

1 Main Manuscript for

2 EEG response during sedation interruption complements behavioral 3 assessment following severe brain injury

4 Charlotte Maschke^{1,2}, Loretta Norton^{3,4}, Catherine Duclos^{5,6,7,8}, Miriam Han^{1,2}, Kira Dolhan^{1,2},
5 Geoffrey Laforge^{3,9}, Allison Frantz^{1,2}, Xiaoyu Wang³, Hassan Al-Hayawi³, Tianyu Zhang¹⁰,
6 Raphaël Lavoie¹, Adrian M. Owen^{3,11}, Stefanie Blain-Moraes^{1,12}

7 1) Montreal General Hospital, McGill University Health Centre, Montreal, Canada

8 2) Integrated Program in Neuroscience, McGill University, Montreal, Canada

9 3) Western Institute of Neuroscience, Western University, London, Ontario, Canada

10 4) Department of Psychology, King's University College at Western University, London, Ontario, Canada

11 5) Centre for Advanced Research in Sleep Medicine & Integrated Trauma Centre, Centre Intégré Universitaire
12 de Santé et de Services Sociaux du Nord-de-l'île-de-Montréal, Montréal, QC, Canada

13 6) Department of Neuroscience, Université de Montréal, Montréal, QC, Canada

14 7) Department of Anesthesiology and Pain Medicine, Université de Montréal, Montréal, QC, Canada

15 8) CIFAR Azrieli Global Scholars Program, Toronto, ON, Canada

16 9) Department of Neurology, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, United States.

17 10) McGill University health center, neurology department, Montreal, Canada

18 11) Department of Physiology and Pharmacology and Department of Psychology, Western University,
19 London, Ontario, Canada

20 12) School of Physical and Occupational Therapy, McGill University, Montreal, Canada

21 * Stefanie Blain-Moraes

22 **Email:** stefanie.blain-moraes@mcgill.ca

23 **Author Contributions:**

24 **C.M.:** Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Software, Writing - Original Draft, Visualization;
25 Resources, Data Curation, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing, Project
26 administration, **L.N.:** Resources, Data Curation, Writing - Review & Editing, Project administration,
27 Funding acquisition **C.D.:** Resources, Data Curation, Writing - Review & Editing, Project
28 administration, Funding acquisition **M.H.:** Resources, Data Curation, Writing - Review & Editing
29 **K.D.:** Resources, Data Curation, Writing - Review & Editing **G.L.:** Resources, Data Curation,
30 Writing - Review & Editing **A.F.:** Resources, Data Curation, Writing - Review & Editing **X.W.:**
31 Resources, Data Curation, Writing - Review & Editing **H.AH.:** Resources, Data Curation, Writing -
32 Review & Editing **T.Z.:** Resources, Data Curation, Writing - Review & Editing, **R.L.:** Resources,
33 Data Curation, Writing - Review & Editing, Project administration **A.O.:** Conceptualization,
34 Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition, Writing - Review & Editing, **S.BM.:**
35 Conceptualization, Supervision, Project administration, Funding acquisition, Writing - Review &
36 Editing,
37

38 **Competing Interest Statement:** none

39 **Keywords:** Consciousness, anesthesia, EEG, coma, unresponsive patients, outcome prediction,
40 neurocritical care

41 **This PDF file includes:**

- 42 1. Main Text
- 43 2. Figures 1 to 5
- 44 3. Tables 1 to 2

45 **Abstract**

46

47 **Background and Objectives:** Accurate assessment of level of consciousness and potential to
48 recover in severe brain injury patients underpins crucial decisions in the intensive care unit but
49 remains a major challenge for the clinical team. The neurological wake-up test (NWT) is a widely
50 used assessment tool, but many patients' behavioral response during a short interruption of
51 sedation is ambiguous or absent, with little prognostic value. This study assesses the brain's
52 electroencephalogram response during an interruption of propofol sedation to complement
53 behavioral assessment during the NWT to predict survival, recovery of consciousness, and long-
54 term functional outcome in acute severe brain injury patients.

55 **Methods:** We recorded 128-channel EEG of 41 severely brain-injured patients during a clinically
56 indicated NWT. The Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) was used to assess behavioral responsiveness
57 before and after interruption of sedation ($GCS_{observed}$). During the NWT, nine patients regained
58 responsiveness, 13 patients showed ambiguous responsiveness and 19 patients were not
59 responsive. Brain response to sedation interruption was quantified using EEG power, spatial ratios
60 and the spectral exponent. We trained a linear regression model to identify brain patterns related
61 to regaining behavioral responsiveness. We then applied this model to patients whose behavioral
62 responses were ambiguous or absent, using their NWT brain responses to predict a change in
63 behavioral response ($\Delta GCS_{predicted}$). Prognostic value of the $\Delta GCS_{predicted}$ was assessed using the
64 Mann-Whitney-U test and group-separability. The patients' survival, recovery of responsiveness,
65 and functional outcomes were assessed up to 12 months post-recording.

66 **Results:** EEG patterns during interruption of sedation reliably predicted the $GCS_{observed}$ in patients
67 who regained responsiveness during the NWT. Electrophysiological patterns of waking-up were
68 observed in some patients whose behavioral response was ambiguous or absent. Compared to
69 the $GCS_{observed}$, the $\Delta GCS_{predicted}$ improved separability of prognostic groups and significantly
70 distinguished patients according to survival ($U = 87$, $p < 0.05$). The EEG-trained model outperformed
71 outcome predictions of the patients' attending physician and predictions based on the patients'
72 APACHE score.

73 **Discussion:** EEG can complement behavioral assessment during the NWT to improve
74 prognostication, inform clinicians, family members and caregivers, and to set realistic goals for
75 treatment and therapy.

76

77

78

79 Main Text

80 1 Introduction

81 The accurate assessment of severely brain injured patients' levels of consciousness and potential
82 to recover underpins the most crucial clinical decisions in the intensive care unit (ICU) but remains
83 a major challenge for the clinical team. Behavioral assessments, such as the Glasgow Coma Scale
84 (GCS) ¹, are widely used to evaluate patients based on their level of arousal, reaction to pain and
85 capacity to follow commands. However, in patients who have suffered moderate to severe brain
86 injury, consciousness and responsiveness can be completely dissociated; in other words, patients
87 can be behaviorally unresponsive despite being covertly conscious ²⁻⁴.

88 Sedation plays a key role in the early treatment of acutely brain-injured patients ^{5,6}. During the first
89 days of ICU admission, these patients are often continuously sedated to regulate pain and agitation,
90 improve tolerance to intubation and reduce the risk of secondary injury ^{5,6}. However, extended
91 periods of sedation also limit the clinical team's ability to identify changes in the patient's mental
92 status and to separate injury-related impairments from drug-induced effects ⁷. It has therefore
93 become routine practice to interrupt sedation at least once a day to allow patients to wake up for a
94 neuro-cognitive assessment; this practice is known as the neurological wake-up test (NWT) ⁵⁻⁷.
95 During this short sedation interruption, the *presence* of signs of awareness of self and of
96 environment are key indicators for early recovery of consciousness and predictive of a good long-
97 term recovery ^{8,9}. However, the *absence* of a behavioral response has less diagnostic or prognostic
98 value, as it may be caused by confounding factors ranging from sensory or motor impairments to
99 pain and fatigue.

100 Accordingly, a multitude of methods have been developed to assess patients by using
101 electrophysiology and neuroimaging techniques to bypass their behavioral capacity ¹⁰⁻¹³. However,
102 most methods require patients to tolerate an extended period without sedation and are therefore
103 not suited for acute severely brain-injured patients, for whom even a short interruption of sedation
104 may cause increased levels of stress and clinical risk ^{14,15}. Our research group has previously
105 shown that the brain's EEG response to propofol anesthesia *induction* can successfully be used
106 for the assessment of unresponsive patients ¹⁶⁻¹⁹. We demonstrated that EEG reconfiguration in
107 response to propofol anesthesia has diagnostic ¹⁸ and prognostic ¹⁷ value to predict recovery of
108 consciousness in unresponsive patients. However, this protocol ¹⁷ can only be applied to patients
109 who are not already sedated and thus excludes most severe brain-injury patients during the first
110 days of ICU admission, when many critical treatment decisions are made.

111 In this study, we propose the brain's EEG response to *interruption* of propofol sedation as a
112 complementary measure to behavioral assessment during the NWT. In particular, EEG power,
113 spatial ratios and spectral exponents have been shown to be reliable markers of propofol-induced
114 unconsciousness ²⁰⁻²². We first hypothesize that we will observe a dynamic change in these EEG
115 features in the patients who regained responsiveness during an interruption of propofol sedation.
116 We further hypothesize that changes in these EEG features can be decoupled from the behavioral
117 response in some patients, with dynamic changes in EEG features despite a lack of behavioral
118 response. Finally, we hypothesize that the EEG response to interruption of sedation provides
119 prognostic value for survival and functional outcome of patients who show *absent* or *ambiguous*
120 behavioral response during the NWT.

121 Continuous EEG monitoring and, in resource-limited settings, serial EEGs, are routinely used to
122 assess the potential for neurological recovery ²³. Our approach proposes a novel way of capturing
123 dynamic and reactive electrophysiological features, which is highly translatable to clinical practice
124 and resource- and time-efficient. In current clinical practice, early prognostication of brain-injured
125 patients remains an 'uncertain art and science' ²⁴; our study aims to support clinical decision making
126 by providing a tool that complements behavioral assessment with neurological markers of return of
127 consciousness.

128 2 Methods

129 2.1 Participants

130 This study was part of a larger protocol, previously published by Duclos et al. ²⁵. Patients were
131 recruited from four different intensive care units in Canada: 1) Montreal General Hospital; 2)
132 Montreal Neurological Institute; 3) London University Hospital and 4) London Victoria Hospital.
133 Since 2020, a total of 1878 patients were screened; 183 patients were eligible for the study; consent
134 was obtained for 53 patients; and EEG data was acquired from 47 patients.

135 Patients were included if they were at least 18 years old, within 14-days of ICU admission and
136 continuously sedated following a brain injury (e.g., stroke, anoxic injury, traumatic brain injury,
137 subarachnoid hemorrhage). Patients were only recruited if an interruption of sedation was planned
138 as part of the standard of care and if they were deemed medically suitable for the study by their
139 attending intensivist. Patients were excluded according to the following criteria: low comprehension
140 of English or French; injuries which hindered high-density EEG (e.g., large bandages, infections,
141 spine fracture); presence of status epilepticus; and history of pre-existing dementia or mild cognitive
142 impairment ²⁵. The study was approved by the Research Ethics Board of the McGill University
143 Health Centre (Project ID 2020-5972) and the Western University Health Science Research Ethics
144 Board (Project ID 114303). Written informed consent was provided by the patient's legal
145 representative family member, in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.




Figure 1: Schematic illustration of study design.

Patients were recruited within 14 days of admission to the ICU, and EEG was recorded in in 5 phases: 1) on sedation, 2) during the transition post-interruption of sedation, 3) off sedation, 4) during the transition post re-initiation of sedation and 5) when sedation was on again. Behavioral assessment using the GCS was performed three times during the protocol. Patients' functional outcome was determined using phone assessments. In this study, we evaluated the value of behavioral and EEG response to prognosticate patients' long-term functional outcome. ICU: intensive care unit, GCS: Glasgow Coma Scale, GOS-E: Glasgow Outcome Scale - Extended, EEG: electroencephalography

146

147 **2.2 Electroencephalography data acquisition and anesthetic protocol**

148 EEG data was recorded in 5 phases: 1) pre-interruption of continuous sedation; 2) during the
149 transition after interruption of sedation; 3) during a resting state off sedation; 4) during the transition
150 after re-initiation of sedation and 5) resumption of continuous sedation (see Figure 1 for schematic
151 illustration of the recording protocol). Phase 1 was recorded for 10 minutes, the other phases had
152 variable durations (see below). EEG data were recorded using a high-density 128 channel saline
153 net and an Amps 400 amplifier (Electrical Geodesic, Inc., USA). Data were recorded at a sampling
154 rate of 1kHz and were referenced to the vertex; electrode impedances were reduced to below 5K Ω
155 prior to recording.

156 Patient responsiveness was assessed by the attending nurse using the GCS¹ three times during
157 the protocol: before Phase 1 (GCS_{sedation}); at the end of Phase 3 (GCS_{observed}); and at the end of
158 Phase 5 (see Figure 1 for schematic illustration of recording protocol).

159 Parameters for interruption of sedation were not standardized. Instead, EEG response was
160 recorded during routine ICU patient assessments. Thus, the initial sedation concentration, duration
161 of sedation interruption and the need for a re-initialization of sedation were determined for every
162 patient individually by the attending nurse or intensivist according to standard of care. Initial
163 concentrations of propofol infusion varied between 16 to 83 $\mu\text{g}/\text{kg}/\text{min}$ (see Table 1). The total time
164 between interruption and re-initiation of sedation was determined by the attending nurse based on
165 medical judgement (i.e., patient's level of agitation, inter-cranial pressure, respiration) and varied
166 between 11 and 33 minutes. Of the 47 patients whose EEG was recorded, 6 patients were excluded
167 due to increased levels of agitation and head movement, which caused excessive noise in the EEG
168 data.

169 Of the remaining 41 patients, 20 had no medical need for re-initiation of sedation after interruption
170 (i.e., they showed good tolerance to the interruption of sedation or began to obey commands). For
171 these patients, the EEG acquisition was stopped after phase 3 (see Figure 1, see Table 1). For 10
172 patients, phase 2 (i.e. anesthesia infusion) was not recorded. A total of 21 patients followed the full
173 protocol of 5 states. To include the maximum number of participants, we report the EEG effect of
174 interruption of sedation (i.e., Phase 1-3, n = 41). The same analysis on the EEG effect of re-
175 initialization of propofol (i.e., Phase 3-5, n = 21) is provided in the Supplementary Material.

176

Table 1: Demographic information of 41 patients included in this study

ID: patient identifier; Sex (M: Male, F: Female), Prop: Propofol concentration in mcg/kg/min, score of Glasgow coma scale (GCS) in Phase 1 and Phase 3 (E: Eye opening, V: verbal Response, M: motor response, T: Intubated); Outcome 1: Survival (W: Withdrawn from life sustaining treatment, S: Survived, D: deceased), Outcome 2: Responsiveness (N: no- did not regain responsiveness, Y: yes- did regain responsiveness), Outcome 3: maximal score on Glasgow outcome scale-extended (GOS-E), Outcome 4: minimal score on Disability Rating Scale (DRS).

ID	Age	Sex	Etiology	Prop. Dose [mcg/kg/min]	GCS Phase 1 (E, V, M)	GCS Phase 3 (E, V, M)	Out 1 Surv.	Out 2 Resp.	Out 3 GOSE	Out 4 DRS
1	40-44	M	Stroke	30	4T (1,1T,2)	4T (1,1T,2)	W	N	W	W
2	40-44	M	Stroke	50	7T (1,1T,5)	10T (4,1T,5)	S	Y	3	13
3	60-64	F	Stroke	33	6T (1,1T,4)	6T (1,1T,4)	D	Y	1	n/a
4	65-70	F	Stroke	30	7T (1,1T,5)	7T (1,1T,5)	D	Y	1	n/a
5	55-59	F	Anoxic	33	3T (1,1T,1)	3T (1,1T,1)	S	Y	-	-
6	55-59	M	Anoxic	83	3T (1,1T,1)	3T (1,1T,1)	S	Y	-	-
7	45-49	F	Anoxic	16	3T (1,1T,1)	6T (1,1T,4)	W	N	n/a	n/a
8	65-69	F	Stroke	30	7T (2,1T,4)	10T (3,1T,6)	S	Y	6	1
9	75-79	F	Other	25	3T (1,1T,1)	7T (2,1T,4)	S	Y	8	0
10	40-45	M	Stroke	50	8T (2,1T,5)	10T (3,1T,6)	S	Y	7	2
11	50-54	F	Stroke	50	6T (1,1T,4)	8T (2,1T,5)	S	Y	3	8
12	50-54	M	Anoxic	50	3T (1,1T,1)	4T (1,1T,2)	S	Y	7	6
13	80-84	M	Stroke	20	6T (-, 1T, -)	6T (-, 1T, -)	W	Y	n/a	n/a
14	80-84	M	Stroke	25	7T (1,1T,5)	8T (1,1T,6)	S	Y	3	7
15	30-34	M	Anoxic	66	3T (1,1T,1)	3T (1,1T,1)	D	Y	1	-
16	25-29	M	TBI	50	6T (1,1T,4)	6T (1,1T,4)	S	Y	7	1
17	60-64	M	Anoxic	66	3T (1,1T,1)	10T (4,1T,5)	S	Y	8	0
18	60-64	M	Anoxic	50	3T (1,1T,1)	11T (4,1T,6)	S	Y	6	3
19	85-89	M	TBI	20	6T (1,1T,4)	6T (1,1T,4)	W	N	n/a	n/a
20	50-54	F	Anoxic	50	3T (1,1T,1)	7T (3,1T,3)	S	Y	3	6
21	20-24	M	TBI	40	7T (1,1T,5)	6T (1,1T,4)	S	Y	8	0
22	65-69	M	Anoxic	50	3T (1,1T,1)	11T (4,1T,6)	S	Y	5	4
23	35-39	M	Stroke	25	4T (1,1T,2)	4T (1,1T,2)	D	N	1	-
24	80-84	M	Anoxic	66	3T (1,1T,1)	3T (1,1T,1)	D	N	1	-
25	30-34	M	Anoxic	50	3T (1,1T,1)	8T (4,1T,3)	W	N	n/a	n/a
26	35-39	M	Anoxic	33	3T (1,1T,1)	3T (1,1T,1)	W	N	n/a	n/a
27	85-89	M	TBI	20	6T (1,1T,4)	9T (3,1T,5)	D	N	1	-
28	65-69	F	Anoxic	16	6T (2,1T,3)	8T (2,1T,5)	D	Y	1	-
29	35-39	F	TBI	60	9T (3,1T,5)	11T (4,1T,6)	S	Y	4	5
30	35-39	M	TBI	50	7T (1,1T,5)	7T (1,1T,5)	S	Y	3	5
31	65-69	M	Anoxic	33	3T (1,1T,1)	3T (1,1T,1)	S	Y	-	-
32	40-44	M	Stroke	35	3T (1,1T,1)	4T (1,1T,2)	W	N	n/a	n/a
33	75-79	M	Anoxic	33	3T (1,1T,1)	3T (1,1T,1)	W	N	n/a	n/a
34	60-64	M	Anoxic	33	3T (1,1T,1)	11T (4,1T,6)	S	Y	-	-
35	30-34	F	Anoxic	50	3T (1,1T,1)	6T (-, 1T, -)	W	N	n/a	n/a
36	85-89	M	Stroke	25	5T (1,1T,3)	11T (4,1T,6)	D	Y	1	-
37	55-59	M	Other	20	3T (1,1T,1)	5T (3,1T,1)	S	Y	8	6
38	80-84	M	Other	30	9T (3,1T,5)	10T (3,1T,6)	W	Y	n/a	n/a
39	40-44	F	Anoxic	40	3T (1,1T,1)	9T (4,1T,4)	S	N	2	20
40	35-39	F	TBI	50	6T (1,1T,4)	9T (3,1T,5)	S	Y	8	0
41	20-24	M	TBI	50	9T (4,1T,4)	9T (4,1T,4)	S	Y	3	8

178 2.3 Data preprocessing

179 Preprocessing was performed using MNE python ²⁶. EEG data was re-referenced to 250 Hz,
180 bandpass-filtered between 0.1 and 50 Hz and Notch-filtered at 60 Hz. Channels with excessive
181 noise and non-physiological artifacts were selected manually and rejected from the data before
182 average referencing. Non-brain electrodes were removed from the subsequent analysis, yielding a
183 maximum of 105 brain channels. Data were segmented in non-overlapping epochs of 10 seconds
184 and evaluated by a trained experimenter. Epochs with non-physiological or movement artifacts
185 were rejected from the subsequent analysis. A total of 113 recordings with an average length of
186 8.6 minutes and 95 channels were included in the final analysis (see Supplementary Material, Table
187 1).




Figure 2: Illustration of EEG feature selection. Colored line represents an example EEG feature (illustrated here is total EEG power over all frequency bands). Green, grey and blue lines indicate values of phase 1, 2 and 3, averaged over electrodes, respectively. The green shaded area indicates the area of ± 1 standard deviation around the mean of Phase 1 signal. The orange shaded area indicates all recording points of Phase 2 and 3 which reached values outside this range. The amount of change was determined by the mean average between Phase 3 and Phase 1. Certainty was rated as the percentage of points outside the green shaded area.

188

189

190 **2.4 Feature extraction**

191 The brain response to the interruption of sedation was estimated using three families of EEG
192 markers: 1) absolute and relative power; 2) spatial ratios; and 3) the spectral exponent. The sum
193 of absolute power of the broadband spectrum and relative power was calculated in five frequency
194 bands: delta (1-4 Hz), theta (4-8 Hz), alpha (8-13 Hz), low beta (13-20 Hz) and high beta (20-30
195 Hz). Power spectral density between 1 and 45 Hz was estimated using the Welch algorithm with a
196 2 second window and 50% overlap. Relative power was defined as the area under the power
197 spectrum in the given frequency range, divided by the total area under the full power spectrum,
198 resulting in the percentage contribution of a specific bandwidth to the total power. We estimated
199 the offset and exponential decay of power over frequency using the aperiodic component (referred
200 to as the spectral exponent). The spectral exponent and offset were estimated using the 'fitting
201 oscillation and one over f ' algorithm²⁷ in the 1-45 Hz range (min_peak_height=0.1,
202 max_n_peaks=3).

203 All features were calculated on each 10-second epoch and channel individually. We then
204 summarized features by extracting 1) the space-averaged feature strength, 2) the standard
205 deviation of the feature over space, and 3) the posterior-anterior ratio (i.e., the geometric mean of
206 power in posterior electrodes, divided by geometric mean of power in anterior electrodes), with
207 each method yielding one value per epoch.

208 **2.5 EEG Dynamic Change**

209 The change in each EEG feature induced by the interruption of propofol was defined as the
210 difference between each feature's Phase 1 average and Phase 3 average (See Figure 2, amount
211 of change). To evaluate whether this difference was induced by the interruption of sedation rather
212 than spontaneous fluctuations, we assessed the proportion of datapoints post-interruption (i.e.,
213 Phase 2 and 3) that were one standard deviation above or below the Phase 1 features (see Figure
214 2, certainty of change). The resulting value can be interpreted as a 'certainty score', with values
215 close to 1 indicating high certainty that the respective feature changed after interruption of sedation,
216 and values of 0 indicating that changes were driven by natural fluctuations in the EEG over time.
217 For the patients for whom Phase 2 was not recorded, certainty was calculated using data from
218 Phase 3 only.

219 The amount of change in each feature was weighted by the certainty score (i.e., amount of change
220 * certainty of change). This dynamic change score was calculated individually on the mean,
221 standard deviation and posterior-anterior ratio of each feature (i.e., total power, delta, theta, alpha,
222 low beta, high beta, exponent and offset), yielding a total of 24 features (i.e., 8 mean, 8 standard
223 deviation, 8 posterior-anterior ratio). We present all analyses on EEG recordings during interruption
224 of sedation (i.e., Phase 1-3) in the main manuscript; the analysis was reproduced for the re-initiation
225 of sedation (i.e., Phase 3-5) and described in the Supplementary Material (see Supplementary
226 Methods)

227 **2.6 Grouping according to behavioral response**

228 Participant behavioral responsiveness was assessed using the GCS before, during and after the
229 interruption of sedation (see Figure 1). The change in behavioral responsiveness (Δ GCS) during
230 the NWT was defined as the difference between GCS score off sedation and pre-interruption of
231 sedation: Δ GCS = GCS_{observed} - GCS_{sedation}.

232 Δ GCS and GCS_{observed} were used to categorize patients into three groups: Nine patients regained
233 ability to obey commands during the NWT and were assigned to 'Group A: regained
234 responsiveness' (see Figure 3, green markers, see Table 1). Thirteen patients showed increased
235 levels of behavior during interruption of sedation (i.e., Δ GCS \geq 2), despite not obeying commands

241 **2.7 Machine learning analysis**

242 We developed a machine learning model (a Linear Ridge regression trained using scikit learn ²⁸)
243 that used the EEG dynamic change score to predict the Δ GCS of Group A participants. For the
244 training, participants' age, concentration of sedation and time without sedation were combined with
245 the 24 EEG features. Model performance was evaluated using mean absolute error (i.e., average
246 error between true and predicted Δ GCS) and a leave-one participant out cross validation. A good
247 model performance indicates that the model has learned to identify EEG patterns which are related
248 to behavioral responsiveness during the NWT.

249 We then used the model to predict the change in GCS (Δ GCS_{predicted}) during the NWT in participants
250 who showed ambiguous or absent behavioral response (Group B and C). Behavioral
251 responsiveness can be dissociated from the cognitive presence of consciousness (i.e. covert
252 consciousness) ²⁻⁴. We therefore did not expect to see a high prediction accuracy for Group B and
253 C. Instead, a high deviation between Δ GCS and Δ GCS_{predicted} could indicate that participants show
254 electrophysiological signs of waking-up despite absent or ambiguous behavioral responsiveness.

255 **2.8 Outcome assessment and prognostic analysis**

256 Functional outcome was assessed at 3, 6 and 12 months post-EEG recording using a phone
257 assessment of the Glasgow Outcome scale-extended (GOS-E) ^{29,30} and the Disability Rating Scale
258 (DRS) ³¹. Depending on the participant's functional capabilities, questions were answered by the
259 participant or participant's next of kin. Four follow-up calls could not be completed due to changed
260 contact information and inability to reach patients' next of kin. We quantified functional outcome as
261 the maximal GOS-E score (i.e., 0 indicating death) and minimal DRS score (i.e., 0 indicating no
262 disability) reached within one-year post-EEG. In the case of death, we additionally asked whether
263 the participant regained capacity to obey commands at any time prior to death.

264 As this study aimed to investigate the value of EEG in patients with *absent* or *ambiguous* behavioral
265 responses, the analysis of prognostic value was only performed on participants from Group B and
266 C (n = 32). Group A was used for model training and was not included in the prognostic analysis.

267 Prognostic analysis was performed based on three outcome criteria: 1) survival; 2) recovery of
268 responsiveness; and 3) functional outcome (i.e., GOS-E and DRS). For the prognostication of
269 survival, 23 patients were included (16 survived, 7 died within three months post-recording). Due
270 to uncertainty of the natural progression of their recovery, participants who had a withdrawal of life
271 sustaining treatment (WLST) were excluded from this analysis (n = 9, see Table 2). For the
272 prognostication of recovery of responsiveness, 24 patients were included (20 regained
273 responsiveness, 4 did not). Participants who had a WLST and had never regained responsiveness
274 (n=8) were excluded from this analysis. For the prognostication of functional outcome, 20
275 participants were included (9 WLST excluded, 3 missed follow-ups, see Table 2).

276

277

Table 2: Summary of outcome measures, split by response groups
 GOS-E: Glasgow Outcome Scale-Extended, DRS: Disability rating score, N: Number of participants, WLST: withdraw of life-sustaining treatment

	N	N Regained responsiveness	N Did not regain responsiveness	N Follow-up calls	GOS-E	DRS
Group A (n = 9)						
Survivors	7	7	0	6 (1 missed)	Mean: 5.16 Std: 1.34 Range: 3 - 7	Mean: 3.67 Std: 1.97 Range: 1 - 7
Non-survivors	1	1	0	-	GOSE = 1	N.A.
WLST	1	1	0	-	-	-
Group B (n = 13)						
Survivors	8	7	1	8	Mean: 5.37 Std: 2.64 Range: 2 - 8	Mean: 6.63 Std: 6.65 Range: 0 - 20
Non-survivors	2	1	1	-	GOSE = 1	N.A.
WLST	3	0	3 (excluded)	-	-	-
Group C (n = 19)						
Survivors	8	8	0	5 (3 missed)	Mean: 5.6 Std: 2.15 Range: 3 - 8	Mean: 4.0 Std: 3.03 Range: 0 - 8
Non-survivors	5	3	2	-	GOSE = 1	N.A.
WLST	6	1	5 (excluded)	-	-	-

278

279 **2.9 Outcome prediction by attending physicians**

280 To compare our proposed tool to bedside clinical practice, we collected clinicians' prognostication
 281 of participant functional recovery. Attending physicians were asked to predict their patient's 6- and
 282 12-month GOS-E score. They were also asked to rank their confidence in their prediction on a
 283 scale from 0 to 4, with 0 indicating not confident and 4 being very confident. Outcome prediction
 284 questionnaires were completed between 1 and 24 hours after the EEG recording. Patient's
 285 APACHE score³³ was calculated by a trained clinician. For three patients, an APACHE score could
 286 not be determined due to missing clinical information.

287 **2.10 Statistical analysis**

288 The prognostic value of the EEG model to predict survival and recovery of responsiveness was
 289 performed using a Python implementation of the one-sided Mann-Whitney-U test³⁴, with the
 290 expectation of a larger $\Delta GCS_{\text{predicted}}$ for patients with a favorable outcome. In addition, we defined

291 an optimal decision-threshold by identifying the value which maximized the distance between the
 292 favorable and unfavorable group. Using this linear split, we defined values of accuracy, specificity
 293 and sensitivity of the group-separability. It is important to note that the machine learning model from
 294 the first part of this study only predicted an expected Δ GCS, but not patient outcome. The purpose
 295 of the optimal threshold was solely to compare how clinically informative the EEG-predicted
 296 response was, compared to the observed behavioral response. The prognostic value for functional
 297 outcome was assessed using a Spearman-rank test³⁴.




Figure 4: Case examples of contradicting EEG and GCS response.

(Top Right) Observed GCS difference (i.e. GCS off sedation – GCS on sedation) and GCS difference predicted by the model. Colors indicate the previously defined response groups. For four highlighted and annotated cases, the EEG response to interruption of sedation is visualized. Each box visualizes a time-resolved spectrogram and topographic maps of spectral exponent for the highlighted case. Dotted lines in the spectrogram indicate the beginning of a new recording phase. In case 4, phase 2 was not recorded. Red arrows indicate the moment when propofol sedation is interrupted.

GCS: Glasgow Coma Scale

299 **3 Results**

300 **3.1 EEG features can be decoupled from participant behavioral response**

301 Using the Linear Ridge Regression, the Δ GCS of participants in Group A was predicted from the
302 EEG model with a mean absolute error of 1.57. The most important features for the prediction were
303 the relative power in the low beta, theta and alpha bandwidth and the magnitude and posterior-
304 anterior ratio of the spectral exponent.

305 The Δ GCS_{predicted} for Groups B and C had an overall error of 2.15. Model prediction for Group B
306 varied between -0.69 and 8.35; model prediction for Group C varied between -0.88 and 8.06. High
307 values of Δ GCS_{predicted} indicate the presence of electrophysiological patterns of waking up, similar
308 to participants with high Δ GCS in Group A. Negative values indicate EEG dynamic changes which
309 were even weaker than the training example with the lowest Δ GCS.


310 Figure 4 illustrates the predicted and observed Δ GCS. Although the predicted difference of most
311 Group B participants matched the observed difference, some participant's Δ GCS_{predicted} were highly
312 under- or over-estimated. We use four case examples of the maximally under- and over-estimated
313 Δ GCS_{predicted} to elucidate the different types of brain responses during the NWT. Case 1 and 2
314 (Patient 33 and 11 in Table 1) showed an absent (Δ GCS = 0) or ambiguous (Δ GCS = 2) behavioral
315 response during the NWT. However, based on the EEG reaction to interruption of sedation, the
316 model generated a Δ GCS_{predicted} of 8.06 and 8.53, respectively. In contrast, Case 3 and 4 (Patient
317 4 and 7 in Table 1) showed an absent (Δ GCS = 0) or ambiguous (Δ GCS = 3) response during the
318 NWT. In both cases, the model generated a negative Δ GCS_{predicted}.

319 The time-resolved spectrogram and topographic maps of spectral exponent for the four highlighted
320 cases reveal electrophysiological patterns underpinning the prediction (see Figure 4). While Cases
321 1 and 2 show a prominent increase of global power and flattening of the spectral exponent following
322 sedation interruption, no such effect was observed for Cases 3 and 4.

323 Altogether, these cases demonstrate that dynamic EEG changes reveal heterogeneity in the group
324 of participants whose response to the NWT was ambiguous or absent. Despite remaining
325 completely unresponsive, some participants showed EEG patterns that have previously been
326 associated with an increased behavioral response. Our results indicated that EEG features can be
327 decoupled from behavioral responsiveness during the NWT.

328 **3.2 EEG response to interruption of sedation has prognostic value for participants with** 329 **absent or ambiguous behavioral responsiveness.**

330 Of the 23 participants included in the prognostic analysis of survival, only 11 had an observed
331 Δ GCS above zero during the NWT. The observed Δ GCS had low predictive value for survival, with
332 an accuracy of 0.61, specificity of 0.56 and sensitivity of 0.71 (Figure 5A). Participants' maximum
333 observed GCS score was also poorly predictive of survival, with an accuracy of 0.61, specificity of
334 0.62 and sensitivity of 0.57 (Figure 5B). In contrast, the Δ GCS_{predicted} had higher prognostic value,
335 with an accuracy of 0.74, specificity of 0.75 and sensitivity of 0.71 (Figure 5A). The predicted
336 maximal GCS only minimally increase group separability, with an accuracy of 0.65, specificity of
337 0.69 and sensitivity of 0.57 (Figure 5B). Observed GCS scores did not significantly differentiate
338 participants according to their outcome; in contrast, the EEG model generated significantly higher
339 Δ GCS_{predicted} for participants who survived ($U = 87$, $p < 0.05$) (Figure 5A). Supplementary Figure 1
340 visualizes this effect for each response group individually.



341

342 The prognostic value for recovery of responsiveness remained unchanged between $GCS_{observed}$
 343 and $\Delta GCS_{predicted}$ (Supplementary Figure 2). No significant correlation was identified between
 344 observed or predicted ΔGCS and maximal GOS-E and DRS score within one-year post-recording.

345 The analysis was repeated using a separate model trained on the brain response to induction of
346 sedation (i.e., Phase 3-5, n = 21) (see Supplementary Methods). Although the effects are reduced
347 due to the smaller sample size, there is a better prognostic separability for survival and recovery of
348 responsiveness using the dynamic EEG changes compared to the observed behavior (Figure S3).

349 Altogether, we demonstrated that the EEG response following interruption of sedation has
350 prognostic value for survival of participants with absent or ambiguous behavioral responsiveness
351 during the NWT. Based on the EEG response, participants who survived showed a higher
352 $\Delta GCS_{\text{predicted}}$ compared to participants who did not. All analyses were repeated using only the
353 averaged EEG features from Phase 1 and Phase 3 independently. There was no increase in
354 prognostic value using the EEG from Phase 1 (Figure S3), though the EEG from Phase 3 had
355 prognostic value for recovery of responsiveness (Figure S3). Figure 5C clearly illustrates the
356 improvements offered by a combined neuro-behavioral assessment during the wake-up test.

357 **3.3 Prognostic value of EEG response to interruption of sedation could benefit clinical** 358 **decision making**

359 Physicians' predicted GOS-E score at 6 months positively correlated with participants' GCS_{observed}
360 ($\rho(28) = 0.39$, $p < 0.05$, partial correlation corrected by age). As expected, a patient's behavioral
361 responsiveness had a strong influence on the physician's prediction of long-term functional
362 outcome, with more responsive patients correlated with predictions of better recovery.

363 Physicians rated their predictions with a confidence of 1.82 ± 0.71 , with 1 indicating 'slightly
364 confident' and 2 being 'fairly confident'. The lowest average confidence score (1.8 ± 0.35) appeared
365 in Group B, who showed an ambiguous behavioral response. Overall, there was a high level of
366 uncertainty in the functional outcome of unresponsive patients, which was maximal when patients
367 show an ambiguous behavioral response.

368 The absolute distance between the real and the physician-predicted GOS-E score was 1.80 ± 1.42
369 (Supplementary Material, Figure S4). However, when binarizing patient outcomes according to
370 survival ($GOS-E > 1$) or recovery of responsiveness ($GOS-E > 2$), physician predictions could not
371 separate good from poor outcomes (Supplementary Material, Figure S5). Similarly, the APACHE
372 score achieved a maximal prognostic accuracy of 0.37 for survival and 0.62 for recovery of
373 responsiveness (Supplementary Material, Figure S5). Our results confirm that prognostication after
374 brain injury in the tested sample is accompanied by an overall high uncertainty and suggests a
375 tendency to overestimate functional outcome.

376 **4 Discussion**

377 In this study, we demonstrated that the EEG dynamic change during the NWT can improve
378 prognostication of severely brain injured patients who show an absent or ambiguous behavioral
379 response to interruption of sedation. The EEG response to interruption of sedation showed
380 electrophysiological signs of waking-up despite behavioral unresponsiveness in some patients.
381 Moreover, the EEG dynamic change during the NWT predicted patient survival better than
382 behavioral responses alone. This has the potential to improve clinical prognostication, as the
383 attending physician's outcome prediction was highly dependent on the patient's observed behavior.
384 Assessing covert neurophysiological function alongside behavior can improve clinician confidence
385 in neuroprognostication and decision-making in acute care settings for severely brain injured
386 patients.

387 Of the four case examples highlighted in the results, the EEG of two changed dynamically in
388 response to interruption of sedation despite the absence of a behavioral response. The first patient
389 suffered an anoxic brain injury and showed a strong EEG dynamic change during the NWT, while
390 his GCS remained constant at 3T. However, these results are inconclusive, as this patient was

391 withdrawn from life sustaining treatment and the natural course of his recovery remains unknown.
392 The second case patient suffered a stroke and had an ambiguous behavioral response during the
393 NWT. Her EEG had strong neurophysiological signs of waking up, which aligned with her survival
394 and recovery of consciousness. The EEG of the third and fourth case examples remained static
395 during the NWT. The third case was a stroke patient who passed away in palliative care but
396 regained the capacity to follow commands in the ICU; the fourth suffered an anoxic brain injury and
397 was withdrawn from life sustaining treatment. This case series illustrates the potential benefits, but
398 also the limitations of the proposed tool. Although the EEG response during the NWT may capture
399 the brain's capacity for recovery, patient survival and long-term functional outcome are also
400 determined by factors including age, organ function, treatment availability, social support and the
401 occurrence of secondary medical events unrelated to the original brain injury. The technique
402 proposed in this study is thus not intended to be used in isolation, but rather to complement current
403 state-of-the-art medical assessments to generate a better informed prognosis.

404 The results of this study need to be considered in light of several limitations. First, while all EEG
405 was recorded during a complete interruption of propofol, other medications including morphine,
406 fentanyl (4 patients), midazolam (3 patients), Keppra (2 patients) and haloperidol (2 patients) were
407 not discontinued during the NWT. Second, before the NWT, patients were continuously sedated
408 for durations ranging from hours to days and were exposed to different concentrations of propofol.
409 We accounted for this potential confound in our analysis by adding the concentration of propofol
410 as a feature to the linear regression. No significant difference was found between the concentration
411 of propofol and participant survival or recovery of responsiveness. Third, EEG markers of
412 consciousness are highly variable across etiologies^{20,35}, and this study analyzed brain-injured
413 participants from anoxic, traumatic and stroke etiologies as a single group. However, our study
414 investigated the propofol-induced *relative* change in EEG features, using a within-subject
415 comparison to account for the specifics in each participant's brain injury. Fourth, the effect of
416 anesthesia on the brain and behavior differs across sex and age³⁶⁻³⁸. We accounted for age-
417 related differences by including age as a feature in the machine learning model, however, a larger
418 dataset is necessary to identify relevant EEG features in different populations. Fifth, we only
419 extracted features based on fixed EEG bandwidths using a 128-channel EEG system. A larger
420 feature space that accounts for the raw spectrogram over time could be implemented on a larger
421 sample of patients. Finally, all features extracted from the EEG were calculated on a single-channel
422 level. It remains to be validated whether EEG features of clinical EEG systems would be sufficient to
423 provide similar results.

424 **5 Acknowledgments**

425 This study was funded by a McGill/Western Collaboration Grant from Healthy Brain for Healthy
426 Lives and BrainsCAN (1a-5a-01) and by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR, Project
427 Grant no. 480995).

428 CM is funded through Fonds de recherche du Québec – Santé (FRQS). This research is supported
429 in part by the FRQNT Strategic Clusters Program (2020-RS4-265502 - Centre UNIQUE - Union
430 Neurosciences & Artificial Intelligence – Quebec) (awarded to CM).

431 AMO is supported by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR, #408004) and is a Fellow
432 of the CIFAR Brain, Mind, and Consciousness program.

433 CD is funded through an FRQS Junior 1 Scholar Award, and Discovery Grant from the Natural
434 Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC), a CIFAR Global Scholars
435 award, and institutional start-up funding from the Research Centre of the Centre intégré
436 universitaire de santé et de services sociaux (CIUSSS) du Nord-Île-de-Montréal.

437 SBM is funded by a Canada Research Chair (Tier II) and a NSERC Discovery Grant (RGPIN-2023-
438 03619).

439 References

440

- 441 1. Teasdale G, Jennett B. Assessment of coma and impaired consciousness : A practical scale.
442 *The Lancet*. 1974;304(7872):81-84. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(74)91639-0
- 443 2. Monti MM, Vanhauzenhuysse A, Coleman MR, et al. Willful Modulation of Brain Activity in
444 Disorders of Consciousness. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2010;362(7):579-589.
445 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa0905370
- 446 3. Owen AM, Coleman MR, Boly M, Davis MH, Laureys S, Pickard JD. Detecting Awareness in
447 the Vegetative State. *Science*. 2006;313(5792):1402-1402. doi:10.1126/science.1130197
- 448 4. Sanders RD, Tononi G, Laureys S, Sleigh JW, Warner DS. Unresponsiveness ≠
449 Unconsciousness. *Anesthesiology*. 2012;116(4):946-959.
450 doi:10.1097/ALN.0b013e318249d0a7
- 451 5. Oddo M, Crippa IA, Mehta S, et al. Optimizing sedation in patients with acute brain injury. *Crit*
452 *Care*. 2016;20(1):128. doi:10.1186/s13054-016-1294-5
- 453 6. Oddo M, Steiner L. Sedation and analgesia in the neurocritical care unit. In: *Oxford Textbook*
454 *of Neurocritical Care*. Oxford University Press; 2016.
- 455 7. Kress JP, Pohlman AS, O'Connor MF, Hall JB. Daily Interruption of Sedative Infusions in
456 Critically Ill Patients Undergoing Mechanical Ventilation. *New England Journal of Medicine*.
457 2000;342(20):1471-1477. doi:10.1056/NEJM200005183422002
- 458 8. Edlow BL, Fecchio M, Bodien YG, et al. Measuring Consciousness in the Intensive Care Unit.
459 *Neurocrit Care*. 2023;38(3):584-590. doi:10.1007/s12028-023-01706-4
- 460 9. Giacino JT. The vegetative and minimally conscious states: consensus-based criteria for
461 establishing diagnosis and prognosis. *NeuroRehabilitation*. 2004;19(4):293-298.
- 462 10. Casali AG, Gosseries O, Rosanova M, et al. A Theoretically Based Index of Consciousness
463 Independent of Sensory Processing and Behavior. *Science Translational Medicine*.
464 2013;5(198):198ra105-198ra105. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.3006294
- 465 11. Kazazian K, Abdalmalak A, Norton L, et al. Functional near-infrared spectroscopy as a tool to
466 assess residual and covert consciousness in the intensive care unit (P11-7.003). *Neurology*.
467 2023;100(17_supplement_2):2010. doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000202261
- 468 12. Kazazian K, Kolisnyk M, Norton L, Gofton T, Debicki D, Owen A. Predicting the recovery of
469 consciousness after severe acute brain injury using resting state networks: a machine learning
470 approach (N3.001). *Neurology*. 2023;100(17_supplement_2):2637.
471 doi:10.1212/WNL.0000000000202688
- 472 13. Norton L, Kazazian K, Gofton T, et al. Functional Neuroimaging as an Assessment Tool in
473 Critically Ill Patients. *Annals of Neurology*. 2023;93(1):131-141. doi:10.1002/ana.26530
- 474 14. Marklund N. The Neurological Wake-up Test—A Role in Neurocritical Care Monitoring of
475 Traumatic Brain Injury Patients? *Front Neurol*. 2017;8. doi:10.3389/fneur.2017.00540

- 476 15. Skoglund K, Enblad P, Hillered L, Marklund N. The neurological wake-up test increases stress
477 hormone levels in patients with severe traumatic brain injury*. *Critical Care Medicine*.
478 2012;40(1):216. doi:10.1097/CCM.0b013e31822d7dbd
- 479 16. Blain-Moraes S, Boshra R, Ma HK, et al. Normal Brain Response to Propofol in Advance of
480 Recovery from Unresponsive Wakefulness Syndrome. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2016;10.
481 doi:10.3389/fnhum.2016.00248
- 482 17. Duclos C, Maschke C, Mahdid Y, et al. Brain Responses to Propofol in Advance of Recovery
483 from Coma and Disorders of Consciousness: A Preliminary Study. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*.
484 2022;205(2):171-182. doi:10.1164/rccm.202105-1223OC
- 485 18. Maschke C, Duclos C, Owen AM, Jerbi K, Blain-Moraes S. Aperiodic brain activity and
486 response to anesthesia vary in disorders of consciousness. *NeuroImage*. 2023;275:120154.
487 doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2023.120154
- 488 19. Maschke C, Duclos C, Blain-Moraes S. Paradoxical markers of conscious levels: Effects of
489 propofol on patients in disorders of consciousness. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*.
490 2022;16. Accessed October 6, 2022.
491 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnhum.2022.992649>
- 492 20. Colombo MA, Comanducci A, Casarotto S, et al. Beyond alpha power: EEG spatial and
493 spectral gradients robustly stratify disorders of consciousness. *Cerebral Cortex*. Published
494 online 2023:bhad031. doi:10.1093/cercor/bhad031
- 495 21. Lendner JD, Helfrich RF, Mander BA, et al. An electrophysiological marker of arousal level in
496 humans. *Elife*. 2020;9:e55092. doi:10.7554/eLife.55092
- 497 22. Purdon PL, Pierce ET, Mukamel EA, et al. Electroencephalogram signatures of loss and
498 recovery of consciousness from propofol. *PNAS*. 2013;110(12):E1142-E1151.
499 doi:10.1073/pnas.1221180110
- 500 23. Alkhachroum A, Appavu B, Egawa S, et al. Electroencephalogram in the intensive care unit: a
501 focused look at acute brain injury. *Intensive Care Med*. 2022;48(10):1443-1462.
502 doi:10.1007/s00134-022-06854-3
- 503 24. Edlow BL, Fins JJ. Assessment of Covert Consciousness in the Intensive Care Unit: Clinical
504 and Ethical Considerations. *The Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation*. 2018;33(6):424.
505 doi:10.1097/HTR.0000000000000448
- 506 25. Duclos C, Norton L, Laforge G, et al. Protocol for the Prognostication of Consciousness
507 Recovery Following a Brain Injury. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2020;14.
508 doi:10.3389/fnhum.2020.582125
- 509 26. Gramfort A, Luessi M, Larson E, et al. MEG and EEG data analysis with MNE-Python. *Frontiers*
510 *in Neuroscience*. 2013;7. Accessed March 23, 2022.
511 <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnins.2013.00267>
- 512 27. Donoghue T, Haller M, Peterson EJ, et al. Parameterizing neural power spectra into periodic
513 and aperiodic components. *Nat Neurosci*. 2020;23(12):1655-1665. doi:10.1038/s41593-020-
514 00744-x
- 515 28. Pedregosa F, Varoquaux G, Gramfort A, et al. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python.
516 *Journal of Machine Learning Research*. 2011;12:2825-2830.

- 517 29. Jennett B, Bond M. Assessment of outcome after severe brain damage. *Lancet*.
518 1975;1(7905):480-484. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(75)92830-5
- 519 30. Wilson J t. L, Pettigrew LE I., Teasdale GM. Structured Interviews for the Glasgow Outcome
520 Scale and the Extended Glasgow Outcome Scale: Guidelines for Their Use. *Journal of*
521 *Neurotrauma*. 1998;15(8):573-585. doi:10.1089/neu.1998.15.573
- 522 31. Rappaport M, Hall KM, Hopkins K, Belleza T, Cope DN. Disability rating scale for severe head
523 trauma: coma to community. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 1982;63(3):118-123.
- 524 32. Esnault P, Montcriol A, D'Aranda E, et al. Early neurological wake-up test in intubated brain-
525 injured patients: A long-term, single-centre experience. *Australian Critical Care*.
526 2017;30(5):273-278. doi:10.1016/j.aucc.2016.10.002
- 527 33. Knaus WA, Draper EA, Wagner DP, Zimmerman JE. APACHE II: A severity of disease
528 classification system. *Critical Care Medicine*. 1985;13(10):818. Accessed April 2, 2024.
529 https://journals.lww.com/ccmjournal/abstract/1985/10000/APACHE_II__A_severity_of_disease_classification.9.aspx%E0%B8%A3%EF%A3%82
530
- 531 34. Vallat R. Pingouin: statistics in Python. *Journal of Open Source Software*. 2018;3(31):1026.
532 doi:10.21105/joss.01026
- 533 35. Maschke C, Belloli L, Manasova D, Sitt JD, Blain-Moraes S. The role of etiology in the
534 identification of clinical markers of consciousness: comparing EEG alpha power, complexity,
535 and spectral exponent. Published online March 22, 2024:2024.03.20.24304639.
536 doi:10.1101/2024.03.20.24304639
- 537 36. Kodaka M, Suzuki T, Maeyama A, Koyama K, Miyao H. Gender differences between predicted
538 and measured propofol CP50 for loss of consciousness. *Journal of Clinical Anesthesia*.
539 2006;18(7):486-489. doi:10.1016/j.jclinane.2006.08.004
- 540 37. Leroy S, Major S, Bublitz V, Dreier JP, Koch S. Unveiling age-independent spectral markers of
541 propofol-induced loss of consciousness by decomposing the electroencephalographic
542 spectrum into its periodic and aperiodic components. *Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience*.
543 2023;14. Accessed September 27, 2023.
544 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnagi.2022.1076393>
- 545 38. Vuyk J, Oostwouder CJ, Vletter AA, Burm AGL, Bovill JG. Gender differences in the
546 pharmacokinetics of propofol in elderly patients during and after continuous infusion. *BJA:*
547 *British Journal of Anaesthesia*. 2001;86(2):183-188. doi:10.1093/bja/86.2.183
- 548