Neural Activation during Response Inhibition Differentiates Blast from Mechanical Causes of Mild to Moderate Traumatic Brain Injury

Barbara L. Fischer,¹ Michael Parsons,² Sally Durgerian,³ Christine Reece,² Lyla Mourany,² Mark J. Lowe,⁴ Erik B. Beall,⁴ Katherine A. Koenig,⁴ Stephen E. Jones,⁴ Mary R. Newsome,^{5,6} Randall S. Scheibel,^{5,6} Elisabeth A. Wilde,^{5,6} Maya Troyanskaya,^{5,6} Tricia L. Merkley,^{5,6} Mark Walker,^{7,8} Harvey S. Levin,^{5,6} and Stephen M. Rao²

Abstract

Military personnel involved in Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom (OEF/OIF) commonly experience blast-induced mild to moderate traumatic brain injury (TBI). In this study, we used task-activated functional MRI (fMRI) to determine if blast-related TBI has a differential impact on brain activation in comparison with TBI caused primarily by mechanical forces in civilian settings. Four groups participated: (1) blast-related military TBI (milTBI; $n = 21$); (2) military controls (milCON; $n = 22$); (3) non-blast civilian TBI (civTBI; $n = 21$); and (4) civilian controls (civCON; $n = 23$) with orthopedic injuries. Mild to moderate TBI (MTBI) occurred 1 to 6 years before enrollment. Participants completed the Stop Signal Task (SST), a measure of inhibitory control, while undergoing fMRI. Brain activation was evaluated with $2 \text{ (mil, civ)} \times 2 \text{ (TBI, CON)}$ analyses of variance, corrected for multiple comparisons. During correct inhibitions, fMRI activation was lower in the TBI than CON subjects in regions commonly associated with inhibitory control and the default mode network. In contrast, inhibitory failures showed significant interaction effects in the bilateral inferior temporal, left superior temporal, caudate, and cerebellar regions. Specifically, the milTBI group demonstrated more activation than the milCON group when failing to inhibit; in contrast, the civTBI group exhibited less activation than the civCON group. Covariance analyses controlling for the effects of education and self-reported psychological symptoms did not alter the brain activation findings. These results indicate that the chronic effects of TBI are associated with abnormal brain activation during successful response inhibition. During failed inhibition, the pattern of activation distinguished military from civilian TBI, suggesting that blast-related TBI has a unique effect on brain function that can be distinguished from TBI resulting from mechanical forces associated with sports or motor vehicle accidents. The implications of these findings for diagnosis and treatment of TBI are discussed.

Key words: blast-related TBI; brain activation; fMRI; inhibitory control; mechanical TBI; traumatic brain injury

Introduction

TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY (TBI) is common in military personnel involved in the Operations Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom (OIF/OEF) conflicts.^{1–4} Epidemiological studies suggest that the prevalence of TBI ranges from 15–28%,^{1,5,6} with a majority of these TBIs (50–79%) resulting from blasts caused by improvised explosive devices.^{1,7,8}

Blast-induced TBI may involve different mechanisms than TBI occurring in civilian settings. Whereas most head trauma in civilians results from mechanical processes such as acceleration/deceleration or rotational forces,⁹ blast-induced TBI is thought to result from rapid changes in atmospheric pressure producing over- and/or under-pressurization. Blast-related damage is thought to occur within internal organs, particularly at air-fluid junctures.¹⁰ Hypothesized mechanisms of blast-induced brain injury include

¹Geriatric Research Education and Clinical Center (GRECC), Wm. S. Middleton Memorial Veterans Affairs Hospital, Madison, Wisconsin.

²Neurological Institute, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, Ohio.

³Department of Neurology, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

⁴Imaging Institute, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, Ohio.

⁵Michael E. DeBakey, Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Houston, Texas.

⁶Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas.

⁷Louis Stokes Cleveland Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Cleveland, Ohio.

⁸Department of Neurology, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

transcranial or intravascular propagation of blast energy, as well as indirect transmission via cerebrospinal fluid through the foramen magnum.² In addition to injury caused by these primary blast forces, damage may result from mechanical forces resulting from displaced projectiles such as bricks, nails, etc. (secondary blast forces). A third form of blast injury occurs after the structural disintegration of buildings and vehicles leading to crush injuries or of persons being slammed into hard surfaces (tertiary blast forces). Thus, military personnel frequently experience both the pressurization effects of blast in combination with mechanical forces (blast + mechanical) and may sustain multiple such injuries over the course of their deployment.¹¹

Animal models have revealed numerous pathological, biochemical, and behavioral changes as a result of blast exposure.³ Among the blast sequelae noted in animals are diffuse axonal injury,¹² sub-arachnoid and parenchymal bleeding,¹³ increases in intracranial pressure,¹⁴ evidence of hippocampal neurodegeneration, phosphorylated tau protein and astrogliosis,¹⁵ vasospasm and white matter (WM) degeneration,¹⁶ increased levels of mortality, brain edema,¹⁷ and downregulation of genes associated with hippocampal neurogenesis.¹⁸ Despite these advances in knowledge from animal models, there remains controversy as to whether the clinical and neuropathological features of blast and mechanical TBI are the result of a unitary mechanism of injury¹⁵ or the result of unique and distinguishable injury parameters.^{16,17}

Attempts to distinguish blast-related from mechanical TBI in humans have met with mixed results. Mild to moderate TBIs typically do not have macroscopic abnormalities on structural MRI. Although we have observed subtle differences in cognitive performance in blast-related TBI,¹⁹ the cognitive deficits observed in the acute and subacute stage of mild to moderate TBI typically resolve in the chronic stage. Belanger and associates²⁰ have suggested that any differences between blast-related and mechanical TBI are likely the result of increased levels of psychological distress in blast-related TBI rather than any unique differences in brain pathology. An alternative strategy for differentiating blast-related from mechanical TBI is to identify unique neural signatures in brain activation patterns using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI). Several fMRI studies have identified anomalous brain activation patterns in mechanical^{21,22} and blast-related²³ TBI compared with non-TBI control groups, but none to date has directly compared blast-related and mechanical TBI.

In this task-activated fMRI study, we compared blast-related and mechanical TBI using a measure of response inhibition, the Stop Signal Task (SST). Response inhibition involves the ability to stop or suspend an intended or initiated action.²⁴ Problems with inhibitory control are common in mild to moderate TBI.^{25,26} To our knowledge, only one fMRI study has evaluated inhibitory control in blast-related TBI. Matthews and colleagues²⁷ compared OEF/OIF veterans who had experienced blast-related concussion with either loss of consciousness (LOC) or alteration of consciousness (AOC) using the SST. While the two groups did not differ in task performance, TBI individuals with LOC demonstrated significantly reduced activation in the left ventromedial prefrontal cortex than those with AOC on "easy" trials. There were no significant group differences in activation on "difficult" trials. The study did not compare blast-related TBI to civilian TBI or to healthy controls.

The present fMRI study, therefore, was designed to identify possible differences between blast-related and mechanical TBI in the brain activation patterns evoked by an inhibitory control task (SST). Our focus was on the long-term neural sequelae, with our TBI participants at least 12 months post-injury. In addition to the

military blast-related TBI and civilian non-blast TBI participant groups, we recruited two healthy control groups: a military group with combat exposure during the OEF/OIF conflict and a civilian group who experienced an orthopedic injury. We hypothesized that brain activation patterns would discriminate TBI and healthy control groups and, most importantly for this study, blast-related and mechanical TBI groups.

Methods

Participants

All procedures and recruitment strategies were reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Boards of the Cleveland Clinic, Stokes Veterans Affairs Medical Center-Cleveland (VAMC), and the U.S. Department of Defense; participants provided written informed consent. Four groups of participants were enrolled: (1) OEF/OIF veterans with blast-related MTBI (milTBI); (2) deployed OEF/OIF veterans who never experienced blast and/or head injury, served as milTBI controls (milCON); (3) civilians with mild TBI (MTBI) (civTBI) from sports or motor vehicle accidents; and (4) civilians with orthopedic injuries served as civTBI controls (civCON).

Veterans were recruited primarily through letters mailed out from the Cleveland VAMC. The pool for recruitment included all OEF/OIF veterans who had registered for VAMC-related services (not restricted to head injury). Letters were sent to those persons describing the study and inviting them to participate if they suffered a head injury (milTBI) or served but did not suffer a head injury (milCON). Veterans were also recruited via referral to the study from a VAMC physician and through advertisements posted at local colleges and in newspapers. Civilian participants were recruited primarily through informational mailings sent from their treating physician at the Cleveland Clinic.

Potential participants initially underwent telephone screening to determine eligibility. Those participants meeting inclusion/exclusion criteria (see below) were invited to undergo a neuroimaging examination at the Cleveland Clinic. Attempts were made to match the four groups with regard to age, sex, education, and, in the case of TBI participants, time since injury. Specific details of the inclusion/exclusion criteria for each group are as follows:

milTBI participants. They sustained a blast-related TBI during deployment between 1 and 6 years before enrollment. To be considered eligible for inclusion, prospective participants must have experienced a blast-induced injury that resulted in LOC, AOC, or a period of post-traumatic amnesia (PTA) after the event. This was assessed via self-report, but with trained interviewers who probed/clarified responses in an attempt to obtain the most accurate information possible (e.g., distinguishing true AOC from "fog of war"). If there was a LOC, it must not have exceeded 24 hours and, if PTA occurred, it must not have exceeded 7 days. Further, milTBI participants had no observable intracranial injury on CT scan (if available), and their Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) score was between 9 and 15 (if available). For those participants with multiple head injuries, the most severe served as the "index injury" for purposes of estimating time since injury.

milCON participants. These served in active OEF/OIF duty within the previous 6 years but had no history of brain injury, primary blast exposure, or LOC during their deployment. This group controlled for the nonspecific emotional distress associated with combat. These participants had no history of TBI either pre- or post-deployment.

civTBI participants. They sustained a mild to moderate TBI through common non-blast mechanisms, such as motor vehicle

accident or sports-related injuries. The head injury must have occurred 1 to 6 years before enrollment. Duration of LOC and PTA, derived from medical records and self-report, must not have exceeded 24 hours and 7 days, respectively. Participants were excluded if there was an observable intracranial injury on brain imaging (if available). GCS score was between 9 and 15 (if available). As with mTBI participants with multiple head injuries, the most severe served as the “index injury” for estimating time since injury.

civCON participants. These were chosen to control for non-specific effects of injury on cognitive and brain imaging data. These participants had no history of brain injury or LOC, and no primary blast exposure. Extracranial injuries were experienced during the previous 6 years and included ligament damage and fractures of the arms and legs from sports or motor vehicle accidents.

All prospective participants were excluded if any of the following were present: not fluent in English, history of neurologic disorders associated with cerebral dysfunction and/or cognitive deficit (e.g., cerebral palsy, mental retardation, epilepsy), history of severe psychiatric disorder (e.g., bipolar disorder, schizophrenia) with the exception of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), penetrating gunshot wound to the brain or contraindications to undergoing MRI (e.g., pregnancy, metal implants, claustrophobia). Potential participants were also excluded based on: (1) significant alcohol and/or drug abuse by administration of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT)²⁸ (cutoff score < 20) and the Drug Abuse Screening Test-10 (DAST-10)²⁹ (cutoff score < 4); (2) pre-injury psychiatric history based on responses to the Structured Clinical Interview for the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual-IV Axis-I Disorders (SCID; Overview Module of the Non-Patient Research version November, 2002³⁰; and (3) symptom invalidity using a combination of Green’s Word Memory Test (WMT)³¹ and performance on the neuropsychological test battery.

Self-report measures

The Neurobehavioral Symptom Inventory (NSI)³² was administered to characterize commonly self-reported symptoms associated with concussion. Severity of PTSD symptoms over the past month was measured with the PTSD Checklist – Civilian version (PCLC).³³ Self-reported depression symptoms were assessed with the Center for the Epidemiological Study of Depression Scale (CES-D).³⁴ Self-report of pain and fatigue were measured using visual analog scales ranging from 0 to 10.

Neuropsychological measures

Participants completed a standard battery of neuropsychological tests designed to measure cognitive deficits most commonly associated with MTBI. The battery included measures of information processing speed, executive function, and memory: written and oral forms of the Symbol Digit Modalities Test (SDMT),³⁵ parts A and B of the Trail Making Test (TMT),³⁶ Controlled Oral Word Association Test (COWAT),³⁷ and the California Verbal Learning Test-2 (CVLT-2).³⁸

SST

The SST paradigm used in this study was similar to that described by Aron and Poldrack³⁹ and illustrated in Figure 1. The SST consisted of 96 GO (75%) and 32 STOP (25%) trials distributed over two imaging runs. On all trials, the participant was presented with a 500 ms warning stimulus consisting of a central fixation cross. This was followed by a left or right arrow. For the GO trials, the participant responded as fast as possible with a left or right key press using the index and middle fingers of the right hand. For the STOP trials, a red filled box was presented above the GO (arrow) stimulus. The

FIG. 1. Schematic timeline for the Stop Signal Task (see Methods). RT, reaction time; SSD, stop signal duration.

participant was instructed to attempt to stop his/her response at the appearance of the red box. The time between the GO (arrows) and STOP (red box) stimuli is referred to as the stop signal duration (SSD). The number of left and right arrows was equal; GO and STOP trials and left/right arrows were presented in a pseudorandom order.

The SSD on STOP trials changed depending on the participant’s behavior. If the participant inhibited successfully on a STOP trial, then inhibition was made more difficult on a subsequent STOP trial by increasing the SSD by 50 ms; if the participant did not successfully inhibit, then inhibition was made easier by decreasing the SSD by 50 ms. A single staircase was used to ensure sufficient number of both correct and incorrect inhibitions by the end of the task. Average SSD was computed, for each subject, from the values for the last 48 moves of the staircase. The stop signal reaction time (SSRT) was calculated by subtracting the average SSD from the mean of median RT on GO trials. Higher SSRT values are indicative of poorer inhibition.

The task was programmed using E-Prime software (Psychology Software Tools, Inc., Sharpsburg, PA) and displayed in the scanner using an Avotec back-projection video system (Avotec, Inc., Stuart, FL).

MRI acquisition

Scanning was conducted at the Cleveland Clinic using a Siemens TIM Trio 3T MRI scanner (Erlangen, Germany) equipped with a 12-channel receive-only head array. Whole-brain fMRI scans were acquired with a gradient-echo, echoplanar (EPI) pulse sequence (31 4-mm thick contiguous axial slices, TE = 29 ms; TR = 2800 ms; flip angle = 80 degrees; field of view [FOV] = 256 × 256 mm; matrix = 128 × 128; in-plane resolution = 2 × 2 mm). The SST task was performed over two imaging runs each lasting a total of 736 sec (263 volumes per imaging run). High resolution structural MRI (sMRI)

scans (T1 with T1-weighted inversion recovery turboflash (MPRAGE), 120 axial slices, thickness 1–1.2 mm, FOV 256 mm × 256 mm, TI/TE/TR/flip angle (FA) 900 ms/1.71 ms/1900 ms/80, matrix 256 × 128, receiver bandwidth (BW) 62 kHz) were acquired for registration with lower resolution EPI images and to measure cortical and subcortical gray (GM) and white matter (WM) volumes.

Image analysis (fMRI)

The first four pre-steady-state volumes of the EPI time series were removed. The remaining images were time shifted, motion corrected, and spatially filtered using a two-dimensional 4-mm full width at half maximum (FWHM) Gaussian filter in the Fourier domain. Multiple regression was performed using Analysis of Functional Neuroimaging (AFNI) software.⁴⁰ A gamma variate hemodynamic response function (HRF) model used regressors for four trial types: GO correct (GO), GO incorrect, correct inhibition (CI), and incorrect inhibition (II). GO incorrect trials were not subsequently analyzed because of their low frequency (see Results). Individual subject t-maps for GO, CI, and II trial types were converted to z-maps and transformed to Talairach stereotaxic space (Talairach and Tournoux, 1988).

Three t-test subtraction maps (CI–GO, II–GO, and II–CI) were generated for each of the four groups (milTBI, milCON, civTBI, and civCON). A significant cluster was defined by an individual voxel probability ($p < 0.005$) and a minimum cluster size (0.684 mL); these joint thresholds set the whole brain false-positive rate for a significant cluster equal to $p = 0.05$. A disjunction mask was then created for each contrast by combining all suprathreshold voxels from any of the four group t-maps. This produced functional region of interest (fROI) maps for each of the three subtraction conditions. Large fROIs were divided along local minima in the averaged t-maps. Within each fROI and condition, z-statistics were averaged for each subject. For each fROI and subtraction condition, two (MIL/CIV) × 2 (TBI/CON) analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted. False discovery rate (FDR) was used to correct for multiple comparisons. For those fROIs surviving the FDR correction, Tukey B *post-hoc* analyses were used to identify which groups demonstrated significant differences in the magnitude of the fMRI response.

Image analysis (sMRI)

All structural MRI scans were reviewed for TBI-related and incidental pathology by a board-certified neuroradiologist (S.E.J.). Quantitative regional brain volumes were obtained using the parcellation method incorporated in FreeSurfer 5.1 software⁴¹ using the Desikan atlas.⁴² Results for each participant were visually inspected by a single rater to ensure accuracy of the cortical surface reconstruction. Manual editing, where necessary, was performed to optimize accuracy. The surface inaccuracies involving skull stripping or frank exclusion of brain parenchyma were edited either by (1) adding control points to aid FreeSurfer in the identification of WM (because it uses the WM/GM boundary as a starting place for reconstructing the pial surface), (2) by fixing the skull strip by removing remaining dura, or (3) by adding back in the sections of brain that were inadvertently automatically removed. Output included 52 volumes including GM (cortical and subcortical) and WM regions and total CSF. Correction for intracranial volume (ICV) was achieved by dividing the volume of interest by ICV and multiplying by 100. For each of the 52 volumes, 2 (MIL/CIV) × 2 (TBI/CON) ANOVAs were conducted. FDR was used to correct for multiple comparisons. For those volumes surviving the FDR correction, *post-hoc* group analyses were performed using the Tukey B statistic.

Results

Of 222 persons who underwent telephone screening, 107 (48.2%) met screening criteria and were scheduled for study visits.

Of those enrolled, 20 participants (7 milTBI, 4 milCON, 2 civTBI, and 7 civCON) were excluded from the final analysis for the following reasons: excessive motion in scanner ($n = 4$), poor cooperation ($n = 3$), inability to understand test instructions ($n = 6$), claustrophobia in scanner ($n = 2$), incidental pathology discovered on MRI ($n = 1$), discovery of medical condition on exclusion list ($n = 2$), and technical problems with SST administration ($n = 2$). The final sample consisted of 21 milTBI, 22 milCON, 21 civTBI, and 23 civCON participants (Table 1). There were no significant differences in age or sex between the four groups; participants were largely male. milTBI participants had significantly fewer years of education than the other groups. Time since the most severe injury was significantly longer for milTBI than civTBI participants (Table 1).

For the milTBI group, five participants (24% of the sample) had been exposed to a single blast event, 8 (38%) reported two blast exposures, and the remaining eight (38%) reported multiple blast exposures (range 3–20). For the civTBI group, six (29%) participants had a history of a single concussion, five (24%) reported two concussions, and eight (38%) reported multiple concussions (range 3–10; data on additional concussions were not available for two participants in this group). A chi-square analysis comparing the civTBI and milTBI groups on the proportion with multiple concussions was not significant.

Injury relevant data were gathered regarding the most severe TBI experienced. Twelve milTBI (57%) participants reported LOC typically ranging from a few seconds to a few minutes (one subject reported a 2.5 h LOC) and all subjects reported either PTA or AOC. Within the milTBI group, 18 (86%) participants were labeled as having an injury of mild severity because of LOC of < 30 min and AOC/PTA of < 24 h. The other three (14%) participants were characterized as having an injury of moderate severity due, in one case, to a reported LOC of 2.5 h and in two cases to a reported AOC/PTA ranging from 5 to 15 days. Within the milTBI group, 13 participants reported suffering additional non-TBI related injuries as a result of the blast episode (polytrauma; 62%).

For the civTBI group, MTBI was caused by participation in sports (13; 62%), motor vehicle accidents (4; 19%), bicycle accident (1; 4.5%), being struck by an object (2; 10%), and by a fall (1; 4.5%). Injury relevant data were gathered regarding the most severe TBI experienced. Eight (38%) participants acknowledged LOC lasting 1 min or less. All participants reported PTA or AOC ranging from a few seconds to 1 h in 19 participants (mild severity; 90%) and up to a few weeks in 2 participants (moderate severity; 10%). Polytrauma was reported in six (29%) civTBI participants.

Self-report measures

Participants in the milTBI group endorsed significantly more concussion-related symptoms (NSI), PTSD (PCLC), depression (CESD), and pain than did participants in the three remaining groups (Table 1). There were no group differences in self-reported fatigue.

Neuropsychological and SST performance

Two-way (MIL/CIV vs. TBI/CON) ANOVAs were conducted on each neuropsychological and SST index (Table 2). No differences in performance were identified for the main effect of TBI (TBI vs. CON). Relative to the civilian participants, the military sample performed more poorly on neuropsychological testing (oral and written versions of the SDMT, COWAT, and short delay of the CVLT-2). A significant interaction between TBI/CON and MIL/

TABLE 1. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION, TBI INJURY DATA, AND SELF-REPORT RATINGS

Variable	milTBI (n = 21)	milCON (n = 22)	civTBI (n = 21)	civCON (n = 23)	TBI vs. CON	Mil vs. Civ	Interaction
Age-years	28.3 (4.6)*	29.7 (5.6)	26.2 (4.8)	27.3 (4.5)	-	0.033 (mil > civ)	-
Education-years	12.7 (1.3)	14.1 (2.2)	15.1 (1.8)	15.5 (2.4)	0.040 (TBI < CON)	<0.001 (mil < civ)	-
Sex-number (%) female	1 (4.7)	1 (4.5)	2 (9.5)	0 (0)	-	-	-
Handedness-number (%) right	18 (86)	22 (100)	20 (95)	20 (87)	-	-	-
Months since last TBI	52.9 (17.9)	NA	29.7 (16.1)	NA	-	-	-
Number (%) with > 1 primary blast	16 (76.2)	NA	NA	NA	-	-	-
PCLC-total	53.8 (15.6)	24.9 (10.3)	24.7 (5.4)	25.0 (10.6)	<0.001 (TBI > CON)	<0.001 (mil > civ)	<0.001 (milTBI > milCON, civTBI, civCON)
CESD-total	22.0 (12.1)	7.4 (9.3)	7.3 (7)	7.5 (7.2)	<0.001 (TBI > CON)	<0.001 (mil > civ)	<0.001 (milTBI > milCON, civTBI, civCON)
Pain-total	3.1 (2.5)	0.6 (1.3)	0.9 (1.5)	0.6 (1.4)	<0.001 (TBI > CON)	0.007 (mil > civ)	0.003 (milTBI > milCON, civTBI, civCON)
Fatigue-total	4.1 (2.9)	2.2 (2.4)	2.4 (2.0)	2.8 (2.2)	-	-	-
NSI-total	33.1 (12.7)	7.9 (9.6)	10.5 (7.8)	8.4 (8.8)	<0.001 (TBI > CON)	<0.001 (mil > civ)	<0.001 (milTBI > milCON, civTBI, civCON)

*Mean (SD), - = not significant.

TBI, traumatic brain injury; CON, controls; mil, military; civ, civilian; PCLC, PTSD Checklist - Civilian Version, CESD, Center for the Epidemiological Study of Depression Scale, NSI, Neurobehavioral Symptom Inventory.

CIV was observed on the long delay of the CVLT-2; *post hoc* analyses indicated that the milTBI group performed worse than the civTBI group.

On the SST (Table 2), no significant differences were observed on any of the indices for the main effect of TBI (TBI vs. CON) or for the interaction effect (TBI/CON vs. MIL/CIV). Significant effects were observed on the MIL vs. CIV main effect, with the military groups demonstrating poorer performance than the civilians, characterized by slower reaction times on GO trials, shorter SSD, and longer SSRT.

fMRI

The disjunction analysis identified 25 fROIs for the CI-GO subtraction, 39 for the II-GO subtraction, and 24 for the CI-II subtraction (Supplementary Figure 1 and Supplementary Tables 1–3; see online supplementary material at ftp.liebertpub.com). None of the regions had a significant main effect of military service (MIL vs. CIV).

Six regions demonstrated a main effect of TBI (TBI vs. CON): bilateral superior medial frontal gyrus/anterior and middle cingulate gyrus (region #1; Fig. 2 and Table 3), left middle frontal gyrus (#2), left middle temporal gyrus (#3), and bilateral precuneus (#4) for the CI-GO subtraction and left amygdala (#12) and left angular gyrus (#13) for the CI-II subtraction (Table 3). For all six regions, the TBI groups demonstrated lower activation than the control groups (Fig. 3).

Seven regions demonstrated significant interaction effects: left middle orbital frontal/anterior cingulate gyrus (#5) for the CI-GO subtraction and the right and left inferior temporal gyrus/fusiform gyrus (#6 and #8), right inferior temporal gyrus (#7), left superior temporal gyrus (STG) (#9), left caudate (#10), and left cerebellum (Crus II) and cerebellar lobule VIIa/Crus I (#11) for the II-GO subtraction. The pattern of interaction effects (Fig. 3) was fairly consistent across all seven regions: the civTBI group exhibited less activation than the civCON group; in contrast, the milTBI group demonstrated more activation than the milCON group.

In light of group differences in education, concussion symptoms (NSI), PTSD (PCLC), depression (CESD), and pain perception (Table 1), we conducted analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs) on each of the 13 significant brain regions. The ANCOVAs were performed with one covariate per analysis rather than with combinations of covariates. None of the covariates (education, NSI, PCLC, CESD, and pain perception) resulted in a significant main or interaction effect becoming non-significant.

sMRI

None of the participants had macroscopic lesions on sMRI scans. None of the 52 FreeSurfer-derived volumes demonstrated significant main or interaction effects after FDR correction.

Correlational analyses

To identify possible relationships between functional brain activity and neurobehavioral measures, Spearman correlations were performed between the 13 significant fROIs (Table 3) and SST performance (SSD, Go Correct RT), cognitive testing (Trails A, Trails B-A, COWAT), and self-report ratings (PCLC, CESD, pain, fatigue, and NSI). For the combined TBI groups, two correlations survived an FDR correction for multiple comparisons: left STG correlated significantly with the SDMT ($r = -0.61, p < 0.0001$) and PCLC ($r = 0.54, p = 0.0002$). These correlations indicate that greater

TABLE 2. NEUROPSYCHOLOGICAL TESTING AND STOP SIGNAL TASK PERFORMANCE

	2×2 ANOVA						
Variable	<i>milTBI</i>	<i>milCON</i>	<i>civTBI</i>	<i>civCON</i>	<i>TBI vs CON</i>	<i>Mil vs Civ</i>	<i>Interaction</i>
Neuropsychological testing							
Trails A - sec	26.5 (10.5) ^a	23.9 (4.6)	22.0 (7.2)	23.0 (9.7)	-	-	-
Trails B - sec	65.5 (41.1)	60.6 (26.8)	50.6 (20.0)	59.0 (28.9)	-	-	-
Trails B-A - sec	39.0 (34.2)	36.6 (24.5)	28.5 (19.1)	35.9 (25.4)	-	-	-
COWAT - total	36.9 (9.5)	36.9 (9.0)	43.6 (9.8)	43.6 (15.0)	-	0.007 ^b (Mil<Civ)	-
CVLT Short Delay - total	9.6 (3.4)	10.2 (3.1)	11.6 (1.7)	10.7 (2.2)	-	0.030 (Mil<Civ)	-
CVLT Long Delay - total	9.4 (3.9)	10.8 (3.1)	12.0 (1.7)	10.6 (2.3)	-	-	0.041 ^c
CVLT - T-score	50.4 (7.9)	49.6 (8.9)	52.2 (7.7)	52.5 (6.4)	-	-	-
SDMT - total written correct	51.5 (12.5)	58.2 (8.7)	61.8 (15.1)	61.2 (9.6)	-	0.010 (Mil<Civ)	-
SDMT - total oral correct	61.2 (13.7)	66.0 (11.1)	68.8 (16.3)	71.9 (12.1)	-	0.024 (Mil<Civ)	-
Stop Signal Task							
GO Correct - % correct	88.8 (7.3)	91.9 (6.3)	87.8 (8.7)	90.0 (6.7)	-	-	-
GO Correct - median RT (ms)	650.4 (84.7)	683.5 (77.7)	715.9 (64.9)	706.6 (94.2)	-	0.014(Mil<Civ)	-
STOP Correct - % correct	37.1 (4.8)	37.5 (4.8)	37.9 (4.6)	38.3 (4.6)	-	-	-
SSD - ms	499.8 (124.9)	545.3 (103.3)	596.0 (93.2)	607.9 (91.6)	-	0.0006 (Mil<Civ)	-
SSRT - ms	150.6 (85.3)	138.0 (59.4)	119.6 (58.2)	98.5 (77.9)	-	0.023 (Mil>Civ)	-

^aMean (SD); ^bp-value; ^cmilTBI < civTBI (pairwise posthoc analysis); - = not significant.

ANOVA, analysis of variance; TBI, traumatic brain injury; CON, controls; mil, military; civ, civilian; COWAT, Controlled Oral Word Association Test; CVLT, California Verbal Learning Test; SDMT, Symbol Digit Modalities Test; SSD, Stop Signal Duration; SSRT, Stop Signal Reaction Time.

FIG. 2. Functional regions of interest (shown in color) demonstrating significant main or interaction effects for the CI–GO, II–GO, and CI–II subtractions. Numbers correspond with brain region described in Table 3 and Figure 3. CI, correct inhibition; II, incorrect inhibition; GO, go conditions. Background gray-scale brain images derived from a rendering of the gray-white matter surface using Caret software (Washington University, St. Louis).

TABLE 3. SIGNIFICANT FUNCTIONAL ROIs FROM 2 (MIL/CIV) × 2 (TBI/CON) ANOVA

#	Region	BA	x	y	z	Vol. (ml)	Mil vs. Civ	TBI vs. CON	Interaction
CI - GO Subtraction									
1	B Superior Medial G., Anterior/Middle Cingulate G.	8, 9, 32	0.5	34.8	27.8	10.22	-	*	-
2	L Middle Frontal G.	6, 8	-35.2	10.4	50.2	2.49	-	*	-
3	L Middle Temporal G.	21	-57.7	-31.6	-2.9	2.81	-	*	-
4	B Precuneus	7	6.7	-64.0	37.9	2.74	-	*	-
5	L Middle Orbital G., Anterior Cingulate G.	11	-15.2	41.3	-9.3	1.22	-	-	*
II - GO Subtraction									
6	R Inferior Temporal G., Fusiform G.	37	48.9	-57.1	-15.2	2.07	-	-	*
7	R Inferior Temporal G.	20	58.4	-26.0	-18.7	0.52	-	-	*
8	L Inferior Temporal G., Fusiform G.	37	-50.8	-59.3	-16.3	1.10	-	-	*
9	L Superior Temporal G.	22	-57.6	-12.9	3.5	1.00	-	-	*
10	L Caudate N.	-	-21.7	-15.0	29.1	1.72	-	-	*
11	L Cerebellum (Crus 2), Lobule VIIa Crus I (Hem)	-	-11.9	-83.9	-22.5	0.16	-	-	*
CI - II Subtraction									
12	L Amygdala	-	-30.2	0.1	-21.3	1.89	-	*	-
13	L Angular G.	39, 40	-43.3	-58.2	40.7	4.77	-	*	-

*Significant main or interaction effect, - = not significant.

TBI, traumatic brain injury, CON, controls, mil, military, civ, civilian, R, right, L, left, B, bilateral, G., gyrus.

activation in the left STG in response to Incorrect Inhibitions is associated with poorer performance on a measure of information processing speed (SDMT) and greater self-report of PTSD symptoms (PCLC). No significant correlations were observed for the combined control groups.

Discussion

Results from this fMRI study of inhibitory control processes may be summarized as follows: (1) relative to healthy controls, both blast-related and mechanical TBI produce an underactivation when participants correctly inhibit a prepotent response; (2) when participants are unable to inhibit a response, blast-related and mechanical TBI demonstrate the opposite neural response, with the former group demonstrating hyperactivation and the latter hypoactivation relative to controls; (3) these results could not be explained by SST performance, neuropsychological test results, demographic variables, or self-reported symptoms, including a measure of PTSD; and (4) SST-related activity during failed inhibition in the left STG is correlated with poorer performance on a measure of information processing speed and greater PTSD-related complaints in the TBI group. These findings are the first to demonstrate a neural basis for distinguishing blast-related from mechanical TBI in humans. More broadly, our fMRI results are noteworthy for identifying a “neural signature” associated with TBI up to 6 years post-injury in the absence of demonstrable cognitive deficits.

When participants correctly inhibit their responses on the SST (CI-GO and CI-II; Fig. 3), TBI participants, regardless of etiology of injury, demonstrate hypoactivation in bilateral medial prefrontal, bilateral precuneus, and left inferior parietal regions. These frontal and parietal regions are frequently associated with the default mode network (DMN), a neural system active during the resting state⁴³ and closely linked with semantic systems involved in reasoning, planning, and problem solving.⁴⁴ Using an independent component analysis of the SST in healthy individuals, Zhang and Li⁴⁵ noted that activity in DMN regions (ventromedial prefrontal cortex, posterior cingulate/precuneus, and inferior parietal) correlates with inhibitory accuracy on the SST. Bonnelle and coworkers⁴⁶ also

found differences in activation within DMN brain regions (precuneus, posterior cingulate cortex) between civilian TBI participants and healthy controls during performance of the SST. Our results, therefore, suggest that TBI alters DMN activity during successful inhibitory processing.

Successful inhibition was also associated with decreased activation of the left amygdala in both TBI groups. Damage to the amygdala has been consistently linked with emotional sequelae of TBI in both military^{47,48} and civilian⁴⁹ settings. The location of the structure in the anterior temporal lobe makes it particularly vulnerable to injury.⁵⁰ The decreased amygdalar activation during inhibition in TBI participants suggests that emotional salience may play a less prominent role in inhibitory processes for these participants than for non-TBI controls. This is in contrast to studies of persons with PTSD,^{51,52} where the opposite pattern is observed (i.e., hyperactivation of the amygdala).

In contrast to successful inhibitions where both TBI groups demonstrated hypoactivation relative to controls, clear differences were observed between blast-related and mechanical TBI groups during unsuccessful inhibition (II-GO subtraction) in the left caudate nucleus and left posterior lobe of the cerebellum. As shown in Figure 3, the blast-related TBI group demonstrated hyperactivation in these regions relative to the military controls, whereas the mechanical TBI group showed hypoactivation relative to the civilian controls. It is noteworthy that the caudate demonstrates increased activity during feedback processing.⁵³ The posterior lobe of the cerebellum, in particular the hemispheric parts of lobule VIIA (Crus I and Crus II) and lobule VIIB, has multiple cognitive and emotional functions, with focal lesions resulting in impairments in executive functions, spatial cognition, language, and affect.⁵⁴ We speculate that blast-related TBI may heighten activation of brain regions that are associated with the cognitive/emotional interpretation of negative feedback. In contrast, mechanical TBI results in a reduction in these same brain regions.

Incorrect Inhibitions elicited increased activation in the milTBI group relative to all other groups in bilateral inferior temporal and fusiform gyri. These regions are thought to be involved in the attentional modulation of visual engagement.^{55,56} Attentional

FIG. 3. Bar graphs illustrating significant main and interaction effects for the CI-GO, II-GO, and CI-II subtractions. CI, correct inhibition; II, incorrect inhibition; GO, go trial conditions. Numbers in brackets correspond to brain regions shown in Figure 2 and described in Table 3. Note that regions 1 to 5 are from the CI-GO subtraction, regions 6 to 11 from the II-GO subtraction; and regions 12 to 13 are from the CI-II subtraction. Error bars=standard error of the mean.

modulation is crucial to responding to visual cues (e.g., stop signal) by filtering out goal irrelevant information quickly to successfully inhibit responses.⁵⁶ Our findings suggest that milTBI persons may receive decreased input from orbital frontal regions on inhibition trials, contributing to inefficient compensatory overactivation of temporal regions in attending to stop cues. Hyperactivation in inferior temporal regions in the milTBI participants may be associated with difficulty in appropriately integrating, contextualizing, and responding to the stop signal cue.

Persons with blast-related TBI are more likely to express non-specific complaints of difficulties with executive functioning and affective disturbances than persons who experience TBI in civilian life.⁵⁷ Indeed, our milTBI participants endorsed significantly more symptoms of PTSD, depression, pain, and post-concussion syndrome. Our brain activation results, however, remained significant even after controlling for self-reported symptoms. Our results do not support the view that self-reported symptoms, like PTSD, provide the most salient explanation for TBI cognitive symptoms.^{1,58,59} Further, we have demonstrated a distinction in fMRI activation patterns between blast-related and mechanical TBI that appears to be independent of the presence of PTSD.

Possible pathophysiological bases underlying our finding that task-activated fMRI discriminates blast-related from mechanical TBI may be related to recent results of a diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) study. Davenport and coworkers⁶⁰ found lower fractional anisotropy (FA) in white matter in blast-related military TBI compared with veterans who had previously incurred mechanical TBI as civilians. Moreover, FA was more affected in persons with multiple blast-related exposures. We speculate that the greater disruption of white matter integrity in blast-related TBI produces a greater alteration in the activation of brain networks subserving response inhibition than in mechanical TBI.

It is important to note that we did not observe group differences in two brain regions that are traditionally associated with response inhibition. fMRI and lesion studies highlight the role of the pre-SMA and right inferior frontal cortex/insula in response inhibition.^{39,45,61,62} While these brain regions were activated by the SST (Supplementary Fig. 1; see online supplementary material at ftp.liebertpub.com), no significant group differences were observed in these two regions. In contrast, our finding of reduced activation among TBI participants in the default mode network during correct inhibitions may be consistent with other findings of decreased resting state default mode connectivity in persons with TBI.^{63,64}

Individuals in both TBI groups demonstrated poorer inhibition (slower reaction times on GO trials, shorter SSD, and longer SSRT) than control participants. The clinical implications of poor performance on measures of response inhibition need further study. It is unclear whether poor performance is associated with impulsive decision making, poor judgment, increased driving accidents, aggressive and/or unlawful behavior, or substance use/abuse. In the military theater, impaired response inhibition may even be associated with decreased survival rates. Interestingly, correlational analyses showed that activation in one brain region, the left STG, was associated with failed inhibition and increased PTSD symptoms in patients with TBI. The precise meaning of this relationship is difficult to discern, because no other relationships were observed between brain activity and neurobehavioral measures.

Relative to other fMRI studies in TBI, our sample size is large. In addition, the four group composition allowed us not only to compare TBI with controls, but also blast-related with mechanical TBI. It is also the first study to examine the inhibitory control circuits disrupted by blast-related TBI. This study is not without limita-

tions, however. First, it is important to note that what we are calling a blast-related TBI is more likely a combination of pressurization changes associated with blast plus secondary and tertiary mechanical forces. In effect, we are comparing blast + mechanical versus mechanical TBI, because in all likelihood, pure blast-related injuries occur rarely in the combat theater. Second, the SST is designed to achieve approximately 50% correct inhibitions. Although our task achieved somewhat less than 40% correct inhibitions, we had enough trials ($n > 12$) to successfully generate brain maps for the CI condition. Third, the diagnosis of blast-related TBI is based on self-report, because military personnel who experience a mild to moderate TBI are rarely removed from the combat theater and medical records are minimally recorded.

Fourth, despite our best attempts to equate the four groups based on demographic variables, the milTBI group was less educated than the two civilian groups. When education was used as a covariate, the fMRI findings remained significant. Fifth, we did not observe differences between TBI and control groups on SST performance and neuropsychological testing. The absence of a TBI effect is likely attributable to the reduced sensitivity of cognitive measures to mild/moderate TBI during the chronic post-injury period. Sixth, the time since injury was significantly shorter in the mechanical (29.7 months) than blast-related (52.9 months) TBI groups. Both groups, however, were clearly in the chronic stage post-injury. Further, when this variable served as a covariate, it did not influence the fMRI results. Seventh, we would have preferred to recruit milCON participants who had experienced an orthopedic injury to equate with the civCON group. This proved to be difficult to recruit, because most orthopedic injuries occurred in the context of blast exposure. Finally, although our two TBI groups had a comparable proportion of single versus multiple concussions, the sample size of our study is underpowered to properly evaluate this variable in the context of our behavioral and imaging data.'

Conclusion

We found common and distinct patterns of brain activation in blast-related and mechanical TBI. During correct inhibitions, both TBI groups demonstrated decreased activation in the DMN. In contrast, during failed inhibition trials, blast-related TBI exhibited hyperactivation and mechanical TBI produced hypoactivation. These divergent brain activation patterns were independent of self-reported complaints, including PTSD. The identification of an imaging test that is specifically sensitive to blast-related TBI in humans raises numerous clinical possibilities. It is conceivable that our brain activation patterns in response to an inhibitory control task could be used as a basis for the diagnosis of blast-related TBI in the clinical setting. The efficacy of potential treatments for the sequelae of blast-related TBI could also be measured with this imaging biomarker. This is critical, because neuropsychological testing is relatively insensitive to the chronic effects of blast-related MTBI. Finally, these findings suggest possibilities for developing an animal model for testing the effects of blast-related trauma on neural function based on inhibitory control testing.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by grants from the U.S. Department of Defense (W81XWH-08-2-0124, W81XWH-10-1-0609).

Supported in part by the Department of Veterans Affairs, Veterans Health Administration, Office of Rehabilitation Research and Development Project #B6812C Traumatic Brain Injury Center of Excellence.

Author Disclosure Statement

No competing financial interests exist.

References

- Hoge, C.W., McGurk, D., Thomas, J.L., Cox, A.L., Engel, C.C., and Castro, C.A. (2008). Mild traumatic brain injury in U.S. Soldiers returning from Iraq. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 358, 453–463.
- Hicks, R.R., Fertig, S.J., Desrocher, R.E., Koroshetz, W.J., and Pancrazio, J.J. (2010). Neurological effects of blast injury. *J. Trauma* 68, 1257–1263.
- Cernak, I. and Noble-Haesslein, L.J. (2010). Traumatic brain injury: an overview of pathobiology with emphasis on military populations. *J. Cereb. Blood Flow Metab.* 30, 255–266.
- Risdall, J.E., and Menon, D.K. (2011). Traumatic brain injury. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci.* 366, 241–250.
- Terrio, H., Brenner, L.A., Ivins, B.J., Cho, J.M., Helmick, K., Schwab, K., Scally, K., Bretthauer, R., and Warden, D. (2009). Traumatic brain injury screening: preliminary findings in a US Army Brigade Combat Team. *J. Head Trauma Rehabil.* 24, 14–23.
- Warden, D. (2006). Military TBI during the Iraq and Afghanistan wars. *J. Head Trauma Rehabil.* 21, 398–402.
- Ling, G., Bandak, F., Armonda, R., Grant, G., and Ecklund, J. (2009). Explosive blast neurotrauma. *J. Neurotrauma* 26, 815–825.
- Benzinger, T.L., Brody, D., Cardin, S., Curley, K.C., Mintun, M.A., Mun, S.K., Wong, K.H., and Wrathall, J.R. (2009). Blast-related brain injury: imaging for clinical and research applications: report of the 2008 St. Louis workshop. *J. Neurotrauma* 26, 2127–2144.
- Hammeke, T.A., Gennarelli, T.A. (2003). Traumatic brain injury, in: *Neuropsychiatry*. R.B. Schiffer, S.M. Rao, and B.S. Fogel (eds). Lippincott Williams Wilkins: Hagerstown, MD, pps. 1149–1167.
- DePalma, R.G., Burris, D.G., Champion, H.R., and Hodgson, M.J. (2005). Blast injuries. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 352, 1335–1342.
- Schneiderman, A.I., Braver, E.R., and Kang, H.K. (2008). Understanding sequelae of injury mechanisms and mild traumatic brain injury incurred during the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan: persistent postconcussive symptoms and posttraumatic stress disorder. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 167, 1446–1452.
- Garman, R.H., Jenkins, L.W., Switzer, R.C., 3rd, Bauman, R.A., Tong, L.C., Swauger, P.V., Parks, S.A., Ritzel, D.V., Dixon, C.E., Clark, R.S., Bayir, H., Kagan, V., Jackson, E.K. and Kochanek, P.M. (2011). Blast exposure in rats with body shielding is characterized primarily by diffuse axonal injury. *J. Neurotrauma* 28, 947–959.
- Säljö, A., Arrhen, F., Bolouri, H., Mayorga, M. and Hamberger, A. (2008). Neuropathology and pressure in the pig brain resulting from low-impulse noise exposure. *J. Neurotrauma* 25, 1397–1406.
- Säljö, A., Svensson, B., Mayorga, M., Hamberger, A., and Bolouri, H. (2009). Low-level blasts raise intracranial pressure and impair cognitive function in rats. *J. Neurotrauma* 26, 1345–1352.
- Goldstein, L.E., Fisher, A.M., Tagge, C.A., Zhang, X.L., Velisek, L., Sullivan, J.A., Upreti, C., Kracht, J.M., Ericsson, M., Wojnarowicz, M.W., Goletiani, C.J., Maglakelidze, G.M., Casey, N., Moncaster, J.A., Minaeva, O., Moir, R.D., Nowinski, C.J., Stern, R.A., Cantu, R.C., Geiling, J., Blusztajn, J.K., Wolozin, B.L., Ikezu, T., Stein, T.D., Budson, A.E., Kowall, N.W., Chargin, D., Sharon, A., Saman, S., Hall, G.F., Moss, W.C., Cleveland, R.O., Tanzi, R.E., Stanton, P.K., and McKee, A.C. (2012). Chronic traumatic encephalopathy in blast-exposed military veterans and a blast neurotrauma mouse model. *Sci. Transl. Med.* 4, 134ra160.
- Bauman, R.A., Ling, G., Tong, L., Januszkievicz, A., Agoston, D., Delanerolle, N., Kim, Y., Ritzel, D., Bell, R., Ecklund, J., Armonda, R., Bandak, F., and Parks, S. (2009). An introductory characterization of a combat-casualty-care relevant swine model of closed head injury resulting from exposure to explosive blast. *J. Neurotrauma* 26, 841–860.
- Wang, Y., Wei, Y., Oguntayo, S., Wilkins, W., Arun, P., Valiaveetil, M., Song, J., Long, J.B., and Nambiar, M.P. (2011). Tightly coupled repetitive blast-induced traumatic brain injury: development and characterization in mice. *J. Neurotrauma* 28, 2171–2183.
- Risling, M., Plantman, S., Angeria, M., Rostami, E., Bellander, B.M., Kirkegaard, M., Arborelius, U., and Davidsson, J. (2011). Mechanisms of blast induced brain injuries, experimental studies in rats. *Neuroimage* 54, Suppl 1, S89–S97.
- Levin, H.S., Wilde, E., Troyanskaya, M., Petersen, N.J., Scheibel, R., Newsome, M., Radaideh, M., Wu, T., Yallampalli, R., Chu, Z., and Li, X. (2010). Diffusion tensor imaging of mild to moderate blast-related traumatic brain injury and its sequelae. *J. Neurotrauma* 27, 683–694.
- Belanger, H.G., Proctor-Weber, Z., Kretzmer, T., Kim, M., French, L.M., and Vanderploeg, R.D. (2011). Symptom complaints following reports of blast versus non-blast mild TBI: does mechanism of injury matter? *Clin. Neuropsychol.* 25, 702–715.
- Slobounov, S.M., Gay, M., Zhang, K., Johnson, B., Pennell, D., Sebastianelli, W., Horovitz, S., and Hallett, M. (2011). Alteration of brain functional network at rest and in response to YMCA physical stress test in concussed athletes: RsfMRI study. *Neuroimage* 55, 1716–1727.
- Zhang, K., Johnson, B., Gay, M., Horovitz, S.G., Hallett, M., Sebastianelli, W., and Slobounov, S. (2012). Default mode network in concussed individuals in response to the YMCA physical stress test. *J. Neurotrauma* 29, 756–765.
- Scheibel, R.S., Newsome, M.R., Troyanskaya, M., Lin, X., Steinberg, J.L., Radaideh, M., and Levin, H.S. (2012). Altered brain activation in military personnel with one or more traumatic brain injuries following blast. *J. Int. Neuropsychol. Soc.* 18, 89–100.
- Aron, A.R., Robbins, T.W. and Poldrack, R.A. (2004). Inhibition and the right inferior frontal cortex. *Trends Cogn. Sci.* 8, 170–177.
- Dimoska-Di Marco, A., McDonald, S., Kelly, M., Tate, R., and Johnstone, S. (2011). A meta-analysis of response inhibition and Stroop interference control deficits in adults with traumatic brain injury (TBI). *J. Clin. Exp. Neuropsychol.* 33, 471–485.
- Dockree, P.M., and Robertson, I.H. (2011). Electrophysiological markers of cognitive deficits in traumatic brain injury: a review. *Int. J. Psychophysiol.* 82, 53–60.
- Matthews, S., Simmons, A., and Strigo, I. (2011). The effects of loss versus alteration of consciousness on inhibition-related brain activity among individuals with a history of blast-related concussion. *Psychiatry Res.* 191, 76–79.
- Saunders, J.B., Aasland, O.G., Babor, T.F., de la Fuente, J.R., and Grant, M. (1993). Development of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT): WHO collaborative project on early detection of persons with harmful alcohol consumption—II. *Addiction* 88, 791–804.
- Skinner, H.A. (1982). The Drug-Abuse Screening-Test. *Addict. Behav.* 7, 363–371.
- Spitzer, R., Williams, J.B., Gibbon, M., First, M.B. (1990). *Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-III-R, Patient Edition/Non-Patient Edition (SCID-P/SCID-NP)*. American Psychiatric Press, Inc.: Washington, D.C.
- Green, P. (2005). *Word Memory Test for Windows: User's Manual and Program*. Green's Publishing: Edmonton.
- Cicerone, K.D., and Kalmar, K. (1995). Persistent postconcussion syndrome—the structure of subjective complaints after mild traumatic brain injury. *J. Head Trauma Rehabil.* 10, 1–17.
- Weathers, F.W., Litz, B.T., Herman, D.S., Huska, J.A., and Keane, T.M. (1993). The PTSD Checklist (PCL): Reliability, validity, and diagnostic utility. Presented at the 9th Annual Conference of the ISTSS: San Antonio.
- Radloff, L.S. (1977). The CES-D Scale: a self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement* 1, 385–401.
- Smith, A. (1968). The Symbol Digit Modalities test: A neuropsychologic test for economic screening of learning and other cerebral disorders. *Learning Disorders* 3, 83–91.
- (1944). Army Individual Test of General Ability. *Manual of Directions and Scoring*. War Department, Adjutant General's Office: Washington, D.C.
- Lezak, M.D. (ed) (1995). *Neuropsychological Assessment*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Delis, D.C., Kramer, J.H., Kaplan, E., and Ober, B.A. (2000). *California Verbal Learning Test: Second Edition*. Psychological Corporation: San Antonio.
- Aron, A.R. and Poldrack, R.A. (2006). Cortical and subcortical contributions to stop signal response inhibition: role of the subthalamic nucleus. *J. Neurosci* 26, 2424–2433.
- Cox, R.W. (1996). AFNI: Software for analysis and visualization of functional magnetic resonance neuroimages. *Computers and Biomedical Research* 29, 162–173.
- Fischl, B., van der Kouwe, A., Destrieux, C., Halgren, E., Segonne, F., Salat, D.H., Busa, E., Seidman, L.J., Goldstein, J., Kennedy, D., Caviness, V., Makris, N., Rosen, B., and Dale, A.M. (2004). Automatically parcellating the human cerebral cortex. *Cereb. Cortex* 14, 11–22.

42. Desikan, R.S., Segonne, F., Fischl, B., Quinn, B.T., Dickerson, B.C., Blacker, D., Buckner, R.L., Dale, A.M., Maguire, R.P., Hyman, B.T., Albert, M.S., and Killiany, R.J. (2006). An automated labeling system for subdividing the human cerebral cortex on MRI scans into gyral based regions of interest. *Neuroimage* 31, 968–980.
43. Raichle, M.E., MacLeod, A.M., Snyder, A.Z., Powers, W.J., Gusnard, D.A., and Shulman, G.L. (2001). A default mode of brain function. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 98, 676–682.
44. Binder, J.R., and Desai, R.H. (2011). The neurobiology of semantic memory. *Trends Cogn Sci* 15, 527–536.
45. Zhang, S., and Li, C.S. (2012). Functional networks for cognitive control in a stop signal task: independent component analysis. *Hum Brain Mapp* 33, 89–104.
46. Bonneville, V., Ham, T.E., Leech, R., Kinnunen, K.M., Mehta, M.A., Greenwood, R.J., and Sharp, D.J. (2012). Salience network integrity predicts default mode network function after traumatic brain injury. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 109, 4690–4695.
47. Kuo, J.R., Kaloupek, D.G., and Woodward, S.H. (2012). Amygdala volume in combat-exposed veterans with and without posttraumatic stress disorder a cross-sectional study. *Arch. Gen. Psychiatry* 69, 1080–1086.
48. Sripada, R.K., King, A.P., Garfinkel, S.N., Wang, X., Sripada, C.S., Welsh, R.C., and Liberzon, I. (2012). Altered resting-state amygdala functional connectivity in men with posttraumatic stress disorder. *J. Psychiatry Neurosci* 37, 241–249.
49. Simmons, A.N., and Matthews, S.C. (2012). Neural circuitry of PTSD with or without mild traumatic brain injury: A meta-analysis. *Neuropharmacology* 62, 598–606.
50. McAllister, T.W. (2011). Neurobiological consequences of traumatic brain injury. *Dialogues Clin. Neurosci.* 13, 287–300.
51. Brunetti, M., Sepede, G., Mingoa, G., Catani, C., Ferretti, A., Merla, A., Del Gratta, C., Romani, G.L., and Babiloni, C. (2010). Elevated response of human amygdala to neutral stimuli in mild post traumatic stress disorder: neural correlates of generalized emotional response. *Neuroscience* 168, 670–679.
52. Liberzon, I., Taylor, S.F., Amdur, R., Jung, T.D., Chamberlain, K.R., Minoshima, S., Koeppe, R.A., and Fig, L.M. (1999). Brain activation in PTSD in response to trauma-related stimuli. *Biol. Psychiatry* 45, 817–826.
53. Packard, M.G., and Knowlton, B.J. (2002). Learning and memory functions of the basal ganglia. *Ann. Rev. Neurosci.* 25, 563–593.
54. Stoodley, C.J., and Schmahmann, J.D. (2010). Evidence for topographic organization in the cerebellum of motor control versus cognitive and affective processing. *Cortex* 46, 831–844.
55. O'Connor, D.A., Rossiter, S., Yücel, M., Lubman, D.I., and Hester, R. (2012). Successful inhibitory control over an immediate reward is associated with attentional disengagement in visual processing areas. *Neuroimage* 62, 1841–1847.
56. Minamoto, T., Osaka, M., and Osaka, N. (2010). Individual differences in working memory capacity and distractor processing: Possible contribution of top-down inhibitory control. *Brain Res.* 1335, 63–73.
57. Belanger, H.G., Curtiss, G., Demery, J.A., Lebowitz, B.K., and Vanderploeg, R.D. (2005). Factors moderating neuropsychological outcomes following mild traumatic brain injury: a meta-analysis. *J. Int. Neuropsychol. Soc.* 11, 215–227.
58. Vasterling, J.J., Brailey, K., Proctor, S.P., Kane, R., Heeren, T., and Franz, M. (2012). Neuropsychological outcomes of mild traumatic brain injury, post-traumatic stress disorder and depression in Iraq-deployed US Army soldiers. *Br. J. Psychiatry* 201, 186–192.
59. Swick, D., Honzel, N., Larsen, J., Ashley, V., and Justus, T. (2012). Impaired response inhibition in veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder and mild traumatic brain injury. *J. Int. Neuropsychological Soc.* 18, 917–926.
60. Davenport, N.D., Lim, K.O., Armstrong, M.T., and Sponheim, S.R. (2012). Diffuse and spatially variable white matter disruptions are associated with blast-related mild traumatic brain injury. *Neuroimage* 59, 2017–2024.
61. Sharp, D.J., Bonneville, V., De Boissezon, X., Beckmann, C.F., James, S.G., Patel, M.C., and Mehta, M.A. (2010). Distinct frontal systems for response inhibition, attentional capture, and error processing. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 107, 6106–6111.
62. Floden, D., and Stuss, D.T. (2006). Inhibitory control is slowed in patients with right superior medial frontal damage. *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* 18, 1843–1849.
63. Iverson, G.L., Lange, R.T., and Franzen, M.D. (2002). Effects of mild traumatic brain injury exaggeration and malingering with the Trail Making Test. *The Clinical Neuropsychologist* 16, 398–406.
64. Mayer, A.R., Mannell, M.V., Ling, J., Gasparovic, C., and Yeo, R.A. (2011). Functional connectivity in mild traumatic brain injury. *Human Brain Mapping* 32, 1825–1835.

Address correspondence to:

Stephen M. Rao, PhD

Schey Center for Cognitive Neuroimaging

Neurological Institute

Cleveland Clinic

9500 Euclid Avenue/U10

Cleveland, OH 44195

E-mail: raos2@ccf.org