The Therapy Intensity Level scale for traumatic brain injury: clinimetric assessment on neuro-monitored patients across 52 European intensive care units

4

Shubhayu Bhattacharyay^{1,2,*}, Erta Beqiri³, Patrick Zuercher⁴, Lindsay Wilson⁵,
 Ewout W Steyerberg⁶, David W Nelson⁷, Andrew I R Maas^{8,9}, David K Menon¹, Ari
 Ercole^{1,10}, and the CENTER-TBI investigators and participants[†]

8

⁹ ¹Division of Anaesthesia, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

- ²Department of Clinical Neurosciences, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United
 Kingdom.
- ¹² ³Brain Physics Laboratory, Division of Neurosurgery, University of Cambridge,
- 13 Cambridge, United Kingdom.
- ⁴Department of Intensive Care Medicine, Inselspital, Bern University Hospital, University
- 15 of Bern, Switzerland.
- ⁵Division of Psychology, University of Stirling, Stirling, United Kingdom.
- ⁶Department of Biomedical Data Sciences, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden,
- 18 The Netherlands.
- ¹⁹ ⁷Department of Physiology and Pharmacology, Section for Perioperative Medicine and
- 20 Intensive Care, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden.
- ⁸Department of Neurosurgery, Antwerp University Hospital, Edegem, Belgium.
- ⁹Department of Translational Neuroscience, Faculty of Medicine and Health Science,
- 23 University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium.
- ¹⁰Cambridge Centre for Artificial Intelligence in Medicine, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
 25
- 26 *Corresponding author: <u>sb2406@cam.ac.uk</u> (SB)
- ¹A full list of the CENTER-TBI investigators and participants are listed after the
- 28 acknowledgements.

29 **ABSTRACT**

30

The Therapy Intensity Level (TIL) scale and its abridged version (TIL^(Basic)) are used to 31 record the intensity of daily management for raised intracranial pressure (ICP) after 32 traumatic brain injury (TBI). However, it is uncertain: (1) whether TIL is valid across the 33 wide variation in modern ICP treatment strategies, (2) if TIL performs better than its 34 predecessors, (3) how TIL's component therapies contribute to the overall score, and (4) 35 whether TIL^(Basic) may capture sufficient information. We aimed to answer these questions 36 37 by assessing TIL on a contemporary population of ICP-monitored TBI patients (n=873) in 52 intensive care units (ICUs) across 18 European countries and Israel. From the 38 observational. prospective Collaborative European NeuroTrauma Effectiveness 39 Research in TBI (CENTER-TBI) study, we extracted first-week daily TIL scores (TIL₂₄), 40 ICP values, physician-based impressions of aberrant ICP, clinical markers of injury 41 severity, and six-month functional outcome scores. We evaluated the construct and 42 43 criterion validity of TIL against that of its predecessors, an unweighted version of TIL, and TIL^(Basic). We calculated the median score of each TIL component therapy for each total 44 score as well as associations between each component score and markers of injury 45 severity. Moreover, we calculated the information coverage of TIL by TIL^(Basic), defined by 46 the mutual information of TIL and TIL^(Basic) divided by the entropy of TIL. The statistical 47 validity measures of TIL were significantly greater or similar to those of alternative scales, 48 and TIL integrated the widest range of modern ICP treatments. First-week median TIL₂₄ 49 50 (TIL_{median}) outperformed first-week maximum TIL₂₄ (TIL_{max}) in discriminating refractory intracranial hypertension (RIC) during ICU stay, and the thresholds which maximised the 51 sum of sensitivity and specificity for RIC detection were TIL_{median}≥7.5 (sensitivity: 81%) 52 [95% CI: 77–87%], specificity: 72% [95% CI: 70–75%]) and TIL_{max}≥14 (sensitivity: 68% 53 [95% CI: 62-74%], specificity: 79% [95% CI: 77-81%]). The sensitivity-specificity-54 optimising TIL₂₄ threshold for detecting surgical ICP control was TIL₂₄≥9 (sensitivity: 87%) 55 56 [95% CI: 83–91%], specificity: 74% [95% CI: 72–76%]). The median component scores for each TIL₂₄ reflected a credible staircase approach to treatment intensity escalation, 57 58 from head positioning to surgical ICP control, as well as considerable variability in the use 59 of cerebrospinal fluid drainage and decompressive craniectomy. First-week maximum TIL^(Basic) (TIL^(Basic)_{max}) suffered from a strong ceiling effect and could not replace TIL_{max}. 60 TIL^(Basic)₂₄ and first-week median TIL^(Basic) (TIL^(Basic)_{median}) could be a suitable replacement 61 for TIL₂₄ and TIL_{median}, respectively (up to 33% [95% CI: 31–35%] information coverage). 62 Numerical ranges were derived for categorising TIL₂₄ scores into TIL^(Basic)₂₄ scores. Our 63 results validate the TIL scale across a spectrum of ICP management and monitoring 64 65 approaches and support its use as an intermediate outcome after TBI.

66 MAIN TEXT

67

68 Introduction

69

Elevated intracranial pressure (ICP) following traumatic brain injury (TBI) may impede the 70 potential recovery of injured brain tissue and damage initially unaffected brain regions.¹ 71 72 Therefore, for TBI patients admitted to the intensive care unit (ICU), clinicians often monitor ICP and may apply a wide range of ICP-reducing treatments.² The selective use 73 74 of these treatments typically follows a staircase approach, in which therapeutic intensity - defined by the risk and complexity of each treatment - is incrementally escalated until 75 adequate ICP control is achieved.^{3–5} Thus, therapeutic intensity must be considered when 76 interpreting ICP. Even if two TBI patients have comparable ICP readings, a difference in 77 the intensity of their ICP-directed therapies likely indicates a difference in 78 pathophysiological severity. 79

80

81 Several versions of the Therapy Intensity Level (TIL) scale have been developed to rate and compare the overall intensity of ICP management amongst TBI patients. TIL scales 82 assign a relative intensity score to each ICP-targeting therapy and return either the sum 83 84 or the maximum value of the scores of simultaneously applied therapies. In 1987, Maset et al. produced the original, 15-point TIL scale (TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾) to be assessed once every four 85 hours.⁶ In 2006, Shore et al. published the 38-point Paediatric Intensity Level of Therapy 86 (PILOT) scale,⁷ revising TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾ to: (1) represent updated paediatric TBI management 87 practices, (2) have a more practical, daily assessment frequency, and (3) resolve a 88 statistical ceiling effect. In 2011, the interagency TBI Common Data Elements (CDE) 89 scheme developed the most recent. 38-point TIL scale as well as a condensed, four-point 90 TIL^(Basic) scale through expert consensus.⁸ The TIL scale revised PILOT to integrate 91 additional ICP-directed therapies and to be applicable to adult TBI management. 92 93 Moreover, TIL^(Basic) was proposed as a simple, categorical measure to use when full TIL assessment would be infeasible. Since Zuercher et al. reported the validity and reliability 94 of TIL in a two-centre cohort (n=31) in 2016,⁹ the scale has become a popular research 95 metric for quantifying ICP treatment intensity.^{10–13} 96

97

However, several critical questions regarding TIL remain unanswered. It is uncertain 98 whether the validity of TIL, reported in a relatively small population, can be generalised 99 across the wide variation of ICP management, monitoring, and data acquisition (i.e., 100 intermittent chart recording or high-resolution storage¹⁴) strategies practised in 101 contemporary intensive care.^{11,12,15,16} Moreover, the scoring configuration of TIL has 102 never been tested against alternatives (e.g., TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾ and PILOT), and the relative 103 contribution of TIL's component therapies towards the total score is unknown. It is unclear 104 how TIL^(Basic) numerically relates to TIL and if the former captures the essential information 105 106 of the latter. In this work, we aimed to answer these questions by performing a 107 comprehensive assessment of TIL on a large, contemporary population of ICP-monitored TBI patients across European ICUs. 108

109

110 Materials and Methods

111

112 Therapy intensity level (TIL) and alternative scales

113

TIL refers to the 38-point scale developed by the CDE scheme for TBI.⁸ The domain or 114 construct (i.e., targeted concept of a scale) of TIL is the therapeutic intensity of ICP 115 management. The TIL scale has twelve items, each representing a distinct ICP-targeting 116 117 treatment from one of eight modalities, as defined in Table 1. TIL was developed by an international expert panel which discussed: (1) the relevant ICP-treatment modalities of 118 modern intensive care, (2) the relative risk and efficacy of individual therapies to derive 119 scores, and (3) practical and statistical limitations of previous TIL scores.⁸ In this way, TIL 120 is a formative measurement model, in which the construct (i.e., ICP treatment intensity) 121 is not unidimensional but rather defined by the combination of items (i.e., ICP-targeting 122 treatments).¹⁷ TIL was shown to have high interrater and intrarater reliability by Zuercher 123 et al.⁹ If a decompressive craniectomy was performed as a last resort for refractory 124 intracranial hypertension, its score was included in the day of the operation and in every 125 subsequent day of ICU stay. TIL scores can be calculated as frequently as clinically 126 desired. For our analysis, we calculated the following TIL scores from the first seven days 127 of ICU stay: 128

- 129 130
- TIL₂₄, the daily TIL score based on the sum of the highest scores per item per calendar day,
- TIL_{max}, the maximum TIL₂₄ over the first week of a patient's ICU stay,
- TIL_{median}, the median TIL₂₄ over the first week of a patient's ICU stay.
- 132 133

131

We also calculated scores from four other therapeutic intensity scales to compare with 134 TIL scores. The 21-point, unweighted TIL (uwTIL) scale replaces each sub-item score in 135 TIL with its ascending rank index (i.e., 1, 2, 3, ...) within each item (Table 1). The four-136 point TIL^(Basic) was also developed by the CDE scheme for TBI and takes the maximum 137 score, from one to four, amongst all included sub-items over the calendar day.⁸ We 138 adapted the 38-point PILOT⁷ and 15-point TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾ scales⁶ with minor adjustments to fit 139 the items of TIL with a daily assessment frequency. PILOT was also shown to have high 140 interrater and intrarater reliability by Shore et al.⁷ For the four alternative scales, daily (i.e., 141 uwTIL₂₄, TIL^(Basic)₂₄, PILOT₂₄, and TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾₂₄), maximum (i.e., uwTIL_{max}, TIL^(Basic)_{max}, 142 PILOT_{max}, and TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾_{max}), and median (i.e., uwTIL_{median}, TIL^(Basic)_{median}, PILOT_{median}, and 143 TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾_{median}) scores were calculated the same way as were TIL₂₄, TIL_{max}, and TIL_{median}, 144 respectively. 145

146

147 Study design and populations

148

Our study population was prospectively recruited for the Collaborative European NeuroTrauma Effectiveness Research in Traumatic Brain Injury (CENTER-TBI) core and high-resolution studies. CENTER-TBI is a longitudinal, observational cohort study (NCT02210221) involving 65 medical centres across 18 European countries and Israel. Patients were recruited between 19 December 2014 and 17 December 2017 if they met the following criteria: (1) presentation within 24 hours of a TBI, (2) clinical indication for a CT scan, and (3) no severe pre-existing neurological disorder. In accordance with

relevant laws of the European Union and the local country, ethical approval was obtained
 for each site, and written informed consent by the patient or legal representative was
 documented electronically. The list of sites, ethical committees, approval numbers, and
 approval dates can be found online: https://www.center-tbi.eu/project/ethical-approval.
 The project objectives and design of CENTER-TBI have been described in detail
 previously.^{18,19}

162

In this work, we applied the following inclusion criteria in addition to those of CENTER TBI (Figure 1): (1) primary admission to the ICU, (2) at least 16 years old at ICU
 admission, (3) invasive ICP monitoring, (4) no decision to withdraw life-sustaining
 therapies (WLST) on the first day of ICU stay, and (5) daily assessment of TIL.

167

For our sub-studies evaluating the association between TIL and ICP-derived values, we created two sub-populations based on the type of ICP values available. Patients with endhour ICP (ICP_{EH}) values, which were recorded by clinicians at the end of every other hour, constituted the TIL-ICP_{EH} sub-population. Patients with high-resolution ICP values (ICP_{HR}), which were automatically stored with monitoring software, constituted the TIL-ICP_{HR} sub-population. All patients in the TIL-ICP_{HR} sub-population were also members of the TIL-ICP_{EH} sub-population (Figure 1).

175

176 Data collection

177

Data for the CENTER-TBI study was collected through the QuesGen electronic case report form system (QuesGen Systems Inc, Burlingame, CA, USA) hosted on the International Neuroinformatics Coordinating Facility (INCF) platform (INCF, Stockholm, Sweden). All data for the validation populations, except high-resolution signals, were extracted from the CENTER-TBI core study¹⁹ (v3.0, ICU stratum) using Opal database software.²⁰

184

185 ICP management data for TIL calculation

186

Since TIL₂₄ was found to be a reliable summary of hourly TIL,⁹ clinical data pertinent to the component items of TIL (i.e., ICP-guided treatments, Table 1) were recorded daily through the first week of ICU stay. We extracted all daily TIL item values for our population, and calculated TIL₂₄, uwTIL₂₄, TIL^(Basic)₂₄, PILOT₂₄, and TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾₂₄ as defined in Table 1. For patients who underwent WLST, we only extracted TIL item information from before the documented date of WLST decision.

193

194 ICP_{EH} and related values

195

196 End-hour ICP (ICP_{EH}), systolic blood pressure (SBP_{EH}), and diastolic blood pressure 197 (DBP_{EH}) were recorded by clinicians every two hours for the TIL-ICP_{EH} sub-population. 198 Mean arterial pressure (MAP_{EH}) was calculated as MAP_{EH} = (SBP_{EH} + 2DBP_{EH})/3, and 199 cerebral perfusion pressure (CPP_{EH}) was calculated as CPP_{EH} = MAP_{EH} – ICP_{EH}. From 1CP_{EH} and CPP_{EH}, we calculated the following values:

- ICP₂₄ or CPP₂₄, the mean ICP or CPP value over a calendar day of ICU stay,
- 202 203
- ICP_{max} or CPP_{min}, the maximum ICP₂₄ or minimum CPP₂₄ value over the first week of a patient's ICU stay,
- ICP_{median} or CPP_{median}, the median ICP₂₄ or CPP₂₄ value over the first week of a patient's ICU stay.
- 206

207 ICP_{HR} and related values

208

209 High-resolution signals were collected using either ICM+ software (Cambridge Enterprise Ltd, Cambridge, UK; http://icmplus.neurosurg.cam.ac.uk), Moberg CNS monitor (Moberg 210 Research Inc, Ambler, PA, USA; https://www.moberg.com), or both. Blood pressure was 211 obtained through arterial lines connected to pressure transducers. High-resolution ICP 212 (ICP_{HR}) was acquired from either an intraparenchymal strain gauge probe (Codman ICP 213 MicroSensor, Codman & Shurtleff Inc, Raynham, MA, USA), a parenchymal fibre optic 214 215 pressure sensor (Camino ICP Monitor, Integra Life Sciences, Plainsboro, NJ, USA; https://www.integralife.com/), or an external ventricular drain. Detailed data collection and 216 pre-processing methods (i.e., artefact cleaning and down-sampling to ten-second 217 averaged time series) applied to high resolution signals in our study have been described 218 previously.²¹ Ten-second mean ICP (ICP_{HR 10sec}) and CPP (CPP_{HR 10sec}) time-series were 219 retrieved for this analysis, and, from ICP_{HR 10sec} and CPP_{HR 10s}, we calculated 220 221 ICP₂₄/CPP₂₄, ICP_{max}/CPP_{min}, and ICP_{median}/CPP_{median} as described above.

222

223 Physician impressions

224

Attending ICU physicians were asked to record their daily concerns with the patient's ICP 225 and CPP, separately, on a scale from one (not concerned) to ten (most concerned). 226 Moreover, on each patient's ICU discharge summary, physicians were asked to record 227 whether the patient experienced refractory intracranial hypertension during his or her ICU 228 stay. Refractory intracranial hypertension was defined as recurrent, sustained (i.e., of at 229 least ten minutes) increases of ICP above 20 mmHg despite medical ICP management. 230 We extracted the daily ICP/CPP concern ratings and refractory intracranial hypertension 231 impressions which coincided with the ICU stays of our population. 232

233

234 Baseline characteristics, prognosis, and outcome

235

We extracted baseline demographic characteristics, Marshall CT classifications,²² and Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS)²³ scores from ICU admission.²⁴ We also extracted Glasgow Outcome Scale – Extended (GOSE) functional outcome scores at six months postinjury,²⁵ with imputation of missing values as previously described.²⁶ Finally, we extracted ordinal functional outcome prognosis scores, calculated from a tokenised embedding of all available clinical information in the first 24 hours of ICU stay, as described previously.²⁷

242

243 Validation

244

We appraised the validity of TIL according to recommendations of best practice from clinimetric literature.²⁸ Based on the identified domain of TIL, we evaluated the construct and criterion validities of TIL. Our qualitative and quantitative assessments of TIL were performed against those of alternative scoring configurations (Table 1) for comparison.

250 Construct validity

251

258

259

260

Construct validity is the extent to which a clinical scale matches expectations of associations with parameters within or outside the identified domain. Construct validity is further broken down into convergent validity (i.e., associations with similar constructs), discriminant validity (i.e., associations with divergent constructs), and differentiation by known groups. In this work, statistical associations between study variables were measured with:

- Spearman's correlation coefficients (ρ) for static (i.e., measured once) variables,
- repeated measures correlation coefficients $(r_m)^{29}$ interpreted as within-individual strength of association for longitudinal (i.e., measured over time) variables,
- linear mixed effects regression (LMER) coefficients (β_{LMER}) of daily scale scores (e.g., TIL₂₄) when regressing ICP₂₄ or CPP₂₄ on daily scale scores and the day of ICU stay (Day_{ICU}), accounting for inter-patient variability with random intercepts. Therefore, β_{LMER} were interpreted as the expected difference in ICP₂₄ or CPP₂₄ per unit increase of daily scale score, independent of time since ICU admission or inter-patient variation.

200

For convergent validity, we expected therapeutic intensity to correlate at least mildly (i.e., 268 $|\rho| \ge 0.2$, $|r_{rm}| \ge 0.2$, $|\beta_{LMER}| > 0$) with markers of injury severity (i.e., baseline GCS and 269 baseline outcome prognoses), functional outcome (i.e., six-month GOSE), clinical 270 concerns of ICP status, and ICP itself. Accordingly, we calculated: (1) ρ values between 271 272 TIL_{max} and GCS, ordinal prognosis scores, GOSE, and ICP_{max}, (2) ρ values between TIL_{median} and GCS, ordinal prognosis scores, GOSE, and ICP_{median}, (3) r_m values between 273 TIL₂₄ and physician concern of ICP and ICP₂₄, and (4) β_{LMER} of TIL₂₄ when regressing 274 275 ICP₂₄ on Day_{ICU} and TIL₂₄ (i.e., ICP₂₄~Day_{ICU}+TIL₂₄), accounting for inter-patient 276 variability with random intercepts. 277

- 278 For discriminant validity, we expected therapeutic intensity to be more strongly correlated with ICP and physician concerns of ICP than with CPP and physician concerns of CPP, 279 280 respectively. Even though CPP control through fluid loading or vasopressor therapy is a 281 component modality of TIL (Table 1), we expected TIL to capture ICP management (i.e., the construct) more accurately than CPP management. We compared: (1) ρ values of 282 TIL_{max} vs. CPP_{min} to those of TIL_{max} vs. ICP_{max}, (2) ρ values of TIL_{median} vs. CPP_{median} to 283 284 those of TIL_{median} vs. ICP_{median}, (3) r_m values of TIL₂₄ vs. CPP₂₄ to those of TIL₂₄ vs. ICP₂₄, and (4) the β_{LMER} of TIL₂₄ when regressing CPP₂₄~Day_{ICU}+TIL₂₄ to the β_{LMER} of TIL₂₄ when 285 regressing ICP₂₄~Day_{ICU}+TIL₂₄. 286
- 287

For differentiation by known groups, we expected TIL_{max} and TIL_{median} to effectively discriminate patients who experienced refractory intracranial hypertension during ICU stay from those who did not. We calculated the area under the receiver operating

characteristic curve (AUC), which, in our case, was interpreted as the probability of a randomly selected patient with refractory intracranial hypertension having a higher TIL_{max} or TIL_{median} score than one without it. We also compared the AUCs of TIL_{max} and TIL_{median} to ICP_{max} and ICP_{median} and determined the sensitivity and specificity of refractory intracranial hypertension detection at each threshold of TIL_{max} and TIL_{median}.

- 297 Criterion validity
- 298

Criterion (or concurrent) validity is the degree to which there is an association between a 299 300 clinical scale and other scales measuring the same construct, particularly a gold standard assessment. Since there is no extant "gold standard" for assessing ICP management 301 intensity, we tested the concurrent criterion validity of TIL by calculating its associations 302 with its predecessors (i.e., PILOT and TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾), mindful of their limitations as described 303 above. More specifically, we calculated: (1) ρ values between TIL_{max} and prior scale 304 maximum scores (i.e., PILOT_{max} and TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾_{max}), (2) ρ values between TIL_{median} and prior 305 scale median scores (i.e., PILOT_{median} and TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾_{median}), and (3) r_{rm} between TIL₂₄ and 306 prior scale daily scores (i.e., PILOT₂₄ and TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾₂₄). 307

308

309 Component item analysis

310

We evaluated inter-item (i.e., inter-treatment) and adjusted item-total associations of 311 TIL₂₄, uwTIL₂₄, PILOT₂₄, and TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾₂₄ by calculating r_m values. Item-total correlations 312 were adjusted by subtracting the tested item score from the total score prior to calculating 313 the correlation. We measured Cronbach's alpha (α) to assess internal reliability amongst 314 scale items at each day of ICU stay. Moreover, we calculated the median score 315 316 contribution of each item per total TIL_{24} score. The association between each TIL_{24} item score and ICP₂₄, CPP₂₄, physician concern of ICP, and physician concern of CPP was 317 calculated with r_m values. Finally, we trained LMER models regressing ICP₂₄ and CPP₂₄ 318 on all TIL items (with categorical dummy encoding) and Day_{ICU} concurrently. The β_{LMER} 319 320 values from these models were interpreted as the average change in ICP₂₄ or CPP₂₄ 321 associated with each treatment when accounting for all other ICP-guided treatments, time 322 since ICU admission, and inter-patient variability with random intercepts.

323

324 TIL^(Basic) information coverage

325

We examined the distributions of TIL^(Basic)₂₄ per TIL₂₄ and TIL₂₄ per TIL^(Basic)₂₄ to derive thresholds for categorising TIL₂₄ into TIL^(Basic)₂₄. Moreover, we calculated the information coverage (IC) of TIL^(Basic) by dividing the mutual information (MI) of TIL^(Basic) and TIL by the entropy of TIL. IC was calculated with TIL^(Basic)₂₄ and TIL₂₄ for days one through seven of ICU stay, with TIL^(Basic)_{max} and TIL_{max}, and with TIL^(Basic)_{median} and TIL_{median}.

- 331
- 332 Statistical analysis
- 333

334 *Multiple imputation of missing values*

335

Five of the static study variables had missing values for some of the patients in our study: 336 GCS, GOSE, baseline prognosis scores, Marshall CT classifications, and refractory 337 338 intracranial hypertension status. We assessed the patterns of missingness (Supplementary Figure S1) and multiply imputed (m=100) these variables with 339 independent, stochastic predictive mean matching functions using the mice package³⁰ 340 341 (v3.9.0). We assumed these variables to be missing-at-random (MAR) (as previously reported on CENTER-TBI data³¹) and supported this assumption by training imputation 342 models on all study measures as well as correlated auxiliary variables (e.g., raised ICP 343 during ICU stay). 344

345

For daily longitudinal study variables, we considered a value to be missing if the patient 346 was still in the ICU and WLST had not been decided on or before that day. We assessed 347 the longitudinal patterns of missingness (Supplementary Figure S2) and multiply imputed 348 (m=100) these variables with the multivariate, time-series algorithm from the Amelia II 349 package³² (v1.7.6) over the first week of ICU stay. The algorithm exploits both between-350 351 variable and within-variable correlation structures over time to stochastically impute missing time series values in independently trained runs. We validated the MAR 352 assumption by identifying characteristics significantly associated with longitudinal 353 354 variable missingness (Supplementary Table S1) and included auxiliary information associated with value missingness (e.g., reasons for stopping ICP monitoring) in the 355 imputation model. 356

357

358 Statistical inference

359

We calculated 95% confidence intervals (CI) for ρ , r_{rm} , β_{LMER} , AUC, sensitivity, specificity, and IC values using bootstrapping with 1,000 resamples of unique patients. For each resample, one of the 100 missing value imputations was randomly chosen. Therefore, confidence intervals represented the uncertainty due to patient resampling and missing value imputation.

365

366 **Code**

367

All statistical analyses were performed in Python (v3.8.2), and all visualisations were created in R (v4.2.3). All scripts used in this study are publicly available on GitHub: <u>https://github.com/sbhattacharyay/CENTER-TBI_TIL</u>.

371

372 **Results**

373

374 Study population

375

Of the 4,509 patients available for analysis in the CENTER-TBI core study, 873 patients from 52 ICUs met the additional inclusion criteria of this work. Amongst them, 837

constituted the TIL-ICP_{EH} sub-population and 259 constituted the TIL-ICP_{HR} subpopulation (Figure 1). Summary characteristics of the overall population as well as those of the TIL-ICP_{EH} and TIL-ICP_{HR} sub-populations are detailed in Table 2. Apart from two of the prognosis scores pertaining to the probability of returning to pre-injury life roles (i.e., Pr(GOSE>5) and Pr(GOSE>6)), none of the tested characteristics were significantly different between patients in the TIL-ICP_{HR} sub-population and those outside of it (Table 2).

385 The median ICU stay duration of our population was 14 days (IQR: 7.8-23 days), and 386 83% (n=726) stayed through at least seven calendar days. At each day of ICU stay, less 387 388 than 2.4% of the expected TIL scores were missing (Supplementary Figure S2). Each TIL component item (Table 1) is represented by at least 17% (*n*=147, intracranial surgery) 389 and each sub-item is represented by at least 4.9% (n=43, high-dose mannitol) of the 390 population (Supplementary Table S2). The distributions of TIL_{max}, TIL_{median}, and TIL₂₄, 391 juxtaposed against the scores of alternative scales (Table 1), are displayed in Figure 2. 392 The distributions of TIL and PILOT were visually similar, and TIL^(Basic)max had a strong 393 394 ceiling effect (i.e., 57% of the population had the maximum score). Whilst there was no significant difference in TIL₂₄ distribution over the first seven days, most patients had their 395 highest TIL₂₄ (i.e., TIL_{max}) soon after ICU admission (median: day two, IQR: days one-396 397 three). The Spearman's rank correlation coefficient (ρ) between TIL_{max} and TIL_{median} was 0.80 (95% CI: 0.77–0.82), and the median TIL_{median}:TIL_{max} ratio was 0.65 (IQR: 0.45– 398 0.80). 399

400

401 Validation of TIL

402

The 95% CIs of ρ values, repeated measures correlation coefficients (r_{rm}), and linear 403 404 mixed effect regression coefficients (β_{LMER}) of TIL with other study measures are visualised in Figure 3. Both TIL_{max} and TIL_{median} had mildly negative correlations (-405 406 $0.26 < \rho_{mean} < -0.19$) with baseline GCS, six-month GOSE, and functional outcome prognoses (Figure 3A–B). The within-individual association of TIL₂₄ with physician 407 408 concerns of ICP was moderately positive (r_m =0.35 [95% CI: 0.31–0.38]) and significantly higher than that of TIL^(Basic)₂₄ (Figure 3C). The association between ICP_{median} and TIL_{median} 409 was moderately positive (0.35 < ρ_{mean} < 0.45) with both ICP_{EH} and ICP_{HR} values, and the 410 association between ICP_{max} and TIL_{max} was moderately positive (p=0.41 [95% CI: 0.33– 411 0.46]) with ICP_{EH} values. The ICP_{max} vs. TIL_{max} correlation was not significant (ρ =0.01 412 [95% CI: -0.16–0.17]) with ICP_{HR} values; however, without imputing missing ICP_{HR} 413 values, the ρ was 0.43 (95% CI: 0.35–0.50). This suggests that the longitudinal 414 missingness of ICP_{HR} (Supplementary Figure S2) for our sample size made the ICP_{max} 415 estimation significantly imprecise. Moreover, the within-individual association with ICP₂₄ 416 was either weak or not significant for any daily scale score according to r_{rm} (Figure 3C) 417 418 and β_{LMER} (Figure 3D) values. On average, a single point increase in TIL₂₄ was associated with a 0.22 (95% CI: 0.15–0.30) mmHg increase in daily mean ICP_{EH} and a 0.19 (95% 419 CI: -0.06–0.43) mmHg increase in daily mean ICP_{HR}. These results mostly affirm the 420 421 convergent validity of TIL but highlight the broad intra-patient variability between ICP and therapeutic intensity. From the distribution of ICP₂₄ values at each TIL₂₄ score (Figure 422

423 4A), we observed both considerable ICP₂₄ overlap across each TIL₂₄ score and an overall 424 positive relationship between TIL₂₄ and ICP₂₄, particularly for TIL₂₄ \geq 8.

425

The correlation between TIL and both prior scales (i.e., PILOT and TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾) was positively strong for maximum, median, and daily scores (Supplementary Figure S3), establishing the criterion validity of TIL. According to 95% CIs, the association of TIL with prior scales was stronger than that of uwTIL or TIL^(Basic) (Supplementary Figure S3).

430

431 According to ρ , r_{rm} , and β_{LMER} values (Figure 3), the associations of TIL with CPP and of 432 TIL with physician concerns of CPP were weaker than or not significantly different from 433 the corresponding associations with ICP. Moreover, the trend of CPP₂₄ distributions over 434 different TIL₂₄ scores is not as visually apparent as that of ICP₂₄ distributions over different 435 TIL₂₄ scores (Figure 4B). These results support the discriminant validity of TIL.

436

In our population, 157 patients (18% of 864 assessed) were reported to experience 437 refractory intracranial hypertension during ICU stay. TIL_{max} correctly discriminated these 438 439 patients from the others 81% (95% CI: 78–84%) of the time (Figure 5A), and TIL_{median} did so 83% (95% CI: 80-86%) of the time (Figure 5B). This performance of TIL was 440 significantly greater than or similar to that of all alternative scales (Figure 5A-B). 441 442 Additionally, TIL_{median} had significantly greater discrimination performance than ICP_{max} (Figure 5C) and ICP_{median} (Figure 5D), respectively. The sensitivity and specificity of 443 refractory intracranial hypertension detection at each threshold of TIL_{max}, TIL_{median}, 444 TIL^(Basic)max, and TIL^(Basic)median are listed in Supplementary Table S3 and visualised in 445 Figure 5C–D. The thresholds which maximised the sum of sensitivity and specificity were 446 TIL_{max}≥14 (sensitivity: 68% [95% CI: 62–74%], specificity: 79% [95% CI: 77–81%]) and 447 TIL_{median}≥7.5 (sensitivity: 81% [95% CI: 77–87%], specificity: 72% [95% CI: 70–75%]) 448 (Table 3). 449

450

451 **TIL component items**

452

453 Whilst there was wide variation in item combinations per TIL_{24} score (i.e., sum of median scores was often under diagonal line in Figure 6A), the average order of therapeutic 454 escalation was fairly consistent: position, sedation, CPP management, ventilatory 455 management, neuromuscular blockade, hyperosmolar therapy, temperature control, and 456 457 then surgery for refractory ICP. Surgical control of ICP occurred in over 50% of reported cases at each TIL₂₄ above 18 (Figure 6A), but the threshold which maximised the sum of 458 sensitivity and specificity in detecting surgical ICP control was $TIL_{24} \ge 9$ (Table 3, 459 performance at each threshold is listed in Supplementary Table S4). The inter-item rm 460 values of TIL₂₄ (Supplementary Figure S4) were mostly positive except for cerebrospinal 461 fluid (CSF) drainage, which did not correlate significantly with most other items, and 462 463 decompressive craniectomy, which did not correlate significantly with CSF, ventilatory, or temperature control. Consistent with Figure 6A, this result suggested that CSF drainage 464 and decompressive craniectomy were the most variably applied therapies across study 465 ICUs. The Cronbach's alpha (α) value of TIL₂₄ was, at best, 0.65 (95% CI: 0.62–0.68) and 466 lower (albeit, not significantly) than that of uwTIL₂₄ at each day of ICU stay 467 (Supplementary Figure S5). However, since TIL is a formative scale (i.e., the construct is 468

multidimensional and defined by the items), high inter-item correlation and α values are 469 not necessary for item validation.¹⁷ Amongst all TIL₂₄ items, sedation was most strongly 470 correlated with adjusted TIL₂₄ scores and physician concerns of ICP (Figure 6B). From 471 10<TIL₂₄<20, a plateau effect of high-dose sedation combined with neuromuscular 472 blockade was observed in most cases (Figure 6A). When accounting for all other TIL₂₄ 473 sub-items, time since ICU admission, as well as inter-patient variability, ventilation, 474 mannitol administration, and hypertonic saline administration were most strongly 475 476 associated with ICP₂₄ and vasopressors were most strongly associated with CPP₂₄ 477 (Figure 6C).

478

479 **TIL**(Basic)

480

Based on the median TIL^(Basic)₂₄ score at each TIL₂₄ score (Figure 7A), we derived the 481 ranges for mapping TIL₂₄ onto TIL^(Basic)₂₄ in Table 3. There is, however, considerable 482 overlap of TIL₂₄ scores across TIL^(Basic)₂₄ scores (Figure 7B), particularly in the range of 483 6≤TIL₂₄≤10, and at no TIL₂₄ score was TIL^(Basic)₂₄=3 the most represented score (Figure 484 7A). TIL^(Basic)₂₄ covered up to 33% (95% CI: 31–34%) of the information (i.e., entropy) in 485 TIL₂₄, and TIL^(Basic)_{median} covered up to 28% (95% CI: 27–30%) of the information in 486 TIL_{median} (Figure 7C). TIL^(Basic)_{max} only covered 17% (95% CI: 16–18%) of the information 487 488 in TIL_{max} (Figure 7C).

- 489 490 **Discussion**
- 491

In this work, we performed a large-scale (n=873), multicentre (52 ICUs, 19 countries), and prospective validation study of TIL and TIL^(Basic) against alternative scales. The CENTER-TBI data not only reflect the modern variation in ICP-directed therapeutic intensity (Figures 2 and 6A) but also illustrate the practical feasibility of daily TIL assessment: out of 885 eligible patients, 873 (99%) had daily TIL scores (Figure 1) with less than 2.4% daily missingness (Supplementary Figure S2).

498

Our findings support the validity of TIL as a metric for scoring ICP-directed therapeutic 499 500 intensity and for marking pathophysiological severity. The statistical construct and criterion validity measures of TIL were significantly greater or similar to those of 501 alternative scales (Figures 3 and 5), and TIL integrated the widest range of modern ICP 502 503 treatments (Table 1). Our analysis yielded empirical ranges for interpreting TIL in terms 504 of refractory intracranial hypertension, surgical intervention, and the condensed, TIL^(Basic) scores (Table 3). On a component level (Figure 6A), TIL₂₄ reflected a pattern of treatment 505 intensity escalation consistent with clinical algorithms^{2,3,5} as well as a wide variation in 506 treatment combinations, particularly in the use of CSF drainage and decompressive 507 508 craniectomy. These results support the use of TIL as an intermediate outcome for 509 treatment effect, as done in previous studies.^{33,34}

510

511 Due to a strong ceiling effect (Figures 2A and 5A), TIL^(Basic) should not be used instead of 512 TIL for rating maximum treatment intensity. TIL^(Basic)₂₄ and TIL_{median} covered up to 33% of

the information in TIL₂₄ (Figure 7C), but the TIL^(Basic)₂₄ associations with physician

concerns of ICP were significantly worse than those of TIL_{24} (Figure 3C). TIL should always be preferred to $TIL^{(Basic)}$, but we believe daily or median $TIL^{(Basic)}$ can be a suitable alternative when daily or median TIL assessment is infeasible.

517

Moreover, we evaluated TIL with both end-hour (ICP_{EH}) and high-resolution (ICP_{HR}) ICP 518 values. ICP_{HR} is the gold standard, and neuromonitoring-related results from the ICP_{HR} 519 population should generally take precedence.¹⁴ However, 67% of expected ICP_{HR} values 520 were missing on day one of ICU stay (Supplementary Figure S2), likely due to the time 521 required to arrange high-resolution data collection. Consequently, estimates of high-522 resolution ICP_{max} were significantly affected by missing value imputation and became 523 imprecise at our sample size (Figure 3A). In these cases, results from the ICP_{EH} 524 population served as a valuable reference on a substantially larger sample size (Table 2) 525 since ICP_{FH} and CPP_{FH} have been shown to be fair end-hour representations of ICP_{HR} 526 and CPP_{HR}, respectively, in CENTER-TBI.¹⁴ The considerable overlap of ICP₂₄ values 527 across TIL₂₄ scores (Figure 4A) and the insignificant-to-weak, within-individual 528 association between ICP₂₄ and TIL₂₄ (Figure 3C–D) highlight the need to account for 529 therapeutic intensity when interpreting ICP. Additionally, the higher median ICP₂₄ values 530 for TIL₂₄≥8 (Figure 4A) may suggest that clinicians accept a slightly higher ICP when 531 532 balancing the risks of elevating therapeutic intensity against those of intracranial 533 hypertension.

534

We see three main opportunities to improve TIL. First, the item scores of TIL and its 535 predecessors (i.e., PILOT and TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾) were not derived empirically. Data-driven 536 techniques, such as confirmatory factor analysis,²⁸ can be used to derive scoring 537 configurations which optimise a defined objective (e.g., maximal separation of patients). 538 539 However, data-driven scores do not necessarily reflect the intended construct (i.e., treatment risk and complexity),³⁵ and, in general, item scoring does not have an 540 appreciable impact on overall scale performance.²⁸ Second, the items of TIL must evolve 541 as therapeutic approaches to ICP management evolve. TIL discriminated refractory 542 intracranial hypertension status significantly better than TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾ (Figure 5A–B) because 543 TIL updated TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾ with six additional items (Table 1). We recommend updating and re-544 evaluating TIL each time ICP-treatment modalities or their perceived risks change. 545 546 Finally, the development of TIL was largely informed by the perspective of ICU practices in high-income countries.⁸ Likewise, this assessment was performed in a cohort of 547 patients across Europe and Israel. Especially given the disproportionately higher burden 548 of TBI in low- and middle-income countries,³⁶ it is imperative to test and, if necessary, 549 adapt TIL to a more inclusive, global population of TBI. 550

551

We recognise several limitations of our analysis. Whilst numerous investigators assessed 552 TIL across the study ICUs, each TIL score was only assessed once. Therefore, we could 553 not evaluate the interrater reliability of TIL. Similarly, data needed to calculate the full TIL 554 555 score was only recorded once a day, so we could not determine if a daily assessment frequency was sufficient. Since the prior TIL validation study reported a high interrater 556 reliability and recommended a daily assessment frequency,⁹ we assumed both to be true. 557 558 The results from the Randomised Evaluation of Surgery with Craniectomy for Uncontrollable Elevation of Intracranial Pressure (RESCUEicp) trial³⁷ – published amidst 559

CENTER-TBI patient recruitment in 2016 – have likely changed the global frequency and 560 perceived intensity of decompressive craniectomy for TBI. Therefore, we recognise the 561 potentially confounding effect of the trial results on treatment decision making for some 562 563 patients in the CENTER-TBI population and encourage a potential reappraisal of the therapeutic intensity of decompressive craniectomy through expert discussion and 564 statistical validation. The physician impressions (i.e., physician concerns of ICP and CPP 565 and refractory intracranial hypertension status) were subjective, and we did not have 566 enough information to account for interrater variability. Therefore, these scores and labels 567 should be considered unrefined. Finally, because of limited dosage data for numerical 568 treatments (i.e., CSF drainage, ventilation, hyperosmolar therapy, and temperature 569 570 control), we did not test alternative sub-item categorisations.

571

572 **Conclusion**

573

574 TIL is a valid, generalisable measurement of ICP management amongst neuro-monitored TBI patients in the ICU. On all validation metrics, TIL performs at least as well as its 575 576 alternatives and considers the widest range of modern treatment strategies. TIL's component scores over increasing TIL reflect a clinically credible order of treatment 577 escalation, from head positioning to ICP-directed surgery. TIL^(Basic) is not suitable for 578 evaluating maximum treatment intensity, but daily TIL^(Basic) and median TIL^(Basic) can cover 579 up to a third of the information in TIL. In the setting of clinical ICP management, TIL is a 580 more sensitive marker of pathophysiological severity than ICP and can be considered an 581 582 intermediate outcome after TBI.

583

584 Transparency, Rigor and Reproducibility Summary

585

The CENTER-TBI study was pre-registered at clinicaltrials.gov (NCT02210221, 586 https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02210221). The analysis plan was registered after 587 beginning data collection but before data analysis at https://www.center-588 tbi.eu/data/approved-proposals (#491), and the lead author with primary responsibility for 589 the analysis certifies that the analysis plan was pre-specified. A sample size of 903 590 591 patients was planned based on availability of critically ill, ICP-monitored, adult TBI patients recruited for CENTER-TBI. Actual sample size was 873, as 18 patients had a 592 documented decision to WLST on the first day of ICU stay and 12 additional patients did 593 not have daily TIL scores assessed. A patient inclusion diagram is provided (Figure 1). 594 TIL scoring and clinical data entry was performed by investigators who were aware of 595 relevant characteristics of the participants. Participants were recruited between 19 596 597 December 2014 and 17 December 2017, and data (including follow-up results) were collected until 31 March 2021. High-resolution waveforms were stored directly from 598 bedside monitoring software, as described in the Methods and Materials. Variability 599 600 amongst different TIL assessors is not expected to be significant based on the established high interrater reliability of TIL.⁹ All equipment and software used to perform imaging and 601 preprocessing are widely available from commercial sources or open source repositories. 602 603 The clinimetric validation procedure and the primary clinical metric (TIL) are established standards in the field, based on previously published results^{9,28} and this study. The 604

assumption of bootstrapping-derived confidence intervals is that the sample is 605 representative of the population. This study is, itself, an external validation, and internal 606 replication by the study group was performed. Individual participant data are available 607 608 online, conditional to approved online study proposal, with no end date at https://www.center-tbi.eu/data. Signed confirmation of a data access agreement is 609 required, and all access must comply with regulatory restrictions imposed on the original 610 study. All analytic code used to perform the statistical analyses are publicly available 611 online at: https://github.com/sbhattacharyay/CENTER-TBI TIL. This paper will be 612 published under a Creative Commons Open Access license, and upon publication, will 613 be freely available at https://www.liebertpub.com/loi/neu. 614

615

616 Acknowledgments

617

This research was supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Brain 618 Injury MedTech Co-operative. CENTER-TBI was supported by the European Union 7th 619 Framework programme (EC grant 602150). Additional funding was obtained from the 620 621 Hannelore Kohl Stiftung (Germany), from OneMind (USA), from Integra LifeSciences Corporation (USA), and from NeuroTrauma Sciences (USA). CENTER-TBI also 622 acknowledges interactions and support from the International Initiative for TBI Research 623 (InTBIR) investigators. S.B. is funded by a Gates Cambridge Scholarship. E.B. is funded 624 by the Medical Research Council (MR N013433-1) and by a Gates Cambridge 625 Scholarship. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, 626 627 decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

628

We are grateful to the patients and families of our study for making our efforts to improve TBI care possible. S.B. would like to thank Kathleen Mitchell-Fox (Princeton University) for offering comments on the manuscript.

632

The CENTER-TBI investigators and participants

634

The co-lead investigators of CENTER-TBI are designated with an asterisk (*), and their contact email addresses are listed below.

637

Cecilia Åkerlund¹, Krisztina Amrein², Nada Andelic³, Lasse Andreassen⁴, Audny Anke⁵, 638 Anna Antoni⁶. Gérard Audibert⁷. Philippe Azouvi⁸. Maria Luisa Azzolini⁹. Ronald Bartels¹⁰. 639 Pál Barzó¹¹, Romuald Beauvais¹², Ronny Beer¹³, Bo-Michael Bellander¹⁴, Antonio Belli¹⁵, 640 Habib Benali¹⁶, Maurizio Berardino¹⁷, Luigi Beretta⁹, Morten Blaabjerg¹⁸, Peter Bragge¹⁹, 641 Alexandra Brazinova²⁰, Vibeke Brinck²¹, Joanne Brooker²², Camilla Brorsson²³, Andras 642 Buki²⁴, Monika Bullinger²⁵, Manuel Cabeleira²⁶, Alessio Caccioppola²⁷, Emiliana 643 Calappi²⁷, Maria Rosa Calvi⁹, Peter Cameron²⁸, Guillermo Carbayo Lozano²⁹, Marco 644 Carbonara²⁷, Simona Cavallo¹⁷, Giorgio Chevallard³⁰, Arturo Chieregato³⁰, Giuseppe 645 Citerio^{31,32}, Hans Clusmann³³, Mark Coburn³⁴, Jonathan Coles³⁵, Jamie D. Cooper³⁶, 646 Marta Correia³⁷, Amra Čović³⁸, Nicola Curry³⁹, Endre Czeiter²⁴, Marek Czosnyka²⁶, Claire 647 Dahyot-Fizelier⁴⁰, Paul Dark⁴¹, Helen Dawes⁴², Véronique De Keyser⁴³, Vincent Degos¹⁶, 648 Francesco Della Corte⁴⁴, Hugo den Boogert¹⁰, Bart Depreitere⁴⁵, Đula Đilvesi⁴⁶, Abhishek 649

Dixit⁴⁷, Emma Donoghue²², Jens Dreier⁴⁸, Guy-Loup Dulière⁴⁹, Ari Ercole⁴⁷, Patrick 650 Esser⁴², Erzsébet Ezer⁵⁰, Martin Fabricius⁵¹, Valery L. Feigin⁵², Kelly Foks⁵³, Shirin 651 Frisvold⁵⁴, Alex Furmanov⁵⁵, Pablo Gagliardo⁵⁶, Damien Galanaud¹⁶, Dashiell Gantner²⁸, 652 653 Guoyi Gao⁵⁷, Pradeep George⁵⁸, Alexandre Ghuysen⁵⁹, Lelde Giga⁶⁰, Ben Glocker⁶¹, Jagoš Golubovic⁴⁶, Pedro A. Gomez⁶², Johannes Gratz⁶³, Benjamin Gravesteijn⁶⁴, 654 Francesca Grossi⁴⁴, Russell L. Gruen⁶⁵, Deepak Gupta⁶⁶, Juanita A. Haagsma⁶⁴, Iain 655 Haitsma⁶⁷, Raimund Helbok¹³, Eirik Helseth⁶⁸, Lindsay Horton⁶⁹, Jilske Huijben⁶⁴, Peter 656 J. Hutchinson⁷⁰, Bram Jacobs⁷¹, Stefan Jankowski⁷², Mike Jarrett²¹, Ji-yao Jiang⁵⁸, Faye 657 Johnson⁷³, Kelly Jones⁵², Mladen Karan⁴⁶, Angelos G. Kolias⁷⁰, Erwin Kompanje⁷⁴, Daniel 658 Kondziella⁵¹, Evgenios Kornaropoulos⁴⁷, Lars-Owe Koskinen⁷⁵, Noémi Kovács⁷⁶, Ana 659 Kowark⁷⁷, Alfonso Lagares⁶², Linda Lanyon⁵⁸, Steven Laureys⁷⁸, Fiona Lecky^{79,80}, Didier 660 Ledoux⁷⁸, Rolf Lefering⁸¹, Valerie Legrand⁸², Aurelie Lejeune⁸³, Leon Levi⁸⁴, Roger 661 Lightfoot⁸⁵, Hester Lingsma⁶⁴, Andrew I.R. Maas^{43,*}, Ana M. Castaño-León⁶², Marc 662 Maegele⁸⁶, Marek Majdan²⁰, Alex Manara⁸⁷, Geoffrey Manley⁸⁸, Costanza Martino⁸⁹, 663 Hugues Maréchal⁴⁹, Julia Mattern⁹⁰, Catherine McMahon⁹¹, Béla Melegh⁹², David 664 Menon^{47,*}, Tomas Menovsky⁴³, Ana Mikolic⁶⁴, Benoit Misset⁷⁸, Visakh Muraleedharan⁵⁸, 665 Lynnette Murray²⁸, Ancuta Negru⁹³, David Nelson¹, Virginia Newcombe⁴⁷, Daan 666 Nieboer⁶⁴, József Nyirádi², Otesile Olubukola⁷⁹, Matej Oresic⁹⁴, Fabrizio Ortolano²⁷, 667 Aarno Palotie^{95,96,97}, Paul M. Parizel⁹⁸, Jean-François Payen⁹⁹, Natascha Perera¹², 668 Vincent Perlbarg¹⁶, Paolo Persona¹⁰⁰, Wilco Peul¹⁰¹, Anna Piippo-Karjalainen¹⁰², Matti 669 Pirinen⁹⁵, Dana Pisica⁶⁴, Horia Ples⁹³, Suzanne Polinder⁶⁴, Inigo Pomposo²⁹, Jussi P. 670 Posti¹⁰³, Louis Puybasset¹⁰⁴, Andreea Radoi¹⁰⁵, Arminas Ragauskas¹⁰⁶, Rahul Raj¹⁰², 671 Malinka Rambadagalla¹⁰⁷, Isabel Retel Helmrich⁶⁴, Jonathan Rhodes¹⁰⁸, Sylvia 672 Richardson¹⁰⁹, Sophie Richter⁴⁷, Samuli Ripatti⁹⁵, Saulius Rocka¹⁰⁶, Cecilie Roe¹¹⁰, Olav 673 Roise^{111,112}, Jonathan Rosand¹¹³, Jeffrey V. Rosenfeld¹¹⁴, Christina Rosenlund¹¹⁵, Guy 674 Rosenthal⁵⁵, Rolf Rossaint⁷⁷, Sandra Rossi¹⁰⁰, Daniel Rueckert⁶¹ Martin Rusnák¹¹⁶, Juan 675 Sahuquillo¹⁰⁵, Oliver Sakowitz^{90,117}, Renan Sanchez-Porras¹¹⁷, Janos Sandor¹¹⁸, Nadine 676 Schäfer⁸¹, Silke Schmidt¹¹⁹, Herbert Schoechl¹²⁰, Guus Schoonman¹²¹, Rico Frederik 677 Schou¹²², Elisabeth Schwendenwein⁶, Charlie Sewalt⁶⁴, Ranjit D. Singh¹⁰¹, Toril 678 Skandsen^{123,124,} Peter Smielewski²⁶, Abayomi Sorinola¹²⁵, Emmanuel Stamatakis⁴⁷, 679 Simon Stanworth³⁹, Robert Stevens¹²⁶, William Stewart¹²⁷, Ewout W. Steyerberg^{64,128}, 680 Nino Stocchetti¹²⁹, Nina Sundström¹³⁰, Riikka Takala¹³¹, Viktória Tamás¹²⁵, Tomas 681 Tamosuitis¹³², Mark Steven Taylor²⁰, Braden Te Ao⁵², Olli Tenovuo¹⁰³, Alice Theadom⁵², 682 Matt Thomas⁸⁷, Dick Tibboel¹³³, Marjolein Timmers⁷⁴, Christos Tolias¹³⁴, Tony Trapani²⁸, 683 Cristina Maria Tudora⁹³, Andreas Unterberg⁹⁰, Peter Vajkoczy ¹³⁵, Shirley Vallance²⁸, 684 Egils Valeinis⁶⁰, Zoltán Vámos⁵⁰, Mathieu van der Jagt¹³⁶, Gregory Van der Steen⁴³, 685 Joukje van der Naalt⁷¹, Jeroen T.J.M. van Dijck¹⁰¹, Inge A. M. van Erp¹⁰¹, Thomas A. van 686 Essen¹⁰¹, Wim Van Hecke¹³⁷, Caroline van Heugten¹³⁸, Dominique Van Praag¹³⁹, Ernest 687 van Veen⁶⁴, Thijs Vande Vyvere¹³⁷, Roel P. J. van Wijk¹⁰¹, Alessia Vargiolu³², Emmanuel 688 Vega⁸³, Kimberley Velt⁶⁴, Jan Verheyden¹³⁷, Paul M. Vespa¹⁴⁰, Anne Vik^{123,141}, Rimantas 689 Vilcinis¹³², Victor Volovici⁶⁷, Nicole von Steinbüchel³⁸, Daphne Voormolen⁶⁴, Petar 690 Vulekovic⁴⁶, Kevin K.W. Wang¹⁴², Daniel Whitehouse⁴⁷, Eveline Wiegers⁶⁴, Guy 691 Williams⁴⁷, Lindsay Wilson⁶⁹, Stefan Winzeck⁴⁷, Stefan Wolf¹⁴³, Zhihui Yang¹¹³, Peter 692 Ylén¹⁴⁴, Alexander Younsi⁹⁰, Frederick A. Zeiler^{47,145}, Veronika Zelinkova²⁰, Agate 693 Ziverte^{60,} Tommaso Zoerle²⁷ 694

- ¹Department of Physiology and Pharmacology, Section of Perioperative Medicine and
 Intensive Care, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden
- ⁶⁹⁸ ²János Szentágothai Research Centre, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary
- ⁶⁹⁹ ³Division of Surgery and Clinical Neuroscience, Department of Physical Medicine and 700 Rehabilitation, Oslo University Hospital and University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
- ⁴Department of Neurosurgery, University Hespital Northern Nervey, Tromse, N
- ⁴Department of Neurosurgery, University Hospital Northern Norway, Tromso, Norway
- ⁵Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, University Hospital Northern
 Norway, Tromso, Norway
- ⁶Trauma Surgery, Medical University Vienna, Vienna, Austria
- ⁷Department of Anesthesiology & Intensive Care, University Hospital Nancy, Nancy,
 France
- ⁸Raymond Poincare hospital, Assistance Publique Hopitaux de Paris, Paris, France
- ⁹Department of Anesthesiology & Intensive Care, S Raffaele University Hospital, Milan,
 Italy
- ¹⁰Department of Neurosurgery, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, The
 Netherlands
- ¹¹Department of Neurosurgery, University of Szeged, Szeged, Hungary
- ¹²International Projects Management, ARTTIC, Munchen, Germany
- ¹³Department of Neurology, Neurological Intensive Care Unit, Medical University of
 Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria
- ¹⁴Department of Neurosurgery & Anesthesia & intensive care medicine, Karolinska
 University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden
- ¹⁵NIHR Surgical Reconstruction and Microbiology Research Centre, Birmingham, UK
- ¹⁶Anesthesie-Réanimation, Assistance Publique Hopitaux de Paris, Paris, France
- ¹⁷Department of Anesthesia & ICU, AOU Città della Salute e della Scienza di Torino -
- 721 Orthopedic and Trauma Center, Torino, Italy
- ¹⁸Department of Neurology, Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark
- ¹⁹BehaviourWorks Australia, Monash Sustainability Institute, Monash University, Victoria,
 Australia
- ²⁰Department of Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences and Social Work, Trnava
 ²⁰Department of Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences and Social Work, Trnava
 ²⁰Department of Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences and Social Work, Trnava
- 727 ²¹Quesgen Systems Inc., Burlingame, California, USA
- 728 ²²Australian & New Zealand Intensive Care Research Centre, Department of
- 729 Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine,
- 730 Monash University, Melbourne, Australia
- ²³Department of Surgery and Perioperative Science, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden
- 732 ²⁴Department of Neurosurgery, Medical School, University of Pécs, Hungary and
- Neurotrauma Research Group, János Szentágothai Research Centre, University of Pécs,
 Hungary
- ²⁵Department of Medical Psychology, Universitätsklinikum Hamburg-Eppendorf,
 Hamburg, Germany
- ²⁶Brain Physics Lab, Division of Neurosurgery, Dept of Clinical Neurosciences, University
 of Cambridge, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge, UK
- ²⁷Neuro ICU, Fondazione IRCCS Cà Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italy
- 740 ²⁸ANZIC Research Centre, Monash University, Department of Epidemiology and
- 741 Preventive Medicine, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

- ²⁹Department of Neurosurgery, Hospital of Cruces, Bilbao, Spain
- ³⁰NeuroIntensive Care, Niguarda Hospital, Milan, Italy
- ³¹School of Medicine and Surgery, Università Milano Bicocca, Milano, Italy
- ³²NeuroIntensive Care, ASST di Monza, Monza, Italy
- ³³Department of Neurosurgery, Medical Faculty RWTH Aachen University, Aachen,
 Germany
- ³⁴Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine, University Hospital Bonn,
 Bonn, Germany
- ³⁵Department of Anesthesia & Neurointensive Care, Cambridge University Hospital NHS
 Foundation Trust, Cambridge, UK
- ³⁶School of Public Health & PM, Monash University and The Alfred Hospital, Melbourne,
 Victoria, Australia
- ³⁷Radiology/MRI department, MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit, Cambridge, UK
- ³⁸Institute of Medical Psychology and Medical Sociology, Universitätsmedizin Göttingen,
 Göttingen, Germany
- ³⁹Oxford University Hospitals NHS Trust, Oxford, UK
- ⁴⁰Intensive Care Unit, CHU Poitiers, Potiers, France
- ⁴¹University of Manchester NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, Critical Care Directorate,
- 760 Salford Royal Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Salford, UK
- ⁴²Movement Science Group, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Oxford Brookes
 University, Oxford, UK
- ⁴³Department of Neurosurgery, Antwerp University Hospital and University of Antwerp,
 Edegem, Belgium
- ⁴⁴Department of Anesthesia & Intensive Care, Maggiore Della Carità Hospital, Novara,
 Italy
- ⁴⁵Department of Neurosurgery, University Hospitals Leuven, Leuven, Belgium
- ⁴⁶Department of Neurosurgery, Clinical centre of Vojvodina, Faculty of Medicine,
 ⁴⁶Department of Neurosurgery, Clinical centre of Vojvodina, Faculty of Medicine,
 ⁴⁶Department of Neurosurgery, Clinical centre of Vojvodina, Faculty of Medicine,
 ⁴⁶Department of Neurosurgery, Clinical centre of Vojvodina, Faculty of Medicine,
 ⁴⁶Department of Neurosurgery, Clinical centre of Vojvodina, Faculty of Medicine,
 ⁴⁶Department of Neurosurgery, Clinical centre of Vojvodina, Faculty of Medicine,
 ⁴⁶Department of Neurosurgery, Clinical centre of Vojvodina, Faculty of Medicine,
- ⁴⁷Division of Anaesthesia, University of Cambridge, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Cambridge,
 UK
- ⁴⁸Center for Stroke Research Berlin, Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate
- 773 member of Freie Universität Berlin, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, and Berlin Institute of
 774 Health, Berlin, Germany
- ⁴⁹Intensive Care Unit, CHR Citadelle, Liège, Belgium
- ⁵⁰Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Therapy, University of Pécs, Pécs,
 Hungary
- ⁵¹Departments of Neurology, Clinical Neurophysiology and Neuroanesthesiology, Region
 Hovedstaden Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen, Denmark
- 780 ⁵²National Institute for Stroke and Applied Neurosciences, Faculty of Health and
- Environmental Studies, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand
- ⁵³Department of Neurology, Erasmus MC, Rotterdam, the Netherlands
- ⁵⁴Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive care, University Hospital Northern Norway,
 Tromso, Norway
- ⁵⁵Department of Neurosurgery, Hadassah-hebrew University Medical center, Jerusalem,
 Israel
- ⁵⁶Fundación Instituto Valenciano de Neurorrehabilitación (FIVAN), Valencia, Spain

- ⁵⁷Department of Neurosurgery, Shanghai Renji hospital, Shanghai Jiaotong
 ⁷⁸⁹ University/school of medicine, Shanghai, China
- ^{790 58}Karolinska Institutet, INCF International Neuroinformatics Coordinating Facility, ⁷⁹¹ Stockholm, Sweden
- ⁵⁹Emergency Department, CHU, Liège, Belgium
- ⁶⁰Neurosurgery clinic, Pauls Stradins Clinical University Hospital, Riga, Latvia
- ⁶¹Department of Computing, Imperial College London, London, UK
- ⁶²Department of Neurosurgery, Hospital Universitario 12 de Octubre, Madrid, Spain
- ⁶³Department of Anesthesia, Critical Care and Pain Medicine, Medical University of
 Vienna, Austria
- ⁶⁴Department of Public Health, Erasmus Medical Center-University Medical Center,
 Rotterdam, The Netherlands
- ⁶⁵College of Health and Medicine, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia
- ⁶⁶Department of Neurosurgery, Neurosciences Centre & JPN Apex trauma centre, All
- ⁸⁰² India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi-110029, India
- ⁶⁷Department of Neurosurgery, Erasmus MC, Rotterdam, the Netherlands
- ⁶⁸Department of Neurosurgery, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway
- ⁶⁹Division of Psychology, University of Stirling, Stirling, UK
- ⁷⁰Division of Neurosurgery, Department of Clinical Neurosciences, Addenbrooke's
 Hospital & University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK
- ⁸⁰⁸ ⁷¹Department of Neurology, University of Groningen, University Medical Center ⁸⁰⁹ Groningen, Groningen, Netherlands
- ⁷²Neurointensive Care, Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Sheffield,
 UK
- ⁷³Salford Royal Hospital NHS Foundation Trust Acute Research Delivery Team, Salford,
 UK
- ⁷⁴Department of Intensive Care and Department of Ethics and Philosophy of Medicine,
 Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands
- ⁷⁵Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Neurosurgery, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden
- ⁷⁶Hungarian Brain Research Program Grant No. KTIA_13_Not ApplicableP-A-II/8,
 ⁸¹⁸ University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary
- ⁷⁷Department of Anaesthesiology, University Hospital of Aachen, Aachen, Germany
- ⁷⁸Cyclotron Research Center, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium
- ⁷⁹Centre for Urgent and Emergency Care Research (CURE), Health Services Research
- 822 Section, School of Health and Related Research (ScHARR), University of Sheffield, 823 Sheffield, UK
- ⁸⁰Emergency Department, Salford Royal Hospital, Salford UK
- ⁸¹Institute of Research in Operative Medicine (IFOM), Witten/Herdecke University,
 Cologne, Germany
- 827 ⁸²VP Global Project Management CNS, ICON, Paris, France
- ⁸³Department of Anesthesiology-Intensive Care, Lille University Hospital, Lille, France
- ⁸⁴Department of Neurosurgery, Rambam Medical Center, Haifa, Israel
- ⁸⁵Department of Anesthesiology & Intensive Care, University Hospitals Southhampton
- 831 NHS Trust, Southhampton, UK
- ⁸⁶Cologne-Merheim Medical Center (CMMC), Department of Traumatology, Orthopedic
- 833 Surgery and Sportmedicine, Witten/Herdecke University, Cologne, Germany

- ⁸⁷Intensive Care Unit, Southmead Hospital, Bristol, Bristol, UK
- ⁸⁸Department of Neurological Surgery, University of California, San Francisco, California,
 USA
- ⁸⁹Department of Anesthesia & Intensive Care, M. Bufalini Hospital, Cesena, Italy
- ⁹⁰Department of Neurosurgery, University Hospital Heidelberg, Heidelberg, Germany
- ⁹¹Department of Neurosurgery, The Walton centre NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, UK
- ⁹²Department of Medical Genetics, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary
- ⁹³Department of Neurosurgery, Emergency County Hospital Timisoara, Timisoara,
 Romania
- ⁹⁴School of Medical Sciences, Örebro University, Örebro, Sweden
- ⁹⁵Institute for Molecular Medicine Finland, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
- ⁹⁶Analytic and Translational Genetics Unit, Department of Medicine; Psychiatric &
- Neurodevelopmental Genetics Unit, Department of Psychiatry; Department of Neurology,
 Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
- ⁹⁷Program in Medical and Population Genetics; The Stanley Center for Psychiatric
- 849 Research, The Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA, USA
- ⁹⁸Department of Radiology, University of Antwerp, Edegem, Belgium
- ⁹⁹Department of Anesthesiology & Intensive Care, University Hospital of Grenoble,
 Grenoble, France
- ¹⁰⁰Department of Anesthesia & Intensive Care, Azienda Ospedaliera Università di
 Padova, Padova, Italy
- ¹⁰¹Dept. of Neurosurgery, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands and
- ⁸⁵⁶ Dept. of Neurosurgery, Medical Center Haaglanden, The Hague, The Netherlands
- ¹⁰²Department of Neurosurgery, Helsinki University Central Hospital
- ¹⁰³Division of Clinical Neurosciences, Department of Neurosurgery and Turku Brain Injury
 Centre, Turku University Hospital and University of Turku, Turku, Finland
- ¹⁰⁴Department of Anesthesiology and Critical Care, Pitié -Salpêtrière Teaching Hospital,
- Assistance Publique, Hôpitaux de Paris and University Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris,
 France
- ¹⁰⁵Neurotraumatology and Neurosurgery Research Unit (UNINN), Vall d'Hebron
 Research Institute, Barcelona, Spain
- ¹⁰⁶Department of Neurosurgery, Kaunas University of technology and Vilnius University,
 Vilnius, Lithuania
- ¹⁰⁷Department of Neurosurgery, Rezekne Hospital, Latvia
- ¹⁰⁸Department of Anaesthesia, Critical Care & Pain Medicine NHS Lothian & University
 of Edinburg, Edinburgh, UK
- ¹⁰⁹Director, MRC Biostatistics Unit, Cambridge Institute of Public Health, Cambridge, UK
- ¹¹⁰Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, Oslo University
- 872 Hospital/University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
- ¹¹¹Division of Orthopedics, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway
- ¹¹²Institue of Clinical Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
- ¹¹³Broad Institute, Cambridge MA Harvard Medical School, Boston MA, Massachusetts
 General Hospital, Boston MA, USA
- ¹¹⁴National Trauma Research Institute, The Alfred Hospital, Monash University,
- 878 Melbourne, Victoria, Australia
- ¹¹⁵Department of Neurosurgery, Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark

- ¹¹⁶International Neurotrauma Research Organisation, Vienna, Austria
- ¹¹⁷Klinik für Neurochirurgie, Klinikum Ludwigsburg, Ludwigsburg, Germany
- ¹¹⁸Division of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, Department of Preventive Medicine,
 University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary
- ¹¹⁹Department Health and Prevention, University Greifswald, Greifswald, Germany
- ¹²⁰Department of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care, AUVA Trauma Hospital, Salzburg,
 Austria
- ¹²¹Department of Neurology, Elisabeth-TweeSteden Ziekenhuis, Tilburg, the Netherlands
- ¹²²Department of Neuroanesthesia and Neurointensive Care, Odense University Hospital,
 Odense, Denmark
- ¹²³Department of Neuromedicine and Movement Science, Norwegian University of
 Science and Technology, NTNU, Trondheim, Norway
- ¹²⁴Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, St.Olavs Hospital, Trondheim
 ¹²⁴Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, St.Olavs Hospital, Trondheim
- ¹²⁵Department of Neurosurgery, University of Pécs, Pécs, Hungary
- ¹²⁶Division of Neuroscience Critical Care, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine,
 Baltimore, USA
- ¹²⁷Department of Neuropathology, Queen Elizabeth University Hospital and University of
 Glasgow, Glasgow, UK
- ¹²⁸Dept. of Department of Biomedical Data Sciences, Leiden University Medical Center,
 Leiden, The Netherlands
- ¹²⁹Department of Pathophysiology and Transplantation, Milan University, and Neuroscience ICU, Fondazione IRCCS Cà Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico,
- Neuroscience ICU, Fondazione IRCCS Cà Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico,
 Milano, Italy
- ¹³⁰Department of Radiation Sciences, Biomedical Engineering, Umeå University, Umeå,
 Sweden
- ¹³¹Perioperative Services, Intensive Care Medicine and Pain Management, Turku
 ⁹⁰⁷University Hospital and University of Turku, Turku, Finland
- ¹³²Department of Neurosurgery, Kaunas University of Health Sciences, Kaunas, Lithuania
 ¹³³Intensive Care and Department of Pediatric Surgery, Erasmus Medical Center, Sophia
 Children's Hospital, Rotterdam, The Netherlands
- ¹³⁴Department of Neurosurgery, Kings college London, London, UK
- ¹³⁵Neurologie, Neurochirurgie und Psychiatrie, Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany
- ¹³⁶Department of Intensive Care Adults, Erasmus MC– University Medical Center
 Rotterdam, Rotterdam, the Netherlands
- ¹³⁷icoMetrix NV, Leuven, Belgium
- ¹³⁸Movement Science Group, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Oxford Brookes
- 918 University, Oxford, UK
- ¹³⁹Psychology Department, Antwerp University Hospital, Edegem, Belgium
- ¹⁴⁰Director of Neurocritical Care, University of California, Los Angeles, USA
- ¹⁴¹Department of Neurosurgery, St.Olavs Hospital, Trondheim University Hospital,
 Trondheim, Norway
- ¹⁴²Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida, USA

- ¹⁴³Department of Neurosurgery, Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member
- 925 of Freie Universität Berlin, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, and Berlin Institute of Health, 926 Berlin, Germany
- ¹⁴⁴VTT Technical Research Centre, Tampere, Finland
- ¹⁴⁵Section of Neurosurgery, Department of Surgery, Rady Faculty of Health Sciences,
 ¹⁴⁵University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada
- 930 931 *Co-lead investigators: andrew.maas@uza.be (AIRM) and dkm13@cam.ac.uk (DM)
- 932

933 **References**

- 934
- 1. Stocchetti N, Maas AIR. Traumatic Intracranial Hypertension. N Engl J Med
 2014;370(22):2121–2130; doi: 10.1056/NEJMra1208708.
- 937 2. Meyfroidt G, Bouzat P, Casaer MP, et al. Management of moderate to severe
 938 traumatic brain injury: an update for the intensivist. Intensive Care Med
 939 2022;48(6):649–666; doi: 10.1007/s00134-022-06702-4.
- 3. Menon DK, Ercole A. Chapter 14 Critical care management of traumatic brain injury.
 Wijdicks EFM, Kramer AH. eds. Handb Clin Neurol 2017;140(Journal Article):239–
 274; doi: 10.1016/B978-0-444-63600-3.00014-3.
- 4. Stocchetti N, Carbonara M, Citerio G, et al. Severe traumatic brain injury: targeted
 management in the intensive care unit. Lancet Neurol 2017;16(6):452–464; doi:
 10.1016/S1474-4422(17)30118-7.
- 5. Hawryluk GWJ, Aguilera S, Buki A, et al. A management algorithm for patients with
 intracranial pressure monitoring: the Seattle International Severe Traumatic Brain
 Injury Consensus Conference (SIBICC). Intensive Care Med 2019;45(12):1783–
 1794; doi: 10.1007/s00134-019-05805-9.
- 6. Maset AL, Marmarou A, Ward JD, et al. Pressure-volume index in head injury. J
 Neurosurg 1987;67(6):832–840; doi: 10.3171/jns.1987.67.6.0832.
- 7. Shore PM, Hand LL, Roy L, et al. Reliability and validity of the Pediatric Intensity
 Level of Therapy (PILOT) scale: A measure of the use of intracranial pressure–
 directed therapies. Crit Care Med 2006;34(7):1981; doi:
 10.1097/01.CCM.0000220765.22184.ED.
- 8. Maas AIR, Harrison-Felix CL, Menon D, et al. Standardizing Data Collection in Traumatic Brain Injury. J Neurotrauma 2011;28(2):177–187; doi:
 10.1089/neu.2010.1617.
- 959
 9. Zuercher P, Groen JL, Aries MJH, et al. Reliability and Validity of the Therapy
 960 Intensity Level Scale: Analysis of Clinimetric Properties of a Novel Approach to
 961 Assess Management of Intracranial Pressure in Traumatic Brain Injury. J
 962 Neurotrauma 2016;33(19):1768–1774; doi: 10.1089/neu.2015.4266.

- Robba C, Graziano F, Guglielmi A, et al. Treatments for intracranial hypertension
 in acute brain-injured patients: grading, timing, and association with outcome. Data
 from the SYNAPSE-ICU study. Intensive Care Med 2023;49(1):50–61; doi:
 10.1007/s00134-022-06937-1.
- Huijben JA, Wiegers EJA, Lingsma HF, et al. Changing care pathways and
 between-center practice variations in intensive care for traumatic brain injury across
 Europe: a CENTER-TBI analysis. Intensive Care Med 2020;46(5):995–1004; doi:
 10.1007/s00134-020-05965-z.
- Huijben JA, Dixit A, Stocchetti N, et al. Use and impact of high intensity
 treatments in patients with traumatic brain injury across Europe: a CENTER-TBI
 analysis. Crit Care 2021;25(1):78; doi: 10.1186/s13054-020-03370-y.
- Bhattacharyay S, Caruso PF, Åkerlund C, et al. Contribution of Clinical Course to
 Outcome after Traumatic Brain Injury: Mining Patient Trajectories from European
 Intensive Care Unit Data. 2023; doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2303.04630.
- Id. Zoerle T, Birg T, Carbonara M, et al. Accuracy of Manual Intracranial Pressure
 Recording Compared to a Computerized High-Resolution System: A CENTER-TBI
 Analysis. Neurocrit Care 2023; doi: 10.1007/s12028-023-01697-2.
- Maas AIR, Menon DK, Manley GT, et al. Traumatic brain injury: progress and
 challenges in prevention, clinical care, and research. Lancet Neurol
 2022;21(11):1004–1060; doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(22)00309-X.
- 16. Cnossen MC, Huijben JA, van der Jagt M, et al. Variation in monitoring and
 treatment policies for intracranial hypertension in traumatic brain injury: a survey in 66
 neurotrauma centers participating in the CENTER-TBI study. Crit Care
 2017;21(1):233; doi: 10.1186/s13054-017-1816-9.
- 987 17. Avila ML, Stinson J, Kiss A, et al. A critical review of scoring options for clinical
 988 measurement tools. BMC Res Notes 2015;8(1):612; doi: 10.1186/s13104-015-1561989 6.
- Maas AIR, Menon DK, Steyerberg EW, et al. Collaborative European
 NeuroTrauma Effectiveness Research in Traumatic Brain Injury (CENTER-TBI): A
 Prospective Longitudinal Observational Study. Neurosurgery 2015;76(1):67–80; doi:
 10.1227/NEU.0000000000575.
- 19. Steyerberg EW, Wiegers E, Sewalt C, et al. Case-mix, care pathways, and
 outcomes in patients with traumatic brain injury in CENTER-TBI: a European
 prospective, multicentre, longitudinal, cohort study. Lancet Neurol 2019;18(10):923–
 934; doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(19)30232-7.

998 20. Doiron D, Marcon Y, Fortier I, et al. Software Application Profile: Opal and Mica:
999 open-source software solutions for epidemiological data management, harmonization
1000 and dissemination. Int J Epidemiol 2017;46(5):1372–1378; doi: 10.1093/ije/dyx180.

- Zeiler FA, Ercole A, Cabeleira M, et al. Patient-specific ICP Epidemiologic
 Thresholds in Adult Traumatic Brain Injury: A CENTER-TBI Validation Study. J
 Neurosurg Anesthesiol 2021;33(1):28–38; doi: 10.1097/ANA.000000000000616.
- Marshall LF, Marshall SB, Klauber MR, et al. The diagnosis of head injury
 requires a classification based on computed axial tomography. J Neurotrauma 1992;9
 Suppl 1:S287-292.
- 1007 23. Teasdale G, Maas A, Lecky F, et al. The Glasgow Coma Scale at 40 years:
 1008 standing the test of time. The LancetNeurology 2014;13(8):844–854; doi:
 1009 10.1016/S1474-4422(14)70120-6.
- Ercole A, Dixit A, Nelson DW, et al. Imputation strategies for missing baseline
 neurological assessment covariates after traumatic brain injury: A CENTER-TBI
 study. PLoS ONE 2021;16(8):e0253425.
- McMillan T, Wilson L, Ponsford J, et al. The Glasgow Outcome Scale 40 years
 of application and refinement. Nat Rev Neurol 2016;12(8):477–485; doi:
 10.1038/nrneurol.2016.89.
- 1016 26. Kunzmann K, Wernisch L, Richardson S, et al. Imputation of Ordinal Outcomes:
 1017 A Comparison of Approaches in Traumatic Brain Injury. J Neurotrauma
 1018 2021;38(4):455–463; doi: 10.1089/neu.2019.6858.
- Bhattacharyay S, Milosevic I, Wilson L, et al. The leap to ordinal: Detailed
 functional prognosis after traumatic brain injury with a flexible modelling approach.
 PLoS ONE 2022;17(7):e0270973; doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0270973.
- 1022 28. Boateng GO, Neilands TB, Frongillo EA, et al. Best Practices for Developing and
 1023 Validating Scales for Health, Social, and Behavioral Research: A Primer. Front Public
 1024 Health 2018;6:149; doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2018.00149.
- 102529.Bakdash JZ, Marusich LR. Repeated Measures Correlation. Front Psychol10262017;8:456; doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00456.
- 102730.van Buuren S, Groothuis-Oudshoorn CGM. mice: Multivariate Imputation by1028Chained Equations in R. J Stat Softw 2011;45(3):1–67; doi: 10.18637/jss.v045.i03.
- 1029 31. Gravesteijn BY, Sewalt CA, Venema E, et al. Missing Data in Prediction
 1030 Research: A Five-Step Approach for Multiple Imputation, Illustrated in the CENTER1031 TBI Study. J Neurotrauma 2021;38(13):1842–1857; doi: 10.1089/neu.2020.7218.
- 1032 32. Honaker J King, G, Blackwell,M. Amelia II: A Program for Missing Data. J Stat 1033 Softw 2011;45(7); doi: 10.18637/jss.v045.i07.
- Beqiri E, Smielewski P, Robba C, et al. Feasibility of individualised severe
 traumatic brain injury management using an automated assessment of optimal

- 1036 cerebral perfusion pressure: the COGiTATE phase II study protocol. BMJ Open1037 2019;9(9):e030727; doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-030727.
- Tas J, Beqiri E, van Kaam RC, et al. Targeting Autoregulation-Guided Cerebral
 Perfusion Pressure after Traumatic Brain Injury (COGiTATE): A Feasibility
 Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial. J Neurotrauma 2021;38(20):2790–2800; doi:
 10.1089/neu.2021.0197.
- Schreiber JB. Issues and recommendations for exploratory factor analysis and principal component analysis. Res Soc Adm Pharm 2021;17(5):1004–1011; doi:
 10.1016/j.sapharm.2020.07.027.
- 1045 36. Clark D, Joannides A, Adeleye AO, et al. Casemix, management, and mortality of
 1046 patients receiving emergency neurosurgery for traumatic brain injury in the Global
 1047 Neurotrauma Outcomes Study: a prospective observational cohort study. Lancet
 1048 Neurol 2022;21(5):438–449; doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(22)00037-0.
- 1049 37. Hutchinson PJ, Kolias AG, Timofeev IS, et al. Trial of Decompressive
- 1050 Craniectomy for Traumatic Intracranial Hypertension. N Engl J Med
- 1051 2016;375(12):1119–1130; doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1605215.

1052



Fig. 1. Flow diagram for patient enrolment and validation population assignment. Abbreviations: CENTER-TBI=Collaborative European NeuroTrauma Effectiveness Research in TBI, ICP=intracranial pressure, ICP_{EH}=end-hour ICP, ICP_{HR}=high-resolution ICP, ICU=intensive care unit, TBI=traumatic brain injury, TIL=Therapy Intensity Level scale,^{8,9} WLST=withdrawal of life-sustaining therapies.





Fig. 2. Distributions of TIL and alternative scales. Abbreviations: ICU=intensive care unit, PILOT=Paediatric Intensity Level of Therapy scale,⁷ TIL=Therapy Intensity Level scale,^{8,9} TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾=original Therapy Intensity Level scale published in 1987,⁶ TIL^(Basic)=condensed TIL scale,⁸ uwTIL=unweighted TIL scale in which sub-item scores are replaced by the ascending rank index within the item. The numeric definition of each scale is listed in Table 1. (**A**) Distributions of maximum scores of TIL (i.e., TIL_{max}) and alternative scales (i.e., uwTIL_{max}, TIL^(Basic)_{max}, PILOT_{max}, and TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾_{max}) over the first week of ICU stay. (**B**) Distribution of median scores of TIL (i.e., TIL_{median}) and alternative scales (i.e., uwTIL_{median}, PILOT_{median}, and TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾_{median}) over the first week of ICU stay. (**C**) Distributions of TIL (i.e., TIL₂₄) and alternative scales (i.e., uwTIL₂₄, TIL^(Basic)₂₄, PILOT₂₄, and TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾₂₄) over the first week of ICU stay.







Fig. 3. Associations of TIL and alternative scales with other clinical measures. Abbreviations: Day_{ICU}=variable representing day (from 1 to 7) of ICU stay, EH=end-hour, CPP=cerebral perfusion pressure, GCS=Glasgow Coma Scale at ICU admission, GOSE=Glasgow Outcome Scale–Extended at six months post-injury, HR=high-resolution, ICP=intracranial pressure, ICU=intensive care unit, PILOT=Paediatric Intensity Level of Therapy scale,⁷ Pr(GOSE>•)="probability of GOSE greater than • at six months post-injury" as previously calculated from the first 24 hours of admission,²⁷ TIL=Therapy Intensity Level scale,^{8,9} TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾=original Therapy Intensity Level scale published in 1987,⁶ TIL^(Basic)=condensed TIL scale,⁸

within the item. The numeric definition of each scale is listed in Table 1, and the calculation of daily (e.g., TIL₂₄), maximum (e.g., TIL_{max}), and median (e.g., TIL_{median}) scores are described in the Methods. The bars represent 95% confidence intervals derived from bootstrapping with 1,000 resamples of unique patients over 100 missing value imputations. (**A**) Spearman's correlation coefficients (ρ) between maximum scale scores over first week of ICU stay (i.e., TIL_{max}, uwTIL_{max}, TIL^(Basic)_{max}, PILOT_{max}, and TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾_{max}) and other clinical measures. (**B**) Spearman's correlation coefficients (ρ) between median scale scores over first week of ICU stay (i.e., TIL_{median}, uwTIL_{median}, TIL^(Basic)_{median}, PILOT_{median}, and TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾_{median}) and other clinical measures. (**C**) Repeated measures correlation coefficients (r_{rm} , from -1 to 1) are interpreted as the strength and direction of association between two variables after accounting for inter-patient variation. (**D**) Linear mixed effects model coefficients (β_{LMER}) are interpreted as the expected difference in dependent variable (e.g., EH ICP₂₄) per unit increase of daily scale score (e.g., TIL₂₄) after accounting for time since ICU admission (i.e., Day_{ICU}) and inter-patient variation.





Fig 4. Distributions of daily intracranial pressure and cerebral perfusion pressure means per daily TIL score. Abbreviations: CPP=cerebral perfusion pressure, CPP₂₄=mean CPP over calendar day, Day_{ICU}=variable representing day (from 1 to 7) of ICU stay, EH=end-hour, HR=highresolution, ICP=intracranial pressure, ICP₂₄=mean ICP over calendar day, TIL=Therapy Intensity Level scale,^{8,9} TIL₂₄=TIL score of calendar day, TIL-ICP_{EH}=end-hour ICP sub-population, TIL-ICP_{HR}=high-resolution ICP sub-population. The values in each panel are the linear mixed effects model coefficients (β_{LMER}) of TIL₂₄ with 95% confidence intervals derived from bootstrapping with 1,000 resamples of unique patients over 100 missing value imputations. The width of violin plots is scaled for each population, but the width of the points inside them demonstrates relative frequency across the populations. The violin plots do not encompass outliers based on 1.5 times the interquartile range. (**A**) Distributions of ICP₂₄ vs. TIL₂₄ for both sub-populations. (**B**) Distributions of CPP₂₄ vs. TIL₂₄ for both sub-populations.



Fig 5. Discrimination of refractory intracranial hypertension status by TIL and alternative scale summary scores. Abbreviations: AUC=area under the receiver operating characteristic curve, EH=end-hour, HR=high-resolution, ICP=intracranial pressure, ICP_{max}=maximum calendar day mean of ICP over first week of ICU stay, ICP_{median}=median calendar day mean of ICP over first week of ICU stay, ICU=intensive care unit, PILOT=Paediatric Intensity Level of Therapy scale,⁷ TIL=Therapy Intensity Level scale,^{8,9} TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾=original Therapy Intensity Level scale published in 1987,⁶ TIL^(Basic)=condensed TIL scale,⁸ uwTIL=unweighted TIL scale in which subitem scores are replaced by the ascending rank index within the item. The 95% confidence intervals of AUC were derived from bootstrapping with 1,000 resamples of unique patients over 100 missing value imputations. (A) Distributions of maximum scores of TIL (i.e., TILmax) and alternative scales (i.e., uwTILmax, TIL^(Basic)max, PILOTmax, and TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾max) stratified by refractory intracranial hypertension status. The horizontal black line segments represent the thresholds which maximised the sum of sensitivity and specificity for each scale. (B) Distributions of median scores of TIL (i.e., TIL_{median}) and alternative scales (i.e., uwTIL_{median}, TIL^(Basic)_{median}, PILOT_{median}, and TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾median) stratified by refractory intracranial hypertension status. The horizontal black line segments represent the thresholds which maximised the sum of sensitivity and specificity for each scale. (C) Receiver operating characteristic curve of refractory intracranial hypertension detection with TIL_{max}. The threshold which maximised the sum of sensitivity and specificity is highlighted with the dark red circle. (D) Receiver operating characteristic curve of refractory intracranial hypertension detection with TILmedian. The threshold which maximised the sum of sensitivity and specificity is highlighted with the dark red circle.





В







imputations. (**A**) Median component score of each ICP-treatment modality (Table 1) per each TIL₂₄ score. The histogram under the *x*-axis represents the relative frequency and count of each TIL₂₄ score in the population, and diagonal dashed line represents the TIL₂₄ score on both axes. If the sum of median item scores does not equal the corresponding TIL₂₄ score, this can be interpreted as high variability in the combination of simultaneously applied therapies at that TIL₂₄ score. (**B**) The repeated measures correlation coefficients (r_{rm} , from -1 to 1) are interpreted as the strength and direction of association between two variables after accounting for inter-patient variation. The component score of each item (Table 1, *x*-axis) was subtracted from the TIL₂₄ score (top row on *y*-axis) before calculating their r_{rm} values. (**C**) Linear mixed effects model coefficients (β_{LMER}) are interpreted as the expected difference in the dependent variable (*y*-axis) associated with the given TIL₂₄ sub-item treatment (Table 1) after accounting for all other TIL₂₄ sub-items, time since ICU admission, and inter-patient variation.



Fig 7. Relationship between TIL and TIL^(Basic). Abbreviations: AUC=area under the receiver operating characteristic curve, ICU=intensive care unit, TIL=Therapy Intensity Level scale,^{8,9} TIL^(Basic)=condensed TIL scale.⁸ The numeric definition of each scale is listed in Table 1, and the calculation of daily (e.g., TIL₂₄), maximum (e.g., TIL_{max}), and median (e.g., TIL_{median}) scores are described in the Methods. The 95% confidence intervals of information coverage were derived from bootstrapping with 1,000 resamples of unique patients over 100 missing value imputations. (**A**) Distribution of corresponding TIL^(Basic)₂₄ scores per each TIL₂₄ score. The values in each cell represent the percent of assessments at a given TIL₂₄ score (i.e., column) corresponding to a TIL^(Basic)₂₄ score (i.e., row). The vertical, dark red lines represent cut-offs across which the median corresponding TIL^(Basic)₂₄ score per TIL₂₄ score changes. (**B**) Distribution of corresponding TIL₂₄ scores, but the width of the points inside them demonstrates relative frequency across the TIL^(Basic)₂₄ scores. The grey, shaded zones represent the range of TIL₂₄ scores with corresponding median TIL^(Basic)₂₄ scores on the x-axis, as determined in panel (A). (**C**) The information of TIL₂₄, TIL_{max}, and TIL_{median} covered by TIL^(Basic)₂₄, TIL^(Basic)_{max}, and TIL^(Basic)₂₄ (or TIL_{max} and TIL^(Basic)_{max} or TIL_{median} and TIL^(Basic)_{median}) divided by the entropy of TIL₂₄ (or TIL_{max} or TIL_{median}).

ICP treatment	Ing configurations i		<u>anu a</u> 1						TII (1	987)†
modality			L	uwi			FILC			
modulity	Sub-item	Score	Max	Score	Max	Score	Score	Max	Score	Max
Positioning	Head elevation for	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	-	-
	flat (180°) for CPP									
	management									
Sedation and	Sedation		5		3			5		4
neuromuscular	Low dose sedation	1		1		1	1		1	
blockade	(as required for			-			-			
	mechanical									
	ventilation)			_		_				
	Higher dose	2		2		2	1		1	
	sedation for ICP									
	aiming for burst									
	suppression)									
	High dose propofol	5		3		4	5		4	
	or barbiturates for									
	ICP control									
	(metabolic									
	suppression)	2	2	1	1		2	2	1	1
	blockade (paralysis)	3	3	1	1	-	2	2		I
CSF drainage	CSF drainage volume		3		2			5		2
s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s	l ow (<120 ml/24h)	2		1		2	4		1	_
	High (>120 ml/24h)	3		2		3	5		2	
CPP	Eluid loading for	1	1	1	1	2	Ŭ		-	
management	maintenance of	1	1	1	1	2	_	-	-	_
managomont	cerebral perfusion									
	Vasopressor therapy	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	-	_
	required for									
	management of									
Ventileton	Cerebral perfusion		4		2			1		2
management	control ($P_{2}CO_{2}$		4		3			4		2
management	[mmHa])									
	Mild	1		1		2	1		1	
	(35≤P _a CO ₂ <40)									
	Moderate	2		2		3	2		1	
	(30≤P _a CO ₂ <35)			2		4			2	
	$(P \cap C_{0} < 30)$	4		3		4	4		2	
Hyperosmolar	Mannitol		3		2			3		6
therapy	administration									-
	≤2g/kg/24h	2		1		2	2		3	
	>2g/kg/24h	3		2		3	3		6	
	Hypertonic saline		3		2			3	_	_
	administration									
	≤0.3g/kg/24h	2		1		2	3			
	>0.3g/kg/24h	3		2		3	3			
Temperature	Temperature control		5		3			5	-	_
control	(T [°C])	Ι.					Ι.			
	Fever control (>38	1		1			1			
	or spontaneous									
	Cooling for ICP	2		2		3	3			
	control (≥35)	-		-		Ŭ	Ŭ			
	Hypothermia (<35)	5		3		4	5			

Table 1. Scoring configurations for TIL and alternative scales

Surgery for intracranial hypertension	Intracranial operation for progressive mass lesion, NOT scheduled on admission	4	4	1	1	4	4	4	_	_
	Decompressive craniectomy	5	5	1	1	4	5	5	-	-
Maximum total possible score			38		21	4		38		15

Abbreviations: CPP=cerebral perfusion pressure, CSF=cerebrospinal fluid, ICP=intracranial pressure, P_aCO₂=partial pressure of carbon dioxide in arterial blood, PILOT=Paediatric Intensity Level of Therapy scale,⁷ T=body temperature in degrees Celsius, TIL=Therapy Intensity Level scale,^{8,9} TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾=original Therapy Intensity Level scale published in 1987,⁶ TIL^(Basic)=condensed TIL scale,⁸ uwTIL=unweighted TIL scale in which sub-item scores are replaced by the ascending rank index within the item.

The TIL scale was developed by Maas *et al.*⁸ For each calendar day, the highest score for each item was summed to derive the TIL score.

*TIL^(Basic) is the maximum score (from 1 to 4) among all included sub-items over the calendar day. [†]PILOT scale⁷ and TIL⁽¹⁹⁸⁷⁾ scale⁶ scoring configurations have been adapted with minor adjustments to fit the items of TIL with a daily assessment frequency.

Summary characteristic	naracteristic TIL validation population						
	Overall	TIL-ICP _{EH}	TIL-ICP _{HR}	<i>p</i> -			
	(<i>n</i> =873, 52 centres)	(<i>n</i> =837, 51 centres)	(<i>n</i> =259, 21 centres)	value [‡]			
Age [years]	47 (29–62)	47 (29–62)	48 (30–62.5)	0.303			
Sex: Female	222 (25%)	213 (25%)	55 (21%)	0.078			
Baseline GCS (<i>n</i> *=822)				0.554			
Mild [13–15]	122 (15%)	115 (15%)	38 (16%)				
Moderate [9–12]	139 (17%)	133 (17%)	36 (15%)				
Severe [3–8]	561 (68%)	539 (68%)	170 (70%)				
Marshall CT (n*=710)				0.278			
No visible pathology (I)	17 (2%)	16 (2%)	6 (3%)				
Diffuse injury II	264 (37%)	248 (36%)	75 (35%)				
Diffuse injury III	93 (13%)	89 (13%)	22 (10%)				
Diffuse injury IV	16 (2%)	16 (2%)	3 (1%)				
Mass lesion (V & VI)	320 (45%)	312 (46%)	107 (50%)				
Six-month GOSE (<i>n</i> *=761)				0.329			
(1) Death	199 (26%)	195 (26%)	54 (23%)				
(2 or 3) Vegetative or lower SD	182 (24%)	181 (25%)	63 (27%)				
(4) Upper SD	70 (9%)	66 (9%)	22 (9%)				
(5) Lower MD	122 (16%)	117 (16%)	44 (19%)				
(6) Upper MD	74 (10%)	71 (10%)	23 (10%)				
(7) Lower GR	56 (7%)	52 (7%)	14 (6%)				
(8) Upper GR	58 (8%)	55 (7%)	13 (6%)				
Baseline functional prognosis [†] [%] (n	ı*=749)						
Pr(GOSE>1)	84.7 (63.5–94.9)	84.1 (62.1–94.7)	83.8 (66.9–94.0)	0.664			
Pr(GOSE>3)	53.9 (29.9–76.0)	53.1 (29.2–75.0)	52.4 (33.9–71.1)	0.287			
Pr(GOSE>4)	39.6 (20.6–59.6)	38.9 (19.8–58.3)	38.1 (22.6–54.6)	0.154			
Pr(GOSE>5)	21.1 (10.2–36.8)	20.7 (10.0–36.0)	19.3 (10.5–30.1)	0.037			
Pr(GOSE>6)	12.4 (5.9–20.8)	12.0 (5.8–19.9)	10.9 (5.8–17.2)	0.009			
Pr(GOSE>7)	4.8 (2.2–9.2)	4.7 (2.2–9.1)	5.3 (2.2–8.5)	0.415			
TIL _{max}	10 (6–14)	10 (6–14)	10 (6–14)	0.577			
TIL _{median}	5 (3–10)	5 (3–10)	5 (4–10)	0.826			
TIL ₂₄ scores							
Day 1 (<i>n</i> *=852)	7 (4–11)	7 (4–11)	7 (5–10)	0.134			
Day 2 (<i>n</i> *=839)	6 (4–10)	6 (4–10)	6 (4–10)	0.860			
Day 3 (<i>n</i> *=819)	6 (3–9)	6 (3–9)	6 (4–9)	0.926			
Day 4 (<i>n</i> *=787)	6 (3–10)	6 (3–10)	5 (4–10)	0.372			
Day 5 (<i>n</i> *=761)	5 (3–10)	5 (3–10)	5 (3–10)	0.941			
Day 6 (<i>n</i> *=733)	5 (2–9)	5 (2.5–9)	5 (3–10)	0.337			
Day 7 (<i>n</i> *=709)	5 (2-9)	4 (2–9)	5 (2–9)	0.425			

Table 2. Summary characteristics of study validation populations

Abbreviations: Baseline GCS=Glasgow Coma Scale at ICU admission, from 3 to 15, GOSE=GOS–Extended, GR=good recovery, ICP=intracranial pressure, ICP_{EH}=end-hour ICP, ICP_{HR}=high-resolution ICP, Marshall CT=Marshall computerised tomography classification, MD=moderate disability, Pr(GOSE>•)="probability of GOSE greater than • at six months postinjury" as previously calculated from the first 24 hours of admission,²⁷ SD=severe disability, TIL=Therapy Intensity Level scale, TIL₂₄=TIL score of calendar day in ICU, TIL_{max}=maximum TIL₂₄ over first week of ICU stay, TIL_{median}=median TIL₂₄ over first week of ICU stay. Data are median (IQR) for numeric characteristics and *n* (% of column group) for categorical characteristics, unless

otherwise indicated. Units or numerical definitions of characteristics are provided in square brackets.

*Limited sample size of non-missing values for characteristic.

[†]Ordinal functional outcome prognostic scores were calculated through tokenised embedding of all clinical information in the first 24 hours of ICU stay, as described previously.²⁷

[‡]*p*-values, comparing patients in TIL-ICP_{HR} sub-population to those not in TIL-ICP_{HR} sub-population, are derived from with Welch's *t*-test for numeric variables and χ^2 contingency table test for categorical variables.

Category	Derived	Performance (95	% confidence interva	Case counts [‡]		Previously		
	ranges	Sensitivity	Specificity	Accuracy	No	Yes	ranges§	
Refractory intracranial hypertension*	TIL _{max} ≥14	68% (62–74%)	79% (77–81%)	77% (75–79%)	707	157	TIL _{max} ≥11	
	TIL _{median} ≥7.5	81% (77–87%)	72% (70–75%)	74% (72–76%)			-	
Day of surgical ICP control [†]	TIL₂₄≥9	87% (83–91%)	74% (72–76%)	76% (74–77%)	4916	585	-	
TIL ^(Basic) 24				72% (70–73%)				
(1) Basic ICU care	1≤TIL₂₄≤2				4932	568	1≤TIL₂₄≤3	
(2) Mild	3≤TIL ₂₄ ≤6				3294	2206	4≤TIL ₂₄ ≤7	
(3) Moderate	7≤TIL₂₄≤8				4709	791	8≤TIL ₂₄ ≤10	
(4) Extreme	TIL ₂₄ ≥9				3919	1581	TIL ₂₄ ≥11	

 Table 3. Optimised ranges for TIL categorisation

Abbreviations: ICP=intracranial pressure, ICU=intensive care unit, TIL=Therapy Intensity Level scale,^{8,9} TIL^(Basic)=condensed TIL scale.⁸ The numeric definition of each scale is listed in Table 1, and the calculation of daily (e.g., TIL₂₄), maximum (e.g., TIL_{max}), and median (e.g., TIL_{median}) scores is described in the Methods. The 95% confidence intervals of performance metrics were derived from bootstrapping with 1,000 resamples of unique patients over 100 missing value imputations. *Refractory intracranial hypertension was defined as recurrent, sustained (i.e., of at least ten minutes) increases of ICP above 20 mmHg despite medical ICP management during ICU stay. This information was recorded by attending physicians in patient discharge summaries.

[†]If a decompressive craniectomy was performed as a last resort for refractory intracranial hypertension, each of the days following the operation were also considered days of surgical ICP control.

[‡]For refractory intracranial hypertension, case counts represent the number of patients (with nonmissing values) without (i.e., No) and with (i.e., Yes) refractory intracranial hypertension. For day of surgical ICP control and TIL^(Basic)₂₄, case counts represent the number of non-missing TIL assessments not in (i.e., No) and in (i.e., Yes) the given category.

[§]Thresholds were previously proposed by the interagency panel which developed TIL based on expert opinion.⁸