Evaluating Neurological Function: Assessment Tools in Neurosurgical Practice

Mostafa Mahmoud Salama Mostafa [1], Osama Mohammed Alkhaldi [2], Atif Tariq Alfatyani [3], Mohammed abdullah Alzahrani [4], Musallam Salem Alabsi [5], Mohammed Abdullah Almutairi [6], Mohammed Aqeel Althobaiti [7], Shahad Jamal Asally [8], Dina Mohammed AlHarthi [9], Sara Abed AlAmri [10]

1- Consultant Neurosurgeon, Al Ahsa Hospital, In Al Ahsa, Saudi Arabia
2- Asir Central Hospital, Asir, Saudi Arabia. Email: oalkhaldimd@gmail.com
3- Armed forces rehabilitation centre, Taif, Saudi Arabia Email: A.fatyani@live.com
4- Armed forces rehabilitation centre, Taif, Saudi Arabia Email: Moude-z@hotmail.com
5- Armed forces rehabilitation centre, Taif, Saudi Arabia Email: Musallam_2016@hotmail.com
6- King Khaled Hospital-Al-Majmaah, Saudi Arabia Email: Mohammedam.pt@gmail.com
7- Armed forces rehabilitation centre in Taif, Saudi Arabia Email: Prins-mohammed101010@hotmail.com
8- Fakeeh college of medical sciences, Saudi Arabia Email: shahadasa321@gmail.com
9- Fakeeh college of medical sciences, Saudi Arabia Email: alharthidina@gmail.com
10- Fakeeh college of medical sciences, Saudi Arabia Email: Sarah.alamri1@outlook.com

Abstract:

In neurosurgical practice, evaluating neurological function is crucial for diagnosing conditions, assessing the severity of injuries, and determining appropriate interventions. Various assessment tools are employed to provide an objective measure of a patient's neurological status. Common tools include the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS), which assesses consciousness levels based on motor, verbal, and eye-opening responses, and the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS), which evaluates the effects of a stroke on a patient's neurological function. Additionally, neuropsychological tests help evaluate cognitive functions, including memory, attention, and language abilities, often essential when planning surgical interventions. These assessments not only guide clinical decisions but also help monitor patient progress and recovery over time. Advanced imaging techniques, such as magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and computed tomography (CT), complement neurological assessments by providing visual insights into the brain's structure and any pathological changes. Functional assessments, like electrophysiological tests (EEG, EMG), can further elucidate the functional status of specific neural pathways. The integration of these tools allows neurosurgeons to form a comprehensive understanding of a patient's neurological health, enabling personalized treatment plans. Continuous advancements in assessment methodologies enhance precision in diagnosing neurological disorders and improving surgical outcomes, ultimately contributing to better patient care in neurosurgical settings.

Keywords: Neurological assessment, neurosurgery, Glasgow Coma Scale, National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale, neuropsychological tests, imaging techniques, MRI, CT, electrophysiological tests, patient care.

Introduction:

Neurological function is a critical aspect of overall health, serving as a vital indicator of brain integrity and systemic functionality. In the realm of neurosurgery, the evaluation of neurological function takes on particular significance; it is essential not only for diagnosing conditions but also for determining the appropriateness of surgical interventions, monitoring postoperative recovery, and predicting long-term outcomes. As the understanding of neurological disorders deepens, alongside advancements in surgical techniques, there arises an ongoing need for comprehensive methodologies that can accurately assess neurological function. This research introduction aims to illuminate the importance of evaluating neurological function in neurosurgical practice, examine the various assessment tools employed by clinicians, and discuss the implications of these assessments on surgical outcomes and patient management [1].

The human nervous system is an intricate network that coordinates bodily functions through the integration of sensory and motor activities. Within the context of neurosurgery, practitioners encounter a spectrum of pathologies, ranging from traumatic brain injuries and tumors to vascular malformations and degenerative diseases. Each condition presents unique challenges that necessitate precise evaluations to tailor surgical approaches effectively. Neurological assessments serve as a foundation upon which clinical decisions are made, contributing to the formulation of prognoses and therapeutic strategies. They provide insights into the functional status of patients, which is paramount in surgical settings where any disruption of neuronal pathways can lead to significant morbidity [2].

Assessment tools in neurosurgery are diverse and multi-faceted, encompassing clinical examinations, neuroimaging techniques, neurophysiological studies, and standardized scales that quantify neurological impairment. For instance, the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) is widely utilized in trauma settings to evaluate consciousness levels, guiding acute management and surgical urgency. More extensive assessments often involve neuroimaging modalities such as magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and computed tomography (CT), which offer visual representations of brain structures and lesions. These imaging tools not only aid in diagnosing pathologies but also help in surgical planning by mapping out crucial neuroanatomical details [3].

In addition to imaging techniques, neurophysiological studies play an integral role in assessing neurological function. Electromyography (EMG) and electroencephalography (EEG) enable clinicians to evaluate electrical activity within the nervous system, identifying dysfunction in motor or cognitive pathways. Moreover, quantitative assessments using validated functional scales—such as the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association (AHA/ASA) Stroke Scale—are essential for measuring patient outcomes post-surgery. These tools provide standardized metrics that facilitate communication among healthcare providers and support broader research initiatives aimed at improving neurosurgical care [4].

The integration of technology into neurological assessments has also revolutionized the field. Advanced techniques such as functional MRI (fMRI) and diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) have enhanced our ability to visualize brain connectivity and assess functional neuroanatomy. This technological evolution allows for more personalized surgical approaches and improved outcomes by reducing the risk of postoperative complications associated with the inadvertent damage of functional brain areas. Additionally, these advancements have spurred the development of cognitive assessments that can evaluate higher-order functions, such as memory, attention, and executive function, which may be relevant for certain neurosurgical interventions [5] .

As the landscape of neurosurgery continues to evolve with the introduction of minimally invasive techniques and novel therapeutic modalities, the assessment of neurological function remains a cornerstone of clinical practice. It is imperative to not only employ a variety of tools but also to continually validate and enhance these methodologies. Understanding the strengths and limitations of various assessment instruments, as well as their implications for surgical decision-making and postoperative care, is vital for clinicians in navigating the complexities of neurological disorders [6].

Overview of Common Assessment Tools:

Assessment tools play a critical role in education, the workplace, healthcare, and various other fields. They are designed to measure knowledge, skills, competencies, attitudes, and even performance. By employing various methodologies and frameworks, these tools allow evaluators to gather quantitative and qualitative data that can inform decisions, drive improvements, and foster personal or professional growth [7].

Educational Assessments

In the education sector, assessment tools are essential for measuring student learning outcomes, providing feedback, and guiding curriculum development. Assessments can be broadly classified into formative and summative types [8].

Formative Assessments

Formative assessments are conducted during the learning process to monitor student comprehension, skills development, and academic progress. Common forms of formative assessments include:

- **Quizzes and Tests**: Short assessments that gauge student understanding of specific topics. They can be conducted in various formats, including multiple-choice, true/false, and short-answer questions [9].
- **Observations**: Teachers observe students in real-time, allowing them to assess engagement and understanding through non-intrusive methods.
- **Portfolios**: Collections of students' work that demonstrate their learning journey, creativity, and progress over time [10].

Summative Assessments

Summative assessments occur at the end of an instructional unit and are used to evaluate overall learning. Examples include:

- **Standardized Tests**: These assessments are uniform in administration and scoring, allowing for comparisons across different populations. Examples include the SAT or ACT in the United States [11].
- **Final Exams**: Comprehensive assessments that cover all major topics from a course, often leading to a final grade.
- **Projects and Presentations**: These allow students to demonstrate their knowledge in a practical or creative manner, often involving collaboration, research, and communication skills [12].

Workplace Evaluations

In professional settings, assessment tools are used to evaluate employee performance, identify training needs, and support career development. Common workplace assessment tools include:

Performance Appraisals

Performance appraisals are systematic evaluations of an employee's job performance over a specific period. They often include feedback on various skills, competencies, and achievements, and can be conducted through:

- **360-Degree Feedback**: An inclusive evaluation process that gathers input from supervisors, peers, and subordinates, providing a holistic view of an employee's performance.
- **Self-Assessment**: Employees evaluate their performance based on defined criteria, fostering self-reflection and personal development [13].

Skills Assessments

Skills assessments are designed to measure specific competencies required for a job. These might include:

- **Technical Tests**: Evaluating proficiency in specific technical skills or knowledge areas relevant to the position.
- **Behavioral Interviews**: Questions focused on past behavior and experiences to predict future performance [14].

Psychological Tests

The field of psychology employs assessment tools to evaluate cognitive abilities, personality traits, emotional functioning, and mental health. Common psychological tests include:

Intelligence Tests

These tests, such as the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS) or the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale, assess various cognitive abilities, including reasoning, problem-solving, and comprehension [15].

Personality Assessments

Tools like the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and the Big Five Personality Test evaluate personality traits and help individuals understand their behavior and preferences in personal and professional contexts.

Clinical Assessments

In clinical settings, various assessments are utilized to diagnose and treat mental health conditions, including:

- **Structured Clinical Interviews**: Standardized interviews used by mental health professionals to gather comprehensive patient history.
- **Self-Report Inventories**: Questionnaires where individuals report their symptoms and feelings (e.g., Beck Depression Inventory) [16].

Health Assessments

In healthcare, assessment tools are critical for evaluating the health status of individuals and populations. These tools assist in diagnosing conditions, monitoring patient progress, and planning treatment. Common health assessments include:

Health Screening Tools

These are designed to identify potential health issues before they become serious. Examples include:

- **Blood Pressure Monitors**: Used to screen for hypertension.
- **BMI Calculators**: Track body mass index as a measure of body fat and overall health.

Functional Assessments

These evaluate individuals' abilities to perform everyday activities. Common tools include:

- **Activities of Daily Living (ADL) Scales**: Assess functionality in daily tasks such as bathing, dressing, and eating.
- **Functional Independence Measure (FIM)**: A tool used by healthcare providers to assess a patient's level of disability and identify areas that may require rehabilitation [17].

Clinical Utility of the Glasgow Coma Scale:

The Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) is an essential clinical tool used to assess the level of consciousness in a patient, primarily following a head injury or in various medical conditions that impact neurological function. Developed in 1974 by neurosurgeons Graham Teasdale and Bryan Jennett at the Western Infirmary in Glasgow, the scale provides a standardized method for assessing and documenting a patient's level of consciousness, facilitating communication between healthcare providers and guiding treatment decisions. The GCS has since become a fundamental component of neurological assessment globally, making it an invaluable tool in various clinical settings [18].

Components of the Glasgow Coma Scale

The GCS is composed of three components: eye opening, verbal response, and motor response. Each component is assigned a score, and the sum of these scores gives a total GCS score that ranges from 3 to 15 [19].

1. **Eye Opening**: This component measures the patient's ability to open their eyes in response to stimuli. Scores range from 1 (no eye opening) to 4 (spontaneous eye opening).
2. **Verbal Response**: This measures the patient’s ability to produce verbal responses to questions or stimuli. The scoring system ranges from 1 (no verbal response) to 5 (oriented conversation).
3. **Motor Response**: This assesses the patient's ability to follow commands or move limbs in response to stimuli. The scores for this component range from 1 (no movement) to 6 (obeys commands) [20].

The total GCS score is calculated by summing the scores of each component. A score of 3 indicates deep coma or death, while a score of 15 indicates a fully alert and oriented individual. Scores from 9 to 12 are generally indicative of a moderate level of impairment, and scores below 8 imply severe impairment and often necessitate urgent clinical attention [21].

Importance of the Glasgow Coma Scale in Clinical Practice

The clinical utility of the GCS is multifaceted, extending beyond mere assessment into realms of diagnosis, prognosis, and treatment planning.

1. **Assessment of Consciousness**: The GCS allows healthcare providers to objectively measure a patient's level of consciousness and neurological status. This is particularly vital in emergency situations, where rapid evaluation can guide immediate intervention, such as intubation or cranial imaging.
2. **Communication Among Healthcare Providers**: The GCS serves as a common language among various practitioners, including emergency medical technicians, nurses, and physicians. This standardized communication system ensures that a patient's condition is clearly understood by all members of the healthcare team, which is crucial when transferring patients between facilities or departments [22].
3. **Determining Severity of Injury**: In traumatic brain injury (TBI) patients, the GCS score is a key determinant of the

injury's severity. It is used in field triage protocols to assess the need for advanced care, surgical intervention, and intensive monitoring. The score can also help predict potential complications, such as increased intracranial pressure, and is frequently incorporated into clinical decision rules concerning the need for imaging studies [23].

4. **Guidance on Prognosis**: The GCS score is often used to provide prognostic information regarding a patient's recovery trajectory. Research has shown that lower GCS scores correlate with poorer outcomes. For instance, a GCS of 3-5 can indicate a higher likelihood of poor functional recovery or mortality, whereas a score above 12 typically reflects a better prognosis.

5. **Outcome Monitoring**: The GCS can be employed to track changes in a patient's neurological status over time. Regular assessments can help identify deterioration or improvement in consciousness, thus guiding healthcare providers in the potential need for adjusting treatment strategies.

6. **Research and Clinical Studies**: The GCS is extensively employed in clinical research, particularly in studies focusing on brain injury and neurocritical care. Its consistent application allows researchers to compare outcomes across trials and formulate evidence-based protocols [23].

Limitations of the Glasgow Coma Scale

Despite its extensive clinical utility, the GCS is not without limitations.

1. **Subjectivity in Scoring**: The assessment of verbal response can be subjective, especially in patients with pre-existing language or hearing impairments. Different evaluators may interpret the same level of responsiveness differently, leading to variability in scores [24].

2. **Non-inclusive**: The GCS does not account for all facets of neurological health. For example, it does not measure cognitive function, pain perception, or emotional responses, all of which are important for understanding a patient's complete neurological status.

3. **Cephalic Trauma**: GCS may be less effective in certain populations, including patients under sedation or those with drug intoxication who may present with altered consciousness independently of their level of brain injury.

4. **Limited Use in Non-Traumatic Cases**: While the GCS is primarily used for traumatic cases, its applicability in non-traumatic situations, such as metabolic disorders or strokes, may be less clear-cut. In such scenarios, complementary assessments may be required to provide a more accurate clinical picture [24].

Application of the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale:

The National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS) is a standardized tool developed to assess the severity of stroke symptoms in patients. Originating in the late 1980s, the NIHSS has become an essential instrument in both clinical practice and research amid a growing understanding of stroke pathophysiology and management over the decades. This comprehensive tool is designed to evaluate various aspects of neurological function, thereby aiding in effective patient assessment, treatment decision-making, and prognosis prediction [25].

The NIHSS was devised to provide a reliable method for quantifying neurological deficits resulting from a stroke. It evaluates 15 specific clinical items including consciousness, language, and motor skills, which are scored to reflect the severity of the stroke as a whole. The total NIHSS score ranges from 0 (no stroke signs) to 42 (most severe stroke), with higher scores indicating increased severity of impairment. One of the primary aims of the scale is to facilitate the collection and comparison of data across different clinical settings, enhancing the quality of stroke care and research [25].

Applications in Clinical Practice

1. **Stroke Assessment and Diagnosis:** In the acute phase of stroke, timely and accurate assessment is crucial. The NIHSS offers a systematic and quantifiable way to assess a patient's neurological status quickly. Emergency medical services and emergency departments routinely use the

NIHSS as part of their evaluation protocols to identify stroke patients and determine the level of emergency care required. By establishing a baseline for the patient’s neurological status, healthcare providers can accurately gauge the extent of the stroke and decide on an appropriate treatment plan [26].

2. **Treatment Decisions:** The NIHSS score plays a pivotal role in deciding treatment modalities. For instance, patients with lower NIHSS scores might be more suitable candidates for thrombolytic therapy, such as tissue plasminogen activator (tPA), whereas those with higher scores may indicate severe strokes where the risks of intervention might outweigh the potential benefits. Additionally, the NIHSS enables clinicians to monitor changes in a patient's neurological condition over time, assisting in dynamic patient management during critical hours.

3. **Communicating Severity:** With the NIHSS score, healthcare providers facilitate effective communication among teams regarding a patient’s condition. A standardized scoring system simplifies discussions among neurologists, emergency physicians, nurses, and rehabilitation specialists, thereby ensuring that everyone involved in the care of the patient is on the same page concerning the patient's neurological status and treatment trajectory [27].

4. **Rehabilitation Planning:** The NIHSS is instrumental in evaluating the functional capacities of stroke patients post-acute phase. Rehabilitation teams can use the NIHSS score to set realistic goals and create tailored rehabilitation plans based on the specific deficits of each patient. For example, patients with significant motor impairments may require different rehabilitation strategies compared to those primarily facing speech difficulties. Assessment through the NIHSS can better identify these rehabilitative needs, enhancing the effectiveness of physical, occupational, or speech therapy [28].

5. **Prognostic Value:** Studies have shown that the NIHSS score correlates with outcomes following a stroke event. Scoring can help predict mortality and long-term functional outcomes; higher scores are associated with poorer prognosis. This prognostic capability not only aids in counseling patients and families about potential outcomes but also assists healthcare providers in resource allocation, particularly among severely affected stroke patients who may need extensive long-term care [29].

Applications in Research

The NIHSS is a cornerstone in stroke research, facilitating advances in understanding stroke pathophysiology and treatment efficacy. Here’s how:

1. **Clinical Trials:** The NIHSS is commonly used in clinical trials to define populations and measure outcomes. By integrating the NIHSS into trial design, researchers can effectively evaluate the efficacy of new therapies by correlating changes in NIHSS scores with clinical outcomes. This standardized measure helps to eliminate variability that can skew results, leading to more reliable conclusions about treatment effectiveness [30].

2. **Comparative Effectiveness Research:** The uniformity provided by the NIHSS allows for comparisons across different institutions and geographic regions. Researchers can aggregate data more effectively, allowing for large-scale analyses of the effectiveness of various therapeutic interventions in real-world settings. Such research can subsequently inform guidelines and recommendations pertaining to stroke management nationally and internationally [31].

3. **Longitudinal Studies:** The use of the NIHSS in longitudinal studies enables scientists to assess the trajectory of recovery from stroke over time. By applying the scale at multiple time points following a stroke, researchers can track recovery patterns and the long-term efficacy of rehabilitation efforts. This

knowledge is essential for developing best practices for stroke rehabilitation and recovery optimization [32].

4. **Identifying Risk Factors:** NIHSS can also be valuable in epidemiological research to identify risk factors associated with adverse stroke outcomes. By correlating NIHSS scores with demographic data, comorbid conditions, and treatment variables, researchers can enhance understanding of factors that contribute to poor recovery and develop targeted interventions aimed at at-risk populations [33].

Neuropsychological Testing: Evaluating Cognitive Function:

Neuropsychological testing serves as a critical tool in the assessment and understanding of cognitive function in individuals. Over the past several decades, the field of neuropsychology has expanded significantly, driven by advances in both neuroscience and psychological assessment methodologies [34].

Neuropsychological testing is designed to evaluate various cognitive functions, including memory, attention, problem-solving skills, language abilities, and reasoning. These assessments are primarily employed when there are concerns regarding cognitive impairment due to various conditions such as traumatic brain injury, neurodegenerative diseases, stroke, or psychiatric disorders. The results of these tests provide valuable insights into an individual's cognitive strengths and weaknesses, guiding subsequent clinical decisions, therapeutic interventions, and rehabilitation strategies [35].

The primary purpose of neuropsychological testing is to obtain a detailed profile of an individual's cognitive abilities. By measuring different cognitive domains, clinicians can discern patterns that may indicate specific dysfunctions or cognitive decline. This is particularly important for conditions such as Alzheimer's Disease, where early detection can significantly influence treatment approaches and improve patient outcomes. Moreover, these tests aid in diagnosing developmental disorders, evaluating the impact of neurological illnesses, and assessing cognitive changes over time, making them a vital component of comprehensive clinical evaluations [36].

Methodologies and Types of Assessments

Neuropsychological assessments utilize a variety of standardized test batteries and instruments to evaluate cognitive function. These assessments can be broadly categorized into two types: fixed batteries and flexible batteries [37].

1. **Fixed Batteries**: This approach involves the administration of a predetermined set of tests that cover a wide range of cognitive functions. Examples of widely used fixed batteries include the Halstead-Reitan Neuropsychological Battery and the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS). These batteries provide a comprehensive overview of cognitive functioning and can be used for normative comparisons against various population groups.

2. **Flexible Batteries**: Unlike fixed batteries, flexible batteries consist of a customized selection of tests tailored to the individual's specific needs and clinical concerns. This approach allows clinicians to focus on particular cognitive areas that may be suspect based on initial evaluations or presenting symptoms. Flexibility in test selection enables a more personalized assessment process and often yields more relevant insights into the individual's cognitive abilities [38].

Each of these assessment approaches may include various test types, such as:

- **Cognitive tests** designed to measure areas such as memory, attention, language, and executive function [39].
- **Behavioral assessments** that explore emotional and psychological aspects of cognitive function, revealing potential mood disorders, anxiety, or other factors that may impact cognitive performance.
- **Functional assessments** that observe a person's ability to perform daily living activities, providing context to their cognitive abilities in real-world settings [39].

Applications of Neuropsychological Testing

Neuropsychological testing finds applications across diverse fields, including clinical psychology, neurology, psychiatry, and education. In clinical settings, neuropsychologists employ these assessments for several purposes:

- **Diagnosis**: Neuropsychological tests help diagnose various neurological and psychiatric conditions, including autism spectrum disorders, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), traumatic brain injury, and neurodegenerative diseases such as Alzheimer's and Parkinson's diseases [40].
- **Treatment Planning**: The detailed cognitive profiles obtained through assessments allow clinicians to customize treatment plans based on an individual's cognitive strengths and weaknesses.
- **Monitoring Progress**: Repeat assessments can aid in tracking cognitive changes over time, particularly in response to treatment or as a function of disease progression. This ongoing evaluation is crucial for adaptive interventions and ensuring optimal care.
- **Legal and Forensic Settings**: Neuropsychological testing is also utilized in legal contexts, where cognitive evaluations may inform matters relating to competency, criminal responsibility, or personal injury cases [40].

Challenges in Neuropsychological Testing

Despite its many benefits, neuropsychological testing faces several challenges. One significant concern is the emphasis on cultural and linguistic competence. Cognitive assessments may be biased against individuals from diverse backgrounds, potentially leading to misdiagnosis or inaccurate conclusions about an individual's cognitive abilities. Psychologists must take into account cultural differences and linguistic proficiency when interpreting test results, ensuring that assessments remain fair and valid across population groups [41].

Additionally, the standardization of tests poses challenges. While standardized tests aim to establish norms for various demographic groups, individual differences can lead to variations that affect test performance. Factors such as age, education, and socio-economic status play significant roles and need careful consideration in interpretation [41].

Furthermore, advancements in neuroimaging techniques and biomarkers challenge the traditional reliance on behavioral assessments. While neuroimaging offers valuable insights into brain structure and function, there is ongoing debate regarding the integration of neuroimaging results with traditional neuropsychological testing in clinical practice. Future directions in neuropsychological assessment may involve a synergistic approach that leverages both behavioral assessments and neuroimaging data to provide a more holistic understanding of cognitive function [42].

The field of neuropsychological testing stands at a crossroads. The technological advancements in neuroimaging, artificial intelligence, and neuropsychological assessments present exciting opportunities for enhancing our understanding of cognitive function. There is potential for developing more personalized assessments through machine learning algorithms that can predict cognitive deficits based on large datasets.

Moreover, continued research is necessary to explore the effects of lifestyle factors—such as exercise, nutrition, and stress management—on cognitive function. By connecting cognitive assessments to lifestyle determinants, clinicians could potentially offer more comprehensive strategies for cognitive health [42].

Imaging Techniques in Neurological Assessment:

Understanding the human brain, the most complex organ in the body, requires sophisticated methods of visualization. Neurological assessment relies heavily on imaging techniques to diagnose, monitor, and manage various disorders affecting the nervous system. These disorders can range from traumatic brain injuries and strokes to neurodegenerative diseases like Alzheimer's and multiple sclerosis [43].

Computed Tomography, or CT, is a widely used imaging technique that employs X-rays to create cross-sectional images of the body. In the context of neurological assessment, CT scans are particularly useful for their speed and efficiency. CT imaging is often the first-line diagnostic tool in emergency settings, particularly for acute conditions such as hemorrhagic strokes or traumatic brain injuries [43].

One of the standout features of CT scans is their speed; images can be produced in a matter of seconds, making CT ideal for rapidly assessing patients who may be suffering from acute neurological events. Additionally, CT scans are widely available in medical facilities, making them accessible in various clinical settings. The technique is particularly adept at visualizing bone structures and detecting acute bleeding in the intracranial region, which can be crucial for timely intervention [44].

Despite its advantages, CT imaging does have limitations. One significant drawback is its reliance on ionizing radiation, which poses a risk, particularly to vulnerable populations such as children or pregnant women. Additionally, while CT imaging can effectively identify large structural abnormalities, it may not provide sufficient detail on soft tissues and is less effective in detecting subtle lesions or early stages of certain diseases compared to MRI [45].

Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) utilizes powerful magnets and radio waves to generate detailed images of the organs and tissues within the body. MRI has become an indispensable tool in the neurological assessment landscape due to its superior soft-tissue contrast resolution.

One of the primary advantages of MRI is its ability to provide high-resolution images of the brain and spinal cord without using ionizing radiation. This makes it a safer option for patients requiring repeated imaging. MRI is particularly effective in identifying and characterizing brain tumors, multiple sclerosis lesions, and neurodegenerative changes. It also allows for various specialized sequences, such as diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) and functional MRI (fMRI), which can assess changes in brain metabolism and function [45].

However, MRI is not without its drawbacks. The procedure can be time-consuming, typically taking 30 minutes to over an hour, which may be uncomfortable for some patients, particularly those with claustrophobia. Additionally, MRI machines are expensive, less widely available than CT scanners, and cannot be used for patients with certain implants, such as pacemakers, due to their strong magnetic fields [46].

Positron Emission Tomography (PET) is advanced imaging that provides insight into the metabolic and functional processes of the body, particularly the brain. PET scans use radioactive tracers that emit positrons to visualize metabolic activity.

The primary utility of PET in neurological assessment lies in its ability to reveal areas of abnormal metabolic activity, which may not be evident through anatomical imaging alone. This is particularly useful in the diagnosis of neurodegenerative diseases, such as Alzheimer's, where PET imaging can identify amyloid plaques and tau tangles even before clinical symptoms manifest. Moreover, PET imaging can be combined with MRI or CT for a more comprehensive view of both functional and structural abnormalities [47].

Despite its strengths, PET has certain limitations, including its relatively low spatial resolution compared to MRI. Furthermore, the use of radioactive tracers introduces complexities regarding patient safety and cost, which may limit its accessibility in some settings. The need for specialized facilities and trained personnel also contributes to the overall cost of PET imaging [48].

Electroencephalography (EEG) is a non-invasive method that measures electrical activity in the brain. While not an imaging technique per se, EEG is often employed in conjunction with imaging studies to assess neurological conditions, particularly seizure disorders and sleep disturbances.

EEG is highly valued for its ability to capture real-time brain activity with minimal invasiveness. It is particularly useful in diagnosing epilepsy, as it can detect abnormal electrical impulses that correlate with seizure events. EEG can also provide insights into brain function during sleep and can be instrumental in assessing other conditions such as encephalopathy and brain death [49].

However, EEG has limitations in spatial resolution; it cannot localize brain activity as precisely as MRI or CT. Furthermore, EEG findings can be influenced by numerous factors, including medication, which may complicate the interpretation of results [49].

Electrophysiological Studies in Neurosurgical Evaluation:

Electrophysiological studies (EPS) represent a pivotal component in the neurosurgical evaluation process, integrating the principles of neurophysiology into clinical decision-making. These studies involve the measurement of the electrical activity of the nervous system, which can provide crucial insights into both the function and pathology of neurological structures. By using various methodologies such as electroencephalography (EEG), electromyography (EMG), and evoked potentials (EPs), neurosurgeons can enhance their understanding of a patient's condition, which ultimately informs surgical planning and execution [50].

Understanding Electrophysiological Studies

Electrophysiological studies are founded on the principles of bioelectrical activity primarily involving neurons and muscles. The core principle rests in the idea that every signal transmitted within the nervous system has an electrical correlation. Neural pathways communicate through action potentials that result from the movement of ions across cell membranes. Similarly, muscles generate electrical signals during contraction. By measuring these electrical signals, clinicians can glean meaningful information about the functional integrity of nerves and muscles, as well as the presence of pathological conditions [51].

Electroencephalography (EEG) is one of the most common electrophysiological tests performed in a neurosurgical context. It involves the placement of electrodes on the scalp, which record the electrical activity of the brain. EEG is particularly useful for diagnosing epilepsy, sleep disorders, and encephalopathies, but it also plays a critical role in pre-surgical evaluations for patients with intractable seizures. Detailed EEG mapping can help identify seizure foci, allowing neurosurgeons to consider targeted resection procedures [51].

Electromyography (EMG) measures the electrical activity of skeletal muscles to assess the functionality of the neuromuscular system. This technique involves inserting small needles (electrodes) into the muscle to record action potentials directly. EMG is useful for diagnosing peripheral nerve disorders, neuromuscular junction diseases, and muscle abnormalities, frequently assisting neurosurgeons in evaluating candidates for nerve repair or decompression surgeries [52].

Evoked Potentials (EPs), including somatosensory evoked potentials (SSEPs), visual evoked potentials (VEPs), and auditory brainstem responses (ABRs), help evaluate the conduction pathways from peripheral receptors to the central nervous system. These tests analyze how effectively the nervous system transmits sensory information and can be instrumental in diagnosing multiple sclerosis and other demyelinating diseases. In the context of surgery, they are utilized intraoperatively to monitor neural function during procedures to minimize the risk of postoperative complications [53].

Applications in Neurosurgical Evaluation

The utility of electrophysiological studies in neurosurgery is multifaceted, ranging from diagnostic purposes to intraoperative monitoring. One of the significant applications of EPS is in the context of epilepsy surgery. Patients with refractory epilepsy — who have not responded to pharmacological treatments — may be evaluated for surgical intervention. Precise localization of epileptogenic foci is crucial, and comprehensive EEG monitoring can reveal patterns that indicate precise brain regions responsible for seizure activity. By employing techniques such as stereo-electroencephalography (SEEG), neurosurgeons can attain high-resolution data regarding brain electrical activity, significantly enhancing surgical outcomes when these foci are surgically resected [53].

In cases of brain tumors, EPS provides crucial insights regarding tumor proximity to critical areas of motor or sensory function. Preoperative EMG studies can evaluate the functional reserve of motor nerves, guiding surgical planning and approach. By mapping motor pathways, neurosurgeons can adopt strategies that minimize the likelihood of postoperative deficits.

Intraoperative monitoring (IOM) is another significant application of EPS that has transformed neurosurgical practices. By continuously measuring electrophysiological parameters during surgery, surgeons can assess real-time neural function, enabling immediate feedback and rapid intervention if neural compromise is detected. For instance, monitoring SSEPs during spinal surgery can provide ongoing evaluation of the spinal cord's integrity, allowing surgeons to adjust their technique if abnormal signals indicate potential harm to the neural structures [54].

Patient Outcomes and Implications

The implications of integrating electrophysiological studies in neurosurgical evaluation are profound, contributing to improved patient outcomes, reduced complication rates, and enhanced individualized treatment approaches. By employing EPS, surgeons can make informed decisions regarding the necessity and extent of surgical intervention, thereby optimizing surgical strategies tailored to the unique anatomical and functional characteristics of each patient [55].

Moreover, EPS enhances the quality of life for patients who undergo surgeries for conditions like epilepsy, tumors, or spinal disorders. With improved surgical precision made possible through the data provided by EPS, there is a greater chance of preserving essential neurological functions, resulting in fewer postoperative deficits and a quicker return to everyday activities [56].

In addition, the advancements in technology and methodologies for EPS, including the integration of high-density EEG cap systems or robot-assisted EMG procedures, continue to enhance the accuracy and reliability of these studies. Innovations in data analysis, including machine learning algorithms applied to EEG signals or EMG data, promise even greater capabilities in the future regarding predictive modeling for surgical outcomes [57].

Integrating Assessment Tools for Comprehensive Patient Care:

The evaluation of neurological function is a critical component of the practice of neurosurgery. Neurosurgeons must accurately assess the neurological status of their patients to diagnose conditions, plan surgical interventions, and monitor postoperative recovery. The intricate nature of the nervous system necessitates a comprehensive approach to evaluation, utilizing various assessment tools and techniques [57].

Neurological function encompasses a range of processes, including motor function, sensory perception, cognitive abilities, reflexive responses, and autonomic regulation. The assessment of these functions is essential for diagnosing a variety of neurological conditions, such as tumors, traumatic brain injuries, strokes, and degenerative diseases. The complexity of the nervous system means that dysfunction in one area can have widespread effects, necessitating thorough examinations to localize issues and determine their causes [57].

Standard Assessment Techniques

Neurosurgeons utilize a variety of standardized assessment techniques to evaluate neurological function. Key components of these assessments include:

1. Clinical Neurological Examination

The clinical neurological examination is the cornerstone of neurological assessment. It includes a detailed examination of the following components:

- **Mental Status Examination**: This assesses cognitive functions such as orientation, attention, calculation, recall, language, and visual-spatial skills. Health care providers may use standardized tests such as the Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE) to quantify cognitive impairment.
- **Cranial Nerve Examination**: Neurosurgeons evaluate the function of the twelve cranial nerves through specific tests. For example, visual acuity, pupillary reflexes, and ocular movements assess cranial nerves II, III, IV, and VI, while facial movements evaluate cranial nerve VII [57].
- **Motor Function Assessment**: Neurologists evaluate muscle strength, tone, and coordination through examination of specific muscle groups. The Medical Research Council (MRC) scale is often employed to grade strength from 0 (no movement) to 5 (normal strength).
- **Sensory Examination**: This involves assessing light touch, pain, temperature, vibration, and proprioception across various body regions to localize sensory deficits.
- **Reflex Testing**: Reflexes provide insight into the integrity of the peripheral and central nervous systems. Common reflexes tested include the patellar reflex and the Achilles reflex [58].

2. Imaging Techniques

In modern neurosurgical practice, imaging technologies are indispensable for assessing neurological function and diagnosing conditions. Key imaging modalities include:

- **Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI)**: MRI provides high-resolution images of soft tissues and is particularly crucial for evaluating lesions, tumors, and structural anomalies within the brain and spinal cord. Functional MRI (fMRI) has emerged as a valuable tool for assessing brain activity through detecting changes in blood flow, providing insights into brain function related to sensory and motor tasks [58].
- **Computed Tomography (CT)**: CT scans are commonly used in emergency settings for their speed and efficacy in detecting

hemorrhagic strokes, fractures, or mass effect. CT angiography can also provide valuable information on vascular structures in the brain.

- **Electroencephalogram (EEG)**: This technique measures electrical activity in the brain and is employed to evaluate seizure disorders, encephalopathies, and other cortical dysfunctions. EEG findings can guide surgical planning for epilepsy patients [58].

3. Neuropsychological Testing

Neuropsychological assessments are critical for evaluating higher-level cognitive functions and emotional status. These tests involve a combination of structured tasks and interviews that gauge memory, executive function, language skills, attention, and social cognition. Tools such as the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS) and the Repeatable Battery for the Assessment of Neuropsychological Status (RBANS) are frequently used in neurosurgical practice, particularly when considering potential cognitive deficits after surgery [59].

The significance of robust assessment tools in neurosurgery cannot be overstated. Accurate neurological evaluation facilitates precise diagnoses and informs treatment decisions. Moreover, preoperative assessments help identify high-risk patients, enabling neurosurgeons to personalize surgical approaches and optimize patient safety [59].

Postoperative assessments are equally vital; they provide insight into patients' recovery trajectories, reveal potential complications, and help formulate rehabilitation plans. For instance, when evaluating a patient who has undergone a craniotomy, immediate postoperative assessments using standardized scoring systems – such as the Glasgow Coma Scale (GCS) – can quickly identify any changes in neurological status, prompting timely interventions.

The landscape of neurological assessment is undergoing significant transformation due to advancements in technology. Innovations such as artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning are becoming integral to the evaluation process, offering new possibilities for interpretation of imaging studies and EEG data [59].

For instance, AI algorithms can enhance enhanced accuracy in interpreting complex MRI and CT scans, identifying patterns that may elude human observers. Furthermore, the use of wearable technology and remote monitoring devices is gaining traction in neurology, allowing for continuous assessment of neurological function outside traditional clinical settings [60].

Similarly, emerging modalities like magnetoencephalography (MEG) and diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) are contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of brain connectivity and functionality. These tools can facilitate surgical planning for epilepsy and brain tumor resections by mapping functional areas critical for motor, language, and cognitive functions [60].

Conclusion:

In conclusion, evaluating neurological function is a critical aspect of neurosurgical practice that directly impacts patient outcomes. Utilizing a range of assessment tools, such as the Glasgow Coma Scale, NIH Stroke Scale, and various neuropsychological and electrophysiological tests, enables neurosurgeons to obtain a comprehensive understanding of a patient's neurological status. These tools not only facilitate accurate diagnosis and effective treatment planning but also provide crucial insights into recovery and rehabilitation trajectories. Moreover, advancements in imaging techniques enhance the ability to visualize and analyze brain structure and function, further informing clinical decisions. As the field of neurosurgery continues to evolve, the integration of these diverse assessment methodologies will further refine patient care, promote successful surgical outcomes, and ultimately improve the quality of life for individuals affected by neurological conditions. Ongoing research and innovation in assessment tools will be vital for addressing the complexities of neurological disorders and enhancing the effectiveness of neurosurgical interventions.

References:

1. Glick HA, Polsky D, Willke RJ, Schulman KA. A comparison of preference assessment instruments used in a clinical trial: Responses to the visual analog scale from the EuroQol EQ-5D and the Health Utilities Index. Med Decis Making. 1999;19:265–75. doi: 10.1177/0272989X9901900305.
2. Khalid MA, Achakzai IK, Khan SA, Majid Z, Hanif FM, Iqbal J, et al. The use of Karnofsky Performance Status (KPS) as a predictor of 3 month post discharge mortality in cirrhotic patients.

Gastroenterol Hepatol Bed Bench. 2018;11:301–5.
3. Denkiewicz J, Cronberg T, Lilja G, Jakobsen JC, Bělohlávek J, Callaway C, et al. Targeted hypothermia versus targeted Normothermia after out-of-hospital cardiac arrest (TTM2): A randomized clinical trial-rationale and design. Am Heart J. 2019;217:23–31. doi: 10.1016/j.ahj.2019.06.012.
4. Cho WS, Kim JE, Kim CH, Ban SP, Kang HS, Son YJ, et al. Long-term outcomes after combined revascularization surgery in adult moyamoya disease. Stroke. 2014;45:3025–31. doi: 10.1161/STROKEAHA.114.005624.
5. Harbaugh RE. History of outcomes measures in neurosurgery. Neurosurg Clin N Am. 2001;12:217–21. xi.
6. Englemann KA, Jordan LC. Outcome measures used in pediatric stroke studies: A systematic review. Arch Neurol. 2012;69:23–7. doi: 10.1001/archneurol.2011.1015.
7. Karnofsky DA, Abelmann WH, Craver LF, Burchenal JH. The use of the nitrogen mustards in the palliative treatment of carcinoma: With particular reference to bronchogenic carcinoma. Cancer. 1948;1:63.
8. Foscolo V, de Gennaro L, Murri A, Speranzon L, Signorelli F, Quaranta N, et al. Postoperative impact of pontocerebellar angle surgery on the quality of life in patients with vestibular schwannoma. Audiol Res. 2022;12:635–43. doi: 10.3390/audiolres12060061.
9. Kasner SE. Clinical interpretation and use of stroke scales. Lancet Neurol. 2006;5:603–12. doi: 10.1016/S1474-4422(06)70495-1.
10. Banks JL, Marotta CA. Outcomes validity and reliability of the modified Rankin scale: Implications for stroke clinical trials: A literature review and synthesis. Stroke. 2007;38:1091–6. doi: 10.1161/01.STR.0000258355.23810.c6.
11. Kohli A, Chao E, Spielman D, Sugano D, Srivastava A, Dayama A, et al. Factors associated with return to work Postinjury: Can the modified Rankin scale be used to predict return to work? Am Surg. 2016;82:95–101.
12. Kwee LE, Harhangi BS, Ponne GA, Kros JM, Dirven CM, Dammers R. Spinal meningiomas: Treatment outcome and long-term follow-up. Clin Neurol Neurosurg. 2020;198:106238. doi: 10.1016/j.clineuro.2020.106238.
13. Hofman M, Jamróz T, Jakutowicz I, Jarski P, Masarczyk W, Niedbała M, et al. Endovascular treatment of complex intracranial aneurysms. Pol J Radiol. 2018;83:109–14. doi: 10.5114/pjr.2018.74968.
14. Jennett B, Bond M. Assessment of outcome after severe brain damage: A practical scale. Lancet. 1975;305:480–4. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(75)92830-5.
15. Katsuki M, Suzuki Y, Kunitoki K, Sato Y, Sasaki K, Mashiyama S, et al. Temporal muscle as an indicator of sarcopenia is independently associated with hunt and kosnik grade on admission and the modified rankin scale score at 6 months of patients with subarachnoid hemorrhage treated by endovascular coiling. World Neurosurg. 2020;137:e526–34. doi: 10.1016/j.wneu.2020.02.033.
16. Crooks V, Waller S, Smith T, Hahn TJ. The use of the Karnofsky Performance Scale in determining outcomes and risk in geriatric outpatients. J Gerontol. 1991;46:M139–44. doi: 10.1093/geronj/46.4.m139.
17. Junior AC, Filho PT, Gonçalves MP, Neto AA, Zanini MA. Cranioplasty: An institutional experience. J Craniofac Surg. 2018;29:1402–5. doi: 10.1097/SCS.0000000000004512.
18. Hansen PM, Lauridsen JT, Frandsen NS. Risk of delirium and impaired neurological outcome associated with delay in neurorehabilitation after acquired brain injury. Dan Med J. 2021;68:A03210199.
19. Wilson MK, Karakasis K, Oza AM. Outcomes and endpoints in trials of cancer treatment: the past, present, and future. Lancet Oncol. 2015;16(1):e32–e42.
20. Roila F, Lupattelli M, Sassi M, et al. Intra and interobserver variability in cancer patients' performance status assessed according to Karnofsky and ECOG scales. Ann Oncol. 1991;2(6):437–439.
21. Herndon RM. Handbook of Neurologic Rating Scales. 2nd ed. New York: Demos Medical Publishing; 2006.
22. Dick JP, Guiloff RJ, Stewart A, et al. Mini-Mental State Examination in neurological

patients. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry. 1984;47(5):496–499.
23. Armstrong TS, Bishof AM, Brown PD, Klein M, Taphoorn MJ, Theodore-Oklota C. Determining priority signs and symptoms for use as clinical outcomes assessments in trials including patients with malignant gliomas: Panel 1 Report. Neuro Oncol. 2016;18 Suppl 2:ii1–ii12.
24. Armstrong TS, Vera-Bolanos E, Gning I, et al. The impact of symptom interference using the MD Anderson Symptom Inventory–Brain Tumor module (MDASI-BT) on prediction of recurrence in primary brain tumor patients. Cancer. 2011;117(14):3222–3228.
25. Hutchinson TA, Boyd NF, Feinstein AR, Gonda A, Hollomby D, Rowat B. Scientific problems in clinical scales, as demonstrated in the Karnofsky index of performance status. J Chronic Dis. 1979;32(9-10):661–666.
26. Helfer JL, Wen PY, Blakeley J, Gilbert MR, Armstrong TS. Report of the Jumpstarting Brain Tumor Drug Development Coalition and FDA clinical trials clinical outcome assessment endpoints workshop (October 15, 2014, Bethesda MD). Neuro Oncol. 2016; 18 Suppl 2: ii26–ii36.
27. Meyers CA, Hess KR. Multifaceted end points in brain tumor clinical trials: cognitive deterioration precedes MRI progression. Neuro Oncol. 2003;5(2):89–95.
28. Lin NU, Wefel JS, Lee EQ, et al. ; Response Assessment in Neuro-Oncology (RANO) group. Challenges relating to solid tumour brain metastases in clinical trials, part 2: neurocognitive, neurological, and quality-of-life outcomes. A report from the RANO group. Lancet Oncol. 2013;14(10):e407–e416.
29. Macdonald DR, Cascino TL, Schold SC, Jr, Cairncross JG. Response criteria for phase II studies of supratentorial malignant glioma. J Clin Oncol. 1990;8(7):1277–1280.
30. Armstrong TS, Gilbert MR. Net clinical benefit: functional endpoints in brain tumor clinical trials. Curr Oncol Rep. 2007;9(1):60–65.
31. Lin NU, Lee EQ, Aoyama H, et al. ; Response Assessment in Neuro-Oncology (RANO) group. Response assessment criteria for brain metastases: proposal from the RANO group. Lancet Oncol. 2015;16(6):e270–e278.
32. Walker M, Brown J, Brown K, Gregor A, Whittle IR, Grant R. Practical problems with the collection and interpretation of serial quality of life assessments in patients with malignant glioma. J Neurooncol. 2003;63(2):179–186.
33. Armstrong TS, Mendoza T, Gning I, et al. Validation of the M.D. Anderson Symptom Inventory Brain Tumor module (MDASI-BT). J Neurooncol. 2006;80(1):27–35.
34. Brott T, Adams HP, Jr, Olinger CP, et al. Measurements of acute cerebral infarction: a clinical examination scale. Stroke. 1989;20(7):864–870.
35. Lin NU, Aoyama H, Lee EQ, et al. ; Response Assessment in Neuro-Oncology (RANO) group. Challenges relating to solid tumour brain metastases in clinical trials, part 1: patient population, response, and progression. A report from the RANO group. Lancet Oncol. 2013;14(10):e396–e406.
36. Wen PY, Macdonald DR, Reardon DA, et al. Updated response assessment criteria for high-grade gliomas: Response Assessment in Neuro-Oncology working group. J Clin Oncol. 2010;28(11):1963–1972.
37. Armstrong TS, Vera-Bolanos E, Gning I, et al. The impact of symptom interference using the MD Anderson Symptom Inventory–Brain Tumor module (MDASI-BT) on prediction of recurrence in primary brain tumor patients. Cancer. 2011;117(14):3222–3228.
38. Meyers CA, Brown PD. Role and relevance of neurocognitive assessment in clinical trials of patients with CNS tumors. J Clin Oncol. 2006;24(8):1305–1309.
39. Lin NU, Wefel JS, Lee EQ, et al. ; Response Assessment in Neuro-Oncology (RANO) group. Challenges relating to solid tumour brain metastases in clinical trials, part 1: patient population, response, and progression. A report from the RANO group. Lancet Oncol. 2013;14(10):e396–e406.
40. Orr ST, Aisner J. Performance status assessment among oncology patients: a review. Cancer Treat Rep. 1986;70(12):1423–1429.
41. Savio K, Pietra GL, Oddone E, Reggiani M, Leone MA. Reliability of the modified Rankin Scale applied by telephone. Neurol Int. 2013;5:e2.
42. McMillan T, Wilson L, Ponsford J, Levin H, Teasdale G, Bond M. The Glasgow outcome scale-40 years of application and

refinement. Nat Rev Neurol. 2016;12:477–85.
43. Van Swieten JC, Koudstaal PJ, Visser MC, Schouten HJ, Van Gijn J. Interobserver agreement for the assessment of handicap in stroke patients. Stroke. 1988;19:604–7.
44. Mor V, Laliberte L, Morris JN, Wiemann M. The Karnofsky performance status scale: An examination of its reliability and validity in a research setting. Cancer. 1984;53:2002–7.
45. Witteler J, Schild SE, Rades D. Palliative radiotherapy of primary glioblastoma. In Vivo. 2021;35:483–7.
46. Wilde EA, Whiteneck GG, Bogner J, Bushnik T, Cifu DX, Dikmen S, et al. Recommendations for the use of common outcome measures in traumatic brain injury research. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2010;91:1650–60.
47. Rankin J. Cerebral vascular accidents in patients over the age of 60: II. Prognosis. Scott Med J. 1957;2:200–15.
48. Pistoia F, Sacco S, Ornello R, Degan D, Tiseo C, Carolei A. Composite scores and other outcome measures in stroke trials. Right Ther Neurol Disorders. 2016;39:60–70.
49. Timmermann C. 'Just give me the best quality of life questionnaire': The Karnofsky scale and the history of quality of life measurements in cancer trials. Chronic Illn. 2013;9:179–90.
50. U.K.-TIA Study Group. United Kingdom transient ischaemic attack (UK-TIA) aspirin trial: Interim results. Br Med J (Clin Res Ed) 1988;296:316–20.
51. Rinaldo L, Johnson DM, Vine RL, Rabinstein AA, Lanzino G. Differences between patient-and professional-reported modified Rankin Scale score in patients with unruptured aneurysms. J Neurosurg. 2018;131:397–402.
52. Schaefer PW, Huisman TA, Sorensen AG, Gonzalez RG, Schwamm LH. Diffusion-weighted MR imaging in closed head injury: High correlation with initial Glasgow coma scale score and score on modified Rankin scale at discharge. Radiology. 2004;233:58–66.
53. McCauley SR, Wilde EA, Anderson VA, Bedell G, Beers SR, Campbell TF, et al. Recommendations for the use of common outcome measures in pediatric traumatic brain injury research. J Neurotrauma. 2012;29:678–705.
54. Schwartz C, Pfefferkorn T, Ebrahimi C, Ottomeyer C, Fesl G, Bender A, et al. Long-term neurological outcome and quality of life after world federation of neurosurgical societies grades IV and V aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage in an interdisciplinary treatment concept. Neurosurgery. 2017;80:967–74.
55. Yip CM, Hsu SS, Liao WC, Liu SH, Lin YS, Hsu YH, et al. Intracranial solitary fibrous tumor/hemangiopericytoma-A case series. Surg Neurol Int. 2020;11:414.
56. Yates JW, Chalmer B, McKegney FP. Evaluation of patients with advanced cancer using the Karnofsky performance status. Cancer. 1980;45:2220–4.
57. Silva CH, Morais SS, Sarian LO, Derchain SF. Association of the Karnofsky Performance Scale with the quality of life of Brazilian women undergoing palliative care. J Palliat Care. 2011;27:164–9.
58. Lorig K, Stewart A, Ritter P, Gonzalez V, Lynch J, Laurent D. Outcome Measures for Health Education and Other Health Care Interventions. California, United States: Sage; 1996.
59. Tobias S, Jahshan S, Grober Y, Soustiel JF. Skull base hemangiopericytomas. Acta Neurol Belg. 2021;126:1537–45.
60. Wilson JL, Pettigrew LE, Teasdale GM. Structured interviews for the Glasgow Outcome Scale and the extended Glasgow Outcome Scale: Guidelines for their use. J Neurotrauma. 1998;15:573–85.