



HAL
open science

Neuropsychiatry Review Series: Mild Traumatic Brain injury.

W. Huw Williams, Seb Potter, Helen J Ryland

► **To cite this version:**

W. Huw Williams, Seb Potter, Helen J Ryland. Neuropsychiatry Review Series: Mild Traumatic Brain injury.. Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery and Psychiatry, 2010, 81 (10), pp.1116. 10.1136/jnnp.2008.171298 . hal-00570135

HAL Id: hal-00570135

<https://hal.science/hal-00570135>

Submitted on 27 Feb 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Mild Traumatic Brain Injury and Post Concussion Symptoms: a Neuropsychological Perspective

W. Huw Williams,¹ Seb Potter² and Helen Ryland¹

¹ School of Psychology, Washington Singer Laboratories, Exeter University, Exeter UK

² Lishman Brain Injury Unit, Maudsley Hospital, Denmark Hill, London UK

Corresponding Author:
A/Prof W. Huw Williams
School of Psychology, Washington Singer Laboratories, Exeter University
Exeter, UK EX4 4QG

w.h.williams@exeter.ac.uk

01392 264661

Fax 01392 264623

Mild Traumatic Brain Injury, Concussion, Neuropsychology, Neuro-psychiatry

Word count: 4850

Introduction

Mild Traumatic Brain Injury (MTBI) is a major public health issue. Around 80% of all TBI's are mild, of which up to 15% may be associated with persisting symptoms.^{1 2} It is unclear whether neurological or psychological factors account for such problems. We shall, first, provide an overview to issues in classification and diagnosis of MTBI and Post Concussion Syndrome (PCS). We will then review the evidence for associations between neurological status and neuropsychological functions, and for psychological mediators of outcomes. We then provide guidance for assessment and intervention post MTBI.

For the purpose of this review, we will use the terms MTBI for the initial injury and acute effects, and PCS for persistent symptoms (over weeks, months and years). Also, when referring to studies, we shall mostly use the terms used by authors of studies for their population of interest.³

MTBI & PCS: Issues in Classification and Diagnosis

Epidemiology: TBI is a leading cause of death and disability and accounts for a significant proportion of life-years of disability.⁴ The yearly incidence of TBI is 180–250 per 100,000 people in the US⁵ and 229 per 100,000 in England.⁶ Risk factors are age (very young (under 5), adolescence and young adulthood, and older age), male gender, urban dwelling, and lower socio-economic level.⁷ Common causes include road accidents, falls, sporting injury and assaults. In non-sporting injuries alcohol and /or drug influence is a key contributory factor.⁸ In non-western area rates are likely to be very high and set to rise substantially.⁹

Definitions and Classification of MTBI : MTBI is “classically defined as an essentially reversible syndrome without detectable pathology”¹⁰ (p.633). Immediate symptoms of MTBI include headache, dizziness and nausea as well as physical signs which may include unsteady gait, slurred speech, poor concentration and slowness when answering questions.¹¹ Recovery following MTBI within sports is rapid, with most acute symptoms resolving within hours, and then, typically, a person being symptom free by around 10 days.¹² Recovery of functions across domains in patients may be differential – with physical and cognitive symptoms being less present than emotional symptoms (irritability, anxiety) at 6 weeks post-injury.¹³ However

headaches appear to be relatively common at such later follow up. MTBI has a variety of clinical indicators, such as GCS of 13 or above¹⁴, Post-Traumatic Amnesia (PTA) of no more than 24 hours (see^{15 16}), and neurological signs such as double vision, headache etc.^{17 18}

¹⁹ A recent study indicated that PTA is a more effective than GCS for predicting behavioural outcomes at 6 months post injury.²⁰ Criteria for diagnosis of MTBI are available from American Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine²¹ and, the World Health Organisation (WHO).²² We also note that there is ongoing debate over whether MTBI is synonymous with “concussion” or not.²³ It seems that MTBI and concussion have been used interchangeably²⁴ although the latter is more commonly used in sports medicine, and MTBI in general medical contexts.

Relationship between MTBI and PCS: PCS is a constellation of symptoms in physical (e.g. fatigue, headaches), cognitive (e.g. difficulties with concentration and memory) and emotional (e.g. irritability, anxiety) domains that persist for weeks, months and even years after a MTBI.²⁵ There are estimates of around 15% of individuals having such persistent symptoms.²⁶ In one study it was reported that 48% of young adults with mild head injuries experienced moderate to severe disability at one year post injury.²⁷ Methodological issues, such as recruitment bias,²⁸ may lead to such figures being over-estimates.²⁹ For example, it was recently shown that Attention-deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) may be a risk factor for early head injury.³⁰ This suggests a degree of reverse-causality for presence of symptoms. Furthermore, three inter-related issues cloud’s an understanding of the true scale and scope of the problem. First, there is disagreement between diagnostic systems on key criteria; second, lack of specificity of symptoms; third, as indicated above, a lack of clarity over pathogenesis.

There are two main diagnostic systems for PCS - ICD (F07.2) and (as Postconcussional Disorder, (PCD)) DSM-IV (research). Whilst there is general agreement across the two sets of criteria in terms of general symptoms, within DSM-IV there are additional requirements for objective cognitive impairment and disturbance in social or occupational functioning and specification of threshold of 3 months for symptoms to persist (see^{31 32 33 34}). Not surprisingly, a comparison of prevalence rates post TBI of PCS according to each criteria revealed a striking difference between them - with DSM IV criteria being met by 11% and 64% by the ICD criteria.³⁴

Symptoms of PCS are not clearly specific to PCS, with a high rate of similar symptoms in non-brain injured such as orthopaedic patients.³⁵ Overlap of symptoms with other clinical populations is considerable, including individuals with depression,³⁶ pain,³⁷ and whiplash symptoms.³⁸ Although there is a lack of specificity to PCS, there does appear to be sufficient evidence of it being a clinical phenomenon that is sensitive to measurement. There is, for example, considerable consistency in symptoms across a range of PCS checklists and questionnaires,³⁹ and the structure of symptoms in cognitive, emotional and physical domains is relatively consistent across a variety of studies using different questionnaires and in different populations.⁴⁰ Assessment of the severity and impact of symptoms, using questionnaires such as the Rivermead PCS, has been advocated. Particularly as the presence and severity of symptoms are associated with quality of life⁴¹ and return to work.⁴²

There is much debate over whether persistent symptoms are “driven” by neurological and/or psychological factors, and how pre-morbid issues may influence both sets of factors.^{43 22 10 44} Female gender, previous psychiatric history and previous head injury²² have been linked to poorer outcome, although much of the literature has been critiqued both conceptually and methodologically.²⁹ Diathesis-stressor models have been proposed to combine both “organic” and “psychogenic” factors for the development of PCS.^{45 46 26} They typically have at their centre the idea proposed by Lishman⁴⁷ that early physiogenic mechanisms may be responsible for early PCS symptoms, but “vicious cycles” that emphasise non-organic, psychological factors may be responsible for their persistence over time. For example, King⁴⁸ outlines a number of potential “windows of vulnerability”, from early worries about symptom longevity and dissonance between injury severity and early symptoms.

There is, therefore, uncertainty over how, and why, MTBI leads to PCS. What is clear is that acute indicators of injury severity, and concomitant neurocognitive dys-function, may be important considerations for understanding later presentation of PCS symptoms. We will now review evidence for neurocognitive sequelae to MTBI. We shall then explore whether there is evidence to link such symptoms with neuroradiological data, principally imaging. We shall then consider how, and why, psychological factors may be related to persistence of symptoms.

Neurocognitive Consequences of MTBI:

There are two main types of neurocognitive studies, those of athletes at “risk” of injury from contact sports, and of patient groups – typically attendees at Emergency Departments. Studies

are focussed on determining presence of neurocognitive symptoms for early diagnosis of MTBI and for monitoring recovery for guiding return to activities.^{49 50 51 52} Systems include traditional neurocognitive measures and/or computerised tests (see⁵³). *Lange*

There are important distinctions to be drawn between sports and patient group studies. First, athletes may “down play” symptoms to enable return to play.⁵⁴ Second, athletes may be assessed as being concussed for relatively minor disturbances in consciousness compared to patients. Third, patients may have greater heterogeneity of issues to consider, such as pre-morbid factors (educational, socio-economic etc). Fourth, the nature of the injury may mean very different degrees of bio-mechanical forces at play - for example, acceleration and deceleration forces are typically far higher in road incidents than in sports.

Sports: There are many sports “return to play” studies that indicate that single concussive episodes leave no lasting neurocognitive consequence.⁵⁵ A meta-analytic review of post-acute neurocognitive effects of concussion in sports by Belanger and Vanderploeg⁵⁴ identified 21 of 69 studies between 1970 and 2004 that met key inclusion criteria (such as including a control or baseline comparisons). They reported that there were mild-moderate effect of concussion in the first 24 hours on global measures of functioning, and larger deficits on memory. However, there was full resolution of functions by 7-10 days post injury. They did note, however, that practice effects may have lead to an underestimate of concussion effects. They also noted that studies that excluded prior “head injury” had smaller effect size than those that did not exclude such athletes.

A landmark study in the area by McCrea et al.,¹² illustrates key point regarding recovery trajectories. They followed up a concussed group (n=94) and an uninjured control group (n=56) of American college football players selected from a cohort of 1631. They were tested pre-season, and then immediately after injury. They were subsequently tested at 3 hours, then at 1, 2, 3, 5, 7 and 90 days post injury. By 7 days there was no difference between the concussed and non-concussed group on the Standardised Assessment of Concussion (SAC, which addresses orientation, balance and coordination, neurological signs and delayed memory). However, it is noteworthy that the concussed group performed “less well” than controls on verbal fluency at 7 days post, and that 10% of players needed more than a week for symptoms to resolve. Importantly, there was no evidence of “lingering symptoms”, or cognitive impairments, at 90 days. Assessment using computerised systems has shown similar resolution of symptoms, albeit, with some variation in recovery. Iverson, Brooks,

Lovell and Collins⁵⁶ followed up concussed athletes (n=30) from baseline at 1-2 days, 3-7 days and 1-3 weeks post using ImPACT™, (Immediate Post-Concussion Assessment and Cognitive Testing).⁵⁷ The athletes' scores on a range of measures (memory, speed, reaction time) were significantly reduced at day 1, but there were significant improvements by 5 days post- injury. Although, at 10 days post- injury, 37% of athletes had 2 or more composite scores that were lower than pre-season. Two or more existing head injuries, or the presence of headaches, were associated with compromised recovery. Collins et al.⁵⁸ also identified repeat injury as related to poorer outcomes. In a sample of 393 American Football players, assessed on annual baselines, they found a history of multiple concussions was associated with lowered performance for divided attention and visuo-motor speed. Similarly Wall et al.⁵⁵ showed that jockeys with repeated concussions, compared to those concussed once, were less efficient on tasks involving executive functions and attention. Younger age appeared to account for this discrepancy, suggesting that either younger age of injury, or greater repeat injury within a shorter time span, may be important considerations when gauging recovery.

In light of a possibility that multiple MTBI's may have a cumulative effect, it is important to note that such effects are not consistently found. Indeed, it has been argued that the cross-sectional research designs typically employed in such studies do not allow confident causal inferences to be made between multiple injury and current status.⁵⁹ Furthermore, some prospective studies have not indicated increased impairment from cumulative injury. For example, Moriarty et al⁶⁰, in a prospective study of 82 amateur boxers participating in a 7 day tournament, found no evidence of short term cognitive impairment. Importantly, though, they did find that there was cognitive dysfunction in those who had had their bout stopped by the referee.

To summarise then, in sports it appears that the effects of a single MTBI typically resolves quickly, although there can be delayed recovery in some, but there appear to be a very low risk of long term effects. There is, though, preliminary evidence of risk of cumulative damage from repeat injury.^{61 23}

Patient groups: One of the earliest, well controlled, patient studies – comparing 22 participants with MTBI versus 19 matched controls - revealed that single minor head injury in persons with no prior compromising condition was associated with mild but “probably clinically non-significant difficulties at 1 month after injury”.⁶² Neurocognitive problems were largely related to concentration and new learning but were not apparent at 1 year post-

injury. It was noted that disruptions of everyday activities were extensive when other “system injuries” were also present. In a meta-analytic review of neurocognitive studies (from 1970-2004) of patients with MTBI Belanger and colleagues⁶³ reported that, of 8 cognitive domains, with unselected samples (recruited prospectively and not based on symptoms), largest effects size were for verbal fluency and delayed memory. Neurocognitive outcomes of those who were “unselected” were equal to control participants at 90 days post injury. However, in those where litigation was involved, the average effect size increased after 90 days post injury. Symptom validity tests did not explain these effects. In another meta-analysis Schretlen and Shapiro⁶⁴ reported that the cognitive performance of MTBI patients could not be distinguished from matched controls at one month post injury. Caution has been expressed regarding acceptance that meta-analyses confirm that MTBI leave no lasting consequence. Pertab et al.⁶⁵ noted that there was significant statistical heterogeneity in the effects sizes of neuropsychological measures used, criteria adopted for defining MTBI and populations, and mechanisms of injury of the MTBI samples. Furthermore, lasting neurocognitive deficits have been shown within sub-sets of neuropsychological measures suggesting that a “likelihood of mTBI individuals that have lingering symptoms exists within the larger group of individuals without symptoms” (p504⁶⁵).

Relationships between imaging and neuro-cognitive processing: There is emerging evidence linking neuro-cognitive dysfunction to neuro-imaging findings post MTBI. We shall now review the strength of such relationships. A neuro-cognitive study of outcomes at 2 weeks in a group of patients with “day of injury” CT scan showing “abnormalities” (hence “complicated”, compared to uncomplicated), showed that complicated MTBI was associated with worse performance.⁶⁶ Executive and attention functions were particularly affected. However, effect size was smaller than predicted and logistical regression indicated that performance was more similar than different between the groups. In a further study 20 “complicated” MTBI (based on CT scan results or GCS falling between 13-15) and “uncomplicated”, well matched, MTBI patients were compared on neurocognitive tasks within days of injury.⁶⁷ The complicated MTBI performed worse on memory and verbal learning. In a recent study of “complicated” patients (abnormal CT scan within 24 hours of injury) and non-patient controls it was found that the complicated group were poorer on speed, attention and executive functions at 1 month post, but by 3 months, speed and divided attention were much improved. However, sustained attention and aspects of executive functions were still not fully resolved.⁶⁸ In an MRI study of neuropsychological functions in

30 MTBI patients, compared to matched controls, it was found that patients with traumatic lesions performed more poorly on neuro-cognitive tasks within 4 days of injury.⁶⁹ The “complicated” group differed to controls on immediate and delayed recall, and on complex reaction time. In another MRI study, with imaging 1-3 days post- injury, with 80 patients from an Emergency Department, abnormalities were found in 26 – although only in 5 were there signs attributable to the injury.⁷⁰ There was a weak correlation between MRI abnormalities and neuropsychological dysfunction (memory, attention and executive skills) at 3 months. However, there was no difference in terms of whether those with normal, or abnormal scans, returned to work. In a MRI with Single-photon Emission CT study it was found that 57% and 61% of 21 patients (GCS on average 14.48) had abnormalities on MRI and SPECT imaging respectively within 5 days after injury.⁷¹ There was also associated brain atrophy at 6 months. Those with complicated MTBI were slower on reaction time tasks. In contrast, a prospective study over 1 year in Norway of 115 patients with Mild (separated into “presence” or absence” of abnormality – including use of MRI), Moderate and Severe TBI showed no differences in PCS symptoms at 3 months or 1 year between the groups.⁷² Also, there was no correlation between measures of “cerebral damage” and neurocognitive performance. Moreover, those without abnormalities tended to report greater subjective symptoms. Most recently, Diffuse Tensor Imaging (DTI) MRI has been developed to measure the integrity of white matter tracts and critical structures. Within the acute and sub-acute period post injury there is preliminary data suggesting involvement of the internal capsule and corpus callosum.^{51 73} In that DTI provides a measure of axonal injury, not death, it is suggested that it may become more relevant for prognostic purposes in future.⁷⁴ These studies therefore provide some evidence linking early neurological scan data, neurocognitive dysfunction and delayed recovery. However, the evidence is not compelling regarding later PCS and social role outcomes – such as return to work.

Another means to indicate whether MTBI has effects on neurological systems linked to cognition is to establish whether there are changes in activation patterns post injury. Functional imaging studies have indicated that there may, indeed, be differential patterns of activity following concussion. In an fMRI study of 12 MTBI patients at 1 month post there were significant changes in activation patterns.⁷⁵ The patient group, compared to controls, had increased complexity in activation patterns on working memory tasks – particularly in right parietal and dorsolateral frontal regions. In an fMRI study using a working memory task with concussed athletes, it was found that several (of 15 “symptomatic” participants), who

had sustained their last injury from 1 to 14 months previously, had differential activity patterns compared to a control group.⁷⁶ It was noted that only one had shown abnormality on standard structural MRI. The region of interest (ROI) identified in controls involving self-monitoring on a working memory task was mid-dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and anterior insula. On fMRI the “symptomatic” participants showed weaker activity in the ROI identified in controls and increased activity outside the ROI. Chen and colleagues⁷⁷ conducted a further fMRI imaging on 2 groups of athletes self-rated for severity of symptoms, “low” (n=9), “moderate” (n=9) and a further control group, with no concussion in past year (n=10) - with a working memory task. Participants were seen at least 1 month (and on average 5 months) post injury. All participants had normal MRI scans. The moderate group showed less activation in the ROI identified in controls for the tasks – the prefrontal cortex - and both concussed groups had increased activation in temporal area. Associations between neurocognitive performance and neurological activation have recently been investigated over a long term with TMS.⁷⁸ In this study, 21 healthy, uninjured, athletes were compared to 19 former athletes who had had concussions 30 years prior to testing. The authors reported that the concussed group were poorer on tasks of memory and response inhibition and had a longer duration of Cortical Silent Period (CSP) on TMS. There are important limitations that relate to a number of these studies. First, there is insufficient information as to whether those who displayed differential activation pattern may have had pre-morbid factors relevant to such functions. Second, particularly at long term post-injury, there is a possibility that participants may have been inaccurate in their reports on the severity and number of MTBIs. Third, numbers of participants tend to be low, and retention rates for follow up studies are particularly low. Consequently samples may not be representative of the MTBI population.

Recovery of Neurocognitive functions: Summary

It may be helpful to consider MTBI as a spectrum disorder, with the “dosage” of injury – depending on biomechanic factors - being important in setting a context for recovery and/or resolution of symptoms. It appears that concentration, attention, executive function, memory and complex attention are all, to degree, affected, but that there is differential recovery of these functions. Sustained attention and executive functions are subject to greater delay. Such problems recover rapidly in context of sports, but there is a tendency for symptoms to linger in a sub-group of patients. Of particular note, studies linking brain imaging and neurocognitive functions suggest two levels of neurological involvement. At one level there may be functional changes in brain activation where, for the same cognitive task or demand,

there is a differential “load” in those who are concussed.⁷⁴ Related symptoms may resolve readily in such cases. At another, level, there may be structural changes, particularly when there are signs of “complicated” injury which may be associated with delayed recovery. Signs of potential for complicated injury appear to be: abnormal imaging findings, prior MTBI, greater LOC/PTA, longer duration of initial symptoms and younger age. Subjective complaints may be more closely associated with neuro-cognitive performance early on, but it appears that there is a loosening of associations between neurological profile, neurocognitive functions and subjective self-reports over time.

Psychological mechanisms and persistent postconcussional symptoms

The evidence that MTBI may be associated with PCS is, therefore, equivocal. In some cases there may be a biological vector that is linked to outcomes. In others, psychological variables may have a key role to play in genesis and/or maintenance of symptoms. These may be in two overlapping areas: symptoms may reflect psychological reactions better conceptualised within a psychiatric nosology, and the role of more idiosyncratic appraisals and attributions of symptoms after MTBI.

Psychological Reaction: It is well established that there are elevated rates of psychiatric co-morbidity in PCS groups.⁷⁹ This may represent a response to persisting effects of brain injury on cognition and associated limitations in functioning. However, the role of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) – in context of other mood issues, particularly depression - has emerged as a critical issue in explaining PCS.

It had been thought that TBI and PTSD were incompatible: without a memory of the event, the survivor of trauma might not have source material for intrusive thoughts to drive avoidance behaviour (see ⁸⁰). However, a number of potential mechanisms have been identified for PTSD post- TBI – such as islands of memory, confabulated memory, external causal attributions and fear conditioning (^{81 82}). Although rates of PTSD after TBI vary hugely between studies (from 0 to 48% prevalence in one review)⁸³ there is accumulating evidence for its presence at various levels of severity.⁸⁴ For example, a large scale study of 920 trauma patients in Australia by Bryant and colleagues showed that MTBI patients were more likely to develop PTSD compared to non-TBI controls (11.8% versus 7.5%).⁸⁵ They also found that longer PTA was a protective factor.

Importantly, it appears that PTSD not only occurs post MTBI, but can contribute to PCS symptomology. For example, following general trauma or mild-moderate TBI, rates for persisting PCS at 3 months was over 3 times higher for individuals with PTSD,⁸⁶ whilst symptoms of depression, anxiety and PTSD at 7-10 days post-MTBI predicted PCS symptoms at 3-6 months later.^{87 88} It seems that PTSD may not only co-exist, but may be a mediator of outcomes post MTBI. Two recent studies with military populations provide insights into this process. In a retrospective review of 2525 U.S. soldiers 3 to 4 months after their return from deployment to Iraq post-concussional symptoms were elevated in individuals exposed to MTBI compared with other injuries.⁸⁹ However, PTSD, along with depression, emerged as major factors mediating the relationship between the two. In a study by Belanger et al⁹⁰ with 225 participants, predominantly active duty or veteran military personnel, it was found that those with MTBI endorsed more PCS symptoms than those with moderate to severe injuries. However, when controlling for variance due to the effect of PTSD, the MTBI group were no different to the other groups - across all 3 domains of affective, somatic and cognitive symptoms. These findings suggest that there is a role for PTSD in explaining PCS post MTBI. It may be that PTSD decreases attenuation of stress response by contributing to a neurogenic process for its persistence and/or lessening coping skills to deal with problems.⁸⁴ However, it may be that PTSD is simply misinterpreted as PCS. Particularly as the relationship between PTSD and PCS is complicated by overlapping symptoms.⁹¹ It is also worth noting that PTSD questionnaires may, in turn, lack validity in that they may be sensitive to the effects of non-traumatic stressors and to personality traits such as negative affectivity.⁹² As noted by Stein and McAllister “the literature [on PCS and PTSD] is far from consistent and serves mainly to raise new, challenging questions about mutual pathophysiology”⁸⁴ (p. 768).

Attributions & Expectations: There may be role of “expectation as aetiology” in maintaining symptoms post MTBI. Individuals with persistent PCS may tend to under-report normal “postconcussional” symptoms they experienced prior to their head injury (described as the “good old days” phenomenon⁹³) whilst uninjured controls can report expecting postconcussional symptoms after reading head injury vignettes.⁹⁴ The role of other aspects of symptom appraisals in the development of persistent symptoms was also indicated by Whitaker and colleagues⁹⁵ in a longitudinal study. Individuals who initially viewed their injury as having serious and persisting negative consequences soon after injury were shown to have greater presence of symptoms at three months.

Involvement in a medico-legal or compensation claim may well lead to a context for expectations to be modulated. There remains a consistent finding of involvement in medico-legal action and poorer outcomes.^{96 29} However, as noted above, this association should not be presumed as being synonymous with malingering: aspects of being involved in a medicolegal process, from the repeated rehearsal of symptoms⁴⁷ to an emphasis on blame and culpability,⁹⁷ may play a role. In this context, it is interesting to note the finding that individuals involved in tort insurance claims had slower recovery trajectories compared to no fault claimants.⁹⁸ There is, however, evidence that at least a proportion of individuals with persisting difficulties after MTBI can show evidence of at least sub-optimal effort on formal neurocognitive assessment.⁹⁹ Nonetheless, other “psychological” variables may impact on neurocognitive test performance in more subtle but significant ways. Suhr and Gunstad¹⁰⁰ for example, administered a battery of measures of memory, attention and executive functioning to two groups of undergraduates who had reported a history of MTBI. One group had their attention drawn to their head injury and typical cognitive effects prior to testing. This “diagnosis threat” group showed significantly worse performance on a number of commonly used tests, with this effect apparently independent of mood or effort.

Implications for Psychosocial Treatment

Whilst MTBI may set the conditions for PCS to occur, there does appear to be a role for psychological mechanisms in persistence of symptoms - which provides potential avenues for treatment. The majority of the current literature on treatment of persistent PCS primarily focuses on the benefits of early interventions (typically in the first week to month post-injury) that focus on prophylactic prevention of persistent symptoms.¹⁰¹ Such interventions typically provide individuals with information about PCS as a common but transient phenomenon after MTBI. A meta-analysis of five studies up to 1997¹⁰² found a modest, positive effect size average of 0.32 in terms of reduction of persistent PCS, and similar results have been replicated subsequently.^{103 104}

In contrast, systematic studies for psychosocial interventions with persistent symptoms remain limited, although single case studies or trials with limited controls do provide some evidence of improving symptoms with use of cognitive behavioural approaches such as for dizziness (e.g.,¹⁰⁵), headache (e.g.¹⁰⁶); depression (e.g.,¹⁰⁷); anger (e.g.,¹⁰⁸); PTSD (e.g.,¹⁰⁹). One randomised control trial with mild-moderate TBI individuals (n=20) used intensive individual cognitive rehabilitation tasks (e.g. remediation and compensation for attentional

difficulties) with cognitive behavioural elements (e.g. modifying coping strategies). Improvements were found for affective symptoms and attention.¹¹⁰ This trial highlights the tension for clinicians between seeing PCS as related to a brain injury that needs to be compensated for, or as being largely maintained by psychological mechanisms that may be managed.¹¹¹ However, these two positions might also be viewed as complimentary and capable of being integrated (see ^{112,113}). Practising tasks involving sustained attention might be framed as a way of “boosting” attentional resources, or desensitisation to improve tolerance to fatigue, and/or as a method of testing and challenging concerns about competence and abilities to learn new skills. The likely heterogeneity of persistent symptoms may make defining a particular treatment protocol difficult. Moreover, clinicians must be vigilant for identifying relevant mood-related issues that might respond better to specific treatment, such as Trauma Focussed Cognitive Behaviour Therapy (TF-CBT) for PTSD.⁸⁰

Conclusion:

The aphorism commonly attributed to Hippocrates that “No head injury is too severe to despair of, nor too trivial to ignore” reminds us that caution is needed in the care of any head injury. Caution is needed to ensure that patients are not provided with scenarios that they imply that their lives are necessarily and forever shattered following MTBI: with any TBI there is a need for a careful formulation of the neurological and psychosocial issues that may be at play. We have argued that there are associations between acute indicators of injury severity, particularly when there are signs of “complicated” injury, and early neurocognitive dysfunction, which may indicate delayed recovery. However, psychological factors are important in persistence of symptoms of PCS. In particular, mood disorders such as PTSD, as well as appraisals and attributions of symptoms, are likely to play a significant role. Crucially patients and relatives need guidance to ensure that recovery is maximised and any risks are managed.

References

- ¹**Kraus F**, Chu LD. Epidemiology. In Silver JM, McAllister TW, Yudofsky, SC. (eds.) *Textbook of traumatic brain injury*. Washington DC: American Psychiatric Publishing, 2005.
- ²**Ruff RM**, Weyer Jamora C. Myths and mild traumatic brain injury. *Psychological Injury and Law* 2005; **2**: 34-42.
- ³**Bigler ED**. Neuropsychology and clinical neuroscience of persistent post-concussive syndrome. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 2008; **14**: 1-22.
- ⁴**Fleminger S**, Ponsford J. Long term outcome after traumatic brain injury. *British Medical Journal*, 2005 **331**, 1419-20.
- ⁵**Bruns J**, Hauser WA. The epidemiology of traumatic brain injury: A review. *Epilepsia*, 2003; **44**: 2-10.
- ⁶**Tennant A**. Admission to hospital following head injury in England: Incidence and socioeconomic associations. *BMC Public Health*, 2005; **5**: 21.
- ⁷**Yates PJ**, Williams WH, Harris A. *et al*. An epidemiological study of head injuries in a UK population attending an emergency department. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 2006; **77**: 699-701.
- ⁸**Kolakowsky-Hayner SA**, Kreutzer JS. Pre-injury crime, substance abuse, and neurobehavioural functioning after traumatic brain injury. *Brain Injury*, 2001 **15**: 53-63.
- ⁹**Hyder AA**, Wunderlich CA, Puvanachandra P. *et al*. The impact of traumatic brain injuries: A global perspective. *Neurorehabilitation*, 2007; **22**: 341-53.
- ¹⁰**Ommaya AK**, Gennarelli, TA. Cerebral concussion and traumatic unconsciousness: Correlation of experimental and clinical observations on blunt head injuries. *Brain*, 1974; **97**: 633-54.
- ¹¹**McCrorry P**, Johnston K, Meeuwisse W. *et al*. Summary and agreement statement of the 2nd International Conference on Concussion in Sport, Prague 2004. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2005; **39**: 196-204.
- ¹²**McCrea M**, Guskiewicz KM, Marshall SW. *et al*. Acute effects and recovery time following concussion in collegiate football players. *JAMA*, 2003; **290**: 2556-63.
- ¹³**Rutherford WH**, Merrett, JD, McDonald, JR. Sequelae of concussion caused by minor head injuries. *Lancet*, 1977; **1**: 1-4.
- ¹⁴**Teasdale G**, Jennett B. Assessment of coma and impaired consciousness. A practical scale. *Lancet*, 1974; **2**: 81-4.

- ¹⁵ **Ruff RM**, Weyer Jamora C. Myths and mild traumatic brain injury. *Psychological Injury and Law*, 2009, **2**, 34-42.
- ¹⁶ **Meares S**, Shores EA, Taylor AJ. *et al.* Mild traumatic brain injury does not predict acute postconcussion syndrome. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery and Psychiatry*, 2008; **79**: 300-6.
- ¹⁷ **Cantu RC**. Return to play guidelines after a head injury. *Clinics in Sports Medicine*, 1998; **17**: 45-60.
- ¹⁸ **Colorado Medical Society**. *Report of the Sports Medicine Committee: Guidelines for the Management of Concussion in Sports*. Denver, CO: Medical Society, 2005.
- ¹⁹ **American Academy of Neurology**. Practice parameter: The management of concussion in sports (summary statement). *Neurology*, 1997; **48**: 581-5.
- ²⁰ **Tellier A**, Marshall SC, Wilson KG, *et al.* The heterogeneity of mild traumatic brain injury: Where do we stand? *Brain Injury*, 2009, **23**: 879-887.
- ²¹ **American Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine**. Report of Mild Traumatic Brain Injury Committee of the Head Injury Interdisciplinary Special Interest Group. Definition of mild traumatic brain injury. *Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation*, 1993; **8**: 86-7.
- ²² **Carroll LJ**, Cassidy JD, Holm L. *et al.* Methodological issues and research recommendations for mild traumatic brain injury: The WHO Collaborating Centre Task Force on Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*, 2004; **S43**: 113-25.
- ²³ **McCrorry P**, Meeuwisse W, Johnston, K. *et al.* Consensus statement on concussion in sport: The 3rd International Conference on Concussion in Sport held in Zurich, November 2008. *Clinical Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2009; **19**: 185-200.
- ²⁴ **Gerberding, JL**, Binder, S. Report to Congress on Mild Traumatic Brain Injury in the United States: Steps to Prevent a Serious Public Health Problem. Atlanta, GA; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; 2003.
- ²⁵ **Ruff RM**, Camenzuli L, Mueller J. Miserable minority: Emotional risk factors that influence the outcome of a mild traumatic brain injury. *Brain In*, 1996; **10**: 551-66.
- ²⁶ **Wood RLI**. Understanding the 'miserable minority': A diathesis-stress paradigm for post-concussional syndrome. *Brain Injury*, 2004; **18**: 1135-53.
- ²⁷ **Thornhill S**, Teasdale GM, Murray GD, *et al.* Disability in young people and adults one year after head injury: prospective cohort study. *British Medical Journal*, 2000; **320**: 1631-35.

- ²⁸ **McCullagh S**, Feinstein A. Outcome after mild traumatic brain injury: An examination of recruitment bias. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 2003; **74**: 39-43.
- ²⁹ **Carroll LJ**, Cassidy JD, Peloso PM. *et al.* Prognosis for mild traumatic brain injury: results of The WHO Collaborating Centre Task Force on Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*, 2004; **36**: 84-105.
- ³⁰ **Keenan HT**, Hall GC, Marshall SW, Early head injury and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: Retrospective cohort study. *British Medical Journal*, 2008, **337**: a1984.
- ³¹ **Boake C**, McCauley SR, Levin HW, *et al.* Limited agreement between criteria-based diagnoses of postconcussional syndrome. *Journal of Neuropsychiatry & Clinical Neurosciences*, 2004; **16**: 493-9.
- ³² **McCauley SR**, Boake C, Pedroza C. *et al.* Correlates of persistent postconcussional disorder: DSM-IV criteria versus ICD-10. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, 2007; **30**: 360-79.
- ³³ **Kashluba S**, Casey JE, Paniak C. Evaluating the utility of ICD-10 diagnostic criteria for postconcussion syndrome following mild traumatic brain injury. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 2006; **12**:111-8.
- ³⁴ **Boake C**, McCauley SR, Levin HS, *et al.* Diagnostic criteria for postconcussional syndrome after mild to moderate traumatic brain injury. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci*, 2005; **17**: 350-356.
- ³⁵ **Bazarian JJ**, Wong T, Harris M, *et al.* Epidemiology and predictors of post-concussive syndrome after minor head injury in an emergency population. *Brain Inj*, 1999; **13**: 173-89.
- ³⁶ **Iverson GL**, Lange RT. Examination of “post-concussion-like” symptoms in a healthy sample. *Applied Neuropsychology*, 2003; **10**: 137-144.
- ³⁷ **Smith-Seemiller L**, Fow NR, Kant R, *et al.* Presence of post-concussion syndrome symptoms in patients with chronic pain vs. mild traumatic brain injury. *Brain Inj*, 2003; **17**: 199-206.
- ³⁸ **Haldorsen T**, Waterloo K, Dahl A, *et al.* Symptoms and cognitive dysfunction in patients with the late whiplash syndrome. *Applied Neuropsychology*, 2003; **10**: 170-5.
- ³⁹ **Alla S**, Sullivan SJ, Hale L, *et al.* Self-report scales/checklists for the measurement of concussion symptoms: A systematic review. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2009; **43**: i3-i12.
- ⁴⁰ **Potter S**, Leigh E, Wade, D, *et al.* The Rivermead Post Concussion Symptoms Questionnaire. *Journal of Neurology*, 2006; **253**: 1603-14.

- ⁴¹ **Stålnacke B-M.** Community Integration, social support and life satisfaction in relation to symptoms 3 years after mild traumatic brain injury. *Brain Inj*, 2007; **21**: 933-42.
- ⁴² **Nolin P,** Heroux L. Relations among sociodemographic, neurologic, clinical and neuropsychologic variables, and vocational status following mild traumatic brain injury: A follow-up study. *Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation*, 2006; **21**: 514-26.
- ⁴³ **Lishman WA.** *Organic Psychiatry: The psychological consequences of cerebral disorder.* (3rd edition). Oxford: Blackwell Scientific, 1988.
- ⁴⁴ **Iverson GL.** Outcome from mild traumatic brain injury. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*, 2005; **18**: 301-17.
- ⁴⁵ **Alexander MP.** Mild traumatic brain injury: Pathophysiology, natural history and clinical management. *Neurology*, 1995; **45**: 1253-1260.
- ⁴⁶ **King NS.** Post-concussion syndrome: clarity amid the controversy? *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 2003; **183**: 276-8.
- ⁴⁷ **Lishman WA.** Physiogenesis and psychogenesis in the 'post-concussional syndrome'. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 1988; **153**: 460-9.
- ⁴⁸ **King NS.** Post-concussion syndrome: clarity amid the controversy? *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 2003; **183**: 276-8.
- ⁴⁹ **Barth JT,** Alves WM, Ryan TV, et al. Mild head injury in sports: Neuropsychological sequelae and recovery of function. In (eds.) Levin, H.L., Eisenberg, H.M., & Benton, A.L. *Mild head injury.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- ⁵⁰ **Macciocchi SN,** Barth JT, Alves W, et al. Neuropsychological functioning and recovery after mild head injury in collegiate athletes. *Neurosurgery*, 1996; **39**: 510-4.
- ⁵¹ **Davis GA,** Iverson GL, Guskiewicz KM. *et al.* Contributions of neuroimaging, balance testing, electrophysiology and blood markers to the assessment of sport-related concussion. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2009; **43**: i36-i45.
- ⁵² **Echemendia RJ,** Putakian M, Mackin SR, et al. Neuropsychological test performance prior to and following sports-related mild traumatic brain injury. *Clinical Journal of Sport Medicine*, 2001; **11**: 23-31.
- ⁵³ **Collie A,** Darby DG, Maruff P. Computerised cognitive assessment of athletes with sports related head injury. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2001; **35**: 297-302.
- ⁵⁴ **Belanger HG,** Vanderploeg RD. The neuropsychological impact of sports-related concussion: A meta-analysis. *Journal of International Neuropsychological Society*, 2005; **11**: 34-57.

- ⁵⁵ **Wall SE**, Williams WH, Cartwright-Hatton S. *et al.* Neuropsychological dysfunction following repeat concussion in jockeys. *Journal of Neurology, Neuropsychiatry and Psychiatry*, 2006; **77**: 518-20.
- ⁵⁶ **Iverson GL**, Brooks BL, Lovell MR *et al.* No cumulative effects for one or two previous concussions. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2006; **40**: 72-5.
- ⁵⁷ **Maroon JC**, Lovell MR, Norwig J, *et al.* Cerebral concussion in athletes: Evaluation and neuropsychological testing. *Neurosurgery*, 2000; **47**: 659-72.
- ⁵⁸ **Collins MW**, Grindel SH, Lovell MR, *et al.* Relationship between concussion and neuropsychological performance in college football players. *Journal of American Medical Association*, 1999; **282**: 964-70.
- ⁵⁹ **Iverson GL**. Sport-Related Concussion. In Schoenberg MR, Scott JG, (eds.) *The black book of neuropsychology : A Syndrome Based Approach*. (In Press).
- ⁶⁰ **Moriarty J**, Collie A, Olson D, *et al.* A prospective controlled study of cognitive function during an amateur boxing tournament. *Neurology*, 2004; **62**:1497-1502.
- ⁶¹ **Collie A**, McCrory P, Makdissi M, *et al.* Does history of concussion affect current cognitive status? *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2006; **40**: 550-551.
- ⁶² **Dikmen S**, McLean A, Temkin N. Neuropsychological and psychosocial consequences of minor head injury. *J Neurol, Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 1996; **49**: 1227-32.
- ⁶³ **Belanger H**, Curtiss G, Demery A *et al.* Factors moderating neuropsychological outcomes following mild traumatic brain injury: A meta-analysis *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 2005, 11:3:215-227
- ⁶⁴ **Schretlen DJ**, Shapiro AM. A quantitative review of the effect of traumatic brain injury on cognitive functioning. *International Review of Psychiatry*, 2003; **15**: 341-9.
- ⁶⁵ **Pertab JL**, James KM, Bigler ED. Limitations of mild traumatic brain injury meta-analyses. *Brain Inj*, 2009; **23**: 498-508.
- ⁶⁶ **Iverson GL**. Complicated vs. uncomplicated mild traumatic brain injury: Acute neuropsychological outcome. *Brain Inj*, 2006; **20**: 1335-44.
- ⁶⁷ **Lange R**, Iverson GL, Franzen M. Neuropsychological functioning following complicated vs. uncomplicated mild traumatic brain injury. *Brain Inj*, 2009; **23**: 83-91.
- ⁶⁸ **Kwok FY**, Lee TMC, Leung CHS, *et al.* Changes of cognitive functioning following mild traumatic brain injury over a 3-month period. *Brain Inj*, 2008; **22**: 740-51.
- ⁶⁹ **Kurca E**, Sivak S, Kucera P. Impaired cognitive functions in mild traumatic brain injury patients with normal and pathologic magnetic resonance imaging. *Neuroradiology*, 2006; **48**: 661-9.

- ⁷⁰ **Hughes DG**, Jackson A, Mason DL, et al. Abnormalities on magnetic resonance imaging seen acutely following mild traumatic brain injury: correlation with neuropsychological tests and delayed recover. *Neuroradiology*, 2004; **46**: 550-8.
- ⁷¹ **Hofman PA**, Stapert SZ, van Kroonenburgh MJ, et al. MR imaging, single-photon emission CT, and neurocognitive performance after mild traumatic brain injury. *American Journal of Neuroradiology*, 2001; **22**: 441-49.
- ⁷² **Sigurdardottir S**, Andelic N, Roe C, et al. Post-concussion symptoms after traumatic brain injury at 3 and 12 months post-injury: A prospective study. *Brain Inj*, 2009; **23**: 489-97.
- ⁷³ **Kumar R**, Gupta RK, Husain M. et al. Comparative evaluation of corpus callosum DTI metrics in acute mild and moderate traumatic brain injury: Its correlation with neuropsychometric tests. *Brain Inj*, 2009; **23**: 675-85.
- ⁷⁴ **Belanger HG**, Vanderploeg RD, Curtiss G, et al. Recent neuroimaging techniques in mild traumatic brain injury. *Journal of Neuropsychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences*, 2007; **19**: 5-20.
- ⁷⁵ **McAllister TW**, Sparling MB, Flashman LA, et al. Neuroimaging findings in mild traumatic brain injury. *Journal of Clinical Experimental Neuropsychology*, 2001; **23**: 775-91.
- ⁷⁶ **Chen J-K**, Johnston KM, Frey S, et al. Functional abnormalities in symptomatic concussed athletes: an fMRI study. *NeuroImage*, 2004; **22**: 68-82.
- ⁷⁷ **Chen J-K**, Johnston KM, Collie A, et al. A validation of the post-concussion symptom scale in the assessment of complex concussion using cognitive testing and functional MRI. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 2007; **78**: 1231-8.
- ⁷⁸ **De Beaumont L**, Théoret H, Mongeon D, et al. Brain function decline in healthy retired athletes who sustained their last sports concussion in early adulthood. *Brain* 2009; **132**: 695-708.
- ⁷⁹ **Ruff RM**, Jurica P. In search of a unified definition for mild traumatic brain injury. *Brain Inj*, 1999; **13**: 943-52.
- ⁸⁰ **McMillan TM**. Errors in diagnosing post-traumatic stress disorder after traumatic brain injury. *Brain Inj*, 2001; **15**: 39-46.
- ⁸¹ **McMillan TM**, Williams WH, Bryant R. Post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury: A review of causal mechanisms, assessment, and treatment. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*, 2003; **13**: 149-64.
- ⁸² **Williams WH**, Evans JJ, Wilson DA, et al. Brief report: Prevalence of post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms after severe traumatic brain injury in a representative community sample. *Brain Inj*, 2002; **16**: 673-9.

- ⁸³ **Harvey AG**, Bryant RA, Tarrier N. Cognitive behaviour therapy for post traumatic stress disorder. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 2003; **23**: 501-22.
- ⁸⁴ **Stein MB**, McAllister, TW. Exploring the convergence of posttraumatic stress disorder and mild traumatic brain injury. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 2009; **166**: 768-776.
- ⁸⁵ **Bryant RA**, Creamer M, O'Donnell M. *et al.* Post-traumatic amnesia and the nature of post-traumatic stress disorder after mild traumatic brain injury. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 2009; **15**: 862-867.
- ⁸⁶ **McCauley SR**, Boake C, Levin HS, *et al.* Postconcussional disorder following mild to moderate traumatic brain injury: Anxiety depression and social support as risk factors and comorbidities. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, 2001; **23**: 792-808.
- ⁸⁷ **King NS**. Emotional neuropsychological and organic factors: their use in the prediction of persisting postconcussion symptoms after moderate to mild head injury. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 1996; **61**: 75-81.
- ⁸⁸ **King NS**, Crawford S, Wenden, FJ, *et al.* Early prediction of persisting post-concussion symptoms following mild and moderate head injuries. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 1999; **38**: 15-25.
- ⁸⁹ **Hoge CW**, McGurk D, Thomas JL, *et al.* Mild traumatic brain injury in US soldiers returning from Iraq. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 2008; **358**: 453-63.
- ⁹⁰ **Belanger H**, Kretzmer T, Vanderploeg RD *et al.* Symptom complaints following combat-related traumatic brain injury: Relationship to traumatic brain injury severity and posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 2009; doi:10.1017/S1355617709990841
- ⁹¹ **Chalton LD**, McMillan TM. Can 'partial' PTSD explain differences in diagnosis of PTSD by questionnaire self-report and interview after head injury? *Brain Inj*, 2009; **23**: 77-82.
- ⁹² **Shapinsky AC**, Rapport LJ, Henderson MJ, *et al.* Civilian PTSD scales: Relationships with trait characteristics and everyday distress. *Assessment*, 2005; **12**: 220-30.
- ⁹³ **Iverson GL**, Lange, RT, Brooks, BL *et al.* "Good Old Days" Bias Following Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist*, in press.
- ⁹⁴ **Mittenberg W**, DiGuilio DV, Perrin S, *et al.* Symptoms following mild head injury: Expectation as aetiology. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 1992; **55**: 200-4.
- ⁹⁵ **Whittaker R**, Kemp S, House A. Illness perceptions and outcome in mild head injury: a longitudinal study. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 2007; **78**: 644-6.

- ⁹⁶ **Binder LM**, Rohling ML. Money matters: A meta-analytic review of the effects of financial incentives on recovery after closed-head injury. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 1996; **153**: 7-10.
- ⁹⁷ **Jacobson RR**. The post-concussional syndrome: Physiogenesis psychogenesis and malingering, an integrative model. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 1995; **39**: 675-93.
- ⁹⁸ **Cassidy JD**, Carroll LJ, Peloso PM. Incidence, risk factors and prevention of mild traumatic brain injury: Results of the WHO collaborating centre task force on mild traumatic brain injury. *Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine*, 2004; **S43**: 28-60.
- ⁹⁹ **Larrabee GJ**. Detection of malingering using atypical performance patterns on standard neuropsychological tests. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist*, 2003; **17**: 410-25.
- ¹⁰⁰ **Suhr JA**, Gunstad J. Further exploration of the effect of “diagnosis threat” on cognitive performance in individuals with mild head injury. *Journal of the International Neuropsychological Society*, 2005; **11**: 23-9.
- ¹⁰¹ **Snell DL**, Surgenor LJ, Hay-Smith JC, *et al*. A systematic review of psychological treatments for mild traumatic brain injury: An update on the evidence. *Journal of Clinical & Experimental Neuropsychology*, 2009; **31**: 20-38.
- ¹⁰² **Mittenberg W**, Canyock EM, Condit D, *et al*. Treatment of post-concussion syndrome following mild head injury. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental Neuropsychology*, 2001; **23**: 829-36.
- ¹⁰³ **Ponsford J**, Willmott C, Rothwell A, *et al*. Impact of early intervention on outcome following mild head injury in adults. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, 2002; **73**: 330-2.
- ¹⁰⁴ **Bell KR**, Hoffman JM, Temkin N, *et al*. The effect of telephone counselling on reducing post-traumatic symptoms after mild traumatic brain injury: A randomised trial. *Journal of Neurology, Neuropsychology and Psychiatry*, 2008; **79**: 1275-81.
- ¹⁰⁵ **Gurr B**, Moffat N. Psychological consequences of vertigo and the effectiveness of vestibular rehabilitation for brain injury patients. *Brain Inj*, 2001; **15**: 387-400.
- ¹⁰⁶ **Martelli MF**, Grayson RL, Zasler ND. Posttraumatic headache: Neuropsychological and psychological effects and treatments implications. *Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation*, 1999; **14**: 49-69.
- ¹⁰⁷ **Rees RJ**, Bellon ML. Post concussion syndrome ebb and flow: Longitudinal effects and management. *Neurorehabilitation*, 2007; **22**: 229-42.
- ¹⁰⁸ **Medd J**, Tate RL. Evaluation of an anger management therapy programme following acquired brain injury: A preliminary study. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*, 2001; **10**: 185-201.

¹⁰⁹ **McGrath J.** Cognitive impairment associated with post-traumatic stress disorder and mild head injury: A case report. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*, 1997; **7**: 231-9.

¹¹⁰ **Tiersky L,** Anselmi V, Johnston M, *et al.* A trial of neuropsychologic rehabilitation in mild-spectrum traumatic brain injury. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 2005; **86**: 1565-74.

¹¹¹ **Paniak C,** Toller-Lobe G, Durand A. *et al.* A randomized trial of two treatments for mild traumatic brain injury. *Brain Inj*, 1998; **12**: 1011-23.

¹¹² **Mateer CA,** Sira CS, O'Connell ME. Putting Humpty Dumpty together again: The importance of integrating cognitive and emotional interventions. *Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation*, 2005; **20**: 62-75.

¹¹³ **Barlow DH,** Allen LB, Choate ML. Toward a unified treatment for emotional disorders. *Behaviour Therapy*, 2004; **35**: 205-230.

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence (or non exclusive for government employees) on a worldwide basis to the BMJ publishing group Ltd and its licencees, to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in JNNP and any other BMJ Group products and to exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence (<http://jnnp.bmjournals.com//ifora/licence.pdf>)