51%-55% was scored -2; 46%-50% was scored -3; and 41%-45% was scored -4, resulting in a rating scale ranging from +4 to -4 in a-point intervals.

## Statistical Analyses

The majority of statistical analyses were performed using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS, version 22, IBM, Armonk, NY) with additional 10-fold cross validation analysis performed in R (<http://www.r-project.org/>). Data were analyzed first at UCLA (CAR) with analyses repeated and results verified independently at the Amen Clinics (DGA) and Thomas Jefferson University (AN). Multiple imputation analysis did not identify any significant missing data (<10%). In doing the analyses, the following steps were invoked: First, binary logistic regression models were built using either rest ROIs, rest VRs, on-task ROIs, or on-task VRs as predictor variables. Cerebellar and vermis regions were averaged to carefully optimize subject to variable ratios. Paired comparisons between the groups described in Tables 1 and 4 were performed. Covariates in the analysis were age, gender, race and psychiatric co-morbidities listed in Tables 1 and 4. For Group 2, an additional covariate of study site ID was included in the analysis. Predicted probabilities from binary logistic regression models were then inputted into a Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) analysis to identify sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy in delineating between the various clinical groups with 95% confidence intervals. Finally, a One Way ANOVA with Least Square Differences (LSD) for correcting for multiple comparisons was done to identify the most diagnostically important regions in separating PTSD from TBI. This analysis was also done to determine if increases or decreases in these diagnostically important regions were the main predictors of diagnostic utility of the SPECT regions tested. 10-fold cross validated models [93] were compared against the main models to assess for performance measure stability.

## Results

For Group 1, rest and on-task ROIs and VRs show significant separations from PTSD, TBI and combined conditions. The non-comorbid group separates 100% with the method described for the ROI analysis and above 89% for accuracy for the VRs. The larger comorbid group has lower sensitivity, specificity and accuracy, but these remain in a clinically relevant range (Tables 5 and 6).

Group 1 ROC Analysis (ROV VR) (%)	TBI from PTSD	PTSD From Co-Occurrence	TBI from Co-Occurrence	TBI from Control	PTSD from Control	Co-Occurrence from Control
Sensitivity on-Task	100/100	100/84	100/100	100/100	100/100	100/100
Sensitivity at Rest	100/86	100/82	100/84	100/100	100/100	100/100
Specificity on-Task	100/100	100/80	100/100	100/100	100/100	100/100
Specificity at Rest	100/81	100/80	100/78	100/100	100/100	100/100
Accuracy on-Task	100/100*	100/90	100/100*	100/100*	100/100*	100/100*
	<i>p</i> -value, 95% C.I.)	.00, .85-.95				
Accuracy at Rest	100/94	100/92	100/89	100/100*	100/100*	100/100*
	<i>p</i> -value, 95% C.I.)	.00, .89-.97	.00, .88-.96			

Comparison of Quantitative ROIs with Visual Readings (VR) in Distinguishing TBI from PTSD  
 \* *p* = .005, 95% C.I. = [1-4]  
 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t005

Table 5. Group 1 ROC Analysis of Task vs. Rest Scans.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t005

Group 2 ROC Analysis (ROV VR) (%)	TBI from PTSD	PTSD from Co-Occurrence	TBI from Co-Occurrence	PTSD from Control	TBI from Control	Co-Occurrence from Control
Sensitivity on-Task	80/80	70/70	70/70	70/70	70/67	70/70
Sensitivity at Rest	80/80	70/70	70/70	70/70	70/70	70/70
Specificity on-Task	60/61	61/61	55/56	58/55	54/58	58/57
Specificity at Rest	62/60	60/62	55/56	54/54	54/54	60/59
Accuracy on-Task	78/78	73/71	68/69	68/67	65/66	70/69
	<i>p</i> -value, 95% C.I.)	.00, .76-.80	.00, .71-.75/00, .89-.85	.00, .66-.70/00, .87-.71	.00, .65-.69/00, .86-.70	.00, .65-.67/00, .86-.72/00, .67-.71
Accuracy at Rest	78/77	73/71	68/68	67/66	67/66	70/69
	<i>p</i> -value, 95% C.I.)	.00, .77-.80	.00, .69-.74/00, .89-.86	.00, .66-.70/00, .85-.68	.00, .66-.69/00, .85-.67	.00, .69-.72/00, .67-.71

Comparison Quantitative ROIs with Visual Readings (VR) in Distinguishing TBI from PTSD  
 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t006

Table 6. Group 2 ROC Analysis of Task vs. Rest Scans.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t006

The most significant regions separating PTSD from TBI for the Group 1 ROI analysis of rest and on-task scans are: limbic regions (amygdala, hippocampus, anterior, middle and posterior cingulum, and thalamus), anterior cerebellum, basal ganglia (caudate and putamen), insula, areas of the prefrontal cortex (inferior orbits, operculum), and temporal lobes (middle and superior temporal lobes and temporal poles). All PTSD-identifying regions were more active on SPECT when compared across all groups, and the TBI-identifying regions were correspondingly hypoactive (Table 7).

Brain Region	Group 1: TBI vs PTSD At Rest	Group 1: TBI vs PTSD On-Task	Group 2: TBI vs PTSD At Rest	Group 2: TBI vs PTSD On-Task
Limbic	Amygdala	Amygdala	Amygdala	Amygdala
	Hippocampus	Hippocampus	Hippocampus	Hippocampus
	Ant Cingulum	Ant Cingulum	Ant Cingulum	Ant Cingulum
	Mid Cingulum	Mid Cingulum	Mid Cingulum	Mid Cingulum
	Post Cingulum	Post Cingulum	Post Cingulum	Post Cingulum
	Thalamus	Thalamus	Thalamus	Thalamus
Basal Ganglia	Caudate	Caudate	Caudate	Caudate
	Putamen	Putamen	Putamen	Putamen
Insula	Insula	Insula	Insula	Insula
	Inferior Orbitals	Inferior Orbitals	Inferior Orbitals	Inferior Orbitals
Prefrontal Cortex	Operculum	Operculum	Operculum	Operculum
	Middle Temporal Lobe	Middle Temporal Lobe	Middle Temporal Lobe	Middle Temporal Lobe
Temporal Lobes	Superior Temporal Lobe	Superior Temporal Lobe	Superior Temporal Lobe	Superior Temporal Lobe
	Temporal Poles	Temporal Poles	Temporal Poles	Temporal Poles
Cerebellum	Anterior Cerebellum	Anterior Cerebellum	Anterior Cerebellum	Anterior Cerebellum

PTSD shows increased rCBF in the limbic system, basal ganglia, insula, prefrontal cortex, temporal lobes, cerebellum, occipital lobe and parietal lobe as compared to TBI both at rest and during a concentration task in Groups 1 and 2 using ROI analysis. Legend for Abbreviations: Ant = Anterior; Mid = Middle; Post = Posterior; Sup = Superior.  
 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t007

Table 7. Regional Increases in rCBF that Differentiate PTSD from TBI using ROI Analysis in Distinguishing TBI from PTSD.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t007

The most significant regions from Group 1 VRs of resting state and on-task scans are: limbic regions (right amygdala, left hippocampus, anterior and middle cingulum, thalamus), cerebellum, basal ganglia (caudate during on-task), right insula at rest, multiple areas of the prefrontal cortex (inferior orbits and anterior lateral prefrontal cortex), and temporal lobes (temporal poles and anterior lateral temporal lobes). All PTSD regions were more active than the TBI regions ([Table 8](#)).

Brain Region	Group 1: TBI vs PTSD At Rest	Group 1: TBI vs PTSD On-Task	Group 2: TBI vs PTSD At Rest	Group 2: TBI vs PTSD On-Task
Limbic	Amygdala	Amygdala	Amygdala	Amygdala
	Hippocampus	Hippocampus	Hippocampus	Hippocampus
	Ant Cingulum	Ant Cingulum	Ant Cingulum	Ant Cingulum
	Mid Cingulum	Mid Cingulum	Mid Cingulum	Mid Cingulum
Basal Ganglia	Thalamus	Thalamus	Thalamus	Thalamus
		Caudate	Caudate	Caudate
Insula	Insula			
Prefrontal Cortex	Inferior Orbits	Inferior Orbits	Inferior Orbits	Inferior Orbits
	Ant Lateral Prefrontal Cortex			
Temporal Lobes	Temporal Poles	Temporal Poles	Pole prefrontal cortex	Pole prefrontal cortex
	Ant Lateral Temporal Lobe	Ant Lateral Temporal Lobe	Temporal Poles	Temporal Poles
			Ant Lateral Temporal Lobe	Ant Lateral Temporal Lobe
			Mid Lateral Temporal Lobe	Mid Lateral Temporal Lobe
Cerebellum	Cerebellum	Post Lateral Temporal Lobe	Post Lateral Temporal Lobe	
Occipital Lobe		Cerebellum	Cerebellum	
Parietal Lobe		Occipital Lobe	Occipital Lobe	
		Parietal Lobe	Parietal Lobe	

PTSD shows increased rCBF in the limbic centers, basal ganglia, insula (Group 1 at rest only), prefrontal cortex, temporal lobes, cerebellum, occipital lobe and parietal lobe as compared to TBI both at rest and during a concentration task in Groups 1 and 2 using visual readings. Legend for Abbreviations: Ant = Anterior; Lat = Lateral; Mid = Middle; Post = Posterior.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t008

Table 8. Regional Increases in rCBF that Differentiate PTSD from TBI using Visual Readings (VR) in Distinguishing TBI from PTSD.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t008

The most significant regions from Group 2 ROI analysis of rest and on-task scans are: limbic regions (amygdala, hippocampus, anterior, middle and posterior cingulum, thalamus), anterior cerebellum, basal ganglia (caudate and putamen), insula, areas of the prefrontal cortex (inferior orbits, operculum), and temporal lobes (middle and superior temporal lobes and temporal poles). All PTSD regions were more active than the TBI regions ([Table 7](#)). Group 2 baseline ROI differences are quantified in [Table 9](#).

Brain Level	Brain Area	TBI		PTSD		Statistic			
		Mean	STDEV	Mean	STDEV	F	Sig		
Cerebellum	Cornebellum 3 Left	53.11	7.23	55.04	7.5	2.53	5.98	0.014481	
	Vermis 1 2	52.74	7.66	55.36	8.01	2.64	6.55	0.010529	
Frontal Lobe	Rectus Left	52.25	6.93	54.1	7.53	1.85	4.67	0.030794	
	Rectus Right	51.74	6.75	53.64	7.36	1.8	4.03	0.044795	
Insula	Insula Left	56.67	7.45	59.56	8.01	2.89	6.84	0.008915	
	Insula Right	57.18	7.81	60.01	8.24	2.83	4.8	0.032072	
Limbic	Amygdala Left	51.83	6.93	54.03	7.3	2.8	8.53	0.003909	
	Amygdala Right	55.76	7.05	54.43	7.36	2.66	4.36	0.036363	
	Cingulum Ant Left	55.26	8.09	58.89	8.48	3.33	8.04	0.002848	
	Cingulum Ant Right	51.82	7.54	55.05	7.92	3.23	10.93	0.000952	
	Cingulum Mid Left	57.19	7.8	60.17	8.30	2.98	5.48	0.019304	
	Cingulum Mid Right	55.1	7.5	58.01	7.9	2.9	5.9	0.015155	
	Cingulum Post Left	56.29	8.38	59.32	8.89	3.03	5.41	0.020545	
	Hippocampus Left	51.31	6.94	53.98	7.25	2.87	4.54	0.044881	
	Hippocampus Right	51.42	7.25	54.3	7.47	2.88	5.43	0.018775	
	Parahippocampal Left	46.88	5.75	49.19	6.23	2.31	15.21	0.000007	
	Parahippocampal Right	50.57	6.42	52.97	6.75	2.39	8.3	0.00398	
	Olfactory	Olfactory Left	52.43	7.1	55.26	7.54	2.83	8.8	0.001748
		Olfactory Right	53.85	7.04	56.21	7.57	2.76	7.88	0.006115
	Parietal	Preuneus Left	48.71	6.06	50.78	6.37	2.07	4.38	0.036363
Frontal Inf Orb Left		47.88	5.95	49.45	6.27	1.57	8.31	0.003963	
Prefrontal Cortex	Frontal Inf Orb Right	44.45	5.63	45.64	5.97	1.19	5.73	0.018879	
	Fusiform Left	52.62	6.31	54.86	6.72	2.05	4.85	0.031073	
Temporal Lobes	Fusiform Right	51.67	6.27	53.66	6.57	1.99	4.13	0.042155	
	Heuff Left	58.21	8.03	61.15	8.5	2.95	4.62	0.031883	
	Temporal Inf Mid Left	44.24	5.89	45.21	5.96	0.97	7.34	0.006746	
	Temporal Inf Mid Right	45.03	5.47	46.51	5.75	1.49	3.81	0.047962	
	Temporal Mid Ant Left	49.55	6.23	51.28	6.69	1.74	6.3	0.015982	
	Temporal Mid Mid Left	51.54	6.5	53.55	6.79	2.01	4.67	0.030794	
	Temporal Pole Sup Left	45.13	5.3	48.82	5.76	1.69	10.6	0.001137	
	Temporal Pole Sup Right	42.19	5.06	43.54	5.61	1.35	8.91	0.002853	
	Temporal Sup Ant Left	53.35	6.99	56.01	7.43	2.66	7.47	0.006274	
	Temporal Sup Mid Left	56.02	7.49	58.81	7.8	2.79	6.15	0.013179	

Analysis of variance between shows higher cerebral blood flow in subjects with PTSD compared to TBI patients in the cerebellum, frontal lobes, insular cortex, limbic system, olfactory and parietal lobes, prefrontal cortex, and temporal lobes. Significance is shown by F statistic, difference of the means and p value (all areas with p < 0.05). Legend for Abbreviations: Ant = Anterior; Inf = Inferior; Lat = Lateral; Mid = Middle; Orb = Orbital; Post = Posterior; Sup = Superior

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t009

Table 9. Baseline ROI Differences between TBI and PTSD Group 2.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t009

The most significant regions from Group 2 VRs of rest and on-task scans are: limbic regions (amygdala, hippocampus, and anterior and middle cingulum), cerebellum, basal ganglia (caudate), occipital and parietal lobes, multiple areas of the prefrontal cortex (inferior orbits, anterior lateral prefrontal cortex and prefrontal pole—only left side at baseline), and temporal lobes (temporal poles and anterior, mid and posterior lateral temporal lobes). All PTSD regions were more active than the TBI regions (Table 8). Analysis included a 10-fold cross validation of the protocol in the larger community sample (Group 2), which confirmed the findings. Table 10 and Table 11 show that the difference in performance between the two models produce the same sensitivity, specificity, and accuracy results in ranges from between less than .01% and .11%, which is within the acceptable range as defined by the 95% CI.

Group 2 ROC Analysis (%)	TBI from PTSD	
	ROI	VR
Δ Sensitivity on-Task	-0.29	<0.01
Δ Sensitivity at Rest	-0.29	<0.01
Δ Specificity on-Task	-0.78	<0.01
Δ Specificity at Rest	-1.37	0.11

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t010

Table 10. Comparative Performance Measures in a 10-Step Cross Validation in the Group 2 Diagnostic Separation of TBI from PTSD.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t010

Group 2 ROC Analysis (%)	TBI from PTSD		Confidence Intervals		Within CI	
	ROI	VR	ROI	VR	ROI	VR
Δ Accuracy on-Task	-0.34	0.02	(-0.79;0.77)	(-0.85;0.82)	Y	Y
Δ Accuracy at Rest	-0.34	<0.01	(-0.80;0.76)	(-0.87;0.84)	Y	Y

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t011

Table 11. Confidence Intervals.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.t011

[Fig 3](#) visually displays with 3-D rendered SPECT maps using Picker Odyssey Software (Eclipse Systems Inc., Branford CT) the different findings in TBI versus PTSD and in persons with both conditions. The first volume rendered row shows inferior underside surface rendered images. The second row shows intensity projection images in which white colors represent the top 8 percent of cerebral flow in that subject's brain compared to their whole brain perfusion. A healthy control shows normal higher perfusion to the cerebellum. The PTSD subject shows increased perfusion in the brain—particularly in the frontal lobes. The TBI subject shows decreased perfusion throughout by comparison. The subject with both PTSD and TBI shows perfusion that is lower than the person with PTSD but higher than the subject with TBI.




Fig 3. Brain SPECT Images of Healthy, PTSD, TBI and PTSD Co-morbid with TBI Perfusion Patterns.

Top row, underneath surface scans, threshold set at 55%, looking at top 45% of brain perfusion. Bottom row, underneath active scans where blue = 55%, looking at top 45% of brain perfusion, red = 85% and white 93%. Healthy shows full even, symmetrical perfusion with most active area in cerebellum. Classic PTSD shows increased anterior cingulate, basal ganglia and thalamus perfusion. Classic TBI shows multiple areas of low perfusion seen on surface scans (top row). TBI and PTSD show both.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0129659.g003

## Discussion

The present study examines resting state and on-task rCBF differences which distinguish PTSD from TBI, either disorder from TBI+PTSD, and all three conditions from normal controls. When compared in a larger population with high psychiatric morbidity, TBI, PTSD and TBI+PTSD could be distinguished from non-TBI/non-PTSD with reasonable ROC characteristics which are similar across rest and task states, whether using quantitative or visual analysis.

Since visual analysis of resting state brain perfusion SPECT is a routinely performed and widely-available nuclear medicine procedure, the potential exists for the use of this test in clinical settings. Furthermore, the absence of any requirement for symptom-provocation, a commonly employed technique in functional imaging studies of PTSD, may make a resting state study more

acceptable to individuals with active symptoms and to referring physicians. This investigation also uses the non-distressing Conners Continuous Performance Test for an activation task in all cases.

Compared to multiple severities of TBI—incurring primarily from blunt force—our findings showed increases in the limbic structures, cingulum, basal ganglia, insula, thalamus, prefrontal cortex and temporal lobes in subjects with PTSD. These results are consistent with the limited functional neuroimaging literature on PTSD. At baseline, both military and civilian PTSD subjects show increased perfusion in the caudate/putamen area, right temporal, orbitofrontal cortex, limbic regions, anterior cingulum, cerebellum, and medial prefrontal cortex [24–31, 94–96]. A recent meta-analysis showed that PTSD patients had significant activation in midline areas implicated in self-referential processing and autobiographical memory [75]. Peterson et al.'s recent survey takes a network-based approach to findings in 11 fMRI studies which met her quality threshold over the survey period, 2009 to mid-2013 [77]. They report a positive correlation between default mode network (DMN) connectivity in PTSD severity in five studies, negative in two. Similarly, the present data replicate SPECT findings in TBI. Specifically, hypoperfusion in the orbitofrontal cortex, temporal poles, and anterior cingulum are consistent with the most frequent findings in the TBI literature [8].

The symptoms of chronic TBI can often overlap with those of PTSD [2, 3, 32, 39, 48, 58]. About 15–19% of returning service members have probable mild TBI [34, 35], while an estimated 8–19% meet criteria for PTSD [2, 59, 97, 98]. The overlap of these two populations has been estimated at approximately 40% [34, 35, 39]. Neuropsychological testing has been unsuccessful in clearly differentiating these two disorders [99, 100]. These two overlapping populations have potentially different treatment requirements and different prognoses. For example, the treatments for PTSD may be harmful or, at best, not helpful in the case of TBI. The pharmacological treatments for PTSD, such as benzodiazepines and atypical antipsychotics [101, 102], can impede function or be dangerous in those who have TBI [3, 103, 104]. Similarly, antipsychotics are often prescribed for Veterans with PTSD [103, 105–107], but have been shown to impede recovery or be contraindicated in clinical studies and animal models of TBI [108, 109]. Other treatments for PTSD, such as transcranial magnetic stimulation [110], can be harmful in TBI due to induction of seizures [111]. Emerging treatments for TBI are more targeted and require an understanding of what portion of the individual's brain is involved.

TBI is underappreciated as a contributing factor to the persistent symptoms experienced by service members, athletes [112, 113], and others who experience mild TBI [114, 115]. Differentiating TBI from PTSD is difficult based on symptoms alone or by neuropsychological testing. The treatment for TBI is considerably different from that for PTSD. Therefore, a specific and sensitive biomarker is needed that can readily distinguish TBI from PTSD [56, 59, 63].

The present study demonstrates a novel application of brain SPECT imaging to differentiate TBI from PTSD with sufficient sensitivity, specificity and accuracy to incrementally enhance clinical decision-making. The strengths of this work include the use of both resting state and concentration task scans from an objectively validated functional imaging modality, detailed quantitative analysis, and an extensively characterized psychiatric population obtained across

multiple sites. The large sample size, while a critical attribute, is further enhanced by the separate analysis of a carefully matched smaller cohort that still has a relatively large sample size.

This study also includes several potential limitations. First, this was a retrospective analysis, and we acknowledge that higher levels of evidence can be derived from either prospective studies or randomized clinical trials. Second, subjects in this study had varying degrees of injury severity. While this improves the overall generalizability of our results, future prospective studies investigating a particular class of injury severity (mild, moderate, severe) within a specific cohort (veteran, civilian) with a specific type of injury (blast, penetrating) will be prudent in validating these findings. Third, we did not account for the effect of socioeconomic status which is important as it is a risk factor for PTSD. And fourth, this dataset did not have accompanied structural imaging data, which would have provided useful information on hypoperfusion-associated atrophy, particularly in TBI.

## **Conclusion**

In summary, this is the first SPECT imaging study performed at rest and on-task demonstrating the ability to differentiate PTSD from TBI of varying degrees of severity in large patient cohorts with multiple comorbidities using both ROI and visual analysis. A clinically relevant level of sensitivity, specificity and accuracy was achieved. When compared to subjects with TBI, relative increases in perfusion were observed in PTSD in the limbic regions, cingulum, basal ganglia, insula, thalamus, prefrontal cortex and temporal lobes. These results suggest that TBI is associated with hypoperfusion while PTSD is associated with regional hyperperfusion, providing important insights regarding pathophysiological differences between the disorders. Replication of this work, even in smaller cohorts, would provide a solid basis for identification of biomarkers distinguishing TBI from PTSD, and has the potential to yield significant prognostic value in treating veteran, active military and civilian populations.

## **Acknowledgments**

The authors thank J. Faherty for her assistance in reviewing and editing the manuscript and L. Taylor for her contribution with the data collection.

## **Author Contributions**

Conceived and designed the experiments: DA CR KW. Performed the experiments: DA CR DT. Analyzed the data: DA CR DT. Contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools: CR DT. Wrote the paper: DA KW CR RT AN TH.

## **References**

1. Bryant R. Post-traumatic stress disorder vs traumatic brain injury. *Dialogues Clin Neurosci.* 2011;13(3):251–62. pmid:22034252; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3182010.

2. 2. Lew HL, Vanderploeg RD, Moore DF, Schwab K, Friedman L, Yesavage J, et al. Overlap of mild TBI and mental health conditions in returning OIF/OEF service members and veterans. *J Rehabil Res Dev*. 2008;45(3):xi–xvi. pmid:18629743.
3. 3. Kennedy JE, Jaffee MS, Leskin GA, Stokes JW, Leal FO, Fitzpatrick PJ. Posttraumatic stress disorder and posttraumatic stress disorder-like symptoms and mild traumatic brain injury. *J Rehabil Res Dev*. 2007;44(7):895–920. pmid:18075948. doi: 10.1682/jrrd.2006.12.0166
4. 4. Huang M, Risling M, Baker DG. The role of biomarkers and MEG-based imaging markers in the diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder and blast-induced mild traumatic brain injury. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*. 2015. doi: 10.1016/j.psyneuen.2015.02.008 pmid:25769625.
5. 5. Whipple E, Greene J, Biester R, Robinson K, Nucifora P. C-58 Using Multimodal Magnetic Resonance Imaging to Explore Biomarkers of Veterans with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder after Blast Injury. *Arch Clin Neuropsychol*. 2014;29(6):595. doi: 10.1093/arclin/acu038.239 pmid:25176901.
6. 6. Van Boven RW, Harrington GS, Hackney DB, Ebel A, Gauger G, Bremner JD, et al. Advances in neuroimaging of traumatic brain injury and posttraumatic stress disorder. *J Rehabil Res Dev*. 2009;46(6):717–57. pmid:20104401; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3233771. doi: 10.1682/jrrd.2008.12.0161
7. 7. Lee B, Newberg A. Neuroimaging in traumatic brain imaging. *NeuroRx*. 2005;2(2):372–83. doi: 10.1602/neurorx.2.2.372 pmid:15897957; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC1064998.
8. 8. Raji CA, Tarzwell R, Pavel D, Schneider H, Uszler M, Thornton J, et al. Clinical utility of SPECT neuroimaging in the diagnosis and treatment of traumatic brain injury: a systematic review. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(3):e91088. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0091088 pmid:24646878; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3960124.
9. 9. Weniger G, Lange C, Sachsse U, Irle E. Amygdala and hippocampal volumes and cognition in adult survivors of childhood abuse with dissociative disorders. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. 2008;118(4):281–90. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0447.2008.01246.x pmid:18759808.
10. 10. Villarreal G, Hamilton DA, Graham DP, Driscoll I, Qualls C, Petropoulos H, et al. Reduced area of the corpus callosum in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Psychiatry Res*. 2004;131(3):227–35. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2004.05.002 pmid:15465292.
11. 11. Kasai K, Yamasue H, Gilbertson MW, Shenton ME, Rauch SL, Pitman RK. Evidence for acquired pregenual anterior cingulate gray matter loss from a twin study of combat-related posttraumatic stress disorder. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2008;63(6):550–6. doi: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2007.06.022 pmid:17825801; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC2752671.
12. 12. Kitayama N, Quinn S, Bremner JD. Smaller volume of anterior cingulate cortex in abuse-related posttraumatic stress disorder. *J Affect Disord*. 2006;90(2–3):171–4. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2005.11.006 pmid:16375974; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3226710.
13. 13. Yamasue H, Kasai K, Iwanami A, Ohtani T, Yamada H, Abe O, et al. Voxel-based analysis of MRI reveals anterior cingulate gray-matter volume reduction in posttraumatic stress disorder due to terrorism. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2003;100(15):9039–43. doi: 10.1073/pnas.1530467100 pmid:12853571; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC166434.

14. 14. Woodward SH, Kaloupek DG, Streeter CC, Martinez C, Schaer M, Eliez S. Decreased anterior cingulate volume in combat-related PTSD. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2006;59(7):582–7. doi: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2005.07.033 pmid:16165099.
15. 15. Lindauer RJ, Vlioger EJ, Jalink M, Olf M, Carlier IV, Majoie CB, et al. Smaller hippocampal volume in Dutch police officers with posttraumatic stress disorder. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2004;56(5):356–63. doi: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2004.05.021 pmid:15336518.
16. 16. Bremner JD, Vythilingam M, Vermetten E, Southwick SM, McGlashan T, Nazeer A, et al. MRI and PET study of deficits in hippocampal structure and function in women with childhood sexual abuse and posttraumatic stress disorder. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2003;160(5):924–32. pmid:12727697. doi: 10.1176/appi.ajp.160.5.924
17. 17. Defense and Veterans Brain Injury Center. DoD Worldwide Numbers for TBI 2014 [cited 2014 September 9]. Available: <http://dvbic.dcoe.mil/dod-worldwide-numbers-tbi>.
18. 18. Fischer H. U.S. Military Casualty Statistics: Operation New Dawn, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation Enduring Freedom 2014 Nov. 20, 2014. Congressional Research Service.
19. 19. National Institute of Mental Health. Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) [cited 2014 September 9]. Available from: <http://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/topics/post-traumatic-stress-disorder-ptsd/index.shtml>.
20. 20. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Injury Prevention and Control: Traumatic Brain Injury [cited 2014 September 9]. Available: <http://www.cdc.gov/TraumaticBrainInjury/>
21. 21. Pavel D, Jobe T, Devore-Best S, Davis G, Epstein P, Sinha S, et al. Viewing the functional consequences of traumatic brain injury by using brain SPECT. *Brain and Cogn*. 2006;60(2):211–3. pmid:16646126.
22. 22. Gowda NK, Agrawal D, Bal C, Chandrashekar N, Tripathi M, Bandopadhyaya GP, et al. Technetium Tc-99m ethyl cysteinate dimer brain single-photon emission CT in mild traumatic brain injury: a prospective study. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol*. 2006;27(2):447–51. pmid:16484427.
23. 23. Kinuya K, Kakuda K, Nobata K, Sakai S, Yamamoto K, Itoh S, et al. Role of brain perfusion single-photon emission tomography in traumatic head injury. *Nucl Med Commun*. 2004;25(4):333–7. pmid:15097806. doi: 10.1097/00006231-200404000-00004
24. 24. Shin LM, Orr SP, Carson MA, Rauch SL, Macklin ML, Lasko NB, et al. Regional cerebral blood flow in the amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex during traumatic imagery in male and female Vietnam veterans with PTSD. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2004;61(2):168–76. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.61.2.168 pmid:14757593.
25. 25. Bonne O, Gilboa A, Louzoun Y, Brandes D, Yona I, Lester H, et al. Resting regional cerebral perfusion in recent posttraumatic stress disorder. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2003;54(10):1077–86. pmid:14625150. doi: 10.1016/s0006-3223(03)00525-0
26. 26. Francati V, Vermetten E, Bremner JD. Functional neuroimaging studies in posttraumatic stress disorder: review of current methods and findings. *Depress and Anxiety*. 2007;24(3):202–18. doi: 10.1002/da.20208 pmid:16960853; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3233765.
27. 27. Lindauer RJ, Booij J, Habraken JB, Uylings HB, Olf M, Carlier IV, et al. Cerebral blood flow changes during script-driven imagery in police officers with posttraumatic

- stress disorder. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2004;56(11):853–61. doi: 10.1016/j.biopsych.2004.08.003 pmid:15576062.
28. 28. Sachinvala N, Kling A, Suffin S, Lake R, Cohen M. Increased regional cerebral perfusion by 99mTc hexamethyl propylene amine oxime single photon emission computed tomography in post-traumatic stress disorder. *Mil Med*. 2000;165(6):473–9. pmid:10870367.
  29. 29. Seedat S, Warwick J, van Heerden B, Hugo C, Zungu-Dirwayi N, Van Kradenburg J, et al. Single photon emission computed tomography in posttraumatic stress disorder before and after treatment with a selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor. *J Affect Disord*. 2004;80(1):45–53. doi: 10.1016/S0165-0327(03)00047-8 pmid:15094257.
  30. 30. Zubieta JK, Chinitz JA, Lombardi U, Fig LM, Cameron OG, Liberzon I. Medial frontal cortex involvement in PTSD symptoms: a SPECT study. *J Psychiatr Res*. 1999;33(3):259–64. pmid:10367992. doi: 10.1016/s0022-3956(98)00060-0
  31. 31. Lucey JV, Costa DC, Adshead G, Deahl M, Busatto G, Gacinovic S, et al. Brain blood flow in anxiety disorders. OCD, panic disorder with agoraphobia, and post-traumatic stress disorder on 99mTcHMPAO single photon emission tomography (SPET). *Br J Psychiatry*. 1997;171:346–50. pmid:9373423. doi: 10.1192/bjp.171.4.346
  32. 32. Okie S. Traumatic brain injury in the war zone. *N Engl J Med*. 2005;352(20):2043–7. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp058102 pmid:15901856.
  33. 33. Zaroya G. Key Iraq War Wound: Brain Trauma. *USA Today*. 2005 March 3.
  34. 34. Tanielan T, Jaycox LH. Invisible wounds of war: Psychological and cognitive injuries, their consequences, and services to assist recovery, (2008) RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, CA.
  35. 35. Hoge CW, Castro CA, Messer SC, McGurk D, Cotting DI, Koffman RL. Combat duty in Iraq and Afghanistan, mental health problems, and barriers to care. *N Engl J Med*. 2004;351(1):13–22. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa040603 pmid:15229303.
  36. 36. Rosenfeld JV, McFarlane AC, Bragge P, Armonda RA, Grimes JB, Ling GS. Blast-related traumatic brain injury. *The Lancet Neurol*. 2013;12(9):882–93. doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(13)70161-3 pmid:23884075.
  37. 37. Long-term Consequences of Traumatic Brain Injury. *Gulf and War Health*. 2009(7). doi: 10.1097/htr.0b013e3181c13426
  38. 38. Taylor BC, Hagel EM, Carlson KF, Cifu DX, Cutting A, Bidelspach DE, et al. Prevalence and costs of co-occurring traumatic brain injury with and without psychiatric disturbance and pain among Afghanistan and Iraq War Veteran V.A. users. *Med Care*. 2012;50(4):342–6. doi: 10.1097/MLR.0b013e318245a558 pmid:22228249.
  39. 39. Lew HL. Rehabilitation needs of an increasing population of patients: Traumatic brain injury, polytrauma, and blast-related injuries. *J Rehabil Res Dev*. 2005;42(4):xiii–xvi. pmid:16320135. doi: 10.1682/jrrd.2005.01.0124
  40. 40. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Web-based Injury Statistics Query and Reporting System (WISQUARS). Available at <http://www.cdc.gov/injury/wisquars/LeadingCauses.html>. Assessed via National Vital Statistics System- 2007.
  41. 41. Prins ML, Alexander D, Giza CC, Hovda DA. Repeated mild traumatic brain injury: mechanisms of cerebral vulnerability. *J Neurotrauma*. 2013;30(1):30–8. doi: 10.1089/neu.2012.2399 pmid:23025820; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4047842.

42. 42. Barkhoudarian G, Hovda DA, Giza CC. The molecular pathophysiology of concussive brain injury. *Clin Sports Med.* 2011;30(1):33–48, vii–iii. doi: 10.1016/j.csm.2010.09.001 pmid:21074080.
43. 43. Cernak I, Noble-Haesslein LJ. Traumatic brain injury: an overview of pathobiology with emphasis on military populations. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab.* 2010;30(2):255–66. doi: 10.1038/jcbfm.2009.203 pmid:19809467; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC2855235.
44. 44. Bigler ED. Neurobiology and neuropathology underlie the neuropsychological deficits associated with traumatic brain injury. *Arch Clin Neuropsychol.* 2003;18(6):595–621; discussion 3–7. pmid:14591434. doi: 10.1093/arclin/18.6.595
45. 45. Bigler ED, Maxwell WL. Neuropathology of mild traumatic brain injury: relationship to neuroimaging findings. *Brain Imaging and Beh.* 2012;6(2):108–36. doi: 10.1007/s11682-011-9145-0 pmid:22434552.
46. 46. Fann JR, Burington B, Leonetti A, Jaffe K, Katon WJ, Thompson RS. Psychiatric illness following traumatic brain injury in an adult health maintenance organization population. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 2004;61(1):53–61. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.61.1.53 pmid:14706944.
47. 47. Jorge RE, Robinson RG, Moser D, Tateno A, Crespo-Facorro B, Arndt S. Major depression following traumatic brain injury. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 2004;61(1):42–50. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.61.1.42 pmid:14706943.
48. 48. Kashluba S, Hanks RA, Casey JE, Millis SR. Neuropsychologic and functional outcome after complicated mild traumatic brain injury. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2008;89(5):904–11. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2007.12.029 pmid:18452740.
49. 49. Fann JR, Katon WJ, Uomoto JM, Esselman PC. Psychiatric disorders and functional disability in outpatients with traumatic brain injuries. *Am J Psychiatry.* 1995;152(10):1493–9. pmid:7573589. doi: 10.1097/00001199-199608000-00013
50. 50. Bombardier CH, Fann JR, Temkin NR, Esselman PC, Barber J, Dikmen SS. Rates of major depressive disorder and clinical outcomes following traumatic brain injury. *JAMA.* 2010;303(19):1938–45. doi: 10.1001/jama.2010.599 pmid:20483970; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3090293.
51. 51. Kerr ZY, Marshall SW, Harding HP Jr., Guskiewicz KM. Nine-year risk of depression diagnosis increases with increasing self-reported concussions in retired professional football players. *Am J Sports Med.* 2012;40(10):2206–12. doi: 10.1177/0363546512456193 pmid:22922518.
52. 52. Bombardier CH, Fann JR, Temkin N, Esselman PC, Pelzer E, Keough M, et al. Posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms during the first six months after traumatic brain injury. *Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci.* 2006;18(4):501–8. doi: 10.1176/jnp.2006.18.4.501 pmid:17135375.
53. 53. Maroon JC, Lepere DB, Blaylock RL, Bost JW. Postconcussion syndrome: a review of pathophysiology and potential nonpharmacological approaches to treatment. *Phys Sportsmed.* 2012;40(4):73–87. doi: 10.3810/psm.2012.11.1990 pmid:23306417.
54. 54. Rigg JL, Mooney SR. Concussions and the military: issues specific to service members. *PM & R.* 2011;3(10 Suppl 2):S380–6. doi: 10.1016/j.pmrj.2011.08.005 pmid:22035680.
55. 55. Anderson RJ. Shell shock: an old injury with new weapons. *Mol Interv.* 2008;8(5):204–18. doi: 10.1124/mi.8.5.2 pmid:19015383.

56. 56. Vaishnavi S, Rao V, Fann JR. Neuropsychiatric problems after traumatic brain injury: unraveling the silent epidemic. *Psychosomatics*. 2009;50(3):198–205. doi: 10.1176/appi.psy.50.3.198 pmid:19567758.
57. 57. Vasterling JJ, Proctor SP, Amoroso P, Kane R, Heeren T, White RF. Neuropsychological outcomes of army personnel following deployment to the Iraq war. *JAMA*. 2006;296(5):519–29. doi: 10.1001/jama.296.5.519 pmid:16882958.
58. 58. Neurobehavioral Working Group, Warden DL, Gordon B, McAllister TW, Silver JM, Barth JT, et al. Guidelines for the pharmacologic treatment of neurobehavioral sequelae of traumatic brain injury. *J Neurotrauma*. 2006;23(10):1468–501. doi: 10.1089/neu.2006.23.1468 pmid:17020483.
59. 59. Brenner LA, Vanderploeg RD, Terrio H. Assessment and diagnosis of mild traumatic brain injury, posttraumatic stress disorder, and other polytrauma conditions: burden of adversity hypothesis. *Rehabil Psychol*. 2009;54(3):239–46. doi: 10.1037/a0016908 pmid:19702422.
60. 60. Hibbard MR, Uysal S, Kepler K, Bogdany J, Silver J. Axis I psychopathology in individuals with traumatic brain injury. *J Head Trauma Rehabil*. 1998;13(4):24–39. pmid:9651237. doi: 10.1097/00001199-199808000-00003
61. 61. Schwab KA, Ivins B, Cramer G, Johnson W, Sluss-Tiller M, Kiley K, et al. Screening for traumatic brain injury in troops returning from deployment in Afghanistan and Iraq: initial investigation of the usefulness of a short screening tool for traumatic brain injury. *J Head Trauma Rehabil*. 2007;22(6):377–89. doi: 10.1097/01.HTR.0000300233.98242.87 pmid:18025970.
62. 62. Stein MB, McAllister TW. Exploring the convergence of posttraumatic stress disorder and mild traumatic brain injury. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2009;166(7):768–76. doi: 10.1176/appi.ajp.2009.08101604 pmid:19448186.
63. 63. Terrio H, Brenner LA, Ivins BJ, Cho JM, Helmick K, Schwab K, et al. Traumatic brain injury screening: preliminary findings in a US Army Brigade Combat Team. *J Head Trauma Rehabil*. 2009;24(1):14–23. doi: 10.1097/HTR.0b013e31819581d8 pmid:19158592.
64. 64. Kim J, Whyte J, Patel S, Europa E, Slattery J, Coslett HB, et al. A perfusion fMRI study of the neural correlates of sustained-attention and working-memory deficits in chronic traumatic brain injury. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2012;26(7):870–80. doi: 10.1177/1545968311434553 pmid:22357634.
65. 65. Fischer BL, Parsons M, Durgerian S, Reece C, Mourany L, Lowe MJ, et al. Neural activation during response inhibition differentiates blast from mechanical causes of mild to moderate traumatic brain injury. *J Neurotrauma*. 2014;31(2):169–79. doi: 10.1089/neu.2013.2877 pmid:24020449; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3900006.
66. 66. Byrnes KR, Wilson CM, Brabazon F, von Leden R, Jurgens JS, Oakes TR, et al. FDG-PET imaging in mild traumatic brain injury: a critical review. *Front Neuroenergetics*. 2014;5:13. doi: 10.3389/fnene.2013.00013 pmid:24409143; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3885820.
67. 67. American College of Radiology. ACR-SPR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Single Photon Emission Computed Tomography (SPECT) Brain Perfusion and for Brain Death Studies. 2014.
68. 68. Jacobs A, Put E, Ingels M, Put T, Bossuyt A. One-year follow-up of technetium-99m-HMPAO SPECT in mild head injury. *J Nucl Med*. 1996;37(10):1605–9. pmid:8862291.

69. 69. Stamatakis EA, Wilson JT, Wyper DJ. Analysis of HMPAO SPECT scans in head injury using Statistical Parametric Mapping. *Behav Neurol*. 2000;12(1–2):29–37. pmid:11455040. doi: 10.1155/2000/681916
70. 70. Stamatakis EA, Wilson JT, Hadley DM, Wyper DJ. SPECT imaging in head injury interpreted with statistical parametric mapping. *J Nucl Med*. 2002;43(4):476–83. pmid:11937590.
71. 71. Van Laere KJ, Warwick J, Versijpt J, Goethals I, Audenaert K, Van Heerden B, et al. Analysis of clinical brain SPECT data based on anatomic standardization and reference to normal data: an ROC-based comparison of visual, semiquantitative, and voxel-based methods. *J Nucl Med*. 2002;43(4):458–69. Epub 2002/04/09. pmid:11937588.
72. 72. Bremner JD. Alterations in brain structure and function associated with post-traumatic stress disorder. *Semin Clin Neuropsychiatry*. 1999;4(4):249–55. doi: 10.153/SCNP00400249 pmid:10553030.
73. 73. Rauch SL, Whalen PJ, Shin LM, McInerney SC, Macklin ML, Lasko NB, et al. Exaggerated amygdala response to masked facial stimuli in posttraumatic stress disorder: a functional MRI study. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2000;47(9):769–76. pmid:10812035. doi: 10.1016/s0006-3223(00)00828-3
74. 74. Hayes JP, Hayes SM, Mikedis AM. Quantitative meta-analysis of neural activity in posttraumatic stress disorder. *Biol Mood Anxiety Disord*. 2012;2(1):9. doi: 10.1186/2045-5380-2-9 pmid:22738125; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3430553.
75. 75. Sartory G, Cwik J, Knuppertz H, Schurholt B, Lebens M, Seitz RJ, et al. In search of the trauma memory: a meta-analysis of functional neuroimaging studies of symptom provocation in posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD). *PloS One*. 2013;8(3):e58150. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0058150 pmid:23536785; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3607590.
76. 76. Peskind ER, Petrie EC, Cross DJ, Pagulayan K, McCraw K, Hoff D, et al. Cerebrocerebellar hypometabolism associated with repetitive blast exposure mild traumatic brain injury in 12 Iraq war Veterans with persistent post-concussive symptoms. *NeuroImage*. 2011;54 Suppl 1:S76–82. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.04.008 pmid:20385245; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3264671.
77. 77. Peterson A, Thome J, Frewen P, Lanius RA. Resting-state neuroimaging studies: a new way of identifying differences and similarities among the anxiety disorders? *Can J Psychiatry*. 2014;59(6):294–300. pmid:25007403; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4079145.
78. 78. Lanius RA, Bluhm RL, Coupland NJ, Hegadoren KM, Rowe B, Theberge J, et al. Default mode network connectivity as a predictor of post-traumatic stress disorder symptom severity in acutely traumatized subjects. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. 2010;121(1):33–40. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0447.2009.01391.x pmid:19426163.
79. 79. Buckner RL, Andrews-Hanna JR, Schacter DL. The brain's default network: anatomy, function, and relevance to disease. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 2008;1124:1–38. doi: 10.1196/annals.1440.011 pmid:18400922.
80. 80. Kim SY, Chung YK, Kim BS, Lee SJ, Yoon JK, An YS. Resting cerebral glucose metabolism and perfusion patterns in women with posttraumatic stress disorder related to sexual assault. *Psychiatry Res*. 2012;201(3):214–7. doi: 10.1016/j.psychresns.2011.08.007 pmid:22464826.
81. 81. Chung YA, Kim SH, Chung SK, Chae JH, Yang DW, Sohn HS, et al. Alterations in cerebral perfusion in posttraumatic stress disorder patients without re-exposure to

- accident-related stimuli. *Clin Neurophysiol.* 2006;117(3):637–42. doi: 10.1016/j.clinph.2005.10.020 pmid:16426890.
82. 82. Davenport ND, Lim KO, Sponheim SR. White matter abnormalities associated with military PTSD in the context of blast TBI. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 2014. doi: 10.1002/hbm.22685 pmid:25387950.
83. 83. Yeh PH, Wang B, Oakes TR, French LM, Pan H, Graner J, et al. Postconcussional disorder and PTSD symptoms of military-related traumatic brain injury associated with compromised neurocircuitry. *Hum Brain Mapp.* 2014;35(6):2652–73. doi: 10.1002/hbm.22358 pmid:24038816.
84. 84. Krystal JH, State MW. Psychiatric disorders: diagnosis to therapy. *Cell.* 2014;157(1):201–14. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2014.02.042 pmid:24679536; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4104191.
85. 85. Teasdale G, Jennett B. Assessment of coma and impaired consciousness. A practical scale. *Lancet.* 1974;2(7872):81–4. pmid:4136544. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(74)91639-0
86. 86. DOD/VA COMMON DEFINITION OF TBI 2008. Available: <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/icd/Sep08TBI.pdf>.
87. 87. Amen DG, Hanks C, Prunella J. Predicting positive and negative treatment responses to stimulants with brain SPECT imaging. *J Psychoactive Drugs.* 2008;40(2):131–8. Epub 2008/08/30. pmid:18720661. doi: 10.1080/02791072.2008.10400622
88. 88. Amen DG, Hanks C, Prunella J. Preliminary evidence differentiating ADHD using brain SPECT imaging in older patients. *J Psychoactive Drugs.* 2008;40(2):139–46. Epub 2008/08/30. pmid:18720662. doi: 10.1080/02791072.2008.10400623
89. 89. Chang W, Henkin RE, Buddemeyer E. The sources of overestimation in the quantification by SPECT of uptakes in a myocardial phantom: concise communication. *J Nucl Med.* 1984;25(7):788–91. pmid:6610732.
90. 90. Tzourio-Mazoyer N, Landeau B, Papathanassiou D, Crivello F, Etard O, Delcroix N, et al. Automated anatomical labeling of activations in SPM using a macroscopic anatomical parcellation of the MNI MRI single-subject brain. *NeuroImage.* 2002;15(1):273–89. doi: 10.1006/nimg.2001.0978 pmid:11771995.
91. 91. Thomas JT, C. B. A note on the estimation of the location parameters of the Cauchy distribution. *J Am Stat Assoc.* 1964;61:852–5.
92. 92. Mai JK, Paxino G, Voss T. *Atlas of the Human Brain.* 3rd ed. San Diego, CA: Academic Press; 1997.
93. 93. Hastie TT, R. . Model Assessment and Selection. In *The elements of statistical learning: Data mining, inference, and prediction.* New York: Springer; 2001. doi: 10.1016/j.neunet.2009.04.005. pmid:19443179
94. 94. Bremner JD, Innis RB, Ng CK, Staib LH, Salomon RM, Bronen RA, et al. Positron emission tomography measurement of cerebral metabolic correlates of yohimbine administration in combat-related posttraumatic stress disorder. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 1997;54(3):246–54. pmid:9075465. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.1997.01830150070011
95. 95. Lindauer RJ, Booij J, Habraken JB, van Meijel EP, Uylings HB, Olf M, et al. Effects of psychotherapy on regional cerebral blood flow during trauma imagery in patients with post-traumatic stress disorder: a randomized clinical trial. *Psychol Med.* 2008;38(4):543–54. doi: 10.1017/S0033291707001432 pmid:17803835.
96. 96. Ruffolo LF, Guilmette TJ, Willis GW. Comparison of time and error rates on the trail making test among patients with head injuries, experimental malingerers, patients with

- suspect effort on testing, and normal controls. *Clin Neuropsychol.* 2000;14(2):223–30. doi: 10.1076/1385-4046(200005)14:2;1-Z;FT223 pmid:10916197.
97. Milliken CS, Auchterlonie JL, Hoge CW. Longitudinal assessment of mental health problems among active and reserve component soldiers returning from the Iraq war. *JAMA.* 2007;298(18):2141–8. doi: 10.1001/jama.298.18.2141 pmid:18000197.
98. Smith TC, Ryan MA, Wingard DL, Slymen DJ, Sallis JF, Kritz-Silverstein D, et al. New onset and persistent symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder self reported after deployment and combat exposures: prospective population based US military cohort study. *BMJ.* 2008;336(7640):366–71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.39430.638241.AE pmid:18198395; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC2244768.
99. Sayer NA, Rettmann NA, Carlson KF, Bernardy N, Sigford BJ, Hamblen JL, et al. Veterans with history of mild traumatic brain injury and posttraumatic stress disorder: challenges from provider perspective. *J Rehabil Res Dev.* 2009;46(6):703–16. pmid:20104400. doi: 10.1682/jrrd.2009.01.0008
100. Macera CA, Aralis HJ, Macgregor AJ, Rauh MJ, Galarneau MR. Postdeployment symptom changes and traumatic brain injury and/or posttraumatic stress disorder in men. *J Rehabil Res Dev.* 2012;49(8):1197–208. pmid:23341312. doi: 10.1682/jrrd.2011.07.0131
101. Jain S, Greenbaum MA, Rosen C. Concordance between psychotropic prescribing for veterans with PTSD and clinical practice guidelines. *Psychiatr Serv.* 2012;63(2):154–60. doi: 10.1176/appi.ps.201100199 pmid:22302333.
102. Watts BV, Schnurr PP, Mayo L, Young-Xu Y, Weeks WB, Friedman MJ. Meta-analysis of the efficacy of treatments for posttraumatic stress disorder. *J Clin Psychiatry.* 2013;74(6):e541–50. doi: 10.4088/JCP.12r08225 pmid:23842024.
103. Morgan M, Lockwood A, Steinke D, Schleenbaker R, Botts S. Pharmacotherapy regimens among patients with posttraumatic stress disorder and mild traumatic brain injury. *Psychiatr Serv.* 2012;63(2):182–5. doi: 10.1176/appi.ps.201000531 pmid:22302339.
104. Silver JM, Arciniegas DB, Yudofsky SC. Psychopharmacology In: Silver JM, McAllister TW, Yudofsky SC., (eds). *Textbook of Traumatic Brain Injury.* 2nd ed. American Psychiatric Publishing Arlington, VA: 2011. p. 609–39.
105. Hermes E, Sernyak M, Rosenheck R. The use of second generation antipsychotics for post-traumatic stress disorder in a US Veterans Health Administration Medical Center. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci.* 2014;23(3):281–8. doi: 10.1017/S2045796013000449 pmid:24007653.
106. Krystal JH, Rosenheck RA, Cramer JA, Vessicchio JC, Jones KM, Vertrees JE, et al. Adjunctive risperidone treatment for antidepressant-resistant symptoms of chronic military service-related PTSD: a randomized trial. *JAMA.* 2011;306(5):493–502. doi: 10.1001/jama.2011.1080 pmid:21813427.
107. Wang HR, Woo YS, Bahk WM. Atypical antipsychotics in the treatment of posttraumatic stress disorder. *Clin Neuropharmacol.* 2013;36(6):216–22. doi: 10.1097/WNF.0b013e3182aa365f pmid:24201234.
108. Kline AE, Hoffman AN, Cheng JP, Zafonte RD, Massucci JL. Chronic administration of antipsychotics impede behavioral recovery after experimental traumatic brain injury. *Neurosci Lett.* 2008;448(3):263–7. doi: 10.1016/j.neulet.2008.10.076 pmid:18983891; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3055241.

109. 109. Phelps TI, Bondi CO, Ahmed RH, Olugbade YT, Kline AE. Divergent long-term consequences of chronic treatment with haloperidol, risperidone, and bromocriptine on traumatic brain injury-induced cognitive deficits. *J Neurotrauma*. 2015;32(8):590–7. doi: 10.1089/neu.2014.3711 pmid:25275833.
110. 110. Berlim MT, Van Den Eynde F. Repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation over the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex for treating posttraumatic stress disorder: an exploratory meta-analysis of randomized, double-blind and sham-controlled trials. *Can J Psychiatry*. 2014;59(9):487–96. pmid:25565694; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4168811. doi: 10.1017/s0033291713000512
111. 111. Castel-Lacanal E, Tarri M, Loubinoux I, Gasq D, de Boissezon X, Marque P, et al. Transcranial magnetic stimulation in brain injury. *Ann Fr Anesth Reanim* 2014;33(2):83–7. doi: 10.1016/j.annfar.2013.11.006 pmid:24378049.
112. 112. Casson IR, Viano DC, Powell JW, Pellman EJ. Twelve years of national football league concussion data. *Sports Health*. 2010;2(6):471–83. doi: 10.1177/1941738110383963 pmid:23015977; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3438866.
113. 113. Casson IR, Viano DC, Powell JW, Pellman EJ. Repeat concussions in the national football league. *Sports Health*. 2011;3(1):11–24. doi: 10.1177/1941738110391413 pmid:23015986; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3445193.
114. 114. Selassie AW, Wilson DA, Pickelsimer EE, Voronca DC, Williams NR, Edwards JC. Incidence of sport-related traumatic brain injury and risk factors of severity: a population-based epidemiologic study. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2013;23(12):750–6. doi: 10.1016/j.annepidem.2013.07.022 pmid:24060276; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC4021712.
115. 115. Jeyaraj JA, Clendenning A, Bellemare-Lapierre V, Iqbal S, Lemoine MC, Edwards D, et al. Clinicians' perceptions of factors contributing to complexity and intensity of care of outpatients with traumatic brain injury. *Brain Inj*. 2013;27(12):1338–47. doi: 10.3109/02699052.2013.823650 pmid:23923818.