

Central versus Local Radiological Reading of Acute Computed Tomography Characteristics in Multi-Center Traumatic Brain Injury Research

Citation for published version (APA):

Vande Vyvere, T., Wilms, G., Claes, L., Leon, F. M., Nieboer, D., Verheyden, J., van den Hauwe, L., Pullens, P., Maas, A. I. R., Parizel, P. M., CENTER-TBI Investigators, & van Heugten, C. M. (2019). Central versus Local Radiological Reading of Acute Computed Tomography Characteristics in Multi-Center Traumatic Brain Injury Research. *Journal of Neurotrauma*, 36(7), 1080-1092. <https://doi.org/10.1089/neu.2018.6061>

Document status and date:

Published: 01/04/2019

DOI:

[10.1089/neu.2018.6061](https://doi.org/10.1089/neu.2018.6061)

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Document license:

Taverne

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.umlib.nl/taverne-license

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

Central versus Local Radiological Reading of Acute Computed Tomography Characteristics in Multi-Center Traumatic Brain Injury Research

Thijs Vande Vyvere,¹ Guido Wilms,^{2,3} Lene Claes,² Francisco Martin Leon,² Daan Nieboer,⁴ Jan Verheyden,² Luc van den Hauwe,^{1,2} Pim Pullens,⁶ Andrew I.R. Maas,⁵ Paul M. Parizel¹
and the Collaborative European NeuroTrauma Effectiveness Research in Traumatic Brain Injury (CENTER-TBI) Investigators and Participants*

Abstract

Observer variability in local radiological reading is a major concern in large-scale multi-center traumatic brain injury (TBI) studies. A central review process has been advocated to minimize this variability. The aim of this study is to compare central with local reading of TBI imaging datasets and to investigate the added value of central review. A total of 2050 admission computed tomography (CT) scans from subjects enrolled in the Collaborative European NeuroTrauma Effectiveness Research in Traumatic Brain Injury (CENTER-TBI) study were analyzed for seven main CT characteristics. Kappa statistics were used to calculate agreement between central and local evaluations and a center-specific analysis was performed. The McNemar test was used to detect whether discordances were significant. Central interobserver and intra-observer agreement was calculated in a subset of patients. Good agreement was found between central and local assessment for the presence or absence of structural pathology (CT+, CT–, $\kappa=0.73$) and most CT characteristics ($\kappa=0.62$ to 0.71), except for traumatic axonal injury lesions ($\kappa=0.37$). Despite good kappa values, discordances were significant in four of seven CT characteristics (i.e., midline shift, contusion, traumatic subarachnoid hemorrhage, and cisternal compression; $p=0.0005$). Central reviewers showed substantial to excellent interobserver and intra-observer agreement ($\kappa=0.73$ to $\kappa=0.96$), contrasted by considerable variability in local radiological reading. Compared with local evaluation, a central review process offers a more consistent radiological reading of acute CT characteristics in TBI. It generates reliable, reproducible data and should be recommended for use in multi-center TBI studies.

Keywords: agreement; central radiology review; traumatic brain injury

Introduction

COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY (CT) imaging remains the modality of choice for assessing structural brain damage in the acute phase after traumatic brain injury (TBI).^{1–3} It allows for the detection of most injuries and can indicate the need for surgical intervention or intracranial pressure management.^{1,4}

Several acute CT characteristics and intracranial lesion types have shown to be strong predictors of clinical outcome.^{5–9} In large-scale multi-center research initiatives, they are therefore often collected and assessed by investigators as key radiological variables.^{10,11} However, the investigator-based assessment process is taking place in an acute clinical setting, which is difficult to stan-

dardize. Depending on the number of participating clinical centers, the pool of readers can become very heterogeneous in terms of experience, training, and use of terminology. This has been associated with high observer variability and can possibly confound statistical analyses.^{12,13}

Various reports have stressed the importance of minimizing observer variability and have advocated a centralized reading process.^{12,14} In central review, a limited pool of independent readers, blinded to patient information, receive uniform training to assess images according to a standardized reading protocol.¹³ A standard lexicon of common data elements (CDEs) is used that can be entered into structured templates.¹⁵ This approach to evaluation already has shown great benefits in other fields of medicine.¹³ Not only can it

¹Department of Radiology, ⁵Department of Neurosurgery, Antwerp University Hospital and University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium.

²icometrix, Research and Development, Leuven, Belgium.

³Department of Radiology, University Hospital Leuven and Catholic University of Leuven, Leuven, Belgium.

⁴Department of Public Health, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

⁶Department of Radiology, Ghent University Hospital, Ghent, Belgium.

*CENTER-TBI investigators and participants listed at end of the article.

minimize observer variability, but it can also provide highly structured data that may facilitate cohort analysis of large datasets across and between different TBI studies.¹⁰

Despite the implementation of both radiological reading approaches in multi-center TBI research projects, the degree of agreement between central and local assessments has not been extensively studied. Our objective was therefore to determine the value of a central reading process by comparing central and local assessments of acute CT characteristics, by computing central interobserver and intra-observer agreement and by investigating the variability of local radiological readings.

Methods

Study population and CT assessors

This study was conducted in the context of the Collaborative European NeuroTrauma Effectiveness Research in Traumatic Brain Injury (CENTER-TBI)¹⁰ project, that included a multi-center longitudinal and observational study (registered at clinicaltrials.gov: NCT02210221). The CENTER-TBI study implemented both central and local reading of CT characteristics. Patients with a clinical diagnosis of TBI and an indication for CT scanning were enrolled in three strata, differentiated by care path: Emergency Room (ER) stratum (patients discharged from the ER), Admission (ADM) stratum (patients admitted to the hospital ward), or Intensive Care Unit (ICI) stratum (patients admitted primarily to the ICU). The study protocol was approved by the national and local ethics committees for each participating center. Informed consent, including use of data for other research purposes, was obtained in each subject according to local regulations.

For this study, we used data on 2050 CT scans, obtained between January 2015 and March 2018, from 34 centers that enrolled at least 10 patients. Imaging datasets that had been labeled as “uninterpretable” by the central reviewers (i.e., datasets with large artefacts or noise) were excluded from the analysis. At minimum, transverse scans with reconstructed section thickness of 3–5 mm were present in all datasets. All centers used routine clinical protocols. CT scanners came from four different vendors (i.e., Siemens, 16 centers; General Electric, eight centers; Philips, five centers; and Toshiba, five centers). The majority of scanners were 64 slice-dual source (65%) or 128 slice-dual source (24%) CT scanners. Only four centers (12%) were 16 slice dual source.

Initial radiological assessments were performed by local radiologists, radiology residents, neurosurgeons or intensivists according to their own local clinical practices. Findings were entered into a clinical database via electronic case report forms by either the physician who performed the assessment (15/34 centers) or by a third person (19/34 centers), based on the radiological report. CT scans were then de-identified and transferred to a central imaging repository for storage and independent central reading. Patients were coded by means of a Global Unique Patient Identifier to ensure adequate de-identification. The central review panel consisted of three protocol-trained reviewers (i.e., one supervising neuroradiologist with over 25 years of clinical experience at the time of the study, and two neuroanatomists, trained to read head CTs for the CENTER-TBI study with 1 to 2 years of experience at the time of the study) who entered CT characteristics into custom-made structured templates, according to the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke (NINDS) TBI Common Data Elements (TBI-CDE).¹⁵ These are standardized formats with common terminology and operational definitions to interpret radiologic images of TBI patients. The reviewers were blinded to local assessment and clinical patient information, except for gender, age, and care path stratum. Each CT report was generated by consensus between one of the two neuroanatomists and the expert neuroradiologist.

Observer agreement

Agreement between central and local assessments. The following overlapping seven acute CT characteristics were extracted from the 2050 assessments in the clinical database and the central imaging repository: epidural hematoma, subdural hematoma, traumatic subarachnoid hemorrhage (tSAH), contusion, traumatic axonal injury (TAI), midline shift (MLS), and cisternal compression. For the purposes of this study, we defined a positive CT scan (CT+) as a CT scan showing any of the selected CT characteristics. A negative CT scan (CT–) was defined as a CT scan showing none of the selected CT characteristics. The dataset consisted of 1364 males (67%) and 686 females (33%) with a median age of 51 years (standard deviation [SD]=21.99). A total of 451 (22%) patients were in the ER stratum, 716 (35%) patients were in the admission stratum, and 883 (43%) were in the ICU stratum. Scans came from 34 clinical centers in Europe, with a minimum of 11 and a maximum of 234 scans per center.

Variability between centers in agreement with central review. For the center-specific analysis, we calculated the agreement between the individual centers and the central review and retrospectively sent out a questionnaire to the participating centers to estimate the number of readers that were involved in initial CT assessment and to disclose the background and experience of the local readers.

Agreement between central reviewers. A subset of 100 unread CT examinations was randomly selected from the imaging repository and independently assessed by the three central reviewers to calculate interobserver agreement. This smaller dataset consisted of 69 males (69%) and 31 females (31%), with a median age of 49.5 years (SD=18.64). A total of 22 were ER patients (22%), 29 were admitted to the hospital (ADM; 29%) and 49 patients were ICU patients (49%). Scans came from 20 centers in Europe, with a minimum of one and a maximum of 16 scans per center. A consensus dataset was created based on the readings of the three reviewers and used to compare with the lesions reported by the centers in the larger dataset. We performed this analysis to ensure that the smaller sample ($n=100$) was representative of the larger sample ($n=2050$). The presence of CT characteristics did not statistically differ from the larger dataset ($n=2050$) for five of seven characteristics (CT+, contusion, tSAH, MLS, and TAI; $p>0.005$). Two characteristics were more prevalent in the smaller dataset: basal cistern compression and acute subdural hematoma (22% vs. 11%, $p=0.002$; and 44% vs. 28%, $p=0.001$). These findings indicate that the two datasets had a similar overall composition, with slightly more pathology in the smaller dataset. Intra-observer agreement was calculated on a subset of 20 CT scans that were randomly drawn from the smaller data set ($n=100$) and were assessed by each central reviewer a second time, with a minimum interval of 4 months between reviews.

Statistical analysis

Cohen's kappa statistics were calculated to assess the overall agreement between central and local assessments and to assess the intra-observer agreement between central reviewers. Fleiss' kappa statistics were used to calculate interobserver agreement between the three central reviewers. Values below 0.2 indicate poor agreement; between 0.21 and 0.4, fair agreement; between 0.41 and 0.60, moderate agreement; between 0.61 and 0.8, substantial agreement; and >0.8 , excellent agreement.¹⁶

For each individual CT characteristic, we calculated the McNemar's test to determine if the differences in the proportion of discordant findings between central and local readings were significant, taking into account the matched data.¹⁷ As opposed to Cohen's kappa, the McNemar test only takes into account the

TABLE 1. AGREEMENT BETWEEN CENTRAL AND LOCAL RADIOLOGICAL EVALUATION OF 2050 ADMISSION CT SCANS

	<i>Central and site agreement (n=2050)</i>	<i>Detection frequency</i>		<i>Concordance (n)</i>		<i>Discordance (n)</i>		<i>McNemar (p value)</i>
	<i>Kappa (95% CI)</i>	<i>Central (n)</i>	<i>Site (n)</i>	<i>+/+</i>	<i>-/-</i>	<i>+/-</i>	<i>-/+</i>	
CT+	0.73 (0.70–0.76)	1221 (60%)	1222 (60%)	1098	696	133	132	1.000
CT–	0.73 (0.70–0.76)	829 (40%)	828 (40%)	696	1098	132	133	1.000
Epidural hematoma	0.64 (0.59–0.70)	221 (11%)	217 (11%)	149	1761	72	68	0.800
Acute subdural hematoma	0.63 (0.59–0.67)	574 (28%)	587 (29%)	425	1315	148	162	0.460
tSAH	0.65 (0.62–0.68)	931 (45%)	770 (38%)	677	1026	254	93	0.000
Contusion	0.62 (0.58–0.65)	603 (30%)	692 (34%)	477	1232	126	215	0.000
TAI	0.37 (0.31–0.44)	188 (9%)	176 (9%)	78	1764	110	98	0.446
MLS	0.71 (0.66–0.76)	190 (9%)	277 (14%)	173	1756	17	104	0.000
Cisternal compression	0.62 (0.56–0.68)	236 (12%)	161 (8%)	129	1784	105	32	0.000

Kappa values for a positive and negative CT scan (CT+, CT–; see Methods section) and 7 different CT characteristics. Frequencies in which CT characteristics were reported by the investigator sites and by the central review are also shown, with associated McNemar’s tests for discordance of paired values.

+/+ (concordant present between central review and site)

-/- (concordant absent between central review and site)

+/- (discordant present central review and absent site)

-/+ (discordant absent central review and present site).

CT, computed tomography; CI, confidence interval; tSAH, traumatic subarachnoid hemorrhage; TAI, traumatic axonal injury; MLS, midline shift.

proportion of discordant findings.¹⁷ We chose a *p* value threshold of 0.05 to indicate systematic differences between the proportion of abnormal findings. Finally, descriptive statistics were used to quantify the variability in the pool of local readers.

All statistical analyses were performed in R (version 3.3.1.).

Results

Agreement between central and local assessments

Table 1 shows the number of times individual CT characteristics were reported by the centers and by the central review for 2050 patients. Good agreement ($\kappa=0.73$) was found between the central review and the centers for detecting a positive CT (CT+) scan. For most individual CT characteristics, we found relatively good kappa

values ($\kappa=0.62$ to $\kappa=0.71$), except for TAI lesions ($\kappa=0.37$). Overall, central reviewers reported more tSAH (45% vs. 38%) and cisternal compression (12% vs. 8%), while investigators reported more contusions (34% vs. 30%) and MLS (14% vs. 9%). Despite good kappa values, these discordances in reporting were significant, as indicated by a positive McNemar’s test ($p=0.000$, 95% CI).

Agreement between central reviewers

Table 2 shows Fleiss kappa values between central reviewers for 100 patients and intra-observer agreement for the three reviewers on a subset of 20 patients. CT+ was almost perfect ($\kappa=0.96$). For individual CT characteristics, values ranged from substantial to excellent (i.e., epidural hematoma, $\kappa=0.78$; subdural hematoma,

TABLE 2. INTEROBSERVER AND INTRA-OBSERVER AGREEMENT BETWEEN CENTRAL REVIEWERS

	<i>Central inter-observer agreement (n=100)</i>	<i>Detection frequency (n=100)</i>			<i>Central intra-observer agreement (n=20)</i>		
	<i>Kappa (95% CI)</i>				<i>Kappa (95% CI)</i>		
	CR1+2+3	CR1	CR2	CR3	CR1	CR2	CR3
CT+	0.96 (0.84, 1.07)	61 (61%)	62 (62%)	59 (59%)	1.00 (1.00–1.00)	0.89 (0.67–1.00)	1.00 (1.00–1.00)
CT–	0.96 (0.84, 1.07)	39 (39%)	38 (38%)	41 (41%)	1.00 (1.00–1.00)	0.89 (0.67–1.00)	1.00 (1.00–1.00)
Epidural hematoma	0.78 (0.67, 0.90)	17 (17%)	17 (17%)	16 (16%)	0.32 (–0.27–0.90)	0.62 (0.15–1.00)	0.61 (0.11–1.00)
Acute subdural hematoma	0.81 (0.70, 0.93)	38 (38%)	40 (40%)	34 (34%)	0.80 (0.54–1.00)	0.80 (0.54–1.00)	0.90 (0.71–1.00)
tSAH	0.83 (0.71, 0.94)	49 (49%)	51 (51%)	49 (49%)	0.70 (0.40–1.00)	0.79 (0.53–1.00)	0.60 (0.26–0.94)
Contusion	0.87 (0.75, 0.98)	34 (34%)	36 (36%)	33 (33%)	0.90 (0.71–1.00)	1.00 (1.00–1.00)	1.00 (1.00–1.00)
TAI	0.84 (0.73, 0.95)	12 (12%)	12 (12%)	11 (11%)	1.00 (1.00–1.00)	1.00 (1.00–1.00)	1.00 (1.00–1.00)
MLS	0.84 (0.73, 0.96)	11 (11%)	11 (11%)	14 (14%)	0.77 (0.35–1.00)	0.83 (0.50–1.00)	0.77 (0.39–1.00)
Cisternal compression	0.73 (0.62, 0.84)	15 (15%)	17 (17%)	22 (22%)	0.69 (0.31–1.00)	0.58 (0.19–0.98)	0.73 (0.39–1.00)

Kappa values for a positive and negative CT scan (CT+, CT–, see Methods) and 7 different CT characteristics. Frequencies are shown in which CT characteristics were reported by the central review for a subset of patients ($n=100$) and intra-observer agreement is shown for the three protocol-trained central reviewers for 20 patients.

CI, confidence interval; CR, central reader; CT, computed tomography; tSAH, traumatic subarachnoid hemorrhage; TAI, traumatic axonal injury; MLS, midline shift.




FIG. 1. Variability between centers in agreement with the central review for a positive computed tomography scan (CT+) and seven CT characteristics. The x-axis displays the individual centers and the dots represent the associated kappa value for each center. Substantial variability exists between different centers in how much they agree with the central review.

$\kappa=0.81$; tSAH, $\kappa=0.83$; contusion, $\kappa=0.87$; TAI, $\kappa=0.84$; cisternal compression, $\kappa=0.73$; MLS, $\kappa=0.84$). Intra-observer agreement was excellent for all three reviewers for all CT characteristics, except for epidural hematoma in one reviewer ($\kappa=0.32$) and cisternal compression in another reviewer ($\kappa=0.58$)

Variability between centers

Variability between centers in agreement with central review. Figure 1 shows the agreement between the individual centers and the standardized central review for CT+ and for the seven CT characteristics in 2050 patients. The different centers showed substantial variability in how much they agreed with the central review for each individual CT characteristic. Centers that scored poorly on one characteristic did not necessarily do so on all others. No clear trend could be found. Overall however, centers showed highest agreement with the central review for MLS and lowest agreement for TAI.

Variability between centers in amount and background of the readers. The estimated pool of readers at the centers was very large (over 250), with mainly four different medical specialties that performed initial CT assessments (i.e., neurosurgeons, radiologists, intensivists, and radiology residents; Fig. 2A). Radiology residents were included in our analysis because they are crucial in first-line assessment. Years of experience in the case of residents indicates the year of residency. Overall, the level of experience of the readers was highly variable (Fig. 2B). However, the main group of readers were radiologists with over 10 years of experience.

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first large-scale study that has systematically compared central with local radiological evaluation of acute CT pathology in TBI. Our data indicate that despite the differences in workflow, the agreement between central reviewers and local centers is good for identifying the presence or absence of

structural abnormalities (CT+, CT-). CT positive and CT negative patients can thus accurately be differentiated in both local and centralized radiologic evaluations. This is an important finding for the reliability of research studies that investigate which predictors (e.g., blood-based biomarkers) can differentiate between complicated (CT+) and uncomplicated (CT-) TBI patients.¹⁸⁻²² Agreement was also relatively good for the evaluation of most individual CT characteristics, specifically for space-occupying extra-axial bleedings (i.e., epidural and subdural hematomas), a finding that also has been reported in previous studies.^{23,24}

However, substantial disagreement may arise when more detailed classification of injury is needed, even between expert radiologists.^{24,25} In our study, this is reflected in the significant scoring discrepancies that were found between the two approaches for the remaining investigated CT characteristics. Despite good kappa values of agreement, four of seven CT characteristics had a positive McNemar's test, which indicates that different reporting tendencies existed between central and local evaluation. Understanding these discordances is crucial to the advancement of multi-center TBI research.

A possible explanation for these discrepancies is the use of discordant reading criteria and terminology. For example, central readers quantified the degree of tSAH according to NINDS TBI-CDEs practices (trace, moderate, or full) and evaluated more anatomical locations compared with the centers (cortical, basal, tentorial, and interhemispheric vs. basal and/or cortical). This could explain why the central review reported more tSAH. However, detection and grading of tSAH is challenging and has been associated with low observer agreement in the past, even when concordant terminology is used.^{24,26}

Central reviewers also showed a tendency to report more basal cistern compression. Evaluation of the basal cisterns is highly subjective and depends on reader background, experience and reading criteria. In addition, different ways to evaluate cisternal compression exist. According to the neurosurgical guidelines of 2006, compression should be evaluated at the level of the midbrain (i.e., the quadrigeminal cistern).²⁷ However, radiologists assess all




FIG. 2A. Retrospectively collected information about the pool of readers at the level of the center. A substantial number of readers were involved in radiological reading (> 250).

subarachnoid cisterns for any sign of abnormality. In our study, central reviewers also evaluated all cisterns (i.e., the suprasellar, prepontine, quadrigeminal, ambient cistern, and cisterna magna) separately and reported any asymmetry, compression, or effacement according to NINDS TBI-CDE practices (Fig. 3).

Differences in reading criteria and the subjective nature of visual interpretation could explain why central reviewers systematically reported more basal cistern compression.²⁸ Besides cisternal compression, MLS is an important indicator of mass effect and can help determine the need for surgical intervention.²⁷ However, depending on local practices and reader background, measurements of this CT characteristic can also vary (Fig. 4). Central readers consistently used one measuring method (Fig. 4, method 2) and only reported shift when greater than 5 mm. In contrast, no strict reading criteria or cut-off values were used at the centers and the pool of readers was very heterogeneous (Fig. 2 and Fig. 3). Retrospective analysis showed that of 104 discordant cases, 93 patients had a shift (89%) that was below 5 mm, indicating that the use of a cut-off value of 5 mm in the central review is most probably the main cause of discordance in our study and not the use of different measuring methods. However, the 11 cases that were genuinely discordant were borderline around 5 mm and differed substantially between the three methods.

Finally, we found significant differences in the classification of contusion and TAI. Small TAI lesions and cortical contusions can be challenging to distinguish on CT, especially when they are oc-

curing at the gray–white matter junction (Fig. 5). Central reviewers reported all focal hyperdense axonal injuries as TAI, including isolated ones that did not span multiple areas of the brain. In contrast, local readers reported diffuse axonal injury (DAI), which could have introduced a reporting bias and a tendency to classify small focal axonal lesions as contusions or only report diffuse lesions as DAI. The fact that local readers reported significantly more contusions supports this hypothesis. The detection of contusions and TAI lesions has been associated with poor observer agreement in the past.^{24,25} In addition, as shown in our study, axonal injury terminology is still in a state of flux,²⁹ which may lead to interpretation differences. Better definitions are therefore needed. At specific locations (i.e., in proximity to the os petrosus), contusions can also easily be missed or overreported due to artefacts, depending on the quality and resolution of the images.²⁴ Magnetic resonance imaging could offer greater anatomical detail and increased sensitivity for the detection and classification of these two lesion types.^{30–32}

For all of the above-described discrepancies, reading criteria, terminology, reader background, and experience play an important role. Central reading in our study was performed by a select panel of only three uniformly trained readers, using strict and standardized reading criteria (NINDS TBI-CDEs) for all of the CT characteristics. Variables were entered directly into the database by the reader who performed the assessment. Excellent interobserver and intra-observer agreement was found between all central readers for




FIG. 2B. Retrospectively collected information about the pool of readers at the level of the center. There was large variability in background and experience between the readers. In most centers the local readers were radiologists with over 10 years of experience.

all of the CT characteristics, including the ones that were discordant with local evaluation. This indicates that no significant differences existed between the assessments of the three reviewers in the central reading panel. It also shows that their individual evaluations were consistent.

The fact that central reading was so consistent allowed us to perform a center-specific analysis to indirectly quantify inter-center differences. This revealed substantial variability between the centers with regard to the extent of agreement with the central review and confirms the existence of great variability in local radiological reading.

Retrospective analysis showed that initial local evaluation of the CT scans was performed by over 250 readers with different backgrounds, different levels of experience and without the use of strict reading criteria. In addition, CT characteristics were not always entered by the physician who performed the assessment. In more than half of the cases, the variables were entered into the database by a third person, based on the radiological report, which could have been an extra source of variability and human error. This approach, however, reflects common procedures in recruiting centers.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to implement strict reading criteria at the level of the centers, where the evaluation is performed in an emergency setting and where time is of the essence. In contrast, in off-site central reading, the readers can go through the structured template without any pressure of time or responsibility to guide therapeutic decision-making. This could be another possible reason why we find reading differences for certain lesion types, especially those that the central reviewers tend to report more of. Our study shows that in large-scale TBI studies, the pool of readers becomes too heterogeneous and substantial variability arises between their radiological readings, which could reduce the reliability and clinical usefulness of the final radiological data. Our study also highlights the importance of using well-defined standardized reading criteria and confirms that an off-site centralized review process using NINDS TBI-CDEs considerably increases reading consistency and reproducibility. The data, generated by central reviewers, are highly reliable, minimize observer variability, and facilitate analyses on large datasets between and across TBI studies. In light of the urgent calls to standardize data collection in TBI research,³³ we therefore strongly recommend the implementation of a central review process in large-scale multi-center TBI studies.




FIG. 3. Examples of discordances in three different patients between the central review and the centers for basal cistern compression. The arrows indicate subarachnoid cisterns that were reported as compressed by the central review, but overall, were considered normal by the centers.

We acknowledge several limitations inherent to our study. First, kappa statistics are influenced by prevalence,³⁴ which restricted us to select individual centers with a large enough sample to compare with the central review ($n > 10$). For some of these centers, certain CT pathologies did not occur often, which can explain the large confidence intervals in the center-specific analysis. The same holds true for the intra-observer dataset ($n = 20$), where some CT characteristics (e.g., epidural hematoma) occurred less frequently. A second limitation is that we required a retrospective analysis to uncover the number of local readers,

their background, and experience. This provided an estimate of how many readers were actually involved and what their level of experience was, as not all centers could retrieve all the requested information. Finally, the lack of other prognostically important CT characteristics in our definition of a CT+ (i.e., skull fractures, pneumocephalus, intraventricular hemorrhage, ventricular compression, brain herniation, etc.) may be considered a limitation. Central reviewers assessed these characteristics, but they were not evaluated at the centers and could therefore not be included in our comparison.




FIG. 4. Different ways to measure midline shift (MLS) in one patient. (1) The (A/2-B) method according to Bullock and colleagues,²⁷ where A is the width of the intracranial space and B is the distance from the tabula interna to the septum pellucidum at the foramen of Monro (MLS = 1.44 cm). (2) The (A/2-B) method where shift is measured at the foramen of Monro, or alternatively at the site of largest displacement, according to the Common Data Elements (TBI-CDE) (MLS = 2.01 cm). (3) A third method, which is commonly used in routine radiological practice. The ideal midline C is determined as the line between the most anterior and posterior part of the falx cerebri. Line D is drawn to the septum pellucidum and is then calculated as shift (MLS = 1.94 cm).




FIG. 5. Examples of discordances in three different patients between the central review and the centers for traumatic axonal injury (TAI). The small focal hyperdense lesions indicated by the arrows were all classified as TAI by the central review, as opposed to contusion by the centers. Lesions occurring at the gray–white matter junction are specifically difficult to discriminate on computed tomography imaging.

Conclusion

Our results indicate good agreement between central reviewers and local investigators for the differentiation between CT positive (CT+) and CT negative (CT-) TBI patients. We also found relatively good agreement for the evaluation of most individual acute CT characteristics, particularly for extra-axial bleedings. However, relevant scoring discrepancies exist between the two approaches upon subclassification of injury and substantial inter-center variability was found in local radiological reading. This is most probably attributable to the large size and heterogeneity of the pool of readers. In contradistinction, interobserver and intra-observer agreement between the select panel of central reviewers was excellent for almost all CT characteristics. We therefore conclude that a standardized central review process with strict reading criteria reduces reader variability, offers a more consistent radiological reading, produces more reproducible data, and should be recommended for implementation in multi-center TBI studies.

Acknowledgments

Data used in preparation of this manuscript were obtained in the context of CENTER-TBI, a large collaborative project supported by the European Commission 7th Framework program (602150). Funding of additional elements has been provided by the Hannelore Kohl Foundation (Germany) and by the non-profit organization One Mind.

CENTER-TBI Investigators and Participants

Ackerlund, Cecilia,¹ Adams, Hadie,² Agnoletti, Vanni,³ Allanson, Judith,⁴ Amrein, Krisztina,⁵ Andaluz, Norberto,⁶ Andelic, Nada,⁷ Andreassen, Lasse,⁸ Antun, Azasevac,⁹ Anke, Audny,¹⁰ Antoni, Anna,¹¹ Ardon, Hilko,¹² Audibert, Gérard,¹³ Auslands, Kaspars,¹⁴ Azouvi, Philippe,¹⁵ Azzolini, Maria Luisa,¹⁶ Baciu, Camelia,¹⁷ Badenes, Rafael,¹⁸ Bartels, Ronald,¹⁹ Barzó, Pál,²⁰ Bauerfeind, Ursula,²¹ Beauvais, Romuald,²² Beer, Ronny,²³ Belda,

Francisco Javier,¹⁸ Bellander, Bo-Michael,²⁴ Belli, Antonio,²⁵ Bellier, Rémy,²⁶ Benali, Habib,²⁷ Benard, Thierry,²⁶ Bernardino, Maurizio,²⁸ Beretta, Luigi,¹⁶ Beynon, Christopher,²⁹ Bilotta, Federico,¹⁸ Binder, Harald,¹¹ Biqiri, Erta,¹⁷ Blaabjerg, Morten,³⁰ den Boogert, Hugo,¹⁹ Bouzat, Pierre,³¹ Bragge, Peter,³² Brazinova, Alexandra,³³ Brinck, Vibeke,³⁴ Brooker, Joanne,³⁵ Brorsson, Camilla,³⁶ Buki, Andras,³⁷ Bullinger, Monika,³⁸ Calappi, Emiliana,³⁹ Calvi, Maria Rosa,¹⁶ Cameron, Peter,⁴⁰ Carbayo Lozano, Guillermo,⁴¹ Carbonara, Marco,³⁹ Carise, Elsa,²⁶ Carpenter, K.,⁴² Castaño-León, Ana M.,⁴³ Causin, Francesco,⁴⁴ Chevillard, Giorgio,¹⁷ Chieregato, Arturo,¹⁷ Citerio, Giuseppe,^{45,46} Cnossen, Maryse,⁴⁷ Coburn, Mark,⁴⁸ Coles, Jonathan,⁴⁸ Coles-Kemp, Lizzie,⁵⁰ Collett, Johnny,⁵⁰ Cooper, Jamie D.,⁵¹ Correia, Marta,⁵² Covic, Amra,⁵³ Curry, Nicola,⁵⁴ Czeiter, Endre,⁵⁵ Czosnyka, Marek,⁵⁶ Dahyot-Fizelier, Claire,²⁶ Damas, François,⁵⁷ Damas, Pierre,⁵⁸ Dawes, Helen,⁵⁹ De Keyser, Véronique,⁶⁰ Della Corte, Francesco,⁶¹ Depreitere, Bart,⁶² de Ruiter, Godard C.W.,⁶³ Dilvesi, Dula,⁹ Ding, Shenghao,⁶⁴ Dippel, Diederik,⁶⁵ Dixit, Abhishek,⁶⁶ Donoghue, Emma,⁴⁰ Dreier, Jens,⁶⁷ Dulière, Guy-Loup,⁵⁷ Eapen, George,⁶⁸ Engemann, Heiko,⁵³ Ercole, Ari,⁶⁶ Esser, Patrick,⁵⁹ Ezer, Erzsébet,⁶⁹ Fabricius, Martin,⁷⁰ Feigin, Valery L.,⁷¹ Feng, Junfeng,⁶⁴ Foks, Kelly,⁶⁵ Fossi, Francesca,¹⁷ Francony, Gilles,³¹ Freo, Ulderico,⁷² Frisvold, Shirin,⁷³ Furmanov, Alex,⁷⁴ Gagliardo, Pablo,⁷⁵ Galanaud, Damien,²⁷ Gantner, Dashiell,⁴⁰ Gao, Guoyi,⁷⁶ Geleijns, Karin,⁴² George, Pradeep,¹ Ghuysen, Alexandre,⁷⁷ Giga, Lelde,⁷⁸ Giraud, Benoit,²⁶ Glocker, Ben,⁷⁹ Golubovic, Jagos,⁹ Gomez, Pedro A.,⁴³ Grossi, Francesca,⁶¹ Gruen, Russell L.,⁸⁰ Gupta, Deepak,⁸¹ Haagsma, Juanita A.,⁴⁷ Haitisma, Iain,⁸² Hartings, Jed A.,⁸³ Helbok, Raimund,²³ Helseth, Eirik,⁸⁴ Hertle, Daniel,³⁰ Hoedemaekers, Astrid,⁸⁵ Hofer, Stefan,⁵³ Horton, Lindsay,⁸⁶ Huijben, Jilske,⁴⁷ Hutchinson, Peter J.,² Häberg Asta, Kristine,⁸⁷ Jacobs, Bram,⁸⁸ Jankowski, Stefan,⁶⁸ Jarrett, Mike,³⁴ Jelaca, Bojan,⁹ Jiang, Ji-yao,⁷⁶ Jones, Kelly,⁸⁹ Kamnitsas, Konstantinos,⁷⁹ Karan, Mladen,⁶ Katila Ari,⁹⁰ Kaukonen, Maija,⁹¹ Kerforne, Thomas,²⁶ Kivisaari, Riku,⁹¹ Kolias, Angelos G.,² Kolumbán, Bálint,⁹² Kompanje, Erwin,⁹³ Kolundzija, Ksenija,⁹⁴ Kondziella,

- Daniel,⁷⁰ Koskinen, Lars-Owe,³⁶ Kovács, Noémi,⁹² Lagares, Alfonso,⁴³ Lanyon, Linda,¹ Laureys, Steven,⁹⁵ Lecky, Fiona,⁹⁶ Ledig, Christian,⁷⁹ Lefering, Rolf,⁹⁷ Legrand, Valerie,⁹⁸ Lei, Jin,⁶⁴ Levi, Leon,⁹⁹ Lightfoot, Roger,¹⁰⁰ Lingsma, Hester,⁴⁷ Loeckx, Dirk,¹⁰¹ Lozano, Angels,¹⁸ MacDonald, Stephen,¹⁰² Maegele, Marc,¹⁰³ Majdan, Marek,³³ Major, Sebastian,¹⁰⁴ Manara, Alex,¹⁰⁵ Manley, Geoffrey,¹⁰⁶ Martin, Didier,¹⁰⁷ Martino, Costanza,³ Maruenda, Armando,¹⁸ Maréchal, Hugues,⁵⁷ Masala, Alessandro,³ Mattern, Julia,²⁹ McFadyen, Charles,⁶⁶ McMahon, Catherine,¹⁰⁸ Melegh, Béla,¹⁰⁹ Menon, David,⁶⁶ Menovsky, Tomas,⁶⁰ Morganti-Kossmann, Cristina,¹¹⁰ Mulazzi, Davide,³⁹ Muraleedharan, Visakh,¹ Murray, Lynnette,⁴⁰ Mühlan, Holger,¹¹¹ Nair, Nandesh,⁶⁰ Negru, Ancuta,¹¹² Nelson, David,¹ Newcombe, Virginia,⁶⁶ Nieboer, Daan,⁴⁷ Noirhomme, Quentin,⁹⁵ Nyirádi, József,⁵ Oddo, Mauro,¹¹³ Oldenbeuving, Annemarie,¹¹⁴ Oresic, Matej,¹¹⁵ Ortolano, Fabrizio,³⁹ Palotie, Aarno,^{116,117,118} Patrung, Adriana,¹²⁰ Payen, Jean-François,³¹ Perera, Natascha,²² Perlbarg, Vincent,²⁷ Persona, Paolo,¹²¹ Peul, Wilco,⁶³ Piippo-Karjalainen, Anna,⁹¹ Pili Flourey, Sébastien,¹²² Pirinen, Matti,¹¹⁶ Ples, Horia,¹¹² Poca, Maria Antonia,¹²³ Polinder, Suzanne,⁴⁷ Pomposo, Inigo,⁴¹ Posti, Jussi,⁹⁰ Puybasset, Louis,¹²⁴ Radoi, Andreea,¹²³ Ragauskas, Arminas,¹²⁵ Raj, Rahul,⁹¹ Rambadagalla, Malinka,¹²⁶ Real, Ruben,⁵³ Rehorčíková, Veronika,³³ Rhodes, Jonathan,¹²⁷ Ripatti, Samuli,¹¹⁶ Rocka, Saulius,¹²⁵ Roe, Cecilie,¹²⁸ Roise, Olav,¹²⁹ Roks, Gerwin,¹³⁰ Rosand, Jonathan,¹³¹ Rosenfeld, Jeffrey,¹¹⁰ Rosenlund, Christina,¹³² Rosenthal, Guy,⁷⁴ Rossaint, Rolf,⁴⁸ Rossi, Sandra,¹²¹ Rueckert, Daniel,⁷⁹ Rusnák, Martin,¹³³ Sacchi, Marco,¹⁷ Sahakian, Barbara,⁶⁶ Sahuquillo, Juan,¹²³ Sakowitz, Oliver,^{134,135} Sala, Francesca,¹²⁰ Sanchez-Porras, Renan,¹³⁴ Sandor, Janos,¹³⁶ Santos, Edgar,²⁹ Sasu, Luminita,⁶¹ Savo, Davide,¹²⁰ Schäffer, Nadin,¹⁰³ Schipper, Inger,¹³⁷ Schlößer, Barbara,²¹ Schmidt, Silke,¹¹¹ Schoechl, Herbert,¹³⁸ Schoonman, Guus,¹³⁰ Schou, Rico Frederik,¹³⁹ Schwendenwein, Elisabeth,¹¹ Schöll, Michael,²⁹ Sir, Özcan,¹⁴⁰ Skandsen, Toril,¹⁴¹ Smakman, Lidwien,⁶³ Smeets, Dirk,¹⁰¹ Smielewski, Peter,⁵⁶ Sorinola, Abayomi,¹⁴² Stamatakis, Emmanuel,⁶⁶ Stanworth, Simon,⁵⁴ Steinbüchel, Nicole,¹⁴³ Stevanovic, Ana,⁴⁸ Stevens, Robert,¹⁴⁴ Stewart, William,¹⁴⁵ Steyerberg, Ewout W.,^{47,146} Stocchetti, Nino,¹⁴⁷ Sundström, Nina,³⁶ Synnot, Anneliese,^{34,148} Taccone, Fabio Silvio,¹⁸ Takala, Riikka,⁹⁰ Tamás, Viktória,¹⁴² Tanskanen, Päivi,⁹¹ Taylor, Mark Steven,³³ Te Ao, Braden,⁷¹ Tenovu, Olli,⁹⁰ Telgmann, Ralph,⁵³ Teodorani, Guido,¹⁴⁹ Theadom, Alice,⁷¹ Thomas, Matt,¹⁰⁵ Tibboel, Dick,⁴² Tolia, Christos,¹⁵⁰ Tshibanda, Jean-Flory Luaba,¹⁵¹ Trapani, Tony,⁴⁰ Tudora, Cristina Maria,¹¹² Vajkoczy, Peter,⁶⁷ Vallance, Shirley,⁴³ Valeinis, Egils,⁷⁸ Van der Steen, Gregory,⁶⁰ van der Jagt, Mathieu,¹⁵² van der Naalt, Joukje,⁸⁸ van Dijck, Jeroen T.J.M.,⁶³ van Essen, Thomas A.,⁶³ Van Hecke, Wim,¹⁰¹ van Heugten, Caroline,⁵⁹ Van Praag, Dominique,⁶⁰ Van Waesberghe, Julia,⁴⁸ Vanhau-denhuysse, Audrey,^{27,95} Vargiolu, Alessia,¹²⁰ Vega, Emmanuel,¹⁵³ Velt, Kimberley,⁴⁷ Vespa, Paul M.,¹⁵⁴ Vik, Anne,¹⁵⁵ Vilcinis, Rimantas,¹⁵⁶ Vizzino, Giacinta,¹⁷ Vleggeert-Lankamp, Carmen,⁶³ Volovici, Victor,⁸² Voormolen, Daphne,⁴⁷ Vulekovic, Peter,⁹ Vámos, Zoltán,⁶⁹ Wade, Derick,⁵⁹ Wang, Kevin K.W.,¹⁵⁷ Wang, Lei,⁶⁴ Wessels, Lars,¹⁵⁸ Wildschut, Eno,⁴² Williams, Guy,⁶⁶ Wilson, Lindsay,⁸⁶ Winkler, Maren K.L.,¹⁰⁴ Wolf, Stefan,¹⁵⁸ Ylén, Peter,¹⁵⁹ Younsi, Alexander,²⁹ Zaaroor, Menashe,⁹⁹ Zhihui, Yang,¹⁶⁰ Ziverte, Agate,⁷⁸ Zumbo, Fabrizio.³
- ¹Karolinska Institutet, INCF International Neuroinformatics Coordinating Facility, Stockholm, Sweden.
- ²Division of Neurosurgery, Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Addenbrooke's Hospital and University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom. United Kingdom.
- ³Department of Anesthesia and Intensive Care, M. Bufalini Hospital, Cesena, Italy.
- ⁴Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Addenbrooke's Hospital and University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
- ⁵János Szentágotthai Research Centre, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary.
- ⁶University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- ⁷Division of Surgery and Clinical Neuroscience, Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Oslo University Hospital and University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.
- ⁸Department of Neurosurgery, University Hospital Northern Norway, Tromsø, Norway.
- ⁹Department of Neurosurgery, Clinical Centre of Vojvodina, Faculty of Medicine, University of Novi Sad, Novi Sad, Serbia.
- ¹⁰Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, University Hospital, Northern Norway.
- ¹¹Trauma Surgery, Medical University Vienna, Vienna, Austria.
- ¹²Department of Neurosurgery, Elisabeth-Tweesteden Ziekenhuis, Tilburg, the Netherlands.
- ¹³Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care, University Hospital Nancy, Nancy, France.
- ¹⁴Riga Eastern Clinical University Hospital, Riga, Latvia.
- ¹⁵Raymond Poincaré hospital, Assistance Publique—Hôpitaux de Paris, Paris, France.
- ¹⁶Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care, San Raffaele University Hospital, Milan, Italy.
- ¹⁷NeuroIntensive Care, Niguarda Hospital, Milan, Italy.
- ¹⁸Department Anesthesiology and Surgical-Trauma Intensive Care, Hospital Clinic Universitari de Valencia, Spain.
- ¹⁹Department of Neurosurgery, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, the Netherlands.
- ²⁰Department of Neurosurgery, University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary.
- ²¹Institute for Transfusion Medicine (ITM), Witten/Herdecke University, Cologne, Germany.
- ²²International Projects Management, ARTTIC, Munchen, Germany.
- ²³Department of Neurology, Neurological Intensive Care Unit, Medical University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria.
- ²⁴Department of Neurosurgery and Anesthesia and intensive care medicine, Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden.
- ²⁵NIHR Surgical Reconstruction and Microbiology Research Centre, Birmingham, U.K.
- ²⁶Intensive Care Unit, CHU Poitiers, Poitiers, France.
- ²⁷Anesthésie-Réanimation, Assistance Publique—Hôpitaux de Paris, Paris, France.
- ²⁸Department of Anesthesia and ICU, AOU Città della Salute e della Scienza di Torino—Orthopedic and Trauma Center, Torino, Italy.
- ²⁹Department of Neurosurgery, University Hospital Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany.
- ³⁰Department of Neurology, Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark.
- ³¹Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care, University Hospital of Grenoble, Grenoble, France.
- ³²BehaviourWorks Australia, Monash Sustainability Institute, Monash University, Victoria, Australia.
- ³³Department of Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences and Social Work, Trnava University, Trnava, Slovakia.
- ³⁴Quesgen Systems Inc., Burlingame, California.
- ³⁵Australian and New Zealand Intensive Care Research Centre, Department of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, School of

Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.

³⁶Department of Neurosurgery, Umea University Hospital, Umea, Sweden.

³⁷Department of Neurosurgery, University of Pecs and MTA-PTE Clinical Neuroscience MR Research Group and Janos Szentagothai Research Centre, University of Pecs, Hungarian Brain Research Program, Pecs, Hungary.

³⁸Department of Medical Psychology, Universitätsklinikum Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany.

³⁹Neuro ICU, Fondazione IRCCS Cà Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italy.

⁴⁰ANZIC Research Centre, Monash University, Department of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

⁴¹Department of Neurosurgery, Hospital of Cruces, Bilbao, Spain.

⁴²Intensive Care and Department of Pediatric Surgery, Erasmus Medical Center, Sophia Children's Hospital, Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

⁴³Department of Neurosurgery, Hospital Universitario 12 de Octubre, Madrid, Spain.

⁴⁴Department of Neuroscience, Azienda Ospedaliera Università di Padova, Padova, Italy

⁴⁵NeuroIntensive Care, ASST di Monza, Monza, Italy.

⁴⁶School of Medicine and Surgery, Università Milano Bicocca, Milano, Italy.

⁴⁷Department of Public Health, Erasmus Medical Center-University Medical Center, Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

⁴⁸Department of Anaesthesiology, University Hospital of Aachen, Aachen, Germany.

⁴⁹Department of Anesthesia and Neurointensive Care, Cambridge University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

⁵⁰Movement Science Group, Oxford Institute of Nursing, Midwifery and Allied Health Research, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, United Kingdom.

⁵¹School of Public Health and PM, Monash University and The Alfred Hospital, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

⁵²Radiology/MRI department, MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

⁵³Institute of Medical Psychology and Medical Sociology, Universitätsmedizin Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany.

⁵⁴Oxford University Hospitals NHS Trust, Oxford, United Kingdom.

⁵⁵Department of Neurosurgery, University of Pecs and MTA-PTE Clinical Neuroscience MR Research Group and Janos Szentagothai Research Centre, University of Pecs, Hungarian Brain Research Program (Grant No. KTIA 13 NAP-A-II/8), Pecs, Hungary.

⁵⁶Brain Physics Lab, Division of Neurosurgery, Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Cambridge, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

⁵⁷Intensive Care Unit, CHR Citadelle, Liège, Belgium.

⁵⁸Intensive Care Unit, CHU, Liège, Belgium.

⁵⁹Movement Science Group, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, United Kingdom.

⁶⁰Department of Neurosurgery, Antwerp University Hospital and University of Antwerp, Edegem, Belgium.

⁶¹Department of Anesthesia and Intensive Care, Maggiore Della Carità Hospital, Novara, Italy.

⁶²Department of Neurosurgery, University Hospitals Leuven, Leuven, Belgium.

⁶³Department of Neurosurgery, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands. and Department of Neurosurgery, Medical Center Haaglanden, the Hague, the Netherlands.

⁶⁴Department of Neurosurgery, Renji Hospital, Shanghai Jiaotong University School of Medicine, Shanghai, China.

⁶⁵Department of Neurology, Erasmus MC, Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

⁶⁶Division of Anaesthesia, University of Cambridge, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

⁶⁷Neurologie, Neurochirurgie und Psychiatrie, Charité—Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany.

⁶⁸Neurointensive Care, Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Sheffield, United Kingdom.

⁶⁹Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Therapy, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary.

⁷⁰Departments of Neurology, Clinical Neurophysiology and Neuroanaesthesiology, Region Hovedstaden Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen, Denmark.

⁷¹National Institute for Stroke and Applied Neurosciences, Faculty of Health and Environmental Studies, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand.

⁷²Department of Medicine, Azienda Ospedaliera Università di Padova, Padova, Italy.

⁷³Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive care, University Hospital Northern Norway, Tromsø, Norway.

⁷⁴Department of Neurosurgery, Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center, Jerusalem, Israel.

⁷⁵Fundación Instituto Valenciano de Neurorehabilitación (FI-VAN), Valencia, Spain.

⁷⁶Department of Neurosurgery, Shanghai Renji Hospital, Shanghai Jiaotong University/School of Medicine, Shanghai, China.

⁷⁷Emergency Department, CHU, Liège, Belgium.

⁷⁸Pauls Stradins Clinical University Hospital, Riga, Latvia.

⁷⁹Department of Computing, Imperial College London, London, United Kingdom.

⁸⁰Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore; and Monash University, Australia.

⁸¹Department of Neurosurgery, Neurosciences Centre and JPN Apex trauma centre, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi-110029, India.

⁸²Department of Neurosurgery, Erasmus MC, Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

⁸³Department of Neurosurgery, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.

⁸⁴Department of Neurosurgery, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway.

⁸⁵Department of Intensive Care Medicine, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, the Netherlands.

⁸⁶Division of Psychology, University of Stirling, Stirling, United Kingdom.

⁸⁷Department of Medical Imaging, St. Olav's Hospital and Department of Neuroscience, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway.

⁸⁸Department of Neurology, University Medical Center Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands.

⁸⁹National Institute for Stroke and Applied Neurosciences of the AUT University, Auckland, New Zealand.

⁹⁰Rehabilitation and Brain Trauma, Turku University Central Hospital and University of Turku, Turku, Finland.

⁹¹Helsinki University Central Hospital, Helsinki, Finland.

⁹²Hungarian Brain Research Program—Grant No. KTIA 13 NAP-A-II/8, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary.

- ⁹³Department of Intensive Care and Department of Ethics and Philosophy of Medicine, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, the Netherlands.
- ⁹⁴Department of Psychiatry, Clinical Centre of Vojvodina, Faculty of Medicine, University of Novi Sad, Novi Sad, Serbia.
- ⁹⁵Cyclotron Research Center, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium.
- ⁹⁶Emergency Medicine Research in Sheffield, Health Services Research Section, School of Health and Related Research (ScHARR), University of Sheffield, Sheffield, United Kingdom.
- ⁹⁷Institute of Research in Operative Medicine (IFOM), Witten/Herdecke University, Cologne, Germany.
- ⁹⁸VP Global Project Management CNS, ICON, Paris, France.
- ⁹⁹Department of Neurosurgery, Rambam Medical Center, Haifa, Israel.
- ¹⁰⁰Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care, University Hospitals Southampton NHS Trust, Southampton, United Kingdom.
- ¹⁰¹icoMetrix NV, Leuven, Belgium.
- ¹⁰²Cambridge University Hospitals, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
- ¹⁰³Cologne-Merheim Medical Center (CMMC), Department of Traumatology, Orthopedic Surgery and Sportmedicine, Witten/Herdecke University, Cologne, Germany.
- ¹⁰⁴Centrum für Schlaganfallforschung, Charité—Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany.
- ¹⁰⁵Intensive Care Unit, Southmead Hospital, Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom.
- ¹⁰⁶Department of Neurological Surgery, University of California, San Francisco, California.
- ¹⁰⁷Department of Neurosurgery, CHU, Liège, Belgium.
- ¹⁰⁸Department of Neurosurgery, The Walton Centre NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, United Kingdom.
- ¹⁰⁹Department of Medical Genetics, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary.
- ¹¹⁰National Trauma Research Institute, The Alfred Hospital, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.
- ¹¹¹Department Health and Prevention, University Greifswald, Greifswald, Germany.
- ¹¹²Department of Neurosurgery, Emergency County Hospital Timisoara, Timisoara, Romania.
- ¹¹³Centre Hospitalier Universitaire Vaudois, Lausanne, Switzerland.
- ¹¹⁴Department of Intensive Care, Elisabeth-Tweesteden Ziekenhuis, Tilburg, the Netherlands.
- ¹¹⁵Department of Systems Medicine, Steno Diabetes Center, Gentofte, Denmark.
- ¹¹⁶Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland.
- ¹¹⁷Analytic and Translational Genetics Unit, Department of Medicine; Psychiatric and Neurodevelopmental Genetics Unit, Department of Psychiatry; Department of Neurology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA.
- ¹¹⁸Program in Medical and Population Genetics; The Stanley Center for Psychiatric Research, The Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA.
- ¹¹⁹Department of Radiology, Antwerp University Hospital and University of Antwerp, Edegem, Belgium.
- ¹²⁰NeuroIntensive Care Unit, Department of Anesthesia and Intensive Care, ASST di Monza, Monza, Italy.
- ¹²¹Department of Anesthesia and Intensive Care, Azienda Ospedaliera Università di Padova, Padova, Italy.
- ¹²²Intensive Care Unit, CHRU de Besançon, Besançon, France.
- ¹²³Department of Neurosurgery, Vall d'Hebron University Hospital, Barcelona, Spain.
- ¹²⁴Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care, Pitié - Salpêtrière Teaching Hospital, Assistance Publique, Hôpitaux de Paris and University Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris, France.
- ¹²⁵Department of Neurosurgery, Kaunas University of technology and Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania
- ¹²⁶Rezekne Hospital, Latvia.
- ¹²⁷Department of Anaesthesia, Critical Care and Pain Medicine NHS Lothian and University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, United Kingdom.
- ¹²⁸Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Oslo University Hospital/University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.
- ¹²⁹Division of Surgery and Clinical Neuroscience, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway.
- ¹³⁰Department of Neurology, Elisabeth-TweeSteden Ziekenhuis, Tilburg, the Netherlands.
- ¹³¹Broad Institute, Cambridge MA Harvard Medical School, Boston MA, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA.
- ¹³²Department of Neurosurgery, Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark.
- ¹³³International Neurotrauma Research Organisation, Vienna, Austria.
- ¹³⁴Klinik für Neurochirurgie, Klinikum Ludwigsburg, Ludwigsburg, Germany.
- ¹³⁵University Hospital Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany.
- ¹³⁶Division of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, Department of Preventive Medicine, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary.
- ¹³⁷Department of Traumasurgery, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands.
- ¹³⁸Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care, AUVA Trauma Hospital, Salzburg, Austria.
- ¹³⁹Department of Neuroanesthesia and Neurointensive Care, Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark.
- ¹⁴⁰Department of Emergency Care Medicine, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, the Netherlands.
- ¹⁴¹Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, St. Olav's Hospital and Department of Neuroscience, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway.
- ¹⁴²Department of Neurosurgery, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary.
- ¹⁴³Universitätsmedizin Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany.
- ¹⁴⁴Division of Neuroscience Critical Care, John Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD.
- ¹⁴⁵Department of Neuropathology, Queen Elizabeth University Hospital and University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom.
- ¹⁴⁶Department of Biomedical Data Sciences, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands.
- ¹⁴⁷Department of Pathophysiology and Transplantation, Milan University, and Neuroscience ICU, Fondazione IRCCS Cà Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milano, Italy.
- ¹⁴⁸Cochrane Consumers and Communication Review Group, Centre for Health Communication and Participation, School of Psychology and Public Health, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia.
- ¹⁴⁹Department of Reahabilitation, M. Bufalini Hospital, Cesena, Italy.
- ¹⁵⁰Department of Neurosurgery, King's College London, London, United Kingdom.
- ¹⁵¹Radiology/MRI Department, CHU, Liège, Belgium.

¹⁵²Department of Intensive Care, Erasmus MC, Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

¹⁵³Department of Anesthesiology-Intensive Care, Lille University Hospital, Lille, France.

¹⁵⁴Director of Neurocritical Care, University of California, Los Angeles.

¹⁵⁵Department of Neurosurgery, St. Olav's Hospital and Department of Neuroscience, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway.

¹⁵⁶Department of Neurosurgery, Kaunas University of Health Sciences, Kaunas, Lithuania.

¹⁵⁷Department of Psychiatry, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.

¹⁵⁸Interdisciplinary Neuro Intensive Care Unit, Charité—Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany.

¹⁵⁹VTT Technical Research Centre, Tampere, Finland.

¹⁶⁰University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.

Author Disclosure Statement

Francisco Martin Leon and Jan Verheyden are employees of icometrix, a for-profit imaging biomarker company. Prof. Dr. Guido Wilms and Dr. Luc van den Hauwe are consultant neuro-radiologists for icometrix. No competing financial interests exist.

References

- Parizel, P.M., Van Goethem, J.W., Özsarlak, Ö., Maes, M., and Phillips, C.D. (2005). New developments in the neuroradiological diagnosis of craniocerebral trauma. *Eur. Radiol.* 15, 569–581.
- Provenzale, J. (2007). CT and MR imaging of acute cranial trauma. *Emerg. Radiol.* 14, 1–12.
- Kim, J.J. and Gean, A.D. (2011). Imaging for the diagnosis and management of traumatic brain injury. *Neurotherapeutics* 8, 39–53.
- Chesnut, R.M. and Marshall, L.F. (1991). Management of head injury. Treatment of abnormal intracranial pressure. *Neurosurg. Clin. N. Am.* 2, 267–284.
- van Dongen, K.J., Braakman, R., and Gelpke, G.J. (1983). The prognostic value of computerized tomography in comatose head-injured patients. *J. Neurosurg.* 59, 951–957.
- Eisenberg, H.M., Gary, H.E., Aldrich, E.F., Saydjari, O., Turner, B., Foulkes, M.A., Jane, J.A., Marmarou, A., Marshall, L.F., and Young, H.F. (1990). Initial CT findings in 753 patients with severe head injury. A report from the NIH Traumatic Coma Data Bank. *J. Neurosurg.* 73, 688–698.
- Servadei, F., Nasi, M.T., Giuliani, G., Cremonini, A.M., Cenni, P., Zappi, D., and Taylor, G.S. (2000). CT prognostic factors in acute subdural haematomas: the value of the “worst” CT scan. *Br. J. Neurosurg.* 14, 110–116.
- Azian, A.A., Nurulazman, A.A., Shuaib, L., Mahayidin, M., Ariff, A.R., Naing, N.N., and Abdullah, J. (2001). Computed tomography of the brain in predicting outcome of traumatic intracranial haemorrhage in Malaysian patients. *Acta Neurochir. (Wien)*, 143, 711–720.
- Bahloul, M., Chelly, H., Ben Hmida, M., Ben Hamida, C., Ksibi, H., Kallel, H., Chaari, A., Kassis, M., Rekik, N., and Bouaziz, M. (2004). Prognosis of traumatic head injury in South Tunisia: a multivariate analysis of 437 cases. *J. Trauma* 57, 255–261.
- Maas, A.I.R., Menon, D.K., Steyerberg, E.W., Citerio, G., Lecky, F., Manley, G.T., Hill, S., Legrand, V., and Sorgner, A. (2015). Collaborative European NeuroTrauma Effectiveness Research in Traumatic Brain Injury (CENTER-TBI). *Neurosurgery* 76, 67–80.
- Yue, J.K., Vassar, M.J., Lingsma, H.F., Cooper, S.R., Okonkwo, D.O., Valadka, A.B., Gordon, W.A., Maas, A.I.R., Mukherjee, P., Yuh, E.L., Puccio, A.M., Schnyer, D.M., Manley, G.T., Casey, S.S., Cheong, M., Dams-O'Connor, K., Hricik, A.J., Knight, E.E., Kulubya, E.S., Menon, D.K., Morabito, D.J., Pacheco, J.L., and Sinha, T.K. (2013). Transforming Research and Clinical Knowledge in Traumatic Brain Injury Pilot: multicenter implementation of the Common Data Elements for traumatic brain injury. *J. Neurotrauma* 30, 1831–1844.
- Maas, A.I.R., Steyerberg, E.W., Butcher, I., Dammers, R., Lu, J., Marmarou, A., Mushkudiani, N. a, McHugh, G.S., and Murray, G.D. (2007). Prognostic value of computerized tomography scan characteristics in traumatic brain injury: results from the IMPACT study. *J. Neurotrauma* 24, 303–314.
- Ford, R., Schwartz, L., Dancy, J., Dodd, L.E., Eisenhauer, E.A., Gwyther, S., Rubinstein, L., Sargent, D., Shankar, L., Therasse, P., and Verweij, J. (2009). Lessons learned from independent central review. *Eur. J. Cancer* 45, 268–274.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration; Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER); Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER). (2004). Clinical Medical, Guidance for Industry, Developing Medical Imaging Drug and Biologic Products. www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/Guidances/ucm071600.pdf. (Last accessed October 9, 2018).
- Haacke, E.M., Duhaime, C., Gean, A.D., Riedy, G., Wintermark, M., Mukherjee, P., Brody, D.L., Degraba, T., Duncan, T.D., Elovic, E., Hurley, R., Latour, L., Smirniotopoulos, J.G., and Smith, D.H. (2010). Common data elements in radiologic imaging of traumatic brain injury. *J. Magn. Reson. Imaging* 32, 516–543.
- Landis, J.R. and Koch, G.G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics* 33, 159–174.
- McNemar, Q. (1947). Note on the sampling error of the difference between correlated proportions or percentages. *Psychometrika* 12, 153–157.
- Lagerstedt, L., Egea-Guerrero, J.J., Bustamante, A., Montaner, J., Rodríguez-Rodríguez, A., El Rahal, A., Turck, N., Quintana, M., García-Armengol, R., Prica, C.M., Andereggen, E., Rinaldi, L., Sarrafzadeh, A., Schaller, K., and Sanchez, J.C. (2017). H-FABP: A new biomarker to differentiate between CT-positive and CT-negative patients with mild traumatic brain injury. *PLoS One* 12, e0175572.
- Lagerstedt, L., Egea-Guerrero, J.J., Rodríguez-Rodríguez, A., Bustamante, A., Montaner, J., El Rahal, A., Andereggen, E., Rinaldi, L., Sarrafzadeh, A., Schaller, K., and Sanchez, J.C. (2018). Early measurement of interleukin-10 predicts the absence of CT scan lesions in mild traumatic brain injury. *PLoS One* 13, e0193278.
- Kisat, M., Zafar, S.N., Latif, A., Villegas, C. V, Efron, D.T., Stevens, K.A., Haut, E.R., Schneider, E.B., Zafar, H., and Haider, A.H. (2012). Predictors of positive head CT scan and neurosurgical procedures after minor head trauma. *J. Surg. Res.* 173, 31–37.
- Bazarian, J.J., Biberthaler, P., Welch, R.D., Lewis, L.M., Barzo, P., Bogner-Flatz, V., Gunnar Brolinson, P., Büki, A., Chen, J.Y., Christenson, R.H., Hack, D., Huff, J.S., Johar, S., Jordan, J.D., Leidel, B.A., Lindner, T., Ludington, E., Okonkwo, D.O., Ornato, J., Peacock, W.F., Schmidt, K., Tyndall, J.A., Vossough, A., and Jagoda, A.S. (2018). Serum GFAP and UCH-L1 for prediction of absence of intracranial injuries on head CT (ALERT-TBI): a multicentre observational study. *Lancet Neurol.* 17, 782–789.
- Jagoda, A.S., Bazarian, J.J., Bruns, J.J., Cantrill, S. V., Gean, A.D., Howard, P.K., Ghajar, J., Riggio, S., Wright, D.W., Wears, R.L., Bakshy, A., Burgess, P., Wald, M.M., and Whitson, R.R. (2008). Clinical policy: neuroimaging and decisionmaking in adult mild traumatic brain injury in the acute setting. *Ann. Emerg. Med.* 52, 714–748.
- Chun, K.A., Manley, G.T., Stiver, S.I., Aiken, A.H., Phan, N., Wang, V., Meeker, M., Cheng, S., Gean, A.D., and Wintermark, M. (2010). Interobserver variability in the assessment of CT imaging features of traumatic brain injury. *J. Neurotrauma* 27, 325–330.
- Laalo, J.P., Kurki, T.J., Sonninen, P.H., and Tenovuo, O.S. (2009). Reliability of diagnosis of traumatic brain injury by computed tomography in the acute phase. *J. Neurotrauma* 26, 2169–2178.
- Huff, J.S. and Jahar, S. (2014). Differences in interpretation of cranial computed tomography in ED traumatic brain injury patients by expert neuroradiologists. *Am. J. Emerg. Med.* 32, 606–608.
- Harburg, L., Mccormack, E., Kenney, K., Moore, C., Yang, K., Vos, P., Jacobs, B., Madden, C.J., Diaz-arrastia, R., Harburg, L., Mccormack, E., Kenney, K., Moore, C., Yang, K., Vos, P., Jacobs, B., Madden, C.J., Diaz-Arrastia, R., and Bogoslovsky, T. (2017). Reliability of the NINDS common data elements cranial tomography (CT) rating variables for traumatic brain injury (TBI) variables for traumatic brain injury (TBI). *Brain Inj.* 31, 174–184.
- Bullock, M.R., Chesnut, R., Ghajar, J., Gordon, D., Hartl, R., Newell, D.W., Servadei, F., Walters, B.C., and Wilberger, J.E. (2006). Introduction. *Neurosurgery* 58, S2-1–S2-3.

28. Duhaime, A.C., Gean, A.D., Haacke, E.M., Hicks, R., Wintermark, M., Mukherjee, P., Brody, D., Latour, L., and Riedy, G. (2010). Common data elements in radiologic imaging of traumatic brain injury. *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.* 91, 1661–1666.
29. Hill, C.S., Coleman, M.P., and Menon, D.K. (2016). Traumatic Axonal Injury: Mechanisms and Translational Opportunities. *Trends Neurosci.* 39, 311–324.
30. Gentry, L.R., Godersky, J.C., and Thompson, B. (1988). MR imaging of head trauma: review of the distribution and radiopathologic features of traumatic lesions. *AJR. Am. J. Roentgenol.* 150, 663–672.
31. Parizel, P.M., Ozsarlak, Van Goethem, J.W., van den Hauwe, L., Dillen, C., Verlooy, J., Cosyns, P., and De Schepper, A.M. (1998). Imaging findings in diffuse axonal injury after closed head trauma. *Eur. Radiol.* 8, 960–965.
32. Karantanas, A.H., Komnos, A., Paterakis, K., and Hadjigeorgiou, G. (2005). Differences between CT and MR imaging in acute closed head injuries. *C Extra Cases* 29, 1–8.
33. Maas, A.I.R., Harrison-Felix, C.L., Menon, D., Adelson, P.D., Balkin, T., Bullock, R., Engel, D.C., Gordon, W., Langlois-Orman, J., Lew, H.L., Robertson, C., Temkin, N., Valadka, A., Verfaellie, M., Wainwright, M., Wright, D.W., and Schwab, K. (2011). Standardizing data collection in traumatic brain injury. *J. Neurotrauma* 28, 177–187.
34. Byrt, T., Bishop, J., and Carlin, J.B. (1993). Bias, prevalence and kappa. *J. Clin. Epidemiol.* 46, 423–429.

Address correspondence to:

*Thijs Vande Vyvere, MSc
Poelsnepstraat 11
9000 Ghent
Belgium*

E-mail: thijs.vandevyvere@uantwerpen.be

This article has been cited by:

1. Frederick A. Zeiler, François Mathieu, Miguel Monteiro, Ben Glocker, Ari Ercole, Manuel Cabeleira, Nino Stocchetti, Peter Smielewski, Marek Czosnyka, Virginia Newcombe, David K. Menon, the Collaborative European Neurotrauma Effectiveness Research in Traumatic Brain Injury (CENTER-TBI) High-Resolution ICU (HR ICU) Sub-Study Participants and Investigators. 2021. Systemic Markers of Injury and Injury Response Are Not Associated with Impaired Cerebrovascular Reactivity in Adult Traumatic Brain Injury: A Collaborative European Neurotrauma Effectiveness Research in Traumatic Brain Injury (CENTER-TBI) Study. *Journal of Neurotrauma* 38:7, 870-878. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF] [PDF Plus] [Supplementary Material]
2. Sophie Richter, Stefan Winzeck, Evgenios N. Kornaropoulos, Tilak Das, Thijs Vande Vyvere, Jan Verheyden, Guy B. Williams, Marta M. Correia, David K. Menon, Virginia F. J. Newcombe. 2021. Neuroanatomical Substrates and Symptoms Associated With Magnetic Resonance Imaging of Patients With Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *JAMA Network Open* 4:3, e210994. [Crossref]
3. Frederick A. Zeiler, Ari Ercole, Michal M. Placek, Peter J. Hutchinson, Nino Stocchetti, Marek Czosnyka, Peter Smielewski, the CENTER-TBI High-Resolution ICU (HR ICU) Sub-Study Participants and Investigators. 2021. Association between Physiological Signal Complexity and Outcomes in Moderate and Severe Traumatic Brain Injury: A CENTER-TBI Exploratory Analysis of Multi-Scale Entropy. *Journal of Neurotrauma* 38:2, 272-282. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF] [PDF Plus] [Supplementary Material]
4. Sven Dekeyzer, Luc van den Hauwe, Thijs Vande Vyvere, Paul M. Parizel. Traumatic Brain Injury: Imaging Strategy 1-45. [Crossref]
5. François Mathieu, Helge Güting, Benjamin Gravesteijn, Miguel Monteiro, Ben Glocker, Evgenios N. Kornaropoulos, Konstantinos Kamnitsas, Claudia S. Robertson, Harvey Levin, Daniel P. Whitehouse, Tilak Das, Hester F. Lingsma, Marc Maegle, Virginia F.J. Newcombe, David K. Menon, the Collaborative European NeuroTrauma Effectiveness Research in Traumatic Brain Injury (CENTER-TBI) Investigators and Participants. 2020. Impact of Antithrombotic Agents on Radiological Lesion Progression in Acute Traumatic Brain Injury: A CENTER-TBI Propensity-Matched Cohort Analysis. *Journal of Neurotrauma* 37:19, 2069-2080. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF] [PDF Plus] [Supplementary Material]
6. Frederick A. Zeiler, Erta Beqiri, Manuel Cabeleira, Peter J. Hutchinson, Nino Stocchetti, David K. Menon, Marek Czosnyka, Peter Smielewski, Ari Ercole, the Collaborative European NeuroTrauma Effectiveness Research in Traumatic Brain Injury (CENTER-TBI) High-Resolution ICU (HR ICU) Sub-Study Participants and Investigators. 2020. Brain Tissue Oxygen and Cerebrovascular Reactivity in Traumatic Brain Injury: A Collaborative European NeuroTrauma Effectiveness Research in Traumatic Brain Injury Exploratory Analysis of Insult Burden. *Journal of Neurotrauma* 37:17, 1854-1863. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF] [PDF Plus] [Supplementary Material]
7. Frederick A. Zeiler, François Mathieu, Miguel Monteiro, Ben Glocker, Ari Ercole, Erta Beqiri, Manuel Cabeleira, Nino Stocchetti, Peter Smielewski, Marek Czosnyka, Virginia Newcombe, David K. Menon. 2020. Diffuse Intracranial Injury Patterns Are Associated with Impaired Cerebrovascular Reactivity in Adult Traumatic Brain Injury: A CENTER-TBI Validation Study. *Journal of Neurotrauma* 37:14, 1597-1608. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF] [PDF Plus] [Supplementary Material]
8. Sean Creeden, Victoria Y. Ding, Jonathon J. Parker, Bin Jiang, Ying Li, Bryan Lanzman, Austin Trinh, Alexander Khalaf, Dylan Wolman, Casey H. Halpern, Derek Boothroyd, Max Wintermark. 2020. Interobserver Agreement for the Computed Tomography Severity Grading Scales for Acute Traumatic Brain Injury. *Journal of Neurotrauma* 37:12, 1445-1451. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF] [PDF Plus] [Supplementary Material]
9. Thijs Vande Vyvere, Ezequiel De La Rosa, Guido Wilms, Daan Nieboer, Ewout Steyerberg, Andrew I.R. Maas, Jan Verheyden, Luc van den Hauwe, Paul M. Parizel, CENTER-TBI Participants and Investigators. 2020. Prognostic Validation of the NINDS Common Data Elements for the Radiologic Reporting of Acute Traumatic Brain Injuries: A CENTER-TBI Study. *Journal of Neurotrauma* 37:11, 1269-1282. [Abstract] [Full Text] [PDF] [PDF Plus] [Supplementary Material]
10. Miguel Monteiro, Virginia F J Newcombe, Francois Mathieu, Krishma Adatia, Konstantinos Kamnitsas, Enzo Ferrante, Tilak Das, Daniel Whitehouse, Daniel Rueckert, David K Menon, Ben Glocker. 2020. Multiclass semantic segmentation and quantification of traumatic brain injury lesions on head CT using deep learning: an algorithm development and multicentre validation study. *The Lancet Digital Health* 2:6, e314-e322. [Crossref]
11. Frederick A. Zeiler, Manuel Cabeleira, Peter J. Hutchinson, Nino Stocchetti, Marek Czosnyka, Peter Smielewski, Ari Ercole. 2020. Evaluation of the relationship between slow-waves of intracranial pressure, mean arterial pressure and brain tissue oxygen in TBI: a CENTER-TBI exploratory analysis. *Journal of Clinical Monitoring and Computing* 21. . [Crossref]
12. Jeroen T. J. M. van Dijck, Cassidy Q. B. Mostert, Alexander P. A. Greeven, Erwin J. O. Kompanje, Wilco C. Peul, Godard C. W. de Ruiter, Suzanne Polinder. 2020. Functional outcome, in-hospital healthcare consumption and in-hospital costs for hospitalised traumatic brain injury patients: a Dutch prospective multicentre study. *Acta Neurochirurgica* 18. . [Crossref]

13. Benjamin Y. Gravesteijn, Charlie A. Sewalt, Ari Ercole, Cecilia Akerlund, David Nelson, Andrew I.R. Maas, David Menon, Hester F. Lingsma, Ewout W. Steyerberg, the Collaborative European NeuroTrauma Effectiveness Research for Traumatic Brain Injury Collaborators. 2020. Toward a New Multi-Dimensional Classification of Traumatic Brain Injury: A Collaborative European NeuroTrauma Effectiveness Research for Traumatic Brain Injury Study. *Journal of Neurotrauma* 37:7, 1002-1010. [[Abstract](#)] [[Full Text](#)] [[PDF](#)] [[PDF Plus](#)] [[Supplementary Material](#)]
14. Jed A. Hartings, Norberto Andaluz, M. Ross Bullock, Jason M. Hinzman, Bruce Mathern, Clemens Pahl, Ava Puccio, Lori A. Shutter, Anthony J. Strong, Achala Vagal, J. Adam Wilson, Jens P. Dreier, Laura B. Ngwenya, Brandon Foreman, Laura Pahren, Hester Lingsma, David O. Okonkwo. 2020. Prognostic Value of Spreading Depolarizations in Patients With Severe Traumatic Brain Injury. *JAMA Neurology* 77:4, 489. [[Crossref](#)]
15. Sven Dekeyzer, Luc van den Hauwe, Thijs Vande Vyvere, Paul M. Parizel. Traumatic Brain Injury: Imaging Strategy 1-45. [[Crossref](#)]
16. Sven Dekeyzer, Luc van den Hauwe, Thijs Vande Vyvere, Paul M. Parizel. Traumatic Brain Injury: Imaging Strategy 355-399. [[Crossref](#)]