





QEEG Clinical Report BrainLens V0.4

Report Description

Personal & Clinical Data


Name	Meisam Rajabi	Date of Recording	23-Jun-2024		
Date of Birth - Age	10-Apr-1980 - 44.2	Gender	Male		
Handedness(R/L)	Right	Source of Referral	Dr Dehghani		
Initial Diagnosis	Memory Problem				
Current Medication	Medication Free				

Dr Dehghani






Denoising Information (EC)



Number of Eye and Muscle Elements			Low Artifact Percentage		
Eye	1	Muscle	0	0	
Total Artifact Percentage			High Artifact Percentage		
0			()		
EEG Quality	•	good		Total Recording Time Remaining	245.91 sec

Denoising Information (EO)




Number of Eye and Muscle Elements			Low Artifact Percentage		
Eye	2	Muscle	0	0	
Total Artifact Percentage			High Artifact Percentage		
0					
EEG Quality		bad		Total Recording Time Remaining 274.24 sec	






Pathological assessment for adult ADHD


Compare to Adult ADHD Database




Cognitive Functions



Arousal Level Detection




Adult ADHD 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




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= 09.50

IAF(EC)




Eye Close IAF= 11.00

EEG Spectra



Alpha Asymmetry(AA)




Alpha Blocking









Z Score Summary Information (EC)




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) ớ








Absolute Power-Eye Open (EO) 🕢





Relative Power-Eye Open (EO)

