# **QEEG Clinical Report**

**EEGLens** 





The QEEG report is provided by NPCindex Company, operating under the QEEGhome brand.

# **Personal Data:**

Name: Aliasiyabi Gender: Male

Age: 1999-04-18 - 26.6 Handedness: Right

## **Clinical Data:**

Initial diagnosis: Migraine

Medication: -

Date of Recording: 2025-10-06

Source of Referral: Kamal Barzegar Ghazi

This case belongs to Kamal Barzegar Ghazi










## **EEG** Quality

EC


#### Z-score Information



## **■** TMS Reponsibility



## Pathological Assessment



#### **■ EEG Neuromarker Values**

Neuromarker	Region	Value	Assessment
AFP	Frontal	09.25	Normal
AFP	Occipital	09.38	Low
Arousal Level	-	-	Low

QEEGhome Clinical Report


Kamal Barzegar Ghazi





## **Denoising Information**


## Eye Close



Rejected Channel



Denoised EEG



Flat Channel



**Total Recording Time Remaining:** 239.74 sec

Number of Eye and Muscle Elements Eye: 0 Muscle: 0

Low Artifact Percentage

,

High Artifact Percentage

Total Artifact Percentage


**EEG Quality:** perfect





## **Pathological Assessment**

## Main Diagnosis: Depression



## **Description**

According to the guidelines, the initial diagnosis of depression could have comorbidities such as alcohol abuse, panic attacks, OCD, and anxiety. It also differentially diagnoses with anxiety, bipolar disorder, alcohol abuse, psychosis, and somatoform.

In the above graph, the **red area** shows the percentage of each comorbidity from your patient's EEG markers. Observe that each comorbidity marker is not unique and can be shared with other comorbidities.


Side circles in the above graph represent the differential diagnosis between depression and its misdiagnosis conditions based on your patient's EEG markers and trained artificial intelligence. The differential diagnosis probability is represented by **the bold blue bars** in the circles, and the probability of depression is represented by the gray bars.

**Note:** In case your patient has drug abuse, obtain the substance abuse pathologic page of QEEGhome by registering the diagnosis under the initial diagnoses section of the website.

#### References:

Sadock, B. J., Sadock, V. A., & Ruiz, P. (Eds.). (2025). Kaplan and Sadock's comprehensive textbook of psychiatry (11th ed., Vols. 1–2). Wolters Kluwer Sadock, B. J., Sadock, V. A., & Ruiz, P. (2022). Kaplan and Sadock's synopsis of


#### User Manual








## **QEEG Based Predicting Medication Response**





## **Explanation**

These two tables can be considered the most important finding that can be extracted from QEEG. To prepare this list, the NPCIndex Article Review Team has studied, categorized, and extracted algorithms from many authoritative published articles on predict medication response and Pharmaco EEG studies. These articles are published between 1970 and 2021. The findings extracted from this set include 85 different factors in the raw band domains, spectrum, power, coherence, and loreta that have not been segregated to avoid complexity, and their results are shown in these diagrams. One can review details in NPCIndex.com .

#### **Medication Recommendation**

These two charts, calculate response probability to various medications, according only to QEEG indicators. Blue charts favor drug response and red charts favor drug resistance. The longer the bar, the more evidence there is in the articles. Only drugs listed in the articles are listed. These tables present the indicators reviewed in the QEEG studies and are not a substitute for physician selection.





## **rTMS Response Prediction**

#### Network Performance


Accuracy: 92.10% Sensitivity: 89.13% Specificity: 97.47%

## Participants Information







#### Features Information



## Responsibility



#### Data Distribution




## **About Predicting rTMS Response**

This index was obtained based on machine learning approaches and by examining the QEEG biomarkers of more than 470 cases treated with rTMS. The cases were diagnosed with depression (with and without comorbidity) and all were medication free. By examining more than 40 biomarkers capable of predicting response to rTMS treatment in previous studies and with data analysis, finally 10 biomarkers including bispectral and nonlinear features entered the machine learning process. The final chart can distinguish between RTMS responsive and resistant cases with 92.1% accuracy. This difference rate is much higher than the average response to treatment of 44%, in the selection of patients with clinical criteria, and is an important finding in the direction of personalized treatment for rTMS.






# Vigilance



# Vigilance Slope 0.11




# **EEG Neuromarker Values**


Neuromarker	Region	Value	Assessment
AFP	Frontal	09.25	Normal
AFP	Occipital	09.38	Low
Alpha Asymmetry	Frontal	00.21	Anxiety
Alpha Asymmetry	Occipital	00.02	Anxiety
Beta Asymmetry	Frontal	-0.02	Anxiety
Arousal Level	<b>-</b>	-	Low
Vigilance Level	_	04.00	Normal
Vigilance Mean	_	03.87	Normal
Vigilance Regulation	_	00.11	Normal
Vigilance 0 Stage (%)		00.00	Normal
Vigilance A1 Stage (%)		46.03	-





# **EEG Spectra**











# **Z Score Summary Information**

Eye Close




## **Theta/Beta Ratio**







# **Absolute Power-Eye Close**



# **Relative Power-Eye Close**

