

A Nonlinear Dynamic Approach for Evaluating Postural Control

New Directions for the Management of Sport-Related Cerebral Concussion

James T. Cavanaugh,^{1,2} Kevin M. Guskiewicz³ and Nicholas Stergiou⁴

- 1 Geriatric Research, Education and Clinical Center, Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina, USA
- 2 Department of Physical and Occupational Therapy, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina, USA
- 3 Department of Exercise and Sport Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA
- 4 HPER Biomechanics Laboratory, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Omaha, Nebraska, USA

Contents

Abstract	935
1. Defining and Modelling the Postural Control System	937
1.1 Terminology and the Task of Postural Control	937
1.2 Modelling Postural Control	937
1.3 Postural Steadiness and the Mechanical Perspective	938
1.4 Limitations of the Biomechanical Approach to Measuring Postural Steadiness	939
2. An Alternative Theoretical Proposition: Measuring Complexity in a Nonlinear Postural Control System	940
2.1 Evidence for Postural Steadiness Emerging from a Nonlinear System	940
2.2 Change in Complexity and Postural Control	942
2.3 Approximate Entropy as a Measure of Postural Control	942
3. Recovery of Postural Control After Cerebral Concussion: New Insights Using the Nonlinear Dynamic Theoretical Framework	943
3.1 Basic Concepts of Sport-Related Cerebral Concussion	943
3.2 Recovery of Postural Stability After Cerebral Concussion	944
3.3 Detecting Altered Postural Control in Athletes Without Postural Instability	945
3.4 Comparing the Recovery of Postural Stability with the Recovery of Altered Centre of Pressure Regularity	946
4. Conclusions and Recommendations for Postural Control Assessment Approaches in Sports Medicine	947

Abstract

Recent research suggests that traditional biomechanical models of postural stability do not fully characterise the nonlinear properties of postural control. In

sports medicine, this limitation is manifest in the postural steadiness assessment approach, which may not be sufficient for detecting the presence of subtle physiological change after injury. The limitation is especially relevant given that return-to-play decisions are being made based on assessment results. This update first reviews the theoretical foundation and limitations of the traditional postural stability paradigm. It then offers, using the clinical example of athletes recovering from cerebral concussion, an alternative theoretical proposition for measuring changes in postural control by applying a nonlinear dynamic measure known as 'approximate entropy'. Approximate entropy shows promise as a valuable means of detecting previously unrecognised, subtle physiological changes after concussion. It is recommended as an important supplemental assessment tool for determining an athlete's readiness to resume competitive activity.

Sports injuries are not commonly associated with 'balance problems'. Reports of disequilibrium or falls after injury are rare, because athletes generally are in excellent health or because most injuries are isolated to relatively few musculoskeletal structures. Sport activities, however, often demand exquisite body control, such that even subtle impairments may interfere with optimal performance without producing obvious unsteadiness. Perhaps more so than most individuals, athletes utilise a wide array of complex strategies involving arms, legs, torso, neck and head for control of body position to gain advantage over their competitors. Injuries producing weakness, sensory impairment, diminished joint range of motion, or alterations in neural processing potentially can affect the ability to control the orientation of the body in space.^[1,2]

The medical assessment of postural control after injury often includes the determination of postural stability in quiet standing. In the tradition of Romberg,^[3] postural stability assessment typically requires an athlete to stand as still as possible under any one of a number of base of support (double-limb stance, tandem stance, or single limb stance) or sensory (eyes open vs eyes closed) conditions.^[4-6] More stable athletes are assumed to be able to stand with less postural sway about a central equilibrium point. In this sense, postural control is operationally

defined using an amplitude metric (e.g. magnitude of sway) that denotes precision; i.e. optimal control is evidenced by less movement, or error, about a target position. Athletes who demonstrate normal postural stability (relative to their age-matched peers) are generally assumed to have a healthy postural control system.

This assumption may be fundamentally flawed. During the last decade, a variety of studies have revealed that the variability of centre of pressure (COP) location during quiet standing is not the result of random error.^[7-12] Instead, COP oscillations, despite appearing erratic and irregular, contain a 'hidden' structure, or orderliness, that emerges in time, presumably as a result of interactions among underlying postural control system components. Recent evidence supports the idea that with advanced age and disease, the complexity of temporal structure breaks down, resulting in more regular COP oscillations.^[13,14] Importantly, changes in the regularity of COP oscillations can occur in the absence of changes in postural stability.^[15] Optimal postural control (in quiet standing), therefore, appears to be characterised by COP oscillations that not only are small in amplitude but also are relatively unconstrained and irregular.

For injured athletes, the return of optimal postural control is an important rehabilitation goal. Cur-

rent measures of postural stability, however, may be inadequate for helping athletes, coaches and medical professionals judge when complete recovery of postural control has occurred. The aims of this article are: (i) to review the theoretical basis and limitations of current approaches to postural control assessment; (ii) to offer an alternative measurement approach based on a nonlinear dynamics theoretical framework of motor control; and (iii) using sport-related cerebral concussion as an example, to review recent evidence that highlights the limitations of current approaches and supports the application of a nonlinear dynamic theoretical framework for revealing unique changes in postural control after injury.

1. Defining and Modelling the Postural Control System

1.1 Terminology and the Task of Postural Control

The task of postural control involves controlling the body's position in space for the dual purposes of stability and orientation.^[16] Orientation is defined as the ability to maintain an appropriate relationship between body segments and between the body and the environment. Stability, in the broadest sense, refers to the ability of a system to resist perturbations.^[17] Postural stability defines the ability to maintain a desired postural orientation, either at rest or during movement, in response to perturbations generated from either internal or external sources. For human functional activities performed standing or sitting, postural stability specifically refers to the ability to resist perturbations such that the whole body centre of mass is maintained within the limits of the base of support. Postural steadiness, a special case of postural stability, defines the ability to stand as motionless as possible.^[18] Equilibrium, a term derived from Newtonian mechanics, refers to conditions in which an object is at rest (static equilibrium)

or in constant motion (dynamic equilibrium), i.e. not acted upon by unbalanced external forces.^[17] Balance, often used synonymously with equilibrium, refers to equilibrium about a specified axis, such as the vertical axis in upright standing.^[19] Postural control and balance control, therefore, can be used interchangeably to refer to the act of maintaining or returning the body close to a state of static or dynamic equilibrium.^[19]

1.2 Modelling Postural Control

Current models of the postural control system generally have evolved from the seminal work of Nikolai Bernstein (1896–1966), for whom the model of nervous system function considered the whole body as a mechanical system subject to gravitational and inertial forces.^[20] For Bernstein, coordinated movement, including postural control, was a problem that involved mastering the many redundant degrees of freedom defined over several levels of biological analysis. The large number of potential degrees of freedom in the control system precluded the possibility that each is controlled individually at every point in time; thus, Bernstein proposed that control of integrated movement was probably distributed throughout many interacting systems working cooperatively. Consistent with this idea, current models of postural control can be broadly organised into two categories: models that 'describe' a system of interacting components and models that seek to 'predict' how components interact to achieve postural control. Descriptive models are useful for conceptualising the multidimensional nature of the postural control system but do not guide the measurement of postural control system changes after injury or in response to rehabilitation.^[1,16]

Predictive models of postural control system output have evolved from both linear and nonlinear dynamics frameworks (table I). Linear dynamic modelling is based on a stimulus-response paradigm, in which system output can be predicted from

Table 1. General characteristics of linear and nonlinear postural control system models

Characteristic	Linear model	Nonlinear model
Paradigm	Stimulus response	Self-organisation
Degree of postural control reflected in the output signal	Predicted based on input (perturbation) parameters and known linear relationships among system components	Dependent on initial conditions and nature of multi-linked interactions among system components. Predicted over various time scales
Signal variability	Random error	Can contain temporal structure that reflects the organisation of the underlying control system
Measurement implications	Error magnitude is proportional to the intensity of the perturbation or the severity of disruption in the feedback loop	Error magnitude is irrelevant. Temporal structure is measured as patterns of variability

input using linear equations and knowledge of simple interactions among system components. Importantly, the output of the entire system represents the summed output of local interactions.^[21] Deviations from expected output values are thought to represent random error. Linear models generally predict that magnitude of variability in a postural control output signal increases in direct proportion to the intensity of the perturbation or the severity of disruptions in the feedback loop.^[22]

The linear dynamics theoretical framework has been used to develop single and multi-link biomechanical models that predict ankle joint torque and/or postural sway angle in response to an external perturbation.^[23-25] A simple, early linear model of postural control was based on a sensory-motor feedback loop circuit, in which body position in space was compared with a centrally represented equilibrium point using vestibular information.^[26] The model was used to explain how postural corrections, in response to an external perturbation, are carried out through the musculoskeletal apparatus via a combination of automatic monosynaptic reflexes and postural synergies. More recently, the basic model has been expanded to include multiple feedback loops^[27] and concepts of sensory organisation,^[28] sensory weighting^[29] and sensory noise.^[30]

Alternatively, the nonlinear dynamics theoretical framework supports the idea that postural control

emerges through the interaction of individual physiological systems, task demands and environmental constraints (table 1).^[16,31,32] Nonlinear systems organise themselves according to initial conditions and simple rules that govern the interactions among the most basic, individual components.^[21] Because these components form multi-link networks, simple interactions do not predict the behaviour of the system as a whole, especially over longer time scales. Depending on initial conditions, small perturbations to the system can have no effect, a proportional effect, or a dramatic effect on system output. In contrast to linear models that analyse the magnitude of output signal variability and focus on individual system components, nonlinear models use the time evolutionary properties of an output signal to draw inferences regarding interactions within the underlying control system.^[14] Nonlinear dynamics offer the postural control system the ability to be adaptable and flexible in an unpredictable and ever-changing environment.^[22,33]

1.3 Postural Steadiness and the Mechanical Perspective

The linear dynamics framework and its associated biomechanical models have contributed to the development of commonly employed clinical measures of postural control, for which postural stability is the facet of interest. Postural stability is often

evaluated in terms of 'postural steadiness', i.e. how closely one can mimic a state of static equilibrium in quiet standing. Using static posturography, postural steadiness is measured as the ability to stand upright as motionless as possible with the vertical projection of the body's centre of gravity (CG) maintained within the limits of the base of support defined by the feet. Both non-instrumented (Romberg Test,^[3] Balance Error Scoring System^[4]) and instrumented force plate paradigms^[34] have been developed. The mechanical approach assumes that under normal circumstances, a healthy, developmentally mature individual can precisely regulate the position of the body in space, such that there is only slight variation in whole body CG position about a central equilibrium point. In dynamic posturography, an external perturbation is applied and postural stability is investigated in terms of input/output relationships.

Because measurements of CG variation are technically complicated, cumbersome, costly, and error-prone,^[35] steadiness is often measured by COP variation as a function of time. COP is the point of application of the resultant ground reaction force vector acting on the surface of the force plate.^[17] In reality, however, ground reaction forces do not act at a single point, and thus, the COP represents a weighted average of forces applied diffusely over the contact area. In fact, relative to the forefoot and heel, ground reaction forces at the COP for an individual in quiet standing are relatively small.^[36] In addition, the COP is a compound signal: it represents not only the position of the whole body CG, transformed by the multi-linked system of the body to the support surface, but the muscle activity used to control equilibrium.^[10] The COP corresponds to the vertical projection of the CG only under static conditions in which no horizontal accelerations are applied.^[18]

Given that the COP: (i) is an 'artificial' rather than an anatomical point; (ii) does not always correspond to the location of ground reaction force under

the foot; (iii) is a compound signal; and (iv) is not identical to the whole body CG, many investigators have adopted the biomechanical view that unsteadiness in quiet standing is proportional, rather than equal, to COP variability.^[18] In this context, the COP reflects the net motor control signal output necessary to correct the imbalance of the whole body CG.^[25,37] Because COP is a directly measured, highly reliable and easily quantified parameter, a wide variety of summary statistics reflecting the amplitude of COP variability have been developed.^[1,38-40] Many of these summary statistics have been shown to change reliably under a variety of experimental manipulations, including neurological and musculoskeletal pathology,^[41-45] developmental change,^[46,47] changes associated with aging^[38,48] and changing environmental constraints.^[49] In general, greater magnitude of COP variability is regarded as an indication of greater postural instability.

1.4 Limitations of the Biomechanical Approach to Measuring Postural Steadiness

Although postural steadiness protocols are relatively simple and safe, and COP variability has demonstrated clinical utility as an indicator of postural control system performance, the mechanical perspective described in section 1.3 has not provided substantial insight into the interactions among system components that produce postural control.^[50] A summary of limitations is shown in table II. One issue is that postural steadiness is a special case of postural stability in which no external perturbation is applied. Instead, stability is inferred from the ability to resist internal perturbations created by skeletal muscle activity, heartbeat, respiration and cognitive activity.^[9,38,51] Without external perturbations, and because the internal perturbations are difficult to characterise, input/output, linear dynamics models of postural steadiness are not applicable. A second issue is that traditional linear statistics (e.g. mean and standard deviation) assume that er-

Table II. Limitations of the biomechanical approach to measuring postural steadiness

Limitation	Effect
No external perturbations applied	Unable to apply linear dynamics measurement framework based on input/output relationships
Signal variability summarised using an 'average' statistic (e.g. standard deviation)	Averaging suppresses temporal structure of variability
No evidence to support true static equilibrium as an achievable or desirable goal	Poor content validity
No external criterion ('gold standard')	Poor criterion validity
Lack of reliable and valid sway determinants for evaluating pathological changes	Poor predictive validity

rors in COP location around a central equilibrium point are both random and independent. In this view, because such noise presumably results from measurement error or the degradation in neuromuscular control, averaging the COP variability as a general indication of error is both justified and practical. Averaging, however, suppresses the time-evolving structure of COP variability and limits the inferences that can be made regarding control system dynamics.^[14,22] In addition, the variations observed in the COP time series have been shown to be neither random nor independent but rather to have deterministic properties.^[7-12]

Inferences based on COP summary statistics are also limited because steadiness has not been theoretically defined in terms of force platform measures.^[18] There is no neurophysiological evidence, for example, that supports true static equilibrium in quiet standing as an achievable or even desirable behavioural goal. Alternatively, some investigators have suggested that postural sway necessarily serves as a sensory information gathering mechanism of the control system.^[31,37,52,53] There also exist individuals for whom reduced, rather than increased, COP variability may suggest poor postural control.

For example, some below-knee amputees may appear very steady in quiet standing but cannot effectively respond to an external perturbation.^[54]

Another limitation of the mechanical perspective is that there is no external criterion against which measurement validity can be established.^[18] In the absence of a 'gold standard', investigators have attempted to demonstrate strong relationships between various force plate parameters, under the assumption that measures that represent the same construct should be highly correlated.^[18,55] Although the results of these studies have been mixed, generally the correlations among measures were relatively weak. This finding supports the contention that postural control is a multivariate process^[9,20,29] and that biomechanical output measures do not adequately capture postural control system dynamics.^[14]

A final criticism of the postural steadiness paradigm is that posturography lacks reliable and sensitive sway determinants that can be used for the evaluation of pathological changes.^[56] Despite the many reports of excessive postural sway (or COP variability) in the presence of advanced age and disease, static posturography alone apparently is not sensitive enough to reliably detect abnormality in at least a few impaired populations.^[57,58]

2. An Alternative Theoretical Proposition: Measuring Complexity in a Nonlinear Postural Control System

2.1 Evidence for Postural Steadiness Emerging from a Nonlinear System

The human body is a complex mosaic of nonlinear dynamical systems,^[59] organised within both spatial and temporal domains. Physiological rhythms, i.e. output produced as a result of system interactions over time, are abundant in biological systems and central to life.^[59] Well known examples of physiological rhythms include heartbeat, respiration, reproduction and sleep-wake cycles. Less obvi-

ous, but of equal physiological importance, are such oscillations as the release of insulin and luteinising hormone, peristaltic waves in the intestine and ureters, electrical activity within the cortex and autonomic nervous system, and constriction in peripheral blood vessels and the pupil.^[59] In our view, oscillations in a postural steadiness time series constitute a physiological rhythm associated with the postural control system.

Traditionally postural oscillations had been assumed to be a stationary, stochastic process.^[60,61] However, an alternative explanation for the existence of COP fluctuations is that they have a structure that is dependent on the time scale of observation. This notion has been supported by recent research evidence,^[7-9,27,62] that has confirmed the nonlinear properties of postural steadiness time series. Under fixed task and environmental conditions, nonlinear properties in the postural system arise due to elastic and damping properties of muscles and the varying time scales (delays and thresholds) of sensory systems.^[10,63] Clinical measures derived from the nonlinear dynamics framework are based on the recognition that the collective interaction among these properties, rather than their individual characteristics, produces the visible, complex behaviour of the postural control system.^[21]

Complex systems have the potential to generate output signals containing temporal structure imbedded within what appear to be random oscillations. One nonlinear measure, known as approximate entropy (ApEn), quantifies the ensemble amount of randomness, or irregularity, contained in a time series.^[64] The ApEn algorithm essentially applies a moving window procedure to determine the probability that short sequences of data points are repeated (within a certain error tolerance) throughout the entire time series. Expressing the average probability in logarithmic form (and taking the inverse), ApEn generates a unit-less real number from 0 to 2. Zero values correspond to less randomly

ordered time series that contain greater amounts of temporal structure (i.e. sine wave), whereas values of 2 indicate a completely random and irregular time series (i.e. Gaussian noise).^[22]

ApEn represents a class of nonlinear measures that characterise orderliness in the temporal output of a complex system. A separate class of nonlinear tools, known as dimensional measures (i.e. fractal scaling measures like correlation dimension^[65]), characterise complexity in terms of the degree to which successive points in a time series are related to one another over a range of time scales. Unlike dimensional measures, however, ApEn has the advantage of conceptual simplicity and practical applicability that make it particularly suited for relatively short, noisy biological output signals associated with human movement.

ApEn, as a nonlinear measure of complexity, focuses on the time-evolving properties of the output signal to draw inferences regarding interactions within the underlying control system. Like other nonlinear tools, ApEn requires the collection of data over a relative long period of time to allow the system's properties to unfold, and thus, is not useful for assessing the effect of a specific stimulus (perturbation) on postural sway that may last a few milliseconds.

ApEn also is conceptually distinct from, and does not necessarily correlate well with, traditional linear tools of time series variability. In the spectral domain, for example, small ApEn values often correspond to a narrow frequency range and large ApEn values correlate with a broad-band spectra and a great frequency range; nonetheless, power spectra analysis and the ApEn measure can produce conflicting results.^[66,67] A similar incongruence can exist between ApEn and amplitude measures of variability (e.g. standard deviation).^[66,68] Thus, it seems that ApEn can complement a frequency analysis and provide useful information about the time domain.

2.2 Change in Complexity and Postural Control

Two hypotheses have been developed to describe how a change in regularity corresponds to a change in underlying system complexity. Both can be derived from the broad idea that the entropic concept of randomness is associated with a diversity of possible control system configurations that could produce a given output signal.^[69]

Pincus^[70] and Pincus and Keefe^[71] used mathematical modelling to generate support for the idea that the regularity of system output would reflect the degree of isolation of system components from their surroundings. Systems with a relatively limited number of viable interconnections among components are less complex and generate more predictable output. Fewer components would contribute to the output signal, but each would make a more dominant contribution. Alternatively, complex, highly interconnected nonlinear systems would have good lines of communication, marked by large numbers of interactions.^[72] Consequently, the output signal would contain influences from a greater number of system components, but with each interaction making a relatively small contribution to the behaviour of the composite system.

Newell^[14] proposed a similar idea using a degrees of freedom theoretical framework. Accordingly, a more regularly ordered time series is produced by a system with fewer degrees of freedom, and therefore, greater constraint. In contrast, more irregular output is produced by less constrained systems with greater number of degrees of freedom.^[14] Completely unconstrained systems with an infinite number of degrees of freedom are produced by an entirely random process. The implication is that either fewer or more poorly organised degrees of freedom reduce the adaptive capability of the individual.^[73]

Although support for the hypotheses remains primarily theoretical, together they suggest that a healthy postural control system, because of numer-

ous interconnections among its components, is capable of adapting to a wide variety of task demands and external conditions. Accordingly, when the system is allowed to operate with minimal constraints (e.g. at rest during quiet standing under normal sensory conditions), system output (e.g. COP location) appears to fluctuate in relatively random fashion, presumably reflecting the readiness of the system to rapidly respond to perturbation. In the presence of disease or injury, however, normal interconnections among system components would be compromised, thereby reducing the complexity of the system. As a result, fluctuations in system output at rest would be more constrained, so as to appear more regular and predictable.

2.3 Approximate Entropy as a Measure of Postural Control

ApEn has been employed in several investigations of postural control involving non-athletes^[11-14,53,74] and has shown promise as a clinically applicable tool. The combined results of these studies suggest that healthy, mature postural control in quiet, upright standing is characterised by COP oscillations that are both relatively irregular and small in amplitude. We have recently determined response stability and precision estimates for ApEn of COP anteroposterior (AP) and mediolateral (ML) time series for healthy, young adults across six sensory conditions (figure 1).^[11] Overall, ApEn values for AP time series ranged from 0.50 to 0.84 and demonstrated moderate to good test-retest reliability between trials (intraclass correlation coefficient [ICC] 2, 1; range 0.52–0.75) and days (ICC 2, 2; range 0.79–0.90). In comparison, COP ML oscillations were relatively more random (ApEn range 0.75–0.93) and consequently were less stable between trials (ICC 2, 1; range 0.01–0.72) and days (ICC 2, 2; range 0.53–0.77). As sensory information was withdrawn or degraded, COP oscillations became more regular (lower ApEn) and larger in am-




Fig. 1. Sensory Organisation Test – six conditions (used by permission NeuroCom® International, Inc.).

plitude (diminished postural stability). Consistent with the aforementioned hypotheses (see section 2.2), we suggested that the removal of accurate sensory feedback not only made it more difficult for individuals to precisely control body position, but also artificially constrained interactions among control system components, so as to produce more regular oscillations in system output.

3. Recovery of Postural Control After Cerebral Concussion: New Insights Using the Nonlinear Dynamic Theoretical Framework

3.1 Basic Concepts of Sport-Related Cerebral Concussion

Approximately 300 000 sport-related traumatic brain injuries occur annually in the US.^[75] Although the proportion that are repeat injuries is unknown, a study of high-school and collegiate football players have reported within-season recurrence rates of 14.7%.^[76] Importantly, Guskiewicz et al.^[77] found

that nearly all of the in-season repeat injuries occurred within 10 days of the first injury, suggesting that the brain may be more vulnerable to a second injury during this acute period. There also exists at least some evidence for an increased risk of subsequent traumatic brain injury among persons who have had at least one previously.^[78] Additionally, the severity of cerebral concussion appears to increase with recurrent injury.^[76] Repeated mild traumatic brain injury (MTBI) occurring over an extended period (i.e. months or years) can result in cumulative neurological and cognitive deficits,^[79] but repeated injuries occurring within a short period (i.e. hours, days or weeks) can be catastrophic or fatal.^[80] In light of these reports, there has been a growing concern regarding the potential for persistent impairments in athletes who sustain multiple cerebral concussions over time. This concern has focused particular attention on the criteria used to determine when and whether an athlete with cerebral concussion is fully recovered and ready to resume competitive activities.

Throughout history, the pathophysiology of cerebral concussion has been a matter of dispute.^[81] Recent evidence, however, suggests that cerebral concussion produces functional rather than structural neurophysiological changes in the cortex and brainstem reticular formation.^[82] The latter disturbance in particular is presumed to account for the autonomic, motor and postural impairments that occur in many individuals.^[6,82] Subtle vestibular deficits also may be possible in the MTBI population.^[83] Animal studies of mild head injury have associated an increased brain demand for glucose, combined with a reduction in cerebral blood flow, with an extended state of vulnerability to further neuronal loss.^[84] From a complexity perspective, these concussion-induced pathophysiological changes might reflect alterations in the patterns of interaction among components of the central nervous system. Diffuse axonal injury, resulting from direct trauma

to neurons or secondary metabolic sequelae, may reduce or distort interactions among neurons in the brain.^[85] As a result, brain regions might become less coupled to one another, thereby increasing the regularity of cortical oscillations.^[67] Indeed, the symptoms of minor concussion (being 'stunned, dinged, or dazed') are often strikingly similar to those of minor epilepsy, a condition in which patterns of cortical activity become more synchronised.^[82] Because patterns of brain electrical activity are known to be reflected in patterns of electrical signals descending to the periphery,^[86] it is plausible that changes in patterns of COP oscillation after concussion reflect changes in cortical oscillatory activity.

3.2 Recovery of Postural Stability After Cerebral Concussion

The transient nature of most cerebral concussion symptoms and impairments suggests that postural instability, when it exists, resolves relatively quickly. Indeed several longitudinal studies in college athletes have demonstrated a typical pattern of recovery in which postural stability returned to baseline within approximately 3–5 days.^[5,87-89] These studies were similar in their use of a protocol that required subjects to stand quietly for 20 seconds on a force platform under six different sensory conditions (figure 1). The conditions varied in terms of the amount and quality of environmental cues available, along a continuum of easy (accurate somatosensory and visual cues) to more difficult (inaccurate somatosensory, and unavailable or inaccurate visual cues).

Guskiewicz et al.^[87] used two indices of COP displacement about a fixed, central reference point to quantify impairments in postural stability in two cohorts of college and high-school athletes with cerebral concussion. One cohort included football players who had undergone baseline testing ($n = 10$), while the other included athletes from other sports

who had not undergone baseline testing ($n = 9$). All subjects were matched to healthy comparison subjects. Although precise balance scores were not reported for each sensory condition, the degree of balance impairment in all subjects with cerebral concussion appeared to increase with task demand. The authors concluded that athletes with acute cerebral concussion display problems using various combinations of somatosensory, visual and vestibular information for control of upright posture during the first few days following injury.

In a follow-up study, Guskiewicz et al.^[88] used a sway referenced, force plate driven, computerised balance assessment tool (NeuroCom International Inc., Clakamas, OR, USA) to quantify postural steadiness in a sample of 11 college athletes who had sustained a cerebral concussion. The Sensory Organisation Test (SOT) protocol was used for data collection (figure 1). Subjects with cerebral concussion were tested on the first, third, fifth and tenth day post-injury. Healthy subjects were used for comparison. On each test day, SOT composite equilibrium scores were calculated as the average of a group of 14 individual condition scores that were based on the AP component of the COP trajectory. The equilibrium score represented the margin of stability, represented as a percentage difference between the peak-to-peak COP amplitude and theoretically defined limits of stability. A higher score indicated a greater margin of stability, i.e. smaller range of COP displacement. Additionally, visual, vestibular and somatosensory ratio scores were calculated to determine relative differences between the equilibrium scores of various conditions. The results revealed not only that composite equilibrium scores returned on average to near baseline levels by day 3 post-injury, but that athletes initially appeared to have more difficulty using visual and vestibular information for control of body sway. Importantly, the authors emphasised that the clinical presentation of athletes with cerebral concussion was quite variable.

In some athletes, acute balance deficits were present in the absence of amnesia and/or other post-concussion symptoms. In other athletes, cerebral concussion did not affect the postural control system but resulted in somatic symptoms or cognitive problems.

Mrazik et al.^[89] reported the composite equilibrium score in four college athletes who sustained a cerebral concussion. Three of the subjects each had a different severity level of injury (grades I–III) but no history of prior cerebral concussion. The fourth subject had a grade II concussion but had had a previous concussion. Pre-injury (preseason) equilibrium scores were reported. No healthy subjects were used for comparison. The results revealed that severity of cerebral concussion appeared to correspond to the severity of balance impairment. Despite the varying histories of the subjects, all equilibrium scores returned to baseline levels by the fifth day post-injury.

The entire group of concussion studies cited in this section suggests that force plate measures of postural stability may be more sensitive than traditional clinical measures, e.g. Romberg test, for identifying balance deficits in individuals with cerebral concussion. Furthermore, sway-referenced testing systems, which allow the manipulation of various sensory conditions, appear to be necessary to optimise the sensitivity of postural steadiness testing. It is important to recognise, however, that force plate measures alone have not consistently revealed postural control system alterations post injury.^[88] This inconsistency suggests three possibilities: (i) not all concussions produce postural control impairments; (ii) postural control impairments in some athletes resolve in <24 hours (before initial post injury testing); or (iii) COP parameters derived from biomechanics are not sensitive enough to detect subtle alterations in postural control after cerebral concussion. Because some athletes (collegiate football players) appear to be at increased risk for a

within-season repeat concussion within the first 10 days after a first concussion, the sensitivity of clinical measures for detecting physiological abnormality has important implications for decisions regarding an athlete's safe return to competition.

3.3 Detecting Altered Postural Control in Athletes Without Postural Instability

In light of the issues emphasised in section 3.2 and continued concerns regarding the sensitivity of postural stability measures, we employed ApEn to examine changes in postural control in a sample of 27 male and female collegiate athletes without postural instability following cerebral concussion.^[15] Using a longitudinal design, athletes were tested using the SOT at preseason and within the first 48 hours after injury. A clinically normal Composite Equilibrium Score, no more than 5% below preseason values, verified the absence of postural instability after injury. For comparison, 30 healthy non-athlete subjects were tested on two occasions. ApEn was applied to the AP and ML components of the COP time series collected using the SOT protocol. Whereas for the healthy subjects, ApEn values remained stable across days, ApEn values among the injured athletes generally declined across all sensory conditions. More dramatic increases in COP regularity were observed for the ML time series. The result is important, not only because a change in postural control was detected in the absence of postural instability, but also because it revealed, in contrast to previous studies using ApEn, that the relationship between COP amplitude and regularity is not linear. ApEn is not a simple surrogate for postural stability measures, but provides unique information regarding the state of the postural control system. An illustrative example is presented in figure 2.

The increase in regularity of COP time series was interpreted as an indication that the postural control system was more constrained after injury, as a result




Fig. 2. Centre of pressure (COP) anteroposterior time series collected from an athlete standing still with eyes closed before and after cerebral concussion. Paradoxically, the range of COP displacement decreases from approximately 5cm before injury (a) to <4cm after injury (b), suggesting an 'improvement' in postural stability. At the same time, however, COP oscillations change from being relatively more irregular before injury (approximate entropy [ApEn] value = 0.8694) to being more periodic after injury (ApEn value = 0.6619). The increase in regularity (decrease in ApEn value) was interpreted as an indication that the postural control system was more constrained after injury (reproduced from Cavanaugh et al.,^[15] with permission).

of either mechanical stiffness or neurophysiological impairment.^[15] This interpretation is consistent with the aforementioned theoretical propositions,^[14,71,72] which together suggest that an overly constrained postural control system may be less able to mount a physiological response to a particular task or environmental demand. For athletes returning to competitive activity after concussion, impairment in the adaptability of the postural control system may limit performance during rapidly changing task and environmental conditions. To substantiate this idea, we believe that new post-concussion assessment protocols could be developed, in which athletes not only are re-evaluated during the performance of individual sport-specific tasks, but also are assessed using multiple, simultaneously presented, and rapidly changing tasks and conditions.

3.4 Comparing the Recovery of Postural Stability with the Recovery of Altered Centre of Pressure Regularity

To determine if changes in COP regularity after concussion parallel the recovery of postural stability, we studied COP data collected using the SOT from 29 athletes at preseason, within 48 hours after injury, and between 48 and 96 hours after injury.^[90] The sample included injured athletes with and without postural instability. The number and severity of concussion-related symptoms was also recorded at each time interval. Consistent with previous reports, impaired postural stability resolved within 3–4 days. Importantly, however, ApEn values for COP ML time series remained depressed, even among athletes whose initial postural instability had resolved. There was no significant relationship between changes in ApEn values and symptoms after injury, suggesting that the changes in postural control occurred independently from changes in other physiological systems.

This pattern of results conflicts with a traditional linear dynamics theoretical perspective, in which an input stimulus (i.e. concussion) would produce a predictable and proportionate output response (i.e. series of impairments) according to a fixed set of physiological and biomechanical determinants. In contrast, our results support a nonlinear theoretical framework, according to which the postural control system contains a group of highly interconnected neuromuscular, musculoskeletal and cognitive subsystems whose interactions are dynamic and self-organising. Consequently, relationships among various subsystems, and the resulting global system output, are not necessarily predictable or proportionate to a given input. We would not expect, therefore, for concussion to produce predictable postural control impairments, or for the recovery of postural control necessarily to be related to symptom resolution.

As stated in section 3.1, recent evidence suggests that cerebral concussion produces functional rather than structural neurophysiological changes.^[82] We contend that the disruption in interconnectedness presumed to occur within the postural control system could account for an increase in system constraint without producing detectable impairments in individual sensory or motor subsystems. This proposition allows for the possibility that traditional performance measures of postural stability, as well as neurological measures of sensory and motor systems, would not necessarily reveal concussion-related impairments. The proposition also suggests that nonlinear measures, which reflect the amount of global postural control system constraint, should be included as an important component of post-concussion medical assessment.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations for Postural Control Assessment Approaches in Sports Medicine

Measuring the extent of postural control system changes after cerebral concussion remains an important challenge in sports medicine. The traditional biomechanical approach, which is based on a linear model of system behaviour and primarily concerned with postural stability, appears to lack diagnostic sensitivity in cases of mild injury. As an alternative, ApEn, a nonlinear measure of postural control, has revealed subtle system changes after concussion that appear to be more prevalent and last longer than thought previously. Given the proposed link between the complexity of control system interactions and the capacity for adaptation to stress, the failure of an athlete to recover pre-injury levels of COP irregularity may have important implications regarding the safe return to competition.

There currently exists no validated method for using ApEn to classify the integrity of postural control in absolute terms. Thus, unlike biomechanical balance measures, for which static equilibrium is

the theoretical, albeit unattainable, goal, ApEn values measured on one occasion are not clinically useful. ApEn is best suited for measuring changes in postural control, especially in circumstances where subtle abnormality increases the likelihood of subsequent injury. In this sense, ApEn appears to be a valuable supplemental tool for determining the state of the postural control system.

The implications of this review for clinical practice and future research are significant. The evidence concerning ApEn as a measure of change supports the widespread use of preseason baseline testing for all athletes at risk for sport-related cerebral concussion, especially when pressures to rapidly return to competitive activity are considerable. Whenever possible, traditional measures of postural stability should be supplemented with ApEn applied to COP time series. This implies that in an optimal clinical setting, quantitative (force plate) measures that capture COP variability are an important and necessary assessment tool, and that software should be developed to simultaneously generate COP amplitude and regularity indices. Finally, the review implies that other types of sport-related injuries that affect postural control during athletic performance might benefit from similar multi-modal assessment and the application of a nonlinear theoretical framework to recovery.

Future sports medicine investigations should attempt to determine: (i) the response stability of ApEn values in athletes with concussion and other injuries; (ii) how long ApEn values remain depressed after injury; (iii) what factors correlate with the eventual return of ApEn values to pre-injury levels; and (iv) what specific neurophysiological or mechanical mechanisms explain the changes in COP regularity after concussion. Ideally, these investigations would lead to the determination of whether reduced ApEn values after injury are associated with an increased risk for subsequent injury recurrence.

Acknowledgements

Dr Cavanaugh's dissertation work focusing on the application of approximate entropy to the analysis of centre of pressure time series in athletes with concussion was conducted in the Sports Medicine Research Laboratory at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA, under the direction of Dr Guskiewicz. The work was funded in part by grants from the Injury Prevention Research Center at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control (USA), the National Operating Committee on Standards in Athletic Equipment (USA), and the National Athletic Trainers' Association Research and Education Fund (USA). The authors have no conflicts of interest that are directly relevant to the content of this review.

References

1. Palmieri RM, Ingersoll CD, Stone MB, et al. Center-of-pressure parameters used in the assessment of postural control. *J Sport Rehabil* 2002; 11: 51-66
2. Guskiewicz K. Balance and mild head injury in athletes. *Orthop Phys Ther Clin N Am* 2002; 11 (1): 143-57
3. Romberg M. *Manual of nervous diseases of man*. London: Sydenham Society, 1853: 395-401
4. Riemann BL, Guskiewicz K. Effects of mild head injury on postural stability as measured through clinical balance testing. *J Athl Train* 2000; 35 (1): 19-25
5. Guskiewicz KM, Ross SE, Marshall SM. Postural stability and neuropsychological deficits after concussion in collegiate athletes. *J Athl Train* 2001; 36 (3): 263-73
6. Ingersoll CD, Armstrong CW. The effects of closed-head injury on postural sway. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1992; 24 (7): 739-43
7. Duarte M, Zatsiorsky VM. On the fractal properties of natural human standing. *Neurosci Lett* 2000; 283: 173-6
8. Gagey P-M, Martinierie J, Pezard L, et al. Balance in static conditions is controlled by a non-linear dynamic system. *Ann Otolaryngol Chir Cervicofac* 1998; 115: 161-8
9. Myklebust JB, Prieto TE, Myklebust BM. Evaluation of non-linear dynamics in postural steadiness time series. *Ann Biomed Eng* 1995; 23: 711-9
10. Blaszczyk JW, Klonowski W. Postural stability and fractal dynamics. *Acta Neurobiol Exp (Wars)* 2001; 61: 105-12
11. Cavanaugh JT, Mercer VS, Guskiewicz K. Response stability estimates for the Sensory Organization Test: equilibrium scores and approximate entropy values in healthy young adults. *Gait Posture* 2004; 20 Suppl. 1: S55
12. Cavanaugh JT, Mercer VS, Guskiewicz K. Effect of a secondary cognitive task on the temporal structure of postural control: implications for the dual task paradigm. *Gait Posture* 2004; 20 Suppl. 1: S54
13. Bodfish JW, Parker DE, Lewis MH, et al. Stereotypy and motor control: differences in the postural stability dynamics of persons with stereotyped and dyskinesic movement disorders. *Am J Ment Retard* 2001; 106 (2): 123-34
14. Newell K. Degress of freedom and the development of postural center of pressure profiles. In: Newell K, Molenaar P, editors. *Applications of non-linear dynamics to developmental process modeling*. Mahwah (NJ): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998: 80-1
15. Cavanaugh JT, Guskiewicz K, Giuliani C, et al. Detecting altered postural control after cerebral concussion in athletes without postural instability. *Br J Sports Med*. In press
16. Shumway-Cook A, Woollacott M. *Motor control: theory and practical applications*. 1st ed. Baltimore (MD): Williams & Wilkins, 1995
17. Le Veau BF. *Biomechanics of human motion*. 3rd ed. Philadelphia (PA): WB Saunders, 1992
18. Goldie PA, Bach TM, Evans OM. Force platform measures for evaluating postural control: reliability and validity. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 1989; 70: 510-7
19. Schenkman M. Interrelationship of neurological and mechanical factors in balance control. In: Duncan PW, editor. *Proceedings of the APTA Symposium on Balance*. Nashville (TN): APTA, 1989: 29-41
20. Bernstein NA. *Co-ordination and regulation of movements*. New York: Pergamon Press Inc, 1967
21. Onaral B, Cammarota JP. Complexity, scaling, and fractals in biomedical signals. In: Bronzino JD, editor. *The biomedical engineering handbook*. New York: CRC Press Inc., 1995: 933-44
22. Stergiou N, Buzzi UH, Kurz MJ, et al. Nonlinear tools in human movement. In: Stergiou N, editor. *Innovative analyses of human movement*. Champaign (IL): Human Kinetics, 2004
23. Nashner LM. Sensory, neuromuscular, and biomechanical contributions to human balance. In: Duncan PW, editor. *Proceedings of the APTA Symposium on Balance*. Nashville (TN): APTA, 1989: 5-12
24. Nicholas SC, Doxey-Gasway DD, Paloski WH. A link-segment model of upright human posture for analysis of head-trunk coordination. *J Vestib Res* 1998; 8 (3): 187-200
25. Winter DA, Patla AE, Frank JS. Assessment of balance control in humans. *Med Prog Technol* 1990; 16 (1-2): 31-51
26. Nashner LM. A model describing vestibular detection of body sway motion. *Acta Otolaryngol* 1971; 72: 429-36
27. Sasaki O, Gagey P-M, Ouaknine AM, et al. Non-linear analysis of orthostatic posture in patients with vertigo or balance disorders. *Neurosci Res* 2001; 41: 185-92
28. Woollacott MH, Shumway-Cook A, Nashner LM. Aging and posture control: changes in sensory organization and muscular coordination. *Int J Aging Hum Dev* 1986; 23 (2): 97-114
29. Kuo AD, Speers RA, Peterka RJ, et al. Effect of altered sensory conditions on multivariate descriptors of human postural sway. *Exp Brain Res* 1998; 122: 185-95
30. Speers RA, Kuo AD, Horak F. Contributions of altered sensation and feedback responses to changes in coordination of postural control due to aging. *Gait Posture* 2002; 16: 20-30
31. Slobounov SM, Newell KM. Postural dynamics in upright and inverted stances. *J Appl Biomech* 1996; 12: 185-96
32. Riccio GE, Stoffregen TA. Affordances as constraints on control of stance. *Hum Mov Sci* 1988; 7: 265-300

33. Lipsitz LA, Goldberger AL. Loss of 'complexity' and aging: potential applications of fractals and chaos theory to senescence. *JAMA* 1992; 267 (13): 1806-9
34. Nashner LM. Strategies for organization of human posture. In: Igarashi M, Black O, editors. *Vestibular and visual control on posture and locomotor equilibrium*. 7th International Symposium, International Society Posturography; 1983; Houston (TX). Basel: Karger, 1985: 1-8
35. Hasan SS, Robin DW, Shiavi RG. Drugs and postural sway. *IEEE Eng in Med Biol Mag* 1992; 11 (4): 35-41
36. Rogers MM, Cavanagh PR. Glossary of biomechanical terms, concepts, and units. *Phys Ther* 1984; 64 (12): 23-39
37. Patla A, Winter DA, Frank JS, et al. Identification of age-related changes in the balance control system. In: Duncan PW, editor. *Proceedings of the American Physical Therapy Association Symposium on Balance*; 1989 Jun 13-15; Nashville. Nashville (TN): APTA, 1989: 43-55
38. Prieto TE, Myklebust JB, Myklebust BM. Characterization and modeling of postural steadiness in the elderly: a review. *IEEE Trans Rehabil Eng* 1993; 1 (1): 26-34
39. Rocchi L, Chiari L, Cappello A. Feature selection of stabilometric parameters based on principal component analysis. *Med Biol Eng Comput* 2004 Jan; 42 (1): 71-9
40. Chiari L, Bertani A, Cappello A. Classification of visual strategies in human postural control by stochastic parameters. *Hum Mov Sci* 2000; 19: 817-42
41. Messier SP, Royer TD, Craven TE, et al. Long-term exercise and its effect on balance in older, osteoarthritic adults: results from the Fitness, Arthritis, and Seniors Trial (FAST). *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2000; 48 (2): 131-8
42. Cornwall MW, Murrell P. Postural sway following inversion sprain of the ankle. *J Am Podiatr Med Assoc* 1991; 81: 243-7
43. Hufschmidt A, Dichgans J, Mauritz KH, et al. Some methods and parameters of body sway quantification and their neurological applications. *Arch Psychiatr Nervenkr* 1980; 228: 135-50
44. Rocchi L, Chiari L, Horak F. Effects of deep brain stimulation and levodopa on postural sway in Parkinson's disease. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2002; 73 (3): 267-74
45. Geurts ACH, Ribbers GM, Knoop JA, et al. Identification of static and dynamic postural instability following traumatic brain injury. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 1996; 77: 639-44
46. Foudriat BA, Di Fabio RP, Anderson JH. Sensory organization of balance responses in children 3-6 years of age: a normative study with diagnostic implications. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol* 1993; 27 (3): 255-71
47. Usui N, Maekawa K, Hirasawa Y. Development of the upright postural sway of children. *Dev Med Child Neurol* 1995; 37 (11): 985-96
48. Teasdale N, Stelmach GE, Breunig A. Postural sway characteristics of the elderly under normal and altered visual and support surface conditions. *J Gerontol* 1991; 46 (6): B238-44
49. Paloski WH, Black FO, Reschke MF, et al. Vestibular ataxia following shuttle flights: effects of microgravity on otolith-mediated sensorimotor control of posture. *Am J Otol* 1993; 14 (1): 9-17
50. Collins JJ, De Luca CJ, Burrows A, et al. Age-related changes in open-loop and closed-loop postural control mechanisms. *Exp Brain Res* 1995; 104: 480-92
51. Lajoie Y, Teasdale N, Bard C, et al. Attentional demands for static and dynamic equilibrium. *Exp Brain Res* 1993; 97 (1): 139-44
52. Riley MA, Wong S, Mitra S, et al. Common effects of touch and vision on postural parameters. *Exp Brain Res* 1997; 117: 165-70
53. Sabatini AM. Analysis of postural sway using entropy measures of signal complexity. *Med Biol Eng Comput* 2000; 38: 617-24
54. Winter DA. Sagittal plane balance and posture in human walking. *IEEE Eng Med Biol Mag* 1987; 9: 8-11
55. Karlsson A, Frykberg G. Correlations between force plate measures for assessment of balance. *Clin Biomech* 2000; 15: 365-9
56. Baloh RW, Jacobson KM, Enrietto JA, et al. Balance disorders in older persons: quantification with posturography. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 1998; 119: 89-92
57. Di Fabio RP. Sensitivity and specificity of platform posturography for identifying patients with vestibular function. *Phys Ther* 1995; 75 (4): 290-305
58. Baloh RW, Fife TD, Zwergling L, et al. Comparison of static and dynamic posturography in young and older normal people. *J Am Geriatr Soc* 1994; 42 (4): 405-12
59. Glass L, Mackey MC. *From clocks to chaos: the rhythms of life*. Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press, 1988
60. Carroll JP, Freedman W. Nonstationary properties of postural sway. *J Biomech* 1993; 26 (4/5): 409-16
61. Collins JJ, De Luca CJ. Open-loop and closed-loop control of posture: a random-walk analysis of center-of-pressure trajectories. *Exp Brain Res* 1993; 95 (2): 308-18
62. Oie KS, Kiemel T, Jeka J. Human multisensory fusion of vision and touch: detecting non-linearity with small changes in the sensory environment. *Neurosci Lett* 2001; 315: 113-6
63. Thurner S, Mittermaier C, Hanel R, et al. Scaling-violation phenomena and fractality in the human posture control system. *Phys Rev E Stat Phys Plasmas Fluids Relat Interdiscip Topics* 2000; 62 (3): 4018-24
64. Pincus SM. Approximate entropy as a measure of system complexity. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1991; 88 (6): 2297-301
65. Grassberger P, Procaccia I. Measuring the strangeness of strange attractors. *Physica D* 1983; 9: 189-208
66. Vaillancourt DE, Slifkin AB, Newell KM. Regularity of force tremor in Parkinson's disease. *Clin Neurophysiol Sep* 2001; 112 (9): 1594-603
67. Pincus SM. Quantifying complexity and regularity of neurobiological systems. *Methods Neurosci* 1995; 28: 336-63
68. Slifkin AB, Newell KM. Variability and noise in continuous force production. *J Mot Behav* 2000 Jun; 32 (2): 141-50
69. Yates FE. General introduction. In: Yates FE, editor. *Self-organizing control systems: the emergence of order*. New York: Plenum Press, 1987: 1-14
70. Pincus SM. Greater signal regularity may indicate increased system isolation. *Math Biosci* 1994; 122: 161-81
71. Pincus SM, Keefe DL. Quantification of hormone pulsatility via an approximate entropy algorithm. *Am J Physiol* 1992; 262 (5 Pt 1): E741-54

72. Pincus SM, Goldberger AL. Physiological time-series analysis: what does regularity quantify? *Am J Physiol* 1994; 266 (4 Pt 2): H1643-56
73. Newell KM, van Emmerik REA, Sprague RL. Stereotypy and variability. In: Newell KM, Corcos DM, editors. *Variability and motor control*. Champaign (IL): Human Kinetics Publishers, 1993: 475-96
74. Harbourne RT, Stergiou N. Nonlinear analysis of the development of sitting postural control. *Dev Psychobiol* 2003; 42: 368-77
75. Thurman DJ, Branche CM, Snizek JE. The epidemiology of sports-related traumatic brain injuries in the United States: recent developments. *J Head Trauma Rehabil* 1998; 13 (2): 1-8
76. Guskiewicz KM, Weaver NL, Padua DA, et al. Epidemiology of concussion in collegiate and high school football players. *Am J Sports Med* 2000; 28 (5): 643-50
77. Guskiewicz KM, McCrea M, Marshall SW, et al. Cumulative effects associated with recurrent concussion in collegiate football players: the NCAA Concussion Study. *JAMA* 2003 Nov 19; 290 (19): 2549-55
78. Salcido R, Costich JF. Recurrent traumatic brain injury. *Brain Inj* 1992; 6 (3): 293-8
79. Gronwall D, Wrightson P. Cumulative effect of concussion. *Lancet* 1975; II (7943): 995-7
80. Saunders RL, Harbaugh RE. The second impact in catastrophic contact-sports head trauma. *JAMA* 1984; 252 (4): 538-9
81. McCrory PR, Berkovic SF. Concussion: the history of clinical and pathophysiological concepts and misconceptions. *Neurology* 2001; 57 (12): 2283-9
82. Shaw N. The neurophysiology of concussion. *Prog Neurobiol* 2002; 67 (4): 281-344
83. Mallinson AI, Longridge NS. Dizziness from whiplash and head injury: differences between whiplash and head injury. *Am J Otol* 1998; 19 (6): 814-8
84. Wojtys EM, Hovda D, Landry G, et al. Current concepts: concussion in sports. *Am J Sports Med* 1999; 27 (5): 676-87
85. McCrory P, Johnston KM, Mohtadi NG, et al. Evidence-based review of sport-related concussion: basic science. *Clin J Sport Med* 2001; 11 (3): 160-5
86. Salenius S, Hari R. Synchronous cortical oscillatory activity during motor action. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* Dec 2003; 13 (6): 678-84
87. Guskiewicz KM, Perrin DH, Gansneder BM. Effect of mild head injury on postural stability in athletes. *J Athl Train* 1996; 31 (4): 300-6
88. Guskiewicz KM, Riemann BL, Perrin DH, et al. Alternative approaches to the assessment of mild head injury in athletes. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1997; 29 (7 Suppl.): S213-21
89. Mrazik M, Ferrara MS, Peterson CL, et al. Injury severity and neuropsychological and balance outcomes of four college athletes. *Brain Inj* 2000; 14 (10): 921-31
90. Cavanaugh J, Guskiewicz K, Stergiou N. New insights into the recovery of postural control after cerebral concussion. *J Orthop Sport Phys Ther* 2005; 35 (1): A77-8

Correspondence and offprints: Dr *James T. Cavanaugh*, Department of Physical and Occupational Therapy, Duke University Medical Center, Box 3965, Durham, NC 27710, USA.

E-mail: jim.cavanaugh@duke.edu