





Report Description

Personal & Clinical Data


Name	Huriye Rostami	Date of Recording	30-Jul-2024	
Date of Birth - Age	22-Mar-1954 - 70.36	Gender	Female	
Handedness(R/L)	Right	Source of Referral	Dr Hosseini	
Initial Diagnosis	MDD-OCD			
Current Medication	Medication Free			

Dr Hosseini






Denoising Information (EC)



Number of Eye and Muscle Elements			Low Artifact Percentage		
Eye 1 Muscle 0			()		
Total Artifact Percentage			High Artifact Percentage		
()			0		
EEG Quality good			Total Recording Time Remaining	201.96 sec	

Denoising Information (EO)




Number of Eye and Muscle Elements		Low Artifact Percentage		
Eye 6 Muscle 1		0		
Total Artifact Percentage		High Artifact Percentage		
0		()		
EEG Quality		good		Total Recording Time Remaining 230.18 sec





Pathological assessment for mood disorders


Compare to Mood Disorders Database



EEG Compatibility with Depression Diagnosis

Depression Table	EC		EO	
Feature Name	Threshold	Region	Threshold	Region
Increased Global rAlpha	0.00	NAN	0.00	NAN
Increased global rTheta	0.00	NAN	0.50	global
Decreased rDelta	0.00	NAN	0.00	NAN
Increased rBeta	0.00	NAN	0.00	NAN
Left FAA	-0.18	Left FAA	-0.11	Left FAA
Right OAA	0.00	NAN	0.00	NAN
Decreased Coherence (D, T)	0.00	NAN	0.00	NAN
Increased Coherence (A, B)	0.00	NAN	0.00	NAN
depression 0	10 20	30 40 50 60 Depression Probability	70 80	90 100
Depression Probability				

EEG Compatibility with Anxiety Diagnosis







EEG Compatibility with Mood Swings Diagnosis*

Mood Swings Table	EC		EO	
Feature Name	Threshold	Region	Threshold	Region
Decreased rAlpha	0.00	NAN	-0.50	LF-RF-MF-
Increased (rDelta+rTheta)	0.00	NAN	0.50	LF-RF-MF-LT-RT-C-O-
Increased rBeta	0.00	NAN	0.00	NAN
Decreased Alpha Coherence	-0.50	Decreased Alpha	-0.50	Decreased Alpha
Right FAA	0.00	NAN	0.00	NAN
BMD 0	10 20	1 1 1 1 30 40 50 60	70 80	90 100
Mood Swings Probability				

* This index can only be investigated if there are symptoms of mood swings (R/O BMD or R/O mood swings).

Depression Severity

Anxiety Severity

Mild	Borderline	Moderate	Severe	Extreme



Arousal Level Detection








Pathological assessment for Dementia


Compare to Dementia Database



Dementia Probability

Dementia Table	EC		EO	
Feature Name	Threshold	Region	Threshold	Region
Increased rDelta	0.50	LT	1.00	LF-RF-MF-LT-RT-C-O-
Increased rTheta	0.50	RF-MF-C-	1.00	RF-RT-C-P-
Decreased rAlpha	0.00	NAN	-0.50	LF-RF-MF-
Decreased rBeta	-0.50	LF-LT-RT-O-	-0.50	LF-RF-MF-LT-RT-
Increased T/A Ratio	0.00	NAN	2.00	LF-RF-MF-RT-C-
Increased D/A Ratio	0.00	NAN	1.00	LF-RF-MF-LT-RT-
Decreased (D+T+A+B) Coherence	-0.50	Decreased global	-0.50	Decreased global
dementia	10 20	1 1 1 1 30 40 50 60 Dementia Probability	70 80	90 100
Dementia Probability				


Cognitive Impairment Severity







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 .

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: 92.1% Sensitivity: 89.13% Specificity: 97.47%


Participants Information



Features Information



Responsibility



Data Distribution

Distribution of Dataset | Non-responders | Responders | Responders | New Sample |


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.






IAF(EO)




Eye Open IAF= 10.00

IAF(EC)




Eye Close IAF= 11.00

EEG Spectra



Alpha Asymmetry(AA)



Alpha Blocking








Z Score Summary Information (EC)











Eyes Open





Z Score Summary Information (EO)






















E.C.T/B Ratio (Raw- Z Score)






E.O.T/B Ratio (Raw- Z Score)





Arousal Level











Absolute Power-Eye Closed (EC) 🌮



Relative Power-Eye Closed (EC) 🍪








Absolute Power-Eye Open (EO) 🕢





Relative Power-Eye Open (EO)

