





QEEG Clinical Report BrainLens V0.4

Report Description

Personal & Clinical Data

Name	Amirali Ghorbani	Date of Recording	2025-07-30
Date of Birth - Age	2009-02-09 - 16.47	Gender	Male
Handedness(R/L)	Right	Source of Referral	Dr Saemeh Khani
Initial Diagnosis		-	
Current Medication		-	

Dr Saemeh Khani

Summary Report









Absolute Power

Relative Power



















Posterior APF-EC= 11.25

Posterior APF-EO= 10.75

Arousal Level



TMS Responsibility




To investigate QEEG-based predicting medication response, please refer to the Report.






Denoising Information (EC)



Number of Eye and Muscle Elements			Low Artifact Percentage			
Eye	3	Muscle	0	0		
Total Artifact Percentage				High Artifact Percentage		
0						
EEG Qual	ity	good		Total Recording Time Remaining 621.52 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	717.11 sec





Pathological assessment for ADHD

Compare to ADHD Database
























EEG Compatibility with ADHD Diagnosis







Arousal Level Detection



ADHD Clustering *

1. Same inattentive and hyperactive prevalence, may be anxious, may be highly intelligent, need sufficient sleep, and should avoid high arbohydrate inbtake. Consider clonidine


* If there is Paroxymal epileptic discharge in EEG data, this case needs sufficient sleep and should avoid high carbohydrate intake.

You can consider anticonvulant medications.





QEEG based predicting medication response



Explanation

Medication Recommendation

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.

two charts, calculate 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.






APF(EO)




APF(EC)




Frontal APF= 11.25

Posterior APF= 11.25


EEG Spectra



Alpha Asymmetry(AA)



-Alpha Blocking







EXAMPLE 2 Score Summary Information (EC)





































Z Score Summary Information (EO)

Absolute Power




































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) 🕢

