

1 **A DOUBLE-BLIND, PLACEBO-CONTROLLED, RANDOMIZED, MULTI-CENTRE, PHASE III STUDY OF**
2 **MLC901 (NEUROAID II™) FOR THE TREATMENT OF COGNITIVE IMPAIRMENT AFTER MILD**
3 **TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY**

4 Prof. Pavel I. Pilipenko, MD, PhD;¹ Dr Anna A. Ivanova, MD;² Dr Yulia V. Kotsiubinskaya, MD, PhD;³
5 Prof. Vera N. Grigoryeva, MD, PhD;⁴ A/Prof. Alexey Y. Khrulev, MD, PhD;⁴ Dr Anatoly V. Skorokhodov,
6 MD;⁵ Dr Maxim M. Gavrik, MD;⁶ Dr. Nona N. Mkrtchan, MD;⁷ Prof. Marek Majdan, PhD;⁸ Prof. Peter
7 Valkovic, MD, PhD;⁹ Dr Daria Babarova, PhD;⁸ Prof. Suzanne Barker-Collo, PhD;¹⁰ A/Prof. Kelly Jones,
8 PhD;¹¹ Prof. Valery L. Feigin, MD, PhD¹¹

9

10 ¹Novosibirsk State Medical University, Novosibirsk, Russia

11 ²Municipal Polyclinic № 106 of St. Petersburg, Russia

12 ³X7 Research, St. Petersburg, Russia

13 ⁴Nizhny Novgorod Regional Clinical Hospital named after N.A. Semashko, Russia

14

15 ⁵Ivanovo Regional Clinical Hospital, Ivanovo, Russia

16 ⁶Scientific Research Center Eco Safety LLC, St. Petersburg, Russia

17 ⁷Medical Technologies Ltd, St. Petersburg, Russia

18 ⁸Institute for Global Health and Epidemiology, University in Trnava, Slovakia

19 ⁹2nd Department of Neurology, Faculty of Medicine, Comenius University in Bratislava, Slovakia

20 ¹⁰School of Psychology, The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

21 ¹¹National Institute for Stroke and Applied Neurosciences, School of Clinical Sciences, Faculty of Health
22 and Environmental Sciences, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand

23

24 **Corresponding Authors:**

25 Prof. Valery L. Feigin, MD, PhD, FRSNZ; National Institute for Stroke and Applied Neurosciences,
26 Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand. Email: valery.feigin@aut.ac.nz

27 Prof. Pavel I. Pilipenko, MD, PhD; Novosibirsk State Medical University, Novosibirsk 630091, Russia.
28 Telephone: 8 910 398 44 81. Email: ppilipenko11@gmail.com

29

30 **Word count:** 2934

31 **Figures:** 6

32 **Tables:** 2

33 **References:** 35

34 **Keywords:** traumatic brain injury, concussion, NeuroAid, cognitive deficits, quality of life, MLC901

35

36

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

37 **ABSTRACT**

38 **Introduction:** About half of the world population will suffer from a traumatic brain injury (TBI) during
39 their lifetime, of which about 90% of cases are mild TBI. About 15-40% of adults with TBI experience
40 persistent cognitive deficits, and there is a lack of proven-effective treatment to facilitate cognitive
41 recovery after mild TBI.

42 **Methods and analysis:** This randomized placebo-controlled multi-centre clinical trial aimed to
43 examine the safety and efficacy of herbal supplement MLC901 (NeuroAiD II™) on cognitive
44 functioning following mild TBI. Adults aged 18-65 years, who were 1-12-months post-mild TBI and
45 experienced cognitive impairment, were assigned to receive either MLC901 (0.8g capsules/day) or
46 placebo for 6 months in 7 research centres in Russia using centralized stratified permuted block
47 randomization. The primary outcome was cognitive functioning as assessed by an online
48 neuropsychological test (CNS Vital signs). Secondary outcomes included Rivermead Post-Concussion
49 Symptoms Questionnaire (RPQ; neurobehavioral sequelae), Health Related Quality of Life (QOLIBRI),
50 the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS), and adverse events. Assessments were completed
51 at baseline and 3-, 6-, and 9-month follow-ups. Mixed effects models of repeated measures with
52 intention to treat analysis were employed, with the primary outcome time-point of 6-months. A Least
53 Square Mean Difference (LSMD) from baseline to 3-, 6-, and 9-month follow-up was calculated with
54 95% confidence intervals (CI).

55 **Results:** One hundred and eighty-two participants (mean age 40.6±14.2 in the MLC901 group and
56 40.1±12.0 in the Placebo group, 50% and 47.8% females, respectively) were included in the analysis.
57 Baseline variables were comparable between groups. Multivariate mixed effects model analysis did
58 not reveal significant improvements in complex attention (LSMD=-1.18 [95% CI -5.40; 3.03; p=0.58]
59 and other cognitive domains at 6-months in the MLC901 group compared to the Placebo group. There
60 were significant improvements in RPQ, QOLIBRI, anxiety and depression in the MLC901 group
61 compared to the Placebo group at 6 and 9-months (LSMD -4.36 [-6.46; -2.26] and -4.07 [-6.22; -1.92],
62 4.84 [1.58; 8.10] and 3.74 [0.44; 7.03], -1.50 [-2.29; -0.71] and -0.96 [-1.84; -0.08], -1.14 [-1.92; -0.35]
63 and -1.14 [-1.94; -0.34], respectively. No serious adverse events were reported.

64 **Conclusions:** The 6-month treatment with MLC901 did not result in a statistically significant difference
65 with placebo for CNS-VS measurement of complex attention and other cognitive outcomes in
66 individuals with mild TBI. The study showed a clinically and statistically significant improvement in all
67 clinical scales assessed by the investigators (post-concussion symptoms, quality of life, and mood).
68 This study showed that post-mild TBI treatment with MLC901 0.8g/day is safe.

69 **Trial registration:** ClinicalTrials.gov identifier NCT04861688.

70 **Keywords:** efficacy, safety, MLC901, mild TBI, cognition, randomized controlled trial.

71

72

73

74 INTRODUCTION

75 Traumatic brain injury (TBI) is a leading cause of disability and death in young adults globally.^{1,2} It was
76 estimated that about half of the population has suffered from a TBI at some moment in their life.
77 There are about 50 million people experiencing new TBI annually and the burden of TBI is increasing
78 globally.^{1,3} The annual global cost of TBI is already immense and estimated to be around 400 billion
79 US dollars.¹

80 Injury to the brain is caused by the mechanical impact of the brain onto the bony surfaces within the
81 skull or from penetration of objects into the skull and diffuse axonal injury as a result of rotational
82 forces as the brain moves within the skull. As a result of injury, brain cells can be damaged or die,
83 affecting the functioning of areas that they help to control (e.g., causing neurological/cognitive
84 deficits). The most frequent sites of cerebral contusion in closed TBI are the temporal and basal-
85 frontal regions, both of which are associated with cognitive functioning.^{4,5}

86 Around 90% of all TBI cases are mild TBI, and persistent cognitive deficits have been reported to occur
87 in up to half of adults following a mild TBI and can profoundly impact a person's day-to-day
88 functioning, often affecting their ability to return to work, or impacting their capacity to engage in
89 independent living.^{5,6} The most common cognitive deficits include difficulties with complex attention,
90 executive functioning, and cognitive flexibility. After a brain injury (particularly mild injuries) many
91 people recover spontaneously as the brain mobilizes surviving elements of the central nervous system
92 in the damaged area to facilitate recovery. However often this spontaneous recovery process is
93 insufficient, and people continue to experience cognitive, emotional and physical impairments.⁷⁻⁹

94 Despite the huge and increasing burden from mild TBI, there is still no proven-effective
95 pharmacological treatment to improve post-TBI cognitive functioning and further research into
96 potential new interventions is needed. Due to the complexity of the recovery processes involved after
97 injury to the brain, there is increasing evidence that the search for a single molecule which specifically
98 acts on a single target is not optimal.¹⁰ Combination therapies comprising more than one active
99 ingredient may offer a better treatment strategy.¹¹ Herbal medicine may represent a valuable
100 resource in such a search for safe and effective therapy.

101 NeuroAiD II™ (MLC901) is a botanical product, derived from traditional Chinese medicine, and
102 containing extracts from 9 herbal ingredients. It is a simplified formulation of a predecessor product,
103 MLC601 (NeuroAiD I) which has been used in humans for many years, notably to facilitate functional
104 recovery of patients in the post-acute phase of stroke. The herbal components of MLC601 and MLC901
105 are the same. In in-vitro and animal experiments, both products have been shown to protect brain
106 cells from dying after injury, and to stimulate generation of new neural cells, connections and
107 pathways.¹²⁻¹⁵ In a recent pilot placebo-controlled randomized trial conducted in New Zealand,
108 MLC901 (NeuroAiD II™) demonstrated significant improvement in complex attention and executive
109 functioning in individuals who had experienced some cognitive impairment after mild TBI.¹⁶ That pilot
110 trial informed the design of the current study.

111 METHODS

112 *Overview of design*

113 The **Safety and efficacy of MLC901 in cognitive recovery post traumatic BRAin Injury (SAMURAI)** study
114 was a phase III double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized multicentre clinical trial in five
115 cities/centres in Russia. The study protocol and methodology has been previously published.¹⁷ The

116 primary aim of the study was to determine the cognitive benefit of using NeuroAiD II™ (MLC901) for
117 a treatment of 6 months, compared to placebo, in adult individuals who had recently suffered a mild-
118 TBI, and to assess its safety.

119 The primary efficacy outcome of the study was the measure of complex attention at month 6, one of
120 the numerous parameters included in the battery of measures assessed by using the CNS-VS tool, an
121 online auto-administered computerized cognitive test.^{18,19} Secondary outcomes included other
122 parameters of the CNS-VS (executive functioning, processing speed, memory [visual and verbal] and
123 reaction time), as well as four commonly used investigator assessment clinical outcome scales for TBI
124 patients, namely post-concussion symptoms (as measured by Rivermead Post-Concussion Symptoms
125 Questionnaire [RPQ]),²⁰ Health Related Quality of Life After Brain Injury (QOLIBRI),²¹ anxiety and
126 depression (as measured by the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale [HADS]),^{22,23} and adverse
127 events.

128 The investigational product, active or placebo capsules, were identical in colour, shape and taste, and
129 the investigators and study team remained blind to group allocation throughout the trial. An
130 independent Data Safety and Monitoring Committee (DSMC) ensured study oversight and protection
131 of patients' safety, by reviewing overall data during its meetings, while remaining blinded to treatment
132 allocation. No interim analysis was performed.

133 The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles of good clinical practice, the
134 Declaration of Helsinki²⁴ and all local regulations. SAMURAI was approved by the Ethics Committee of
135 the Ministry of Health of the Russian Federation on 9 March 2021 (Dossier Ref#58074, meeting's
136 protocol #268) and all local Ethics Committees. SAMURAI is registered on ClinicalTrials.gov identifier
137 NCT04861688. Only study participants who provided a written informed consent dated and signed at
138 the presence of the study investigator were randomised.

139 ***Study participants and treatments***

140 The SAMURAI trial included 182 adults of 18-65 years of age who experienced a mild TBI in the past 1
141 to 12 months, had cognitive functioning difficulties as indicated by a score of >30 on the Cognitive
142 Failures Questionnaire²⁵ (consistent with criteria in the pilot study),¹⁶ and gave informed consent to
143 participate in the study. Mild TBI was defined according to the WHO criteria (Glasgow Coma Score
144 13-15 as assessed on scene, on admission and over next 3 days; loss of consciousness for up to 30
145 minutes; being dazed and confused at the time of injury or post-TBI amnesia of < 24 hours duration).
146 Exclusion criteria: (1) co-existing severe co-morbidity, including end-stage renal failure, spinal cord
147 injury, significant substance abuse, severe liver disease, significant mental illnesses, diabetes requiring
148 insulin injections, severe agitation, advanced cancer or other severe conditions with life expectancy
149 of less than 5 years, as judged by the study investigator (neurologist); (2) current participation in
150 another clinical trial within 30 days; (3) women who were pregnant or who had a positive urine
151 pregnancy test or breast-feeding; and (4) not fluent in Russian language or have aphasia/dysphasia.

152 Eligible individuals were randomized using online computer system to receive either the NeuroAiD II™
153 (MLC901) 2 capsules (0.4g/capsule) or matched placebo orally 3 times a day for 6 months using 1:1
154 stratified permuted block randomization (stratified by study center, time since injury [1-3 months/4-
155 12 months] and gender).

156 ***Outcomes***

157 The primary outcome measure was complex attention, as measured by an online CNS Vital signs
158 computerized cognitive test,^{18,19} at 6 months post randomization. CNS Vital Signs is a computerized
159 neurocognitive test battery that was developed as a routine clinical screening instrument.¹⁸ During
160 CNS-VS testing (for measuring primary and secondary cognitive outcomes), after the patient
161 completes the seven cognitive tests, the system automatically calculates scores for domains. Speed
162 and accuracy on six tests were used to calculate the level of functioning across the following cognitive
163 domains: complex attention, executive function, verbal memory, visual memory, processing speed,
164 and reaction time. Raw scores were transformed to standard scores, with a mean of 100 and standard
165 deviation (SD) of 10, based on normative data to account for age and gender effects using an
166 integrated algorithm. Scores <90 indicate below average levels of functioning, with higher scores
167 indicative of better cognitive functioning. The psychometric characteristics of the tests in the CNS-VS
168 battery are very similar to the characteristics of the conventional neuropsychological tests upon which
169 they are based.^{26,27} CNS Vital Signs has demonstrated good discriminant and concurrent validity with
170 conventional neuropsychological tests¹⁸ and is sensitive to impairments across TBI severity, with
171 evidence of good test–retest reliability.^{19,28}

172 The Rivermead Post-Concussion Symptoms Questionnaire (RPQ)²⁰ assesses neurobehavioral sequelae
173 and consists of two subscales including the RPQ3, which includes symptoms of headaches, dizziness
174 and nausea, and the RPQ13 comprising 13 other common symptoms such as restlessness, noise and
175 light sensitivity, sleep disturbance, blurred vision and balance difficulties. Participants are to state the
176 extent to which they experience each symptom in comparison to the time before accident, on a 5-
177 point scale ranging from 0 (not experienced) to 4 (severe problem). The two subscales have revealed
178 good test-re-test reliability and adequate external construct validity.^{29,30} A total score ranges from 0
179 to 64 with higher values indicating greater symptom severity.

180 The Quality of Life after Brain Injury measure (QOLIBRI)²¹ is an internationally validated tool to assess
181 quality of life after brain injury.³¹ It contains two parts. The first part assesses satisfaction with health-
182 related quality of life and is composed of six overall items and 29 items allocated to four subscales:
183 thinking, feelings, autonomy, and social aspects. The second part, devoted to “bothered” questions,
184 is composed of 12 items in two subscales: negative feelings and restrictions. QOLIBRI total scores <60
185 indicate low or impaired health-related quality of life.³² The QOLIBRI showed good construct validity
186 in the TBI group.³³

187 Mood was assessed by the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS).³⁴ The scale has been widely
188 used for assessing levels of anxiety and depression in patients with medical problems including TBI.³⁵
189 The scale consists of 14 statements (e.g., I feel tense or ‘wound up’) that the participant is asked to
190 rate in regards how they have been feeling in the past week, yielding separate subscale scores for
191 anxiety and depression. Scoring for each item ranges from zero to three, with three denoting highest
192 anxiety or depression level. The subscale scores range from 0-21 (0-7 normal, 8-10 mild, 11-14
193 moderate and 15-21 severe). The measure has demonstrated good test-retest reliability³⁶ and good
194 sensitivity and specificity.³⁷

195 Adverse events were monitored at each follow-up assessment visit. An adverse event was defined as
196 any untoward medical occurrence in a study participant that does not necessarily have a causal
197 relationship with the treatment. Assessments of primary and secondary outcomes were completed at
198 baseline and 1-, 3-, 6-, and 9-month follow-up.

199 ***Statistical analyses and power calculations***

200 Socio-demographic and clinical characteristics of the study participants at baseline were evaluated by
201 tests of difference. For the analysis of primary and secondary endpoints, a mixed effects model (PROC
202 MIXED)³⁸ was used with adjustments for baseline and potential covariates, with the participants and
203 sites used as the random effects. Model selection was undertaken with each outcome using standard
204 selection heuristics. Covariates were selected based on improving the overall efficiency of the model.
205 Regardless, baseline value of the outcome variable, age, gender, time since injury (1-3 months/4-12
206 months) and study center were included as covariates in the mixed effects model. Descriptive statistics
207 were used to describe changes in complex attention and other outcome measures in the MLC901 and
208 Placebo groups, as well as mean values and SDs for non-cognitive outcomes obtained by the method
209 of least squares from the mixed effects model. The Wilcoxon test was used to evaluate differences in
210 ordinal items of outcomes. Safety and tolerability were assessed by the frequency and nature of any
211 potential adverse events recorded. Levels of adherence to the treatment regime were determined
212 based on the self-reported number of capsules not taken. Analyses were based on the intention to
213 treat principle.

214 The required sample size for the trial was based on the results of the pilot double-blind, place-
215 controlled randomized clinical trial in New Zealand (n=78) evaluating the effect of MLC901 versus
216 placebo using CNS Vital Signs.¹⁶ It was estimated that a sample of 182 participants (with 1:1 group
217 ratio) would provide 80% statistical power (two sided $\alpha=0.05$, $\beta=0.20$) to detect a clinically significant
218 10 points difference²⁸ (SD=20) between placebo and MLC901 in the change from baseline to month
219 6 for the CNS Vital Signs complex attention score, assuming 30% non-compliance/lost to follow-up.

220 RESULTS

221 The trial results were subject of an abstract presented at the World Congress of Neurology in 2023.³⁹
222 Of the 811 individuals assessed for eligibility, 182 participants (22%) were enrolled and randomized
223 into the study (Figure 1), with the retention rate of 98% at 9-month follow-up (one participant was
224 lost to follow-up and three participants decided to withdraw from the study for unknown reasons).
225 There were no significant differences between the 2 groups regarding demographic and other baseline
226 characteristics, as shown in Table 1. The majority of mild TBIs were caused by falls (61%-62%). The
227 median time from TBI to inclusion was 3 months. Previous history of TBI was reported in 32.6% of the
228 MLC901 group and 40.0% of the Placebo group participants. About half of the randomized participants
229 in both groups were females.

230 Twenty-seven participants in the MLC901 group (29.3%) and 34 participants in the Placebo group
231 (37.8%) reported side effects during the 6 months post-randomization (Table 2). In regard to the most
232 common side effect, in the intervention group, eight participants reported gastrointestinal symptoms
233 (8.8%), as compared to three participants in the control group (3.3%). No serious adverse events
234 (death, hospitalization, disability) were reported in either group. Overall adherence, as measured by
235 returned pill counting, in taking the capsules varied between 99.1% (SD 2.5) for MLC901 and 98.4%
236 (SD 10.7) for placebo at 1 month, 99.7% (SD 3.8) for MLC901 and 98.6% (SD 4.5) at 3-months and
237 98.9% (SD 3.9) for MLC901 and 99.5% (SD 4.3) for placebo at 6-months.

238 The assessment of cognitive impairment made by the patient by using the CNS-VS tool did not reveal
239 a statistically significant difference between placebo and MLC901 (Table 3). This was the case for the
240 primary outcome (change from month 6 to baseline in complex attention (LSMD=-1.18 [95% CI -5.40;
241 3.03], $p=0.58$), as well as for the other CNS-VS derived cognitive parameters (executive functioning,
242 visual memory, verbal memory, processing speed, or reaction time).

243 Participants randomized to receive MLC901 had statistically and clinically significant improvements in
244 post-concussion symptoms, quality of life, anxiety and depression at 6- and 9-months post-
245 randomization compared to participants randomized to receive Placebo (Table 3; Figures 1-4).
246 Importantly, the improvement continued up to 9 months of follow-up although active treatment was
247 stopped at 6-months post-randomization. By the 9month follow-up the Rivermead Post-Concussion
248 Symptoms score improved in the MLC901 group by 47% (95% CI 41% - 53%), while in the Placebo
249 group it improved by only 29% (95% CI 22% - 35%), quality of life improved in the MLC901 group
250 by 22% (95% CI 18% - 26%) and only 14% (95% CI 11% - 18%) in the Placebo group, anxiety score
251 improved in MLC901 group by 49% (95% CI 41% - 57%) and only 42% (95% CI 33% - 51%) in the
252 Placebo group, and depression score reduced by 48% (95% CI 39% - 57%) in the MLC901 group and
253 only 31% (95% CI 22% - 40%) in the Placebo group. Pre-determined subgroup sensitivity analysis with
254 exclusion of missing values, outliers by age, sex at birth, history of cancer, previous TBI, and time since
255 mild TBI event onset did not reveal any significant difference in cognitive outcomes between the
256 groups (these results are not shown).

257

258 **DISCUSSION**

259 To the best of our knowledge this placebo-controlled randomized full-scale trial is the first to
260 determine efficacy of MLC901 (2 capsules 3 times [0.8 g a day] a day for 6 months) on cognitive
261 functioning and post-mild TBI symptoms compared to a matched placebo in adults 16-65 years old
262 with mild TBI. The trial failed to demonstrate a statistically significant difference in the CNS-VS
263 computerized assessment of complex attention (Figure 1) and other CNS-VS measures between the
264 MLC901 group and the Placebo group (Supplement Table 1). However, the assessment of post-TBI
265 symptoms using standard clinical non-cognitive outcome scales used in this setting has shown
266 statistically significant difference at both 6 and 9 months in favour of MLC901. These findings were
267 consistent for all clinical outcome scales used in the trial.

268 Up to 20% of people with mild TBI show persistent post-concussion symptoms,⁴⁰ about one third of
269 people with mild TBI experience reduced quality of life,^{31,41} and many of them suffer from anxiety or
270 depression.⁴² Analysis of common post-TBI somatic symptoms in our trial measured by the Rivermead
271 Post-Concussion Questionnaire (headaches, dizziness, noise sensitivity, sleep disturbance, fatigue,
272 irritability, depression, poor memory, poor concentration, blurred vision, light sensitivity, double
273 vision, restlessness),²⁰ quality of life (as measured by the Quality of Life after Brain Injury measure -
274 QOLIBRI),²¹ anxiety and depression (as measured by the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale)²²
275 showed clinically and statistically significant improvement in the MLC901 group compared to the
276 Placebo group: LSMD=-4.36 (-6.46 to -2.26); 4.84 (1.58 to 8.10), and -1.50 (-2.29 to -0.71) and -1.14 (-
277 1.92 to -0.35), respectively (Figures 2-5). Importantly, the improvements tended to continue and were
278 even enhanced at 9-months of follow-up while the active treatment was stopped at 6 months post-
279 randomization, suggesting that the treatment somehow corrected the pathophysiological
280 mechanisms responsible for these symptoms and triggered a self-recovering process. It remains
281 unclear how long this recovery process might continue in both groups.

282 The trial also showed an excellent safety and tolerability profile. The number of side effects (none of
283 them being considered as serious adverse event [SAE]) was low, and they were more often observed
284 in the placebo group than in MLC901 group (Table 2). None of the side effects required discontinuation

285 of the treatment. Moreover, adherence to the trial medications across the 6 months of the treatment
286 was close to 100%.

287 Comparison of results of this trial with the previous pilot placebo-controlled trial of MLC901 in New
288 Zealand¹⁶ showed that, contrary to the finding of the earlier study, the full-scale trial did not show a
289 statistically significant improvement in complex attention, as measured by the computerized CNS-VS
290 tool. However, the CNS-VS tool is relatively complex to use, and there is very little experience of its
291 use in Russia. It is therefore possible that some questions and instructions used in performing the tests
292 were not done properly in the study in Russia.

293 This assumption is sorted by the observation of statistically significant improvement in some
294 important items of the commonly used and well validated in Russia Rivermead Post-Concussion
295 Questionnaire,⁴³ specifically forgetfulness/poor memory (P=0.008 at 6 months and P=0.006 at 9
296 months of follow-up) and concentration function (P=0.002 at 6 months and P=0.049 at 9 months of
297 follow-up) in the MLC901 group compared to the Placebo group. A cognitive sub-item of the
298 Rivermead Post-Concussion Questionnaire, the speed of processing information (question “taking
299 longer to think”), also demonstrated a statistically significant improvement) in the MLC901 group
300 compared to the Placebo group (P=0.009; for details see Supplement Table 2). This is a particularly
301 important clinical outcome, because speed processing is shown to be one of the most important
302 indicators of diffuse axonal injury and TBI severity.^{44,45} The lack of statistical difference obtained for
303 the CNS-VS endpoints in mild TBI subjects may also be related to the insufficient ability of the CNS VS
304 to detect subtle changes in cognition 6 to 9 months after a mild TBI, as there is evidence that long
305 after a mild TBI, high-functioning young adults invoke a strategy of delaying their identification of
306 targets in order to maintain, and facilitate, accuracy on cognitively demanding tasks.⁴⁶

307 However, both trials showed no statistically significant effect of MLC901 on other cognitive domains
308 of CNS Vital Signs. Although both trials were not statistically powered to reliably assess effect of
309 MLC901 on post-concussion symptoms, quality of life and mood, the direction of the treatment effect
310 on these secondary outcomes in both trials and highly statistically significant and consistent treatment
311 effect of MLC901 on these secondary outcomes in the full-scale trial across all follow-up time-points
312 (including 3 months after cessation of the treatment) may suggest that this treatment effect may not
313 be just by chance. Sensitivity analysis in various age and sex groups, different time points after TBI
314 onset and randomization, and exclusion of outliers did not significantly change the positive treatment
315 effect of MLC901 on post-concussion symptoms, quality of life, and mood, thus supporting the
316 robustness of the results. These observations deserve further investigation.

317 Although our trial met most of the criteria for ‘gold standard’ trials (placebo-controlled, double-
318 blinded, proper quality randomization technique, high generalizability of the trial results [wide
319 inclusion and narrow exclusion criteria, heterogeneous study population with multi-centre-settings],
320 fully-statistically powered with a relatively large sample size, and very low [$<10\%$] attrition rate), it
321 was not free from limitations. The main limitation of the trial was lack of use and absence of validation
322 of the computerized CNS-Vital Signs test in Russia. CNS-VS is also only a cognitive screening tool, not
323 validated for treatment evaluation. CNS-Vital Signs data was also missing for a small number of
324 participants in both groups (5 in MLC901 group and 5 in Placebo group) and outliers in regard to
325 missing data in some of the recruitment sites (i.e., the majority of missing data 8 [80%] came from a
326 single site). However, sensitivity analyses with various assumptions, including exclusion of outliers, did
327 not significantly influence the neurocognitive test results. We also did not record adverse effects right

328 after cessation of the experimental treatment (6-month post-randomisation), but only at 9 months
329 post-randomization.

330 In summary, although the trial was negative for the primary outcome, it was highly positive for other
331 important clinical post-TBI outcomes. Given the perfect safety and tolerability of MLC901 and absence
332 of other proven effective medications for treatment post-mild TBI symptoms, mood and health-
333 related quality of life, a trial treatment with MLC901 in selected mild TBI adults may be worth
334 considering for reducing post-concussion symptoms, anxiety/depression and improving health-
335 related quality of life.

336 **Authors contributions**

337 Study conception and design was primarily performed by Prof. Pavel I. Pilipenko, MD, PhD and Prof.
338 Valery L. Feigin, MD, PhD, who both drafted the first version of the manuscript. Study conduct,
339 including screening of patients, obtaining written informed consent, follow-up and assessment of
340 safety and efficacy and data collection was done by the study Lead Principal Investigator Prof. Pavel
341 I. Pilipenko, MD, PhD; and teams lead by Principal Investigators Dr Anna A. Ivanova, MD; Dr Yulia V.
342 Kotsiubinskaya, MD, PhD; Prof. Vera N. Grigoryeva, MD, PhD; Dr Alexey Y. Khrulev, MD, PhD; Dr
343 Anatoly V. Skorokhodov, MD; Dr Maxim M. Gavrik, MD, Dr. Nona N. Mkrtchan, MD. Monitoring, Data
344 management and statistical analysis were done by an independent CRO “Atlant Clinical”. The
345 Independent Data Monitoring Committee (IDMC) was chaired by Prof. Marek Majdan, PhD, with
346 committee members being Prof. Peter Valkovic, PhD and Dr Daria Babarova, PhD. Overall scientific
347 oversight for the study was provided by Prof. Suzanne Barker-Collo, PhD; A/Prof. Kelly Jones, PhD;
348 Prof. Valery L. Feigin, MD, PhD. All authors have reviewed, provided an intellectual input into the
349 content and approved the final manuscript.

350

351 **Disclosures**

352 The study was funded by Moleac Pte Ltd, Singapore who manufactures the MLC901 supplement.
353 The authors declare no financial or other conflicts of interest.

354

355 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

356 We would like to acknowledge the financial support of Moleac Pte Ltd and thank the participants for
357 their time and interest in taking part in this study.

358

359

360

361 **Table 1. Baseline demographic and medical characteristics of the study participants**

362

363

Characteristics	MLC901 Group N=92	Placebo Group N=90
Age (yrs) mean (SD)	40.6 (14.2)	40.1 (12.0)
Males (%)	50.0	47.8
Caucasian ethnicity (%)	100.0	97.8
Tertiary education or above (%)	50.0	62.2
Months since injury (median)	3.0	2.9
Full-time pre-TBI work (%)	87.0	94.5
Married/Partner (%)	69.6	80.0
Mechanism of TBI injury (%)		
Fall	60.9	62.2
Motor vehicle accident	14.1	13.3
Violence	9.8	11.1
Sport trauma	12.0	6.7
Other	3.3	6.7
Prior TBI (%)	32.6	40.0
Other previous injuries sustained (%)	47.8	55.5
Baseline CNS below average (%)	57.6	52.2

364

365

366 Table 2. Adverse effects in the MLC901 and placebo groups at 9 months post-randomization

Adverse events	MLC901 Group N=92	Placebo Group N=90
Headache	8 (8.9%)	2 (2.2%)
Fatigue	6 (6.7%)	3 (3.3%)
Respiratory tract infection viral	5 (5.6%)	4 (4.3%)
COVID-19	4 (4.4%)	2 (2.2%)
Dizziness	3 (3.3%)	0
Nausea	1 (1.1%)	2 (2.2%)
Abdominal discomfort	0	2 (2.2%)
Abdominal pain	0	2 (2.2%)
Alanine aminotransferase increased	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)
Aspartate aminotransferase increased	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)
Bronchitis	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)
Diarrhoea	0	2 (2.2%)
Nasopharyngitis	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)
Respiratory tract infection	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.1%)
Abdominal distension	1 (1.1%)	0
Anterograde amnesia	0	1 (1.1%)
Asthenia	0	1 (1.1%)
Biliary colic	0	1 (1.1%)
Cholelithiasis	0	1 (1.1%)
Decreased appetite	0	1 (1.1%)
Dermatitis acneiform	1 (1.1%)	0
Disturbance in attention	1 (1.1%)	0
Eye injury	1 (1.1%)	0
Haematuria	0	1 (1.1%)
Numbness in arms or legs	0	1 (1.1%)
Hyposmia	0	1 (1.1%)
Hypothyroidism	0	1 (1.1%)
Increased appetite	0	1 (1.1%)
Insomnia	0	1 (1.1%)
Irritable bowel syndrome	1 (1.1%)	0
Laryngitis	1 (1.1%)	0
Memory impairment	1 (1.1%)	0
Osteoarthritis	0	1 (1.1%)
Otitis media acute	1 (1.1%)	0
Photophobia	1 (1.1%)	0
Rhinitis	1 (1.1%)	0
Rhinitis allergic	0	1 (1.1%)
Sleep disorder	0	1 (1.1%)
Spinal pain	0	1 (1.1%)
Taste disorder	0	1 (1.1%)
Tinnitus	1 (1.1%)	0
Tonsillitis	1 (1.1%)	0
Tremor	1 (1.1%)	0
Vertigo	0	1 (1.1%)
Viral infection	0	1 (1.1%)
Vision blurred	1 (1.1%)	0

367 **Table 3. Least square mean difference, with 95% CI, in primary and secondary outcomes between**
 368 **MLC901 group and Placebo group at 6 and 9 months after randomisation**
 369

Outcomes	Least Square mean difference (95% CI) MLC901 vs Placebo			
	6 months	<i>P</i>	9 months	<i>P</i>
Cognitive functioning				
Complex attention	-1.18 (-5.40 to 3.03)	0.58	-0.53 (-4.54 to 3.47)	0.79
Executive functioning	-0.48 (-4.63 to 3.67)	0.82	0.34 (-3.67 to 4.34)	0.87
Visual memory	-2.81 (-7.67 to 2.04)	0.25	-0.96 (-5.89 to 3.98)	0.70
Verbal memory	0.64 (-3.27 to 4.56)	0.74	-1.60 (-6.58 to 3.39)	0.53
Processing speed	2.88 (-2.38 to 8.13)	0.28	1.00 (-3.79 to 5.79)	0.68
Reaction time	-0.38 (-4.86 to 4.11)	0.87	0.23 (-4.49 to 4.95)	0.92
Rivermead Post-Concussion Symptoms Questionnaire	-4.36 (-6.46 to -2.26)	0.0001	-4.07 (-6.22 to -1.92)	0.0003
Change in Health-related quality of life questionnaire	4.84 (1.58 to 8.10)	0.0038	3.74 (0.44 to 7.03)	0.0264
Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale				
Anxiety	-1.50 (-2.29 to -0.71)	0.0003	-0.96 (-1.84 to -0.08)	0.0333
Depression	-1.14 (-1.92 to -0.35)	0.0050	-1.14 (-1.94 to -0.34)	0.0054

370

371

Figure 1. CONSORT diagram of study participants






Figure 2. Changes in complex attention by CNS Vital Signs across the follow-up time points in MLC901 group compared to Placebo group across 9 months of follow-up period




Least square mean difference at 6 months = -1.18 (95% CI -5.40 to 3.03); p=0.58

Figure 3. Changes in the Rivermead Scale across the follow-up time points in MLC901 group compared to Placebo group across 9 months of follow-up period




Least square mean difference at 6 months = 4.36 (-6.46 to -2.26); p = 0.0001

Figure 4. Changes in the Quality of Life after Brain Injury measured across the follow-up time points in MLC901 group compared to Placebo group across 9 months of follow-up period




Least square mean difference at 6 months = 4.84 (1.58 to 8.10); p = 0.0038

Figure 5. Changes in the anxiety score, as measured by the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, across the follow-up time points in MLC901 group compared to Placebo group across 9 months of follow-up period



Least square mean difference at 6 months = -1.50 (-2.29 to -0.71); $p = 0.0003$

Figure 6. Changes in the depression score, as measured by the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, across the follow-up time points in MLC901 group compared to Placebo group across 9 months of follow-up period



Least square mean difference at 6 months = -1.14 (-1.92 to -0.35); p= 0.0050

References

1. Maas AIR, Menon DK, Adelson PD, Andelic N, Bell MJ, Belli A, . . . Zumbo F. Traumatic brain injury: integrated approaches to improve prevention, clinical care, and research. *The Lancet Neurology*. 2017;16:987-1048. doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(17)30371-X
2. Langlois JA, Rutland-Brown W, Wald MM. The epidemiology and impact of traumatic brain injury: a brief overview. *Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation*. 2006;21:375-378.
3. Feigin VF, Theadom A, Barker-Collo SL, Starkey N, McPherson K, Kahan M, . . . Group ftBS. Incidence of traumatic brain injury in New Zealand: a population-based study. *The Lancet Neurology*. 2013;12:53-64.
4. Halliwell B. Reactive oxygen species and the central nervous system. *Journal of Neurochemistry*. 1992;59:1609-1623.
5. McMahan P, Hricik A, Yue JK, Puccio AM, Inoue T, Lingsma HF, . . . Vassar MJ. Symptomatology and Functional Outcome in Mild Traumatic Brain Injury: Results from the Prospective TRACK-TBI Study. *J Neurotrauma*. 2013;31 Epub ahead of print.
6. Theadom A, Parag V, Dowell T, McPherson K, Starkey N, Barker-Collo S, . . . Group BR. Persistent problems 1 year after mild traumatic brain injury: a longitudinal population study in New Zealand. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2016;66:e16-23. doi: 10.3399/bjgp16X683161
7. Iverson GL. Outcome from mild traumatic brain injury. *Current opinion in psychiatry*. 2005;18:301-317. doi: 10.1097/01.yco.0000165601.29047.ae
8. Lannsjö M, af Geijerstam JL, Johansson U, Bring J, Borg J. Prevalence and structure of symptoms at 3 months after mild traumatic brain injury in a national cohort. *Brain Inj*. 2009;23:213-219.
9. Zumstein MA, Moser M, Mottini M, Ott SR, Sadowski-Cron C, Radanov BP, . . . Exadaktylos A. Long-term outcome in patients with mild traumatic brain injury: a prospective observational study. *Journal of Trauma*. 2011;7:120-127.
10. Lynch, D.G.; Narayan, R.K.; Li, C. Multi-Mechanistic Approaches to the Treatment of Traumatic Brain Injury: A Review. *J. Clin. Med.* 2023, 12, 2179. <https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202302.0471/v1>.
11. Kawata K, Rettke DJ, Thompson C, Mannix R, Bazarian JJ, Datta D. Effectiveness of biomedical interventions on the chronic stage of traumatic brain injury: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Front Neurol*. 2024;15:1321239. doi: 10.3389/fneur.2024.1321239
12. Tsai MC, Chang CP, Peng SW, Jhuang KS, Fang YH, Lin MT, . . . Tsao TC. Therapeutic efficacy of Neuro AiD™ (MLC 601), a traditional Chinese medicine, in experimental traumatic brain injury. *J Neuroimmune Pharmacol*. 2015;10:45-54. doi: 10.1007/s11481-014-9570-0
13. Ranuh I, Sari GM, Utomo B, Suroto NS, Fauzi AA. Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Efficacy of MLC901 (NeuroAiD II(TM)) for Acute Ischemic Brain Injury in Animal Models. *J Evid Based Integr Med*. 2021;26:2515690x211039219. doi: 10.1177/2515690x211039219
14. Heurteaux C, Gandin C, Borsotto M, Widmann C, Brau F, Lhuillier M, . . . Lazdunski M. Neuroprotective and neuroproliferative activities of NeuroAid (MLC601, MLC901), a Chinese medicine, in vitro and in vivo. *Neuropharmacology*. 2010;58:987-1001. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropharm.2010.01.001
15. Quintard H, Borsotto M, Veyssiere J, Gandin C, Labbal F, Widmann C, . . . Heurteaux C. MLC901, a traditional Chinese medicine protects the brain against global ischemia. *Neuropharmacology*. 2011;61:622-631. doi: 10.1016/j.neuropharm.2011.05.003
16. Theadom A, Barker-Collo S, Jones KM, Parmar P, Bhattacharjee R, Feigin VL. MLC901 (NeuroAiD II) for cognition after traumatic brain injury: a pilot randomized clinical trial. *Eur J Neurol*. 2018;25:1055-e1082. doi: 10.1111/ene.13653

17. Pilipenko P, Ivanova AA, Kotsiubinskaya YV, Feigin V, Majdan M, Grigoryeva VN, . . . Khrulev AY. Randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled study investigating Safety and efficacy of MLC901 in post-traumatic brain injury: the SAMURAI study protocol. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12:e059167. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-059167
18. Gualtieri CT, Johnson LG. Reliability and validity of a computerized neurocognitive test battery, CNS Vital Signs. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*. 2006;21:623-643.
19. Gualtieri CT, Johnson LG, Benedict KB. Psychometric and clinical properties of a new, computerized neurocognitive assessment battery. In: *American Neuropsychiatric Association Annual Meeting*. Bal Harbor, FL; 2004.
20. King NS, Crawford S, Wenden FJ, Moss NE, Wade DT. The Rivermead Post Concussion Symptoms Questionnaire: a measure of symptoms commonly experienced after head injury and its reliability. *Journal of Neurology*. 1995;242:587-592.
21. Von Steinbuechel N, Petersen C, Bullinger M. Assessment of health-related quality of life in persons after traumatic brain injury - Development of the Qolibri, a specific measure. In; 2005:43-49.
22. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*. 1983;67:361-370.
23. Bjelland I, Dahl AA, Haug TT, Neckelmann D. The validity of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. An updated literature review. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*. 2002;52:69-77.
24. International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH). ICH Harmonised Guideline Integrated Addendum to ICH E6(R1): Guideline for Good Clinical Practice E6(R2); 2016. chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/E6_R2_Addendum.pdf Accessed 30 October 2023.
25. Broadbent DE, Cooper PF, FitzGerald P, Parkes KR. The Cognitive Failures Questionnaire (CFQ) and its correlates. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 1982;21:1-16.
26. Gualtieri CT, Johnson LG. Reliability and validity of a computerized neurocognitive test battery, CNS Vital Signs. *Arch Clin Neuropsychol*. 2006;21:623-643. doi: 10.1016/j.acn.2006.05.007
27. Papathanasiou A, Messinis L, Georgiou VL, Papathanasopoulos P. Cognitive impairment in relapsing remitting and secondary progressive multiple sclerosis patients: efficacy of a computerized cognitive screening battery. *ISRN Neurol*. 2014;2014:151379. doi: 10.1155/2014/151379
28. Gualtieri CT, Johnson LG. A computerized test battery sensitive to mild and severe brain injury. *Medscape journal of medicine*. 2008;10:90.
29. Eyres S, Carey A, Gilworth G, Neumann V, Tennant A. Construct validity and reliability of the Rivermead Post-Concussion Symptoms Questionnaire. *Clin Rehabil*. 2005;19:878-887. doi: 10.1191/0269215505cr905oa
30. King NS, Crawford S, Wenden FJ, Moss NE, Wade DT. The Rivermead Post Concussion Symptoms Questionnaire: a measure of symptoms commonly experienced after head injury and its reliability. *J Neurol*. 1995;242:587-592. doi: 10.1007/BF00868811
31. Rauen K, Späni CB, Tartaglia MC, Ferretti MT, Reichelt L, Probst P, . . . Plesnila N. Quality of life after traumatic brain injury: a cross-sectional analysis uncovers age- and sex-related differences over the adult life span. *GeroScience*. 2021;43:263-278. doi: 10.1007/s11357-020-00273-2
32. Wilson L, Marsden-Loftus I, Koskinen S, Bakx W, Bullinger M, Formisano R, . . . Truelle JL. Interpreting Quality of Life after Brain Injury Scores: Cross-Walk with the Short Form-36. *J Neurotrauma*. 2017;34:59-65. doi: 10.1089/neu.2015.4287

33. von Steinbuechel N, Wilson L, Gibbons H, Hawthorne G, Hofer S, Schmidt S, . . . Force QT. Quality of Life after Brain Injury (QOLIBRI): scale validity and correlates of quality of life. *J Neurotrauma*. 2010;27:1157-1165. doi: 10.1089/neu.2009.1077
34. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. 1983;67:361-370. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0447.1983.tb09716.x
35. Whelan-Goodinson R, Ponsford J, Schönberger M. Validity of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale to assess depression and anxiety following traumatic brain injury as compared with the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV. *J Affect Disord*. 2009;114:94-102. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2008.06.007
36. Herrmann C. International experiences with the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale--a review of validation data and clinical results. *J Psychosom Res*. 1997;42:17-41. doi: 10.1016/s0022-3999(96)00216-4
37. Bjelland I, Dahl AA, Haug TT, Neckelmann D. The validity of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. An updated literature review. *J Psychosom Res*. 2002;52:69-77. doi: 10.1016/s0022-3999(01)00296-3
38. Thiébaud R, Jacqmin-Gadda H, Chêne G, Leport C, Commenges D. Bivariate linear mixed models using SAS proc MIXED. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*. 2002;69:249-256. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-2607\(02\)00017-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-2607(02)00017-2)
39. Pilipenko PI, Ivanova AA, Kotsiubinskaya YV, Grigoryeva VN, Khrulev AY, Skorokhodov AV, . . . Feigin V. A double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomised, multi-centre, phase III study of MLC901 (neuroaid) for the treatment of cognitive impairment after mild traumatic brain injury. *Journal of the Neurological Sciences*. 2023;455:121095. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jns.2023.121095>
40. Heslot C, Azouvi P, Perdrieau V, Granger A, Lefèvre-Dognin C, Cogné M. A Systematic Review of Treatments of Post-Concussion Symptoms. *J Clin Med*. 2022;11. doi: 10.3390/jcm11206224
41. Polinder S, Haagsma JA, van Klaveren D, Steyerberg EW, van Beeck EF. Health-related quality of life after TBI: a systematic review of study design, instruments, measurement properties, and outcome. *Popul Health Metr*. 2015;13:4. doi: 10.1186/s12963-015-0037-1
42. Wang B, Zeldovich M, Rauen K, Wu YJ, Covic A, Muller I, . . . Investigators. Longitudinal Analyses of the Reciprocity of Depression and Anxiety after Traumatic Brain Injury and Its Clinical Implications. *J Clin Med*. 2021;10. doi: 10.3390/jcm10235597
43. Yrysov KB, Faizullaeva GA, Mashrapov SZ. Assessing the outcomes of mild traumatic brain injury through neurocognitive testing. *Science Magazine Scientific review Medical Sciences*. 2021:5-9.
44. Chen W, Yao C, Li S, Huang H, Zhu Z, Chen R, . . . Wang G. Cognitive impairment in diffuse axonal injury patients with favorable outcome. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*. 2023;17. doi: 10.3389/fnins.2023.1077858
45. Scheid R, Walther K, Guthke T, Preul C, von Cramon DY. Cognitive Sequelae of Diffuse Axonal Injury. *Archives of Neurology*. 2006;63:418-424. doi: 10.1001/archneur.63.3.418
46. Ozen LJ, Fernandes MA. Slowing Down after a Mild Traumatic Brain Injury: A Strategy to Improve Cognitive Task Performance? *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*. 2011;27:85-100. doi: 10.1093/arclin/acr087