

1 **Assessment of somatosensory and cognitive-motor processing time in**
2 **retired athletes with a history of repeated head trauma.**

3 Alan J. Pearce^{a*}, Doug King^{b,c}, Dawson J Kidgell^d, Ashlyn K Frazer^d,
4 Mark Tommerdahl^{e,f}, Catherine M Suter^{g,h}

5 *^a College of Science, Health and Engineering, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia; ^b*
6 *Sports Performance Research Institute New Zealand (SPRINZ), Faculty of Health and*
7 *Environmental Science, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand; ^cWolfson*
8 *Research Institute for Health and Wellbeing, Department of Sport and Exercise Sciences,*
9 *Durham University, Durham, United Kingdom, ^d Faculty of Medicine Nursing and Health*
10 *Science, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia; ^e Cortical Metrics, USA; ^f*
11 *Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of North Carolina, North Carolina,*
12 *USA; ^g Department of Neuropathology, Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, Sydney,*
13 *Australia; ^h Brain and Mind Centre, University Sydney, Camperdown, Australia*

14

15 *Corresponding Author:

16 A/Prof Alan Pearce PhD
17 College of Science, Health and Engineering
18 La Trobe University
19 Kingsbury Avenue, Bundoora, Melbourne
20 Victoria, AUSTRALIA
21 alan.pearce@latrobe.edu.au
22 Twitter: @alanpearcephd
23

24 **Assessment of somatosensory and cognitive-motor processing time in** 25 **retired athletes with a history of repeated head trauma**

26 Measurement of the adverse outcomes of repeated head trauma in contact sport
27 athletes is often achieved using tests where the comparator is the ‘score’ or the
28 ‘accuracy’ obtained. While it is expected that ex-athletes would perform worse
29 than controls, previous studies have shown inconsistent results. Here we have
30 attempted to address these inconsistencies from a different perspective by
31 quantifying not only accuracy, but also the time of motor responses (response
32 time). We tested age-matched control subjects who have never experienced head
33 trauma (n=20; 41.8 ± 14.4 years), and two cohorts of retired contact sport athletes
34 with a history of head trauma and concussions; one with self-reported concerns
35 (n=36; 45.4 ± 12.6 years), and another with no ongoing concerns (n=19; 43.1 ±
36 13.5 years). Participants performed cognitive (*Cogstate*) and somatosensory
37 (*Cortical Metrics*) testing and both accuracy and response time were recorded.
38 Transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) was undertaken to investigate
39 corticospinal conduction and excitability. Results showed that in both test
40 batteries there was little difference between groups when considering only
41 accuracy scores. By contrast, response times in all but one test revealed that ex-
42 athletes with self-reported concerns were significantly slower compared to no
43 concern ex-athlete or control groups (*p* ranges 0.031 to <0.001). TMS latency
44 showed significantly increased conduction time (*p*=0.008) in the group with
45 ongoing concerns. These findings suggest that incorporating response times in
46 cognitive and somatosensory testing is more informative than considering
47 accuracy scores alone when assessing cognitive processing ability in retired
48 contact sport athletes with ongoing brain health concerns.

49 Word count: 250 (250 limit)

50 Keywords: concussion; response speed; sensorimotor; motor evoked potentials;
51 cognition

52

53 **Introduction**

54 The long-term neurological sequelae of head trauma in retired contact sport athletes is
55 of ongoing global concern and investigation. Research into the cognitive and
56 neuropsychological health of retired athletes has by now been carried out over decades,
57 but studies have not always provided consistent results. In particular, there is disparity
58 with respect to self-reported symptomology or concern, and the results of commonly
59 used objective measurements. This is a problem highlighted by Cunningham et al
60 (2020) in a systematic review of 46 cross-sectional studies of retired athletes with a
61 history of sports related concussion. While almost 80% of studies included ex-athletes
62 with self-reported concerns about their cognitive health, only half to two-thirds of these
63 studies showed any impairment in objective measurement of psychomotor function,
64 executive function, or memory.

65 Assessments of cognitive function generally rely on a performance ‘outcome’,
66 and these can be binary (such as correct detection of something or not), or they can be
67 continuous or additive (such as the number of errors made during a given test) (Harvey,
68 2019). However, as illustrated by Cunningham et al (2020), reliance on test outcome
69 measures may not detect subtle impairments, particularly in single testing sessions, that
70 reflect self-reported concerns. This implies that the current objective testing regimes
71 that rely purely on outcome measures are insufficient in measuring subtle cognitive
72 processing abilities (De Boeck & Jeon, 2019; Kyllonen & Zu, 2016).

73 De Boek and Jeon (2019) argue that while cognitive tests measure overall
74 performance abilities, as determined by the number of correct or incorrect responses,
75 less attention is given to quantifying process abilities, reflected by response time. While
76 it is acceptable to determine performance outcome without knowledge of the processes
77 involved, it is only half of the story. Providing cohorts such as retired contact sports

78 athletes who generally are high functioning but struggle with daily activities, an
79 explanation of not only outcomes, but also the process, allows for increased
80 understanding as well as more informative feedback that may assist in interventional
81 therapies (De Boeck & Jeon, 2019).

82 Response time has long been a consideration in cognitive ability measurements,
83 but the increasing precision in measurement by use of computerised testing has allowed
84 for response time data collection to understand cognitive ability in healthy populations
85 (Kyllonen & Zu, 2016). Consequently, interest in response time has revived, with a
86 number of models being developed for use in psychology (see reviews by Kyllonen and
87 Zu 2016, De Boeck and Jeon 2019). However, the use of response time data as a
88 reflection of processing ability appears to not be utilized in exploring long-term
89 consequences of repeated head trauma in retired athletes (Ebaid et al., 2017). A small
90 number of studies have previously employed psychomotor reaction time in retired
91 athletes (Cunningham et al., 2020). However, reaction time and response time are two
92 distinct variables with the former describing the speed of detecting the stimulus, while
93 the latter describes a speed-accuracy trade-off for the determination of the *correct*
94 response to a given stimulus, rather than simply responding to a stimulus (De Boeck &
95 Jeon, 2019; Kyllonen & Zu, 2016; A. Tommerdahl et al., 2019).

96 Our previous work on sensorimotor and neurophysiology of individuals with
97 persistent post-concussion symptoms (Pearce et al., 2020), and chronic long-term
98 outcomes in retired athletes (Pearce et al., 2021), demonstrated slower sensorimotor
99 reaction time in symptomatic individuals when compared with controls. Here we
100 present our studies of *response* time in two groups of retired contact sport athletes': one
101 with ongoing concerns about their cognitive health and the other with no ongoing
102 concerns. We compared these two groups to age-matched controls using two different

103 computerised testing applications. We present both performance outcome and response
104 time data, as well as single pulse transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) for
105 quantification of corticospinal excitability.

106 **Methods**

107 As part of a larger research project, studies reported here were conducted on a
108 convenience sample of 75 male participants (retired contact sport athletes $n=55$; age-
109 matched male controls $n=20$; Table 1). Participants were pre-screened for TMS
110 suitability (Rossi et al., 2011) and provided written informed consent to participate in
111 the study as approved by the University Ethics Committee (HEC18005).

112 The retired playing group were divided into sub-groups based on their self-
113 reported *fatigue and related symptoms* score (Johansson et al, 2009, see section
114 ‘symptom self-report’): participants with ongoing self-reported concerns regarding their
115 mental and cognitive health relating to their history of head trauma experienced in sport
116 (‘self-concern’: $n=36$), and those who acknowledged they had a history of head trauma
117 from sport but did not express any enduring concerns (‘no concern’: $n=19$). Both groups
118 were compared to age-match controls ($n=20$) who had no neurological
119 impairment/disease, and no history of head trauma, either by playing contact sports, or
120 trauma from accidents. All data was completed during one visit to the laboratory and
121 cognitive and TMS testing was randomised to reduce any potential serial order effects.

122

123 ***Symptom self-report***

124 All participants completed a questionnaire regarding their concussion injury history
125 (Pearce et al., 2014), and a self-assessment regarding fatigue and related concerns
126 affecting their daily activities (Johansson et al., 2009). The self-assessment required

127 participants to respond to 15 questions covering a range of concerns including fatigue
128 (general and mental), perception of thinking speed and mental recovery, emotional,
129 irritability and sensitivity changes, and sleep variability, using a Likert rating scale from
130 0 to 3, in 0.5 increments. Higher scores reflect greater severity for each symptom-
131 related question. The questionnaire has been previously validated by Johansson and
132 colleagues (2009, 2010, 2014).

133

134 *Cognitive assessment*

135 Participants completed a computerised brief battery (Cogstate, Melbourne, Australia)
136 that comprised of a subset of tasks from the full Cogstate battery taking about 8-10
137 minutes in total (Maruff et al., 2013). Prior to data collection participants were given a
138 five-minute interactive demonstration and familiarisation. Once participants had
139 demonstrated they were aware of the assessment protocol, data collection began.

140 Participants completed two separate reaction time tests; a simple reaction time
141 ‘detection test’ where the individual was instructed to respond as quickly as possible by
142 pressing a keyboard key as soon as the card was revealed (‘turned up’), and a choice
143 reaction time ‘identification test’ where the participant pressed one of two keys; one
144 representing the ‘yes’ button if the card was revealed red in colour, or another key
145 representing the ‘no’ button if the card was black in colour. For both the detection and
146 identification assessments, if a key was pressed before the card was revealed, this would
147 be recorded as an error, contributing to the accuracy metric. The test was completed
148 when 25 correct responses were recorded or the maximum time (three min) had elapsed
149 (Maruff et al., 2009).

150 Tests for response times included the One-Back and Visual Learning tasks. The
151 one-back task required the participant to respond to the question “is this card the same
152 as the previous card?” Participants were instructed to press a particular key for a ‘yes’
153 or an alternative key for a ‘no’ response as soon as possible. Cards (n=42) were shown,
154 and the correct response was 50% each of the trials presented. The test was completed
155 when all 42 trials were completed or the maximum allowed time of three minutes had
156 passed (Maruff et al., 2009). The visual learning task required the participant to view
157 the card presented in the middle of the screen and respond to the question “have you
158 seen this card before?” Similar to the one-back task, participants were instructed to
159 press a particular key for a ‘yes’ or an alternative key for a ‘no’ response. Participants
160 were required to learn a series of six cards repeated throughout the task, intermixed with
161 eight non-repeating ‘distracter’ cards in series of 14 cards. Three 14-card series were
162 presented, and this task continued until the participant had made 42 complete responses
163 or the maximum time allowed (3 min) had elapsed. The primary outcome measure for
164 this task was the number of correct responses (i.e., true-positive and true-negative)
165 expressed as a proportion of the total trials (Maruff et al., 2009).

166

167 *Somatosensory assessment*

168 As described in previously published studies (Pearce et al., 2019; M. Tommerdahl et al.,
169 2016; Zhang et al., 2011) somatosensory assessment was undertaken by utilising a
170 portable vibrotactile stimulation device (Brain Gauge, Cortical Metrics, USA).
171 Physically similar to a standard computer mouse, the device contains two cylindrical
172 probes (5 mm diameter) positioned at the top and front of the device. These probes,
173 driven by the computer via a USB cable, provided a light vibration stimulus, at

174 frequencies between 25–50 Hz that is sensed by the participant’s index and middle
175 digits of their non-dominant hand.

176 Participants completed the battery involving four discrete tasks, one reaction
177 time and three discriminative tasks (amplitude, duration and temporal order judgement),
178 whereby the participant used their non-dominant hand to detect the stimulus, and their
179 dominant hand to respond via a computer mouse. Testing time took approximately 15
180 minutes. For the discrimination tasks in the battery, a simple tracking procedure that
181 utilized a two-alternative forced choice paradigm was used to determine an individual’s
182 difference distinguished threshold for stimulus (M. Tommerdahl et al., 2016).

183 Familiarization was performed before each test for participant orientation,
184 requiring correct responses on three consecutive trials before progressing the test where
185 data would be acquired. Participants were verbally instructed to respond as quickly as
186 possible, and during testing no feedback or knowledge of the results were provided.

187

188 *Corticospinal excitability*

189 Employing previously published methods in similar cohorts (Pearce et al., 2014; Pearce
190 et al., 2021; Pearce et al., 2018), corticospinal excitability was quantified via single-
191 pulse TMS, delivered over the contralateral primary motor cortex. Surface
192 electromyography (sEMG) measured motor evoked potentials (MEPs) recording 500 ms
193 sweeps (100 ms pre-trigger, 400 ms post-trigger; PowerLab 4/35, ADInstruments,
194 Australia). Electromyography, adhering to the Non-Invasive Assessment of Muscles
195 (SENIAM) guidelines for sEMG (Hermens et al., 1999), was recorded using bipolar
196 Ag/AgCl electrodes, with an intra-electrode distance of 2 cm positioned over the first
197 dorsal interosseous (FDI) muscle of the participant’s dominant hand, and the ground
198 electrode placed over metacarpophalangeal joint of the third digit.

199 Single pulse TMS was delivered using a MagStim 200² stimulator (Magstim,
200 UK) and a figure-of-eight coil (Magstim, UK). Reliability of coil placement was
201 maintained by participants wearing a snugly fitted cap (EasyCap, Germany), positioned
202 with reference to the nasion-inion and interaural lines. The cap was marked with sites at
203 1 x 1 cm spacing in a latitude-longitude matrix to provide reliable coil position
204 throughout the testing protocol (Pearce et al., 2000).

205 Following identification of the ‘optimal site’, defined as the site with the largest
206 observed MEP (Pearce et al., 2000), active motor threshold (aMT) was determined via a
207 low-level voluntary static contraction of the FDI muscle at 10% of Maximal Voluntary
208 Contraction (MVC). The aMT was identified by delivering TMS stimuli (5% of
209 stimulator output steps, and in 1% steps closer to threshold) at intensities from a level
210 below the participant’s threshold until an observable MEP of at 200 μ V and associated
211 cSP could be measured in at least five of ten stimuli (Pearce et al., 2013; Wilson et al.,
212 1995). Once aMT was established, 20 stimuli (four sets of five pulses per set) were
213 delivered in random intervals (between 6–10 s) at intensities to evoke a MEP of 1 mV.
214 A break of 30 s was provided between sets to reduce any possibility of muscular fatigue
215 (Kidgell & Pearce, 2010).

216 ***Data and statistical analyses***

217 Self-report symptom score were totalled from the responses of the 15 questions,
218 giving a maximum of 44 points (Johansson et al., 2009). Outcome measures from
219 Cogstate included percentage of correct responses and mean reaction time for the
220 detection test, and mean response time for the identification test, One-Back and Visual
221 Learning tasks (Maruff et al., 2009). For the somatosensory testing, apart from the mean
222 reaction time for the detection of the sensory stimulus, the discrimination assessments
223 measured response time and calculated score for following presentation of the stimulus

224 (King et al., 2018; A. Tommerdahl et al., 2019). Single pulse MEP latency was
225 calculated as the time between stimulation of the motor cortex to the onset of the MEP
226 (Brasil-Neto et al., 1992). MEP amplitudes were measured from the peak-to-trough
227 difference of the waveform. Duration of the cSP was calculated from the onset
228 (deflection) of the MEP waveform to the return of uninterrupted EMG (Wilson et al.,
229 1993). With the most influencing confounding factor on cSP duration being the
230 preceding MEP (Škarabot et al., 2019), we employed MEP:cSP ratio to compare
231 between groups and reduce between-participant variability (Orth & Rothwell, 2004).
232 We have previously published MEP:cSP ratios in a cohort with persistent post-
233 concussion symptoms (Pearce et al., 2020) and more recently in larger project on retired
234 contact sport athletes (Pearce et al., 2021).

235 All statistical analyses were conducted using Jamovi software (www.jamovi.org,
236 Version 1.0.8). Data were tested for normality using Shapiro-Wilks (S-W) tests showing
237 data to be skewed (all variables $p < 0.05$). Data were analysed using Kruskal-Wallis tests
238 with Dwass, Steel, Critchlow-Fligner post-hoc comparisons, except for comparison for
239 competitive career, the number of concussions, and time since last concussion between
240 ‘self-concern’ and ‘no-concern’ groups which was analysed using a Mann-Whitney test.
241 Effect sizes are presented as rank-biserial correlation (r_{rb}) for 2-group or partial eta
242 squared (η^2p) for 3-group comparisons. The number of previous concussions and the
243 fatigue and related symptom scores to cortical metrics and TMS variables were
244 correlated using Kendall’s Tau B. Data in Tables and Figures are presented as mean (\pm
245 SD) and statistical significance as set as alpha < 0.05 .

246

247 **Results**

248 There were no difference in participant age ($H(2)=0.61$, $p=0.74$, $\eta^2p=0.01$), and

249 education ($H(2)=1.89, p=0.11, n^2p=0.23$) between all groups. Between retired athlete
250 groups there was no difference in career length ($U=242, p=0.33$), the number of
251 concussions ($U=263, p=0.33$), or time since last reported concussion ($U=233, p=0.34$;
252 **Table 1**).

253 **Table 2** presents all items of the fatigue and related symptom questionnaire. There were
254 significant differences observed between groups for total score ($H(2)=63.27, p<0.001,$
255 $n^2p=0.85$). Post hoc comparisons showed the group reporting ongoing concerns with
256 their mental or cognitive health ('self-concern') had significantly higher total scores
257 than both control participants ($W=8.72, p<0.001$), and those ex-players with no ongoing
258 concerns ('no concern'; ($W=8.57, p<0.001$). This pattern was seen in almost every item
259 within the survey except for sensitivity to light and noise, where post hoc differences
260 were observed between ongoing concerns and no concerns groups, and ongoing
261 concerns and control groups ($p<0.001$). For decreased sleep, differences were found
262 only between the ongoing concern and control groups ($p<0.001$). While the no concern
263 group rated higher on the decreased sleep compared to controls, this was not statistically
264 significant ($p=0.103$). There was no difference in increased sleep between groups
265 ($H(2)=4.51, p=0.105$). The total fatigue and related symptom score was not correlated to
266 age (Kendall's Tau $B=0.11, p=0.26$), nor to the number of concussions (Kendall's Tau
267 $B=0.005, p=0.96$), nor the time since last concussion (Kendall's Tau $B=0.12, p=0.28$).

268 <Table 1 here>

269 <Table 2 here>

270 Cognitive assessment revealed no differences in accuracy between groups in each
271 of the four the Cogstate tests performed (**Figure 1a**). However, the time taken to
272 respond to the questions in three of four of these tests was significantly longer in the
273 group with ongoing self concern (**Figure 1b**). Reaction times for the visual detection

274 and attention, tasks showed significant differences ($H(2)=10.61$, $p=0.005$, $n^2p=0.14$)
275 with post hocs revealing a significantly greater time in the group with self concern than
276 both no concern ($W=3.88$, $p=0.017$) and control groups ($W=3.88$, $p=0.017$), despite near
277 identical accuracy scores. Response times in the visual learning task was significantly
278 longer between groups ($H(2)=11.32$, $p=0.003$, $n^2p=0.15$) and post hoc comparison
279 showing a significant difference in response times with ongoing concerns relative to ex-
280 players with no ongoing concern ($W=3.60$, $p=0.029$) and controls ($W=3.94$, $p=0.015$;
281 **Figure 1b**). No differences were detected between groups in the response time of the
282 working memory task ($H(2)=4.61$, $p=0.1$, $n^2p=0.06$). The time taken to respond in all
283 cognitive tasks was positively correlated to fatigue score, however the task result (i.e.
284 the accuracy of response) was not (**Table 3**).

285 <Figure 1 here>

286 <Table 3 here>

287 Like cognitive testing, somatosensory testing using Cortical Metrics showed no
288 difference in the mean score between groups (**Figure 2a**), but again, response times
289 were consistently longer in the self concern group (**Figure 2b**). Specifically, there were
290 significantly delayed reaction times in sensory detection, and response times for
291 sequential amplitude, simultaneous amplitude, and duration discrimination, relative to
292 the control group. Again response times, not overall scores, were significantly
293 positively correlated with fatigue scores (**Table 3**).

294 <Figure 2 here>

295 Differences among groups were also found during transcranial magnetic
296 stimulation (TMS). While the median MEP:cSP ratio (**Figure 3a**) was increased in ex-
297 players both with self concern and no concern, compared to control (37.8 and 48.0 v
298 23.6, respectively), this did not reach statistical significance. However, MEP latency

299 was significantly prolonged in the players with self concern relative to control
300 ($H(2)=9.73$, $p=0.008$, $n^2p=0.13$; **Figure 3b**), suggesting the presence of damage to
301 motor pathways in this group that cannot be discerned from MEP amplitudes alone.
302 TMS latency was, like the response times of cognitive and somatosensory tests,
303 significantly positively correlated with fatigue score (Kendall's Tau B = 0.182, $p =$
304 0.024).

305

306 **Discussion**

307 Our study has found that retired contact sport athletes with self-concerns were
308 significantly slower in both reaction time and response time, compared to retired
309 athletes with no concerns, and age-matched controls. Moreover, reaction and response
310 times correlated with self-reported fatigue and related symptom scale total score, and
311 corticospinal latency. While groups did not differ in outcome performance (i.e.
312 accuracy), the difference in reaction and response times suggest a lack of efficiency at
313 processing ability (A. Tommerdahl et al., 2019) which appeared unrelated to sleep
314 concerns (i.e. the two retired athlete groups did not differ in either decreased in
315 increased sleep concerns). We consider the slowing of responses in lieu of accuracy
316 scores an important finding as the majority of studies investigating cognitive health
317 outcomes in these cohorts report performance outcomes, with only a minority
318 presenting abilities via psychomotor reaction times (Cunningham et al., 2020).
319 Moreover, the novel finding of impaired response times suggests that cognitive
320 impairment of retired athletes with a history of head trauma should include response
321 times in future studies.

322 We have previously employed the fatigue and related symptom survey to
323 characterise and quantify our cohorts, particularly those who express ongoing self-

324 reported symptoms compared to those who report no ongoing symptoms (Pearce et al.,
325 2020; Pearce et al., 2021). We found significant differences between the groups we
326 studied, with the self-concern group having the highest scores. However we also found
327 that players with no-concern scored on average above the 10.5 clinical cut off score for
328 “normal” as suggested by Johansson and Rönnbäck (2014). This may imply that there is
329 an underlying clinical issue for the individual, although a serious problem whereby
330 activities of daily living are significantly affected, is not always the case. For this study,
331 our sample was derived from those who volunteered for testing who explicitly
332 expressed they had no ongoing concerns, and we used the total score to characterise
333 between groups.

334 Slowed response times in the acute period (one to two weeks) following a
335 concussion injury has been previously reported (A. Tommerdahl et al., 2019), but to the
336 best of our knowledge this is the first study to report slowed response times in a long-
337 term cohort with a history of repeated head trauma. While the visual learning task was
338 not statistically significant, the response times reflected the same pattern as the other
339 reaction time and response time tasks: the control group showed the fastest while the
340 self-concern group showed the slowest. Coupled with the TMS data demonstrating
341 altered corticospinal latency, the data suggests that those with a history of repeated
342 neurological insults have some effects on processing ability, with those reporting
343 greater severity of symptoms reflected in worse response times and significantly
344 reduced corticospinal excitability ratio.

345 Our previous studies primarily focussed on neurophysiological alterations in
346 both persistent post concussion symptoms (Pearce et al., 2020; Pearce et al., 2019) and
347 chronic outcomes of repeated head trauma (Pearce et al., 2014; Pearce et al., 2021;
348 Pearce et al., 2018). In contrast, this study was aimed to quantify response times, while

349 TMS was used to provide a potential physiological mechanism to explain differences
350 between groups (De Boeck & Jeon, 2019). While we acknowledge that TMS is an
351 indirect measure of corticospinal excitability and latency is a raw measure of
352 conduction speed, the correlations between significantly prolonged corticospinal latency
353 and cognitive response times in the ‘self-concern’ group was surprising. However, this
354 is not the first time that slowed TMS latency has been reported. Livingston et al
355 reported a slowing of TMS latency in the acute phase following a concussion
356 (Livingston et al., 2012; Livingston et al., 2010), while Stokes et al. (2020) recently
357 reported increased TMS latencies in young athletes (18-22 years) who had reported a
358 history of concussions (>1 year). Our findings, in a group of older retired athletes, may
359 reflect alterations in white matter in the pyramidal pathways (Stokes et al., 2020), where
360 MEP latencies have been shown to increase with demyelination associated with
361 neurogenerative disease (Britton et al., 1991; Schmierer et al., 2002); it has also been
362 postulated that slowed conduction time may be due to neurochemical changes
363 associated with a history of physical brain trauma (Lin et al., 2015). While further
364 research, particularly studies where co-registration of TMS and neuroimaging can be
365 performed, is required, employing response times in computerised cognitive-motor and
366 sensorimotor testing, along with low-cost physiological techniques such as TMS may
367 provide a more accurate picture of long-term cognitive health concerns in those with a
368 history of repeated head trauma.

369 It is outside of the scope of the study to speculate on why some of the retired
370 playing cohort were more affected than others in their self-report. However, the aim of
371 the study was to address the concerns regarding potentially biased sampling that has
372 previously been suggested (Carman et al., 2015). Similar to our more recent studies
373 (Pearce et al., 2021) we specifically aimed to recruit retired athletes with a history of

374 head trauma both with and without ongoing self-reported concerns. In line with our
375 previous work, we found that the group with no reported symptoms fared significantly
376 better than the group with self-reported concerns but did show small-to-moderate effects
377 compared to the age-matched control group. Collectively these data shows that repeated
378 head trauma may affect cortical processing, however there may be a ‘threshold’ before
379 this becomes a clinical concern. Further research is required to ascertain what this
380 threshold may be from a physiological perspective.

381 There are several limitations to consider in this study. Firstly, we have relied on
382 self-report for participants’ concussion history. To assist with recollection we used the
383 criteria of missing playing the following week (AFL Medical Officers Association,
384 2011), however, this may still underestimate the number of concussions players
385 experienced. Moreover, while we report similar career lengths between the two retired
386 playing groups, we are not able to consider the exposure of repetitive sub-concussive
387 trauma experienced, that did not result in concussion signs or symptoms, that may
388 contribute to the neural degradation suggested by increased TMS latency data.
389 Secondly, similar to previous work (De Beaumont et al., 2009; Pearce et al., 2014;
390 Pearce et al., 2021; Pearce et al., 2018), this study used a retrospective cross-sectional
391 design. While we were not able to obtain data of the players’ pre-morbid functioning,
392 we aimed to address this by having a three-group design incorporating an ‘active-
393 control’ group of retire players with a similar history of reported concussions, but no
394 ongoing concerns. Future studies would benefit from prospective designs with players
395 being tested prior to starting their careers, but in light of current cohorts, future studies
396 should consider repeated measures to quantify time-related progressive changes
397 between groups of currently retired athletes.

398 In conclusion, this study is the first to present slowed response times in a cohort
399 of older, retired contact sport athletes with ongoing concerns regarding their head
400 trauma history. While outcome results did not differ between groups, the finding of
401 poorer response time performance, suggests less cognitive processing efficiency and
402 neural conduction integrity, and may underpin the concerns, expressed by some retired
403 players, with regards to struggling with activities of daily living. With computerised
404 testing that collects response time data, our data suggest that analyses of cognitive
405 health will be more informative with the inclusion of cognitive-motor and/or
406 sensorimotor response times.

407 Word Count: 4066

408

409 Acknowledgement/Declarations of Interest

410 This study did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial,
411 or not-for-profit sectors. AJP currently receives partial research salary funding from
412 Erasmus+ strategic partnerships program (2019-1-IE01-KA202-051555). AJP has previously
413 received partial research funding from the Sports Health Check Charity (Australia), Australian
414 Football League, Impact Technologies Inc., and Samsung Corporation, and is remunerated for
415 expert advice to medico-legal practices. The development and manufacture of the Cortical
416 Metrics device used in this study has received partial funding from the Office of Naval Research
417 (USA). MT is a director of Cortical Metrics LLC who has a license from the University of
418 North Carolina to distribute the Brain Gauge device used in this study. No other author has any
419 declaration of interest.


420 **References**

- 421 AFL Medical Officers Association. (2011). *The Management of Concussion in*
422 *Australian Football*. Australian Football League.
- 423 Brasil-Neto, J. P., Cohen, L. G., Panizza, M., Nilsson, J., Roth, B. J., & Hallett, M.
424 (1992). Optimal focal transcranial magnetic activation of the human motor
425 cortex: effects of coil orientation, shape of the induced current pulse, and
426 stimulus intensity. *Journal of clinical neurophysiology : official publication of*
427 *the American Electroencephalographic Society*, 9(1), 132-136.
- 428 Britton, T., Meyer, B.-U., & Benecke, R. (1991). Variability of cortically evoked motor
429 responses in multiple sclerosis. *Electroencephalography and Clinical*
430 *Neurophysiology/Evoked Potentials Section*, 81(3), 186-194.
- 431 Carman, A. J., Ferguson, R., Cantu, R., Comstock, R. D., Dacks, P. A., DeKosky, S. T.,
432 . . . Fillit, H. M. (2015). Mind the gaps—advancing research into short-term and
433 long-term neuropsychological outcomes of youth sports-related concussions.
434 *Nature Reviews Neurology*, 11(4), 230-244.
435 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1038/nrneurol.2015.30>
- 436 Cunningham, J., Broglio, S. P., O'Grady, M., & Wilson, F. (2020). History of Sport-
437 Related Concussion and Long-Term Clinical Cognitive Health Outcomes in
438 Retired Athletes: A Systematic Review. *Journal of athletic training*, 55(2), 132-
439 158. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4085/1062-6050-297-18>
- 440 De Beaumont, L., Théoret, H., Mongeon, D., Messier, J., Leclerc, S., Tremblay, S., . . .
441 Lasseonde, M. (2009). Brain function decline in healthy retired athletes who
442 sustained their last sports concussion in early adulthood. *Brain*, 132(3), 695-708.
443 <https://doi.org/10.1093/brain/awn347>
- 444 De Boeck, P., & Jeon, M. (2019). An Overview of Models for Response Times and
445 Processes in Cognitive Tests [Systematic Review]. *Frontiers in Psychology*,
446 10(102). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00102>
- 447 Ebaid, D., Crewther, S. G., MacCalman, K., Brown, A., & Crewther, D. P. (2017).
448 Cognitive Processing Speed across the Lifespan: Beyond the Influence of Motor
449 Speed. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*, 9, 62-62.
450 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2017.00062>
- 451 Harvey, P. D. (2019). Domains of cognition and their assessment □. *Dialogues in*
452 *clinical neuroscience*, 21(3), 227-237.
453 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31887/DCNS.2019.21.3/pharvey>
- 454 Hermens, H. J., Freriks, B., Merletti, R., Stegeman, D., Blok, J., Rau, G., . . . Hägg, G.
455 (1999). *European recommendations for surface electromyography*. Roessingh
456 Research and Development The Netherlands.
- 457 Johansson, B., Berglund, P., & Rönnbäck, L. (2009). Mental fatigue and impaired
458 information processing after mild and moderate traumatic brain injury. *Brain*
459 *Injury*, 23(13-14), 1027-1040.
460 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3109/02699050903421099>

- 461 Johansson, B., & Ronnback, L. (2014). Evaluation of the mental fatigue scale and its
462 relation to cognitive and emotional functioning after traumatic brain injury or
463 stroke. *Int J Phys Med Rehabil*, 2(01).
- 464 Johansson, B., & Rönnbäck, L. (2014). Long-lasting mental fatigue after traumatic brain
465 injury—a major problem most often neglected diagnostic criteria, assessment,
466 relation to emotional and cognitive problems, cellular background, and aspects
467 on treatment. In F. Sadaka (Ed.), *Traumatic Brain Injury* Intech Open.
468 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5772/57311>
- 469 Johansson, B., Starmark, A., Berglund, P., Rödhholm, M., & Rönnbäck, L. (2010). A
470 self-assessment questionnaire for mental fatigue and related symptoms after
471 neurological disorders and injuries. *Brain Injury*, 24(1), 2-12.
- 472 Kidgell, D. J., & Pearce, A. J. (2010). Corticospinal properties following short-term
473 strength training of an intrinsic hand muscle. *Hum Movement Sci*, 29(5), 631-
474 641. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2010.01.004>
- 475 King, D. A., Hume, P., & Tommerdahl, M. (2018). Use of the Brain-Gauge
476 somatosensory assessment for monitoring recovery from concussion: a case
477 study. *Journal of Physiotherapy Research*, 2(1), 13-13.
- 478 Kyllonen, P. C., & Zu, J. (2016). Use of response time for measuring cognitive ability.
479 *Journal of Intelligence*, 4(4), 14.
480 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/jintelligence4040014>
- 481 Lin, A. P., Ramadan, S., Stern, R. A., Box, H. C., Nowinski, C. J., Ross, B. D., &
482 Mountford, C. E. (2015). Changes in the neurochemistry of athletes with
483 repetitive brain trauma: preliminary results using localized correlated
484 spectroscopy. *Alzheimer's research & therapy*, 7(1), 13.
485 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1186/s13195-015-0094-5>
- 486 Livingston, S. C., Goodkin, H. P., Hertel, J. N., Saliba, E. N., Barth, J. T., & Ingersoll,
487 C. D. (2012). Differential rates of recovery after acute sport-related concussion:
488 electrophysiologic, symptomatic, and neurocognitive indices. *J Clin*
489 *Neurophysiol*, 29(1), 23-32.
- 490 Livingston, S. C., Saliba, E. N., Goodkin, H. P., Barth, J. T., Hertel, J. N., & Ingersoll,
491 C. D. (2010). A preliminary investigation of motor evoked potential
492 abnormalities following sport-related concussion. *Brain Inj*, 24(6), 904-913.
- 493 Maruff, P., Lim, Y. Y., Darby, D., Ellis, K. A., Pietrzak, R. H., Snyder, P. J., . . .
494 Masters, C. L. (2013). Clinical utility of the cogstate brief battery in identifying
495 cognitive impairment in mild cognitive impairment and Alzheimer's disease
496 [journal article]. *BMC Psychology*, 1(1), 30.
497 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1186/2050-7283-1-30>
- 498 Maruff, P., Thomas, E., Cysique, L., Brew, B., Collie, A., Snyder, P., & Pietrzak, R. H.
499 (2009). Validity of the CogState brief battery: relationship to standardized tests
500 and sensitivity to cognitive impairment in mild traumatic brain injury,
501 schizophrenia, and AIDS dementia complex. *Archives of clinical*

- 502 *neuropsychology*, 24(2), 165-178.
503 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/arclin/acp010>
- 504 Orth, M., & Rothwell, J. C. (2004). The cortical silent period: intrinsic variability and
505 relation to the waveform of the transcranial magnetic stimulation pulse. *Clinical*
506 *Neurophysiology*, 115(5), 1076-1082.
507 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2003.12.025>
- 508 Pearce, A. J., Clark, R. A., & Kidgell, D. J. (2013). A Comparison of Two Methods in
509 Acquiring Stimulus–Response Curves with Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation.
510 *Brain Stimul*, 6(3), 306-309.
511 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brs.2012.05.010>
- 512 Pearce, A. J., Hoy, K., Rogers, M. A., Corp, D. T., Maller, J. J., Drury, H. G., &
513 Fitzgerald, P. B. (2014). The long-term effects of sports concussion on retired
514 Australian football players: A study using transcranial magnetic stimulation. *J*
515 *Neurotraum*, 31(3), 1139-1145.
516 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1089/neu.2013.3219>
- 517 Pearce, A. J., Kidgell, D. J., Frazer, A. K., King, D., Buckland, M. E., & Tommerdahl,
518 M. (2020). Corticomotor correlates of somatosensory reaction time and
519 variability in individuals with post concussion symptoms. *Somatosensory and*
520 *Motor Research*, 37(1), 14-21.
521 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/08990220.2019.1699045>
- 522 Pearce, A. J., Kidgell, D. J., Tommerdahl, M., Frazer, A. K., Rist, B., Mobbs, R., . . .
523 Buckland, M. E. (2021). Chronic Neurophysiological Effects of Repeated Head
524 Trauma in Retired Australian Male Sport Athletes [Original Research].
525 *Frontiers in Neurology*, 12(316).
526 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3389/fneur.2021.633320>
- 527 Pearce, A. J., Rist, B., Fraser, C. L., Cohen, A., & Maller, J. J. (2018).
528 Neurophysiological and cognitive impairment following repeated sports
529 concussion injuries in retired professional rugby league players. *Brain Inj*, 32(4),
530 498-505. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/02699052.2018.1430376>
- 531 Pearce, A. J., Thickbroom, G. W., Byrnes, M. L., & Mastaglia, F. L. (2000). The
532 corticomotor representation of elite racquet sport athletes. *Exp Brain Res*, 130,
533 238-243. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s002219900236>
- 534 Pearce, A. J., Tommerdahl, M., & King, D. (2019). Neurophysiological abnormalities in
535 individuals with persistent post-concussion symptoms. *Neuroscience*, 408, 272-
536 281. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2019.04.019>
- 537 Rossi, S., Hallett, M., Rossini, P. M., & Pascual-Leone, A. (2011). Screening
538 questionnaire before TMS: an update. *Clinical neurophysiology: official journal*
539 *of the International Federation of Clinical Neurophysiology*, 122(8), 1686.
540 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clinph.2010.12.037>
- 541 Schmierer, K., Irlbacher, K., Grosse, P., Rörich, S., & Meyer, B.-U. (2002). Correlates
542 of disability in multiple sclerosis detected by transcranial magnetic stimulation.
543 *Neurology*, 59, 1218-1224. <http://www.neurology.org/content/59/8/1218.abstract>


- 544 Škarabot, J., Mesquita, R. N., Brownstein, C. G., & Ansdell, P. (2019). Myths and
545 Methodologies: How loud is the story told by the transcranial magnetic
546 stimulation-evoked silent period? *Experimental physiology*, 104(5), 635-642.
547 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1113/EP087557>
- 548 Stokes, W., Choynowki, J., St. Pierre, M., Anaya, M. A., Statton, M. A., Celnik, P. A.,
549 & Cantarero, G. (2020). Altered corticomotor latencies but normal motor
550 neuroplasticity in concussed athletes. *Journal of Neurophysiology*.
- 551 Tommerdahl, A., Francisco, E. M., Lensch, R., Holden, J. K., Favorov, O. V., &
552 Tommerdahl, M. (2019). Response Time in Somatosensory Discrimination
553 Tasks is Sensitive to Neurological Insult. *Neurology and Neurobiology*, 2(4), 1-
554 7.
- 555 Tommerdahl, M., Dennis, R. G., Francisco, E. M., Holden, J. K., Nguyen, R., &
556 Favorov, O. V. (2016). Neurosensory assessments of concussion. *Mil Med*,
557 181(5S), 45-50. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.7205/MILMED-D-15-00172>
- 558 Wilson, S. A., Lockwood, R. J., Thickbroom, G. W., & Mastaglia, F. L. (1993). The
559 muscle silent period following transcranial magnetic cortical stimulation. *J*
560 *Neurol Sci*, 114(2), 216-222. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-510X(93)90301-E)
561 [510X\(93\)90301-E](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-510X(93)90301-E)
- 562 Wilson, S. A., Thickbroom, G. W., & Mastaglia, F. L. (1995). Comparison of the
563 magnetically mapped corticomotor representation of a muscle at rest and during
564 low-level voluntary contraction. *Electroencephalography and Clinical*
565 *Neurophysiology/Electromyography and Motor Control*, 97(5), 246-250.
566 [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0924-980X\(95\)80001-8](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0924-980X(95)80001-8)
- 567 Zhang, Z., Francisco, E., Holden, J., Dennis, R., & Tommerdahl, M. (2011).
568 Somatosensory Information Processing in the Aging Population. *Front Aging*
569 *Neurosci*, 3(18). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2011.00018>
- 570
- 571



572


573 **Figure 1.** CogState accuracy (a) and median response times between groups.

574



575

576 **Figure 2.** Mean score (a) and response times (b) between groups.



577

578 **Figure 3.** Mean TMS MEP:cSP ratio (a) and MEP latency (b) between groups.

579

580

581 **Table 1.** Participant demographics (mean \pm SD)

582

	Age in years	Education (years)	Competitive career (years)*	Number of concussions	Years since last concussion
Control (n=19)	41.8 \pm 14.4	15.6 \pm 2.4	nil	n/a	n/a
No concern (n=20)	43.1 \pm 13.5	14.8 \pm 1.9	24.6 \pm 8.3	5.2 \pm 4.1	13.3 \pm 7.8
Self-concern (n=36)	45.4 \pm 12.6	14.3 \pm 2.7	25.1 \pm 9.6	6.5 \pm 4.1	16.5 \pm 10.7

583 * Includes competitive junior career

584

585

586 **Table 2.** Fatigue and related symptoms scores (mean \pm SD)
 587

	General fatigue	Lack initiative	Mental fatigue	Mental recovery	Concentration difficulties	Memory problems	Slowness thinking	Sensitive to stress	Emotional instability	Irritability	Sensitivity to light	Sensitivity to noise	Decreased sleep	Increased sleep	Total score
Self-concern (n=36)	1.81 $\pm 0.66^{1,4}$	1.65 $\pm 0.45^{1,4}$	2.11 $\pm 0.41^{1,3}$	1.41 $\pm 0.82^{1,4}$	1.92 $\pm 0.52^{1,3}$	1.93 $\pm 0.55^{1,3}$	1.89 $\pm 0.61^{1,3}$	2.27 $\pm 0.80^{1,3}$	1.77 $\pm 0.92^{1,3}$	2.07 $\pm 0.75^{1,4}$	1.41 $\pm 0.81^{1,4}$	1.61 $\pm 0.78^{1,3}$	1.81 $\pm 0.90^1$	0.64 ± 1.03	25.32 $\pm 4.76^{1,3}$
No concern (n=20)	1.26 $\pm 0.54^1$	1.03 $\pm 0.59^2$	1.39 $\pm 0.66^1$	0.84 $\pm 0.60^1$	1.32 $\pm 0.51^2$	1.21 $\pm 0.56^2$	1.05 $\pm 0.52^2$	1.53 $\pm 0.61^1$	0.87 $\pm 0.50^2$	1.37 $\pm 0.81^2$	0.71 ± 0.67	0.89 ± 0.46	1.21 ± 0.98	0.58 ± 0.63	15.24 $\pm 2.33^1$
Control (n=19)	0.56 ± 0.57	0.36 ± 0.51	0.33 ± 0.66	0.19 ± 0.35	0.61 ± 0.74	0.67 ± 0.71	0.61 ± 0.76	0.67 ± 0.86	0.47 ± 0.67	0.75 ± 1.05	0.50 ± 0.62	0.47 ± 0.63	0.67 ± 0.73	0.19 ± 0.52	4.82 ± 2.74

588 ¹ Significance vs control group (<0.01); ² Significance vs control group (<0.05); ³ Significance vs no concern group (<0.01); ⁴ Significance vs no
 589 concern group (<0.05)
 590

591

592 **Table 3.** Correlation^a between self-reported fatigue score and objective measures
593

	Test score	<i>p</i>	Response time	<i>p</i>
Visual detection	-0.042	ns	0.278	<□0.001
Attention	0.031	ns	0.277	<□0.001
Visual learning	-0.017	ns	0.244	0.002
Working memory	-0.072	ns	0.172	0.031
Sequential Amplitude	-0.029	ns	0.177	0.027
Simultaneous Amplitude	0.085	ns	0.204	0.01
Duration Discrimination	0.022	ns	0.211	0.008

594 ^aKendall's Tau B correlation coefficient

595