A Comprehensive Evidence-Based Approach to Assessment and Treatment of Persons with Disorders of Consciousness: A Training Seminar for **Rehabilitation Professionals**



Holy Cross Hospital Surrey, UK September 15, 2016

Joseph T. Giacino, PhD Spaulding Rehabilitation Hospital Harvard Medical School Boston, MA USA



Disclosure

Dr. Giacino has no significant financial relationship with any commercial or proprietary entity that produces healthcare-related products and/or services relevant to the content of this presentation.

Dr. Giacino occasionally receives honoraria for conducting CRS-R training seminars.

Dr. Giacino receives grant funding from the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, the National Institute on Disability, Independent Living and Rehabilitation Research, U.S. Department of Defense and the James S. McDonnell Foundation.

Course Objectives

Upon completion of the course, participants will be able to:

- 1. Describe 3 neurophysiologic features of syndromes associated with severe alterations in consciousness post traumatic brain injury.
- Identify 2 requirements of operational strategies to support a comprehensive 2. rehabilitation program for patients with disorders of consciousness
- 3. List the 6 components of the Coma Recovery Scale-Revised used for assessment of persons with disorders or consciousness post brain injury.
- 4. Verbalize 4 of the Specialized Metrics considered in the administration guidelines for the Disorders of Consciousness COMPrehensive ASSessment battery (DOC COMPASS©), as discussed by the speaker.
- 5. Generate 3 examples of the clinical data compiled through the use of the DOC COMPASS© to evaluate treatment effectiveness for persons with disorders of consciousness.

Disorders of Consciousness 2016: The State of the Science





DoC State of the Science: Outline

- · The problem of consciousness
- Assessment
 - Behavioral
 - Functional neuroimaging
- · Prognosis and outcome
- Treatment

Continuum of Recovery of Consciousness: (Adapted from Laureys, 2003)





Disorders of Consciousness

Coma: A state of sustained pathologic unconsciousness in which the *eyes remain closed* and the patient cannot be aroused. (MSTF, NEJM, 1994)

Vegetative State: A condition in which there is complete absence of behavioral evidence for awareness of self and environment, with preserved capacity for spontaneous or stimulus-induced arousal (Aspen Workgroup, JHTR, 1997).

Permanent VS: A prognostic term that denotes an irreversible state which can be applied 12 months after a traumatic injury and after 3 months following non-traumatic injury in adults and children (AAN, Neurol, 1995).

Minimally Conscious State: A condition of severely altered consciousness in which minimal but definite behavioral evidence of self or environmental awareness is demonstrated (Giacino, et al., Neurology, 2002). The Problem of Consciousness

"The limits of consciousness are hard to define satisfactorily and we can only infer the selfawareness of others by their appearance and their acts."

> Plum and Posner, 1982 The Diagnosis of Stupor and Coma

Behavioral Algorithm for Differential Diagnosis



Behavior = *Gold standard*

	Admin/Scoring	Validity Aspen Criteria	Consistency	Reliability	Reliability	Validity	Validity	Validity
CRS-R	Acceptable	Excellent	Good (class I)	Good (multiple class II / II)	Excellent (class II / III)	Unproven (class IV)	Unproven (class IV)	Unproven (not studied)
SMART	Acceptable	Good	NA	Excellent (class II / III)	Excellent (class II / III)	Unproven (class IV)	Unproven (not studied)	Unproven (class IV)
WNSSP	Acceptable	Good	Excellent (class I)	Unproven (class IV)	Unproven (class IV)	Unproven (class IV)	Unproven (not studied)	Unproven (class IV)
SSAM	Acceptable	Good	Unproven (not studied)	Unproven (class IV)	Unproven (class IV)	Unproven (class IV)	Unproven (not studied)	Unproven (not studied)
WHIM	Acceptable	Good	Unproven (not studied)	Unproven (class IV)	Unproven (class IV)	Unproven (class IV)	Unproven (not studied)	Unproven (not studied)
DOCS	Acceptable	Acceptable	Good (class II / II)			Construct Valid * (class #l)		Unproven (class IV)
CNC	Acceptable	Acceptable	Unacceptable (class II / III)	Unproven (class IV)	Unproven (not studied)	Unproven (class IV)	Unproven (class IV)	Unproven (class W)
CLOCS	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good (class I)	Unproven (class IV)	Unproven (class IV)	Strong (class II)	Unproven (not studied)	Unproven (class IV)
LOEW	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Unproven (not studied)	Excellent (class II / II)	Unproven (not studied)	Unproven (not studied)	Unproven (not studied)	Unproven (class IV)
RLS05	Unacceptable	Acceptable	NA	Unproven (class IV)	Unproven (not studied)	Strong (class II)	Unproven (class IV)	Unproven (class IV)
FOUR	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Excellent (multiple class I)	Good (multiple class I)	Unproven (not studied)	Unproven (not studied)	Unproven (not studied)	Predictive, 30 days post-injury Good vs. Disability and Death (class I)
INNS	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Acceptable (class I)	Unproven (not studied)	Unproven (not studied)	Unproven (not studied)	Unproven (not studied)	Not predictive, 3 mos. Post- discharge Independent vs. Diaability (class I)
GLS	Unacceptable (Seel, et al,	Unacceptable	Unproven (not studied) Ied &Rehab	Unacceptable (class II / III) II, 2010)	Unproven (not studied)	Unproven (not studied)	Unproven (not studied)	Not predictive, 6 months post-inja Good/Mod Dis, vs. Severe Dis./Pi (class II) Predictive, 6 months post-injury Good/Mod Dis, vs. Sev Dis./VSDeath (class III)

Summary of Evidence Supporting Measurement Properties of Behavioral Assessment Scales for DOC

Coma Recovery Scale- Revised

JFK COMA R	ECO/	ER'	Y S	CAI	E	R	EVI	SE) .a	64					
This form about any be assed in asso which provide itsi	uitere e	ill the br size	*C81	i di Ali Intel a		TPLAT	110.W.	ALE) Baras	1004 Wh	893 1	is where		8.		
Patient		Clap	nceit	c				Cisoli	24						
Date of Droat:		Cate	-91 A	646,7		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		
	Date:			Т	Γ				Т	Т	Т	Г	Γ		
	1446; 2.2M		2	4 5	4			\$	11		2 12	11	15	76	
AUDITORY FUNCTION SCALE															
I - Consistent Movement to Command *															
1 - Reproducible Movement to Command *		1.7		1	1	1	1.7	1	_	£	1	1	1		
2 - Localization to Sound		LП	-1	-	1	17	17	1	_	1	1	1	1	17	
 Auditory Startle 		11	_	-	1				_	£	+	1	1		
- Nora	_	-	_	1	1	-		_	_	1		1			
VISUAL FUNCTION BCALE	_														
5 - Object Remprillon			_	_	-		_		_	-	_	-	-		
- Object Lacelization: Reaching			-	_	-			-	-	+	+-	-	+		
2 - Vieuel Pursuit			-+-	-	+				-	+-	+-	+	+		
z - Pisation			-+	+	+-	-	-	-	-+-	+	+-	+-	+-	-	
- VISAM OBVINE			-	-	+-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	
Dis Norma	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	
Proton Pone, Incer Science	- 12		-	-	-	-	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
- & America Netro Resources			-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	
- Chievi Merindelan			-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	
- Lacalization in Minister Standarton *			-	+	+-	-	-	-	-	+	+-	+-	+-	-	
- Flexico Withdrawal			-	+	+			-	-	+	+-	+	+		
- Aproreal Pasturing		-	-	-	+				-	+	+-	+-	-		
- None Taosid															
OROMOTOR/VERBAL FUNCTION SCAL	LE														
2 - Intelligible Verbalization		TΠ	-T		T			T		T	1	T	17		
2 - Vocalization/Oral Movement		ĿТ	-T	1	1	1.1		1		1	1	1	1	1.1	
- Chal Reflexive Movement															
- Nora	_		_	_	_			_	_	_	_	_	_	_	
COMMUNICATION SCALE	_														
2 - Functional: Accurate			-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	1	-	
- non-europara imentional "			_	-	+	-	-	-	_	+	+	-	+	-	
- Nora	_		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	
AND A SHARE SHARE	- 12		-	-	-	-	-	-4	-	÷	-	-	-	-	
En Contra als Statistics		+ +	+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	
- ris channel an reunation		+ +	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+	-	
- Eye Opening Met Somulation			+	+	+	-	-	-	+	+	+-	+-	+	-	
1 CE 00 CE 0	_		-	-	+		-	-		+	+	+	+	-	

2

Coma Recovery Scale- Revised: Psychometric Characteristics



CRS.R Subscele Cohen x 95% Cl P Rater Agree Auditory 0.63 ±.35 .00 85% Visual 0.90 ±.19 .00 95% Motor 1.00 ±.00 .00 10% Oromotor/verbal 0.23 ±.51 .17 70%	Cohon & Style C P Rear Agreem 0.43 ±.35 6.00 89% 0.30 ±.19 0.00 98% 0.40 ±.00 0.00 100% 0.40 ±.00 0.00 96% ministion 0.89 ±.22 0.00 96% Frequency Test-Retext Agreement in Diagnosis (n Reserved 100%	CRB R Statustic Colum 9% CI P Rear Agreems Acaditory 0.43 2.29 0.00 19% Si Visual 0.90 ±.10 0.00 19% Si Motor 1.00 ±.00 0.00 10% Si Orremotor/verball 0.29 ±.51 1.77 70% Commonitor/verball Table 7; Frequency of Test Retest Agreement in Diagnosis in Tester Agreement of Motor Tester Agreement of Motor	CRB R Suburshi Cohn 95% Cl. P Rate Agreem Australian Auditory 0.50 1.55 0.0 85%. Visual 0.50 1.75 0.0 85%. Motor 1.00 1.00 0.00 10%. Orrenotoriverbal 0.23 1.51 1.7 70%. Communication 0.89 1.22 0.0 95%. Table 7: Frequency of Test-Retest Agreement in Disagnosis (Rater A2 1000 1000
Auditory 0.63 ±.35 .00 85% Visual 0.90 ±.19 .00 95% Motor 1.00 ±.00 .00 100% Oromotor/verbal 0.23 ±.51 .17 70%	y 0.43 ±.38 .00 09% 0.90 ±.19 .00 99% 1.00 ±.00 .00 100% rication 0.89 ±.22 .00 99% Frequency of Test-Retext Agreement in Diagnosis (n Reter A2	Auditory 0.43 ±.25 0.0 85% Visual 0.0 ±.10 0.0 95% Motor 1.00 ±.00 0.00 10% Communication 1.00 ±.00 0.00 10% Communication 0.23 ±.81 1.17 79% Table 7: Frequency of Test Restacement in Diagnosis in Image Restance Image Restance Image Restance Vis Moto Moto Moto 1.00	Auditory 0.83 :.35 .00 .95%. Visual 0.00 :1.71 .00 .95%. Motor 1.00 .00 .00 .00 .00 Oromotorivetaire 1.00 .00 .00 .00 .00 .00 Oromotorivetaire 0.02 :.51 .17 .70%. Communication 0.89 :.22 .00 .95%. Table 7. Frequency of Test-Retest Agreement in Diagnosis (
Visual 0.90 ±.19 .00 95% Motor 1.00 ±.00 .00 100% Oromotor/verbal 0.23 ±.61 .17 70%	0.90 ±.19 .00 95% 07/verbal 0.23 ±.61 .17 70% nication 0.89 ±.22 .00 96% Frequency of Test-Retest Agreement in Diagnosis (m Ratar A2	Visual 0.50 ±.19 0.0 955 Motor 1.00 ±.00 0.005 1007 Orientotorivetbal 0.23 ±.61 1.72 70% Communication 0.89 ±.22 0.00 955 Table 7: Frequency of Test-Retext Agreement in Diagnosis in Inagreement in Diagnosis in Inagreement in Diagnosis in View McS MCS Test	Visual 0.50 1.19 0.00 95% Motor 1.00 1.00 0.00 100% Oromotor/verbal 0.28 1.51 1.17 70% Communication 0.99 ±.22 0.09 96% Table 7: Frequency of Test-Ritest Agreement in Diagnosis (Rese: A2
Motor 1.00 ±.00 .00 100% Oromotor/verbal 0.23 ±.51 .17 70%	1.00 ±.00 .00 100% or/verbal 0.23 ±.61 .17 70% nication 0.89 ±.22 .00 95% Frequency of Test-Retest Agreement in Diagnosis (n Rater A2	Motor 1.00 ±.00 0.00 1.00% CommotiveNall 0.23 ±.81 1.77 70% Communication 0.89 ±.22 0.09 99% Table 7: Frequency of Test-Retest Agreement in Diagnosis (n 1.00 1.00 1.00 Rater A2 VS MCS MCS Test	Motor 1.00 ±.00 1.00 1.00% Oromotor/vebal 0.23 ±.51 1.77 70% Communication 0.89 ±.22 0.00 96% Table 7: Frequency of Test-Retest Agreement in Diagnosis (Rater A2
Oromotor/verbal 0.23 ±.51 .17 70%	07/verbal 0.23 ±.51 .17 70% nication 0.89 ±.22 .00 95% Frequency of Test-Retest Agreement in Diagnosis (n Reter A2	Oromotor/verbal 0.23 ±.51 .17 70% Communication 0.89 ±.22 .00 98% Table 7. Frequency of Test-Retext Agreement in Diagnosis (in Reserver) Reserver Reserver 70% V5 0 0 50 0 76%	Oromotor/verbal 0.23 ±.51 .17 70% Communication 0.89 ±.22 .00 95% Table 7: Frequency of Test-Retest Agreement in Diagnosis (Rater A2 Rater A2
	Frequency of Test-Retest Agreement in Diagnosis (n Rater A2	Communication 0.89 ±.22 .00 98% Table 7: Frequency of Test-Retest Agreement in Diagnosis (n Reser A2 NG NGS+ Tot	Communication 0.89 ±.22 .00 95% Table 7: Frequency of Test-Retest Agreement in Diagnosis (Rater A2
Communication 0.89 ±.22 .00 95%	Frequency of Test-Retest Agreement in Diagnosis (n Reter A2	Rate 7: Frequency of Test-Retest Agreement in Diagnosis (n Rater A2 VS MCS MCS Tot VS 5 0 0 5	Table 7: Frequency of Test-Retest Agreement in Diagnosis (Rater A2
MC3 MC3+	10 Milds Milds+ 10	- VS 5 0 0 F	10 MG0 MG0+ N
110	VS 5 0 0		- VS 5 0 0
- VS 5 0 0		C MCS 1 11 1 13	2 MCS 1 11 1 1
MCS 1 11 1	MCS 1 11 1 13		MCS+ 0 0 2
MCS 1 11 1 MCS+ 0 0 2	MCS 1 11 1 13 MCS+ 0 0 2	MCS+ 0 0 2 2	C Total 6 11 3 2
₹ VS 6 0 0		G MCS 1 11 1 13	2 MCS 1 11 1 1
VS 6 0 0 MCS 1 11 1	MCS 1 11 1 13		Total 6 11 2 2
VS 5 0 0 MCS 1 11 1 MCS+ 0 0 2 Control 6 11 2	MCS 1 11 1 13 MCS+ 0 0 2 2 Total 6 11 2 2	₩ MCS+ 0 0 2 2 Total 6 11 2 20	10dai 0 11 5 3

Coma Recovery Scale- Revised: Scaling Properties(LaPorta, et al., Arch Phys Med Rehabil, 2010

Sound Strength		CR3-R HZ	INC MARK		Local	544	5E 1	fit residual	2."	Pro. 1
	And a final factor and a final factor at	CRS6 - Ar	cesal		-19	14	.124	-0.036	4,898	.179
		CR53 - M	there is a second s		-0.2	15	.082	0.641	3.492	.322
STINAL MITCLE		CR52b - V	isual (TBI-Hae	morrhage)	-0.0	97	.100	-0.207	1.692	/639
in We Scientifically and Reliabl	y Measure the Level of Minimally Conscious States?	CR51 - As	dinory		-0.0	64	.002	-1.057	4.994	375
asch Analysis of the Coma Reco	very Scale-Revised	CR54 - Or	0-motor		0.00	27	.117	0.903	4.657	5,199
abio La Porta, MD.** Serena Caselli, PT.* Al	adar Bruno Sanes, MD, ⁺ Olivia Cameli, MD, ⁴	CR52a - Vi	mail (Anotic -	lschemnic)	0.14	64	.171	-0.964	4,093	252
lario Lino, MD," Roberto Piperno, MD," Anto rancesco Lombardi, MD," Alan Tennant, PhD	mella Sighinolli, MD," "	CR55 - Ce	mmairation		2.0	16	.177	-0.984	4.013	.200
on the "Anishikation Molecus UNE Anisolo Smar Southris Local Automation Multime and Sanda, Tor Departs Dissouth, Aniso 2016	Rodent, Notern, Targe Veld Schurt in Advanced Sciences II "Mediael Direction, Separa Sel, Borter Dong, Miler, Delge ¹⁴ Tare	Table 6	ine more to to all	un etitutei i	conversion table for	the CRS-R I	lated on the lat	givest sample cal	Exact Name	
Wong? Suce in Ngh?" receipts: Rolepts, 2019 "Will debr for to block that Arizado thetic furthers (such franch facily, Basel	w" Augital, Separa S.g.A., Neter Sean, Kowey, http://www. limits.rbids.com??teacheast of behalitation Multime.rbids.of		Tim	mate and kiel	orthogic Brain 215			mak and Other	Gaussi of Solid Dr.	in the
dense over mostly in hersday of Lands, South, UK.		Rev Scow	Institute I	19940	8-305 Scale	19850	Look Scale	1965/1	0-110 Scale	1995423
		0	-4.871	6.196	2.5	23.6	+1.871	1.365	24	3.1
Aut			-1.997	0.8%	2.8	12.2	-5.91	6.986	84	12.6
prover of many six director of many sectors (SAV), and (Tra-	many and standing of the Long Radianty Scholarship and the stand	1.0	-6.796	0.457	16.5	14.4	-4.778	4.811	34.8	36.7
non with DOC array different arrings and propy, including differe	e staliges	1	-1.744	0.746	18.1	11.1	-1.465	4.771	33.0	11.6
Apr. Mainumer durinations properties saily	SIGNER CONTRACTOR STREET	141	-1.242	0.736	21.7	12.7	-3.111	6.746	24.9	0.7
by the amplitude walk, I providely do hollo, will be	tog menn in Edu	16	-2.753	0.754	28.5	12.4	-2.971	6,726	28.7	13.8
Coloruman.			-2.264	0.995	32.5	12.5	~2/024	8,724	34.0	12.8
prosidence the spik colle-		(B)	-1.781	0.306	26.8	32.3	~1,490	0.495	29.5	12.3
the same result is an excite in such as he was for	many others a triangue and a solution of the solution	(8)	-1,338	6.548	45.8	13.8	-1,405	8.859	43.8	11.4
Aperiosing in storing) showed to the most other 8, Rach ander	in desensations and a standard second of the stability suggestion and	 (8) 	-0.879	0.453	45,0	TLA .	-0.591	8.857	47.6	51.8
alog alogen ordering of survive composite, endowski ought, he	at independence, invaluence (p) - 27/78, P -, 146, and always of	(38)	-0.480	0.636	48.7	35.4	-0.279	0.185	\$5.7	25.8
rooted you become areas around the second second with the	a the addition parton separate sector Mic was append to an an an and the based on the CWA & called and	n	-0.065	0.68	92.3	10.8	9.6%	0.564	55.0	10.0
states: To 125 P. is a protonal Cd3 read ad other month	must level. The linear resonance of atticty data without the CRD-# and	14	8.398	0.508	88.3	12.1	0.569	4,555	143	8.8
on a saidy of the procedure of second second second as softs	sortly adults he high makes assumption, such as the diagonals of the	0	0.048	0.591	58.5	10.4	0.961	10.549	55.8	- 9.2
of containing data adultations.	many spore in spinors on an APA second reduction	- (R	3.003	0.578	41.4	- 10.1	0.966	8.550	613	- 92
tion of Figure Middless and Subdivision (1011)10, 127 13.		15	1,525	0.575	84.8	10.3	1,25	6,554	64.2	1.0
#13 hz the involves Congress of RatioNotation Madridan		18	1.834	0.575	87.8	16.1	1,567	6.547	44.5	3.8
		(M)	1,653	2.26	79.4	10.0	1.800	8,575	887	
		1.1	C.(98	0.80	03	- 10.7	2,398	1984	167	21.8
	The Class Research Ande-Revised (CRAR) was presented by	1.1	1.000	0.000		10.0	2.967	1491		
The second state of the location of the second state of the second	Course at d' as a furthisk speckettered are tole for and any country	100				104	2,007	2.667	222	
In 27 years have not been part of the former framework framework in	text incorporating the narrow diagnostic orbit is fur regretive wate		1.000			100	1.003	6.000		
and a second secon	t the assessed sceneral rate of all one plan has been been been been been been been bee	194	m.428	-		40.0	4.822	N758	40.0	-

Coma Recovery Scale- Revised: Construct Validity



Coma Recovery Scale- Revised: Diagnostic Sensitivity/Specificity



Table 1 Se of conscious	nsitivity, s awareness	pecificity, at CRS-R T	and accura S cutoffs b RS-R TS C	cy rates for i etween 7 ai	detection nd 11
Parameter	7	8	9	10	11
Sensitivity	.97	.93	.88	0.78	0.73
Specificity	.80	.963	.97	1	1
A	0.01	007	005	0.0/2	0.000

(Bodien, et al., Arch Phys Med Rehabil, 2016)

Limitations of Behavioral Assessment

- · Behavior is a poor proxy for conscious awareness - Eg, Cannot differentiate volitional from involuntary or reflexive movement (eg, smiling)
- · May fail to detect co-existing sensory (eg, blindness), motor (eg, contractures) and cognitive impairments (eg, aphasia)
- · Subject to subjective bias of examiner
 - No standard of care for examination procedures or response interpretation

(Giacino & Smart, Curr Opin Neurol, 2007)

Incidence of diagnostic error

- ≻ 37% (Childs et al, Neurol, 1993)
- 43% (Andrews et al, BMJ, 1996) ۶
- 41% (Schnakers et al, Brain Injury, 2008) ≻

Functional Neuroimaging Applications in DOC

Neurophysiologic heterogeneity in VS



(Schiff et al, Brain, 2002)



Coleman, et al., Brain, 2009

fMRI Studies of VS and MCS

Passive Paradigms

- Language processing
- Familiar sounds
- Words
- Narratives
- Visual processing
- Shapes
- Pictures/Scenes
- Faces

Active Paradigms

- · Language comprehension
 - Command-following
 - · Word naming/repetition
 - Movement
 - Spatial navigation
 - Pictures
- Communication
 - Yes/no imaging proxies

(Owen & Coleman, Nat Rev Neurosci, 2009; Giacino, Hirsch, Schiff, Laureys, Arch PM&R, 2006; Laureys, Owen, Schiff, Lancet, 2004)

Detecting Awareness in the Vegetative State



(Owen, et al, Science, 2006)

Discordant behavioral and neurophysiologic evidence of conscious awareness in an 18 y/o male s/p severe TBI (Rodriguez-Moreno, Schiff, Giacino et al, Neurol, 2010)

This form abault only be used in assess	iaiten e	-	• '0	64	426	NU:	1942	ion,	w	300	w	au	DeLA	a 1		
and prove at	ter senare annound an distante.									-		-				
de el Ondell	Data of Administration:															
p	abe	Ē	Γ	Г	Г		Γ		-					—		Г
10	100	2	2	4	5		7		,	72	11	12	12	14	15	19
IDITORY FUNCTION SCALE																
Consident Movement to Command *																
Reproducible Movement to Command *																
Localization to Strund																
Auditory Startle					Ľ		1									
None																
AJAL FUNCTION SCALE																
Object Recognition		_	_													
Object Localization: Reaching																
Veas Petol			_													
Fixados *																
Veual State			-	_	_		_	_	_	_	_	_		_		_
Nore																
TOR FUNCTION SCALE	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Fundianal Object Use		_	_													
Automatic Motor Response			_													
Cloyed Manpulation		-	-													
Localization to Novious Stimulation						_			_	_	_	_			_	_
Pleason Withdrawal			-	_	_	-	-	_	_	_	_	_		_	-	_
Abromal Pusturing	-	-	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_		_
NonePlaced	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_		_		_
IONOTOR/VERSEAL FUNCTION SCAL		-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
arenges vebalcator				_	-	_	_	_	_	_	_		_	_	_	_
VALUE AND A				-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cial Reference Movement		_	-	-	-	-	-	_	_	_	_	_	-	_	-	_
None -	-	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
MMUNICATION SCALE	-	-	-	_	-	_	_	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	-
Fundional Alcurate		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	_	_	_	-	-		-
the second se				-	-		-					-		-		
NIGH SCH E	- 62			-	-	-	-	_	_	_	_	_	-	-	-	-
R Rection	- 12	-	-	-	-		-		-		-	-		-		÷
Eva Chanico aris Menultatos		1	r-	-	-	-	-							-	-	H
For the second second determined		-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	⊢
and committee				-	-	H	-	-	-	-	-	-	н	-	H	⊢
THI 50005	1.	1 -	1-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	⊢



Word Repetition Object Naming

Spatial Navigation

Active fMRI Communication Paradigm

• 29 y/o male •MVA (GCS =5) •R frontal SDH/crani •Remained in VS for 3.5 •Admitted to Liege for workup at 5yrs •CRS-R/SMART found reproducible LE command-following but no behavioral evidence of communication •fMRI communication paradigm showed 5/6 accurate yes/no responses



(Monti, et al., NEJM, 2012)

Resting State Networks: DMN Connectivity in DoC



Electrophysiologic Approaches

(Vanhaudenhuyse, et al. Brain 2010)



"MCS+ (plus)" v. "MCS- (minus)"

runo, et al., J Neurol, 2012)

90

J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry, 2008



Time (s)

30

Can electromyography objectively detect voluntary movement in

in disorders of consciousness?







A Theoretically Based Index of Consciousness Independent of Sensory Processing and Behavior

Prognosis and Outcome

Current Guidelines for Predicting Outcome Following Severe Acquired Brain Injury

The Multi-Society Task Force Report on Medical Aspects of the Persistent Vegetative State

(Multi-Society Task Force on PVS, N Engl J Med 1994;330: 1572-79)

"Recovery of consciousness after 12 months is unlikely in adults and children who have had traumatic injuries...Data were available on 434 patients in VS at one month after a severe head injury...Recovery after 12 months was reported in only 7 of the 434 patients."



Prognostic Guideline for the Vegetative State

Criteria for Permanence

- After 12 months following traumatic brain injury in adults and children
- After 3 months following non-traumatic brain injury in adults and children

(American Academy of Neurology, Neurol1995;45:1015-1018)

The Minimally Conscious State: Definition and Diagnostic Criteria (Giacino, et al., Neurol 2002;58:349-53)

- "The natural history and long-term outcome of MCS have not yet been adequately investigated...Although it is not known how many patients will emerge from MCS after 12 months after injury, most patients in MCS for this length of time remain severely disabled..."
- No prognostic guidelines established to date



When is MCS permanent?





Outcome from VS and MCS at 1 Year



Outcome from VS and MCS: 1-4 years (Katz, et al., Prog Brain Res, 2009)



Late Recovery from Vegetative State



At Least 1 F-U: Overall NÏDRR Sample N=337 Model Systems Age (quartiles) Male 20/27/41 72% Race White 67% 80% Black 23% 68% Hispanie 7% 70% Other 3% 50% Education 50% <12 years 29% ≥ 12 years 46% 40% Missing 25% 30% Cause of Injury 20% N Motor (%) 66% ED GCS 7/9/10 10% Rehab Admit GCS 3/8/8 0% Reh ute LOS Rehab LOS 29/46/71

Longitudinal Outcome of Patients with Disorders of Consciousness in the TBI



(Nakase-Richardson, Whyte, Giacino, et al, J Neurotrauma, 2011)

Functional Recovery Over 5 Years in Patients who Recovered Command-Following During Inpatient Rehab (Whyte, Nakase-Richardson, Giacino, et al, APM&R, 2013)



Functional Recovery Over 5 Years in Patients who Failed to Recover Command-Following During Inpatient Rehab (Whyte, Nakase-Richardson, Giacino, et al, APM&R, 2013)



Treatment Interventions: Neuromodulation

Thalamo-cortical connectivity and consciousness



Intralaminar nuclei "reconnections" in spontaneous recovery from "vegetative" unresponsive state

Laureys et al, Lancet 2000

Amantadine



Amantadine-induced facilitation of dopaminergic activity promotes enhanced neurotransmission in the dopamine-dependent nigrostriatal, mesolimbic, and frontostriatal circuits that are responsible for mediating arousal, drive, and attentional functions

(Schnakers et al J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 2008; Giacino et al NEJM 2012) A Multicenter Randomized Controlled Trial of the Effectiveness of Amantadime Hydrochloride in Promoting Recovery of Function Following Severe TBI

▶Primary Aims:

- Determine whether AH, given in a dose of 200 400 mg/day improves functional recovery from post-traumatic VS and MCS (4-16 wks postinjury).
- Determine whether AH-related gains in function persist following drug discontinuation

NIDRR Award # H133A031713) (Giacino, Whyte, Bagiella, et al., NEJM, 2012)



Amantadine Trial Results: Behavioral Recovery (CRS-R)



Discussion: Mechanism of Effect

>Improved dopamine availability may:

- Restore tonic arousal, motor initiation, cognitive persistence and other behaviors mediated by dopaminedependent fronto-striatal circuits
- Preserve dysfunctional but viable neuronal populations in meso-limbic and frontal systems involved in attention and drive.

Relationship of lesion burden to outcome in regions of interest: Resting state and reticulo-thalamic networks



Relationship of lesion burden to outcome in cortical networks (**DRS/CRS-R significant; *DRS significant)



Relationship of lesion burden to outcome in subcortical and brain stem structures

(**DRS/CRS-R significant; *DRS significant)



	NS
Pons/	midbrain
n=176	
DRS: N	lot signig.
CRS-R:	Not signif.

DRS over 4 weeks in amantadine and placebo groups with progressive levels of cortical lesion burden (1st-4th quartiles)



Conclusions

- Higher lesion burden on routine CT imaging is associated with worse recovery in patients with traumatic DoC.
- Some ROIs appear to have a more significant impact on recovery than others, but the specific regions contributing to unfavorable outcome remains uncertain.
- Lesion burden did not significantly limit the response to amantadine treatment, however, a decrease in rate of recovery was observed in the amantadine-treated group with highest lesion burden.

Zolpidem

Marked anterior forebrain hypometabolism is noted bilaterally in frontal/prefrontal cortex, thalami and striatum. Following zolpidem administration broad increases of metabolic rates are observed in these regions.



(Brefel-Courbon, et al., AnnNeurol, 2007)

Thalamo-cortical connectivity and consciousness: Transcranial direct current stimulation (tDCS)

tDCS may increase of neuronal excitability via facilitation of resting membrane action potential, spontaneous neuronal firing rates, synaptic strength and cerebral blood flow/metabolism through NMDA, calcium uptake or dopaminergic modulation.



(Thibaut et al, Neurology 2014)

Central thalamic deep brain stimulation

Central lateral nucleus co-activates with anterior cingulate and SMA, nodes in the mesial frontal circuit that mediate response preparedness, motor intention and drive functions.



Schiff, Giacino, et al, Nature 2007

Central Thalamic Deep Brain Stimulation for Treatment of Chronic Post-Traumatic Minimally Conscious State



Rationale for DBS in MCS

- > Hallmark of MCS: Response inconsistency/impersistence
- Primary aim: To determine whether thalamic DBS can promote behavioral responsiveness and improve functional outcome in patients diagnosed with chronic MCS

Patient 1: Electrode placement



Design

➢ Double-blinded alternating crossover design

Condition	Month 1	Month 2	Month 3	Month 4	Month 5	Month 6
ON	х		х		х	
OFF		х		х		х

Primary Outcome Measure: Coma Recovery Scale- Revised



Frequency of best score on Arousal, Motor, and Communication subscales of CRS-R

(Giacino, et al, Arch Phys Med Rehabil, 1991, 2004)

Patient 1

- ➢ 33 y/o RH male
 - Blunt head trauma following assault resulting in b/l SDH (R>L)
 - 2 yrs inpatient rehab + 4 yrs nursing home
- Clinical status on re-admission (6.5 yrs post-injury):
 - Diagnosis: MCS
 - Inconsistent command-following
 - Rare single-word verbalization
 - Unable to communicate reliably or use common objects
 - Total care required, Unable to communicate with family/staff





Conclusions

> DBS modulates specific cognitive and behavioral functions (arousal, functional limb movement, swallowing) via central thalamic upregulation of mesial frontal circuit (anterior cingulate and SMA).

Behavioral Performance: Pre-DBS v. DBS On v. DBS Off



Image: Additional state of the state of

Paradigms (re)framed by neuroimaging

Summary

- Disorders of consciousness exist along a dynamic continuum of residual cognitive function.
- Diagnostic error remains high among patients with Dock.
 Neuroimaging procedures may play a pivotal role in detecting conscious awareness in patients with concurrent sensory, motor and cognitive deficits, but sensitivity and specificity must be carefully considered.
- Recent outcome studies suggest that individuals who sustain severe brain injury experience more substantial and longer periods of recovery than previously thought.
- Preliminary results support use of targeted neuromodulatory interventions aimed at facilitating recovery of specific cognitive and behavioral functions.