

Amantadine for Severe Traumatic Brain Injury: Impact on Pre-Rehabilitation Acute Hospitalization Recovery. A Retrospective Analysis

Daniel D. Kim BS; Kimberly Sue Meyer MSN, ACNP; Warren W. Boling MD, FRACS, FRCS(C)

Department of Neurosurgery, University of Louisville School of Medicine

Louisville, KY

T-11-4-0-4

Introduction

Amantadine Hydrochloride (AH), a safe, inexpensive NMDA antagonist with dopamine agonist effects, is one treatment considered to have potential therapeutic value in impvoing cognitive and functional outcome for patients who have suffered Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), a leading cause of death and disability(1). A 2012 prospective and placebo controlled trial of AH for TBI administered during the post-acute rehabilitation phase provided the first rigorous evidence that AH therapy accelerated functional recovery, particularly in patients who were enrolled earlier in the study (28-70 days vs 71-112 days) and in those who were in a minimally conscious state rather than in a vegetative state (2). In this retrospective study, the authors investigated outcome variables in the acute hospitalization phase of severe TBI treated with AH. Various acute hospitalization outcome parameters were assessed, and patients were compared with a control that did not receive AH matched for variables that are known to impact outcomes.

Methods

Patients were retrospectively identified from University of Louisville Hospital's (ULH) trauma data base who sustained a traumatic brain injury in 2010-2012. Inclusion Criteria: Individuals ages 18-65 and severe TBI (Glasgow Coma Score (GCS) 3 to 8). Exclusion criteria: missile-type penetrating brain injury, premorbid major CNS/developmental abnormality (e.g., mental retardation, prior significant brain injury, etc.). Injury severity measures were On-Scene GCS and Injury Severity Score (ISS). Outcome Measures were Disability Rating Scale (DRS) score assessed at day of discharge from hospital, total ICU length of stay, total hospital length of stay defined as the date treating physician determined patient was ready for discharge, and discharge destination (to home, subacute (outpatient) rehabilitation, acute rehabilitation, or skilled nursing).

Methods (continued) Over the years, AH has been administered by a few providers at ULH to this severe TBI

population that constituted the study cohort. Matched controls who did not receive AH were compared with the study group. Propensity score matching criteria were ISS (difference within 3), GCS (diff within 2), and age (diff withing 10 yrs) resulting in 22 with AH treatment (AH Group) and 22 with no AH treatment (Controls). Propensity scores were computed using a multivariate logistic regression model. In univariate analysis, nonparametric rank sum test was used to compare continuous outcomes (total hospital days, ICU days, and discharge DRS) and chi-square test was used to compare categorical outcomes (discharge destination and discharge DRS). In multivariate analysis, log-linear model was used for continuous outcomes and logistic regression was used for categorical variables. All tests were two sided and were statistically significant if p-value < 0.05. SAS 9.3 (SAS Institute, Inc, Cary, NC) was used for data processing and data analysis.

Results

Results of unmatched data analysis can be seen on Tables 1 and 2.

After propensity score matching (tables 1 and 2), AH Group and Control group had similar ages (median 33 and 32, respectively, p=0.359), gender compositions (75% and 79%) males, respectively, p=0.505). ISS were similar in both groups (median 29 and 29, respectively, p=0.991). Patients given amantadine still had longer hospital stay (median days 25 vs. 18.5, p -value: 0.0129), which, in multivariate analysis controlling for all considered patient characteristics, translated into a 64% longer stay (estimate ratio: 1.64, 95% CI: 1.28 -2.10), (Fig.1). Total ICU Days were not different in AH group vs Control (median 13.5 vs 8.5, respectively, p=0.1304), (Fig.1). Discharge DRS overall and subcategories were not different in AH group vs Control (median 14 vs 11, respectively, p=0.139), (Fig.2 and Fig.3). Disposition was not different in AH Group and Controls for outpatient rehabilitation (42% vs 46%, p=0.771), acute rehab (29% vs 29%, p=1.00), or subacute rehab (4% vs 1%, p=0.157), (Fig.4).

	All patients			Propensity Score Matched Patients		
C	Control (n=39)	Amantadine (n=38)	p-value	Control (n=24)	Amantadine (n=24)	p-value
Age						
Mean (STD)	37.2 (11.6)	38.2 (12.1)		34.9 (12.5)	37.8 (13.1)	
Median (Q1 – Q3)	38 (27 – 45)	38 (29 - 48)	0.7988	33.0 (26 - 42)	32 (28 – 49)	0.3585
Gender			0.1654			0 7313
Female	7 (17.95)	12 (31.58)		5 (20.83)	6 (25.00)	
Male	32 (82.05)	26 (68 42)		19 (79.17)	18 (75.00)	
	()			,		
Injury Severity Score						
Mean (STD)	26.7 (8.1)	32.0 (11.8)		27.9 (83.7)	27.9 (9.8)	
Median (Q1 – Q3)	25 (22 - 33)	30 (22 - 38)	0.0446*	29 (21 - 33)	29 (19.5-35.5)	0.9917
On-scene 1st GCS			0.1449			0.7204
3	21 (53.85)	11 (28.95)		12 (50.00)	10 (41.67)	
4	3 (7.69)	5 (13 16)		3 (12.50)	3 (12 50)	
5	5 (12.82)	7 (18 42)		2 (8 33)	5 (20.83)	
8	6 (15.39)	0 (22 69)		6 (25.00)	4 (16 67)	
7	4 (0.50)	5 (23.00)		0 (23.00)	4 (10.07)	
1	1 (2.50)	5 (13.16)		1 (4.17)	1 (4.17)	
			10 m			
Table 2: Univariate and	Multivariate Co	mparison of Outcome All patients	s	Propens	sity Score Matched Pa	atients
Table 2: Univariate and	Control (r	All patients =39) Amantadine (n=	-38) <i>p-</i> va	Propensi	sity Score Matched Pa 4) Amantadine (n=24	itients
Table 2: Univariate and	Control (r	mparison of Outcome All patients =39) Amantadine (n=	:38) <i>p-</i> va	Propens	sity Score Matched Pa 4) Amantadine (n=24	atients) p-value
Table 2: Univariate and Total Hospital Days Mean (SD) Median (01 = 03)	Control (r 17.9 (9)	All patients Imparison of Outcome All patients Imparison of Outcome All patients Imparison of Outcome	:s :38) p-va	Propens lue Control (n=2- 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 (9.5 - 28	aity Score Matched Pa 4) Amantadine (n=24 27.6 ± 14.0 25 (18 - 32 5)	p-value
Total Hospital Days Mean (SD) Median (Q1 – Q3) Estimate ratio, 95% Cl	Multivariate Co Control (r 17.9 (9) 16 (10 - : Referen	mparison of Outcome All patients =39) Amantadine (n= 6) 27.8 (12.5) 24) 25 (18 - 34) 26 1.50 (1.21 - 1.6)	is 38) p-va 0.000 35)	Propension lue Control (n=24) 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 (9.5 - 26) Reference Reference	sity Score Matched Pa 4) Amantadine (n=24 27.6 ± 14.0) 25 (18 - 32.5) 1.63 (1.20 - 2.22)	atients) p-value 0.0129*
Table 2: Univariate and Total Hospital Days Mean (SD) Median (Q1 – Q3) Estimate ratio, 95% Cl Total ICU Days	Multivariate Co Control (r 17.9 (9.) 16 (10 -) Reference	All patients All patients areasy) Amantadine (n= 6) 27.8 (12.5) 24) 25 (18 - 34) 5e 1.50 (1.21 - 1.8)	• 38) p-va 0.000	Propens lue Control (n=2- 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 (9.5 - 26 Reference	Score Matched Pa 4) Amantadine (n=24 27.6 ± 14.0 25 (18 – 32.5) 1.63 (1.20 – 2.22)	atients) p-value 0.0129*
Table 2: Univariate and Total Hospital Days Mean (SD) Median (Q1 – Q3) Estimate ratio, 95% Cl Total ICU Days Mean (SD)	Multivariate Co Control (n 17.9 (9) 16 (10 - 1 Reference 9.8 (6.8	All patients All patients i=39) Amantadine (n= 6) 27.8 (12.5) 24) 25 (18 - 34) ce 1.50 (1.21 - 1.6) a) 17.0 (11.8)	• 38) p-va 0.000	Propension lue Control (n=2-1) 04* 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 (9.5 - 26) Reference 10.4 ± 6.9 10.4 ± 6.9	sity Score Matched Pa 4) Amantadine (n=24 27.6 ± 14.0) 25 (18 - 32.5) 1.63 (1.20 - 2.22) 14.3 ± 6.8	atients) p-value 0.0129*
Total Hospital Days Mean (SD) Median (C1 – Q3) Estimate ratio, 95% C1 Total ICU Days Mean (SD) Median (C1 – Q3)	Multivariate Co Control (r 17.9 (9) 16 (10 - 1 Reference 9.8 (6.8 8.5 (4 - 1	Imparison of Outcome All patients =39) Amantadine (n= 6) 27.8 (12.5) 24) 25 (18 - 34) ce 1.50 (1.21 - 1.8) 3) 17.0 (11.8) 15) 13.5 (10 - 18)	• 38) p-va •38) 0.000 0.000	Propension lue Control (n=2-4) 14.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 (9.5 - 28) Raference 10.4 ± 6.9 8.5 (4 - 15)	ity Score Matched Pi 4) Amantadine (n=24 27.6 ± 14.0) 25 (18 - 32.5) 1.63 (1.20 - 2.22) 14.3 ± 6.8 13.5 (10 - 16.5)	atients) p-value 0.0129* 0.1304
Table 2: Univariate and Total Hospital Days Mean (SD) Median (G1 – G3) Estimate ratio, 95% Cl Total ICU Days Median (G1 – G3) Estimate ratio, 95% Cl	Multivariate Co Control (r 17.9 (9) 16 (10 - : Reference 9.8 (6.8 8.5 (4 - Reference	Imparison of Outcome All patients =39) Amantadine (n= 6) 27.8 (12.5) 24) 25 (18 - 34) ce 1.50 (1.21 - 1.8) 3) 17.0 (11.8) 15) 13.5 (10 - 18) ce 1.66 (1.22 - 2.2)	 38) p-va 35) 0.000 0.000 0.000 24) 0.000 	Propent lue Control (n=2- 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 14* 18.6 (9.5 - 26 Reference 10.4 ± 6.9 907* 8.5 (4 - 15)	Amantadine (n=24 27.6 ± 14.0 25 (18 - 32.5) 1.63 (1.20 - 2.22) 14.3 ± 6.8 13.5 (10 - 16.5)	atients) p-value 0.0129* 0.1304
Table 2: Univariate and Total Hospital Days Mean (SD) Median (G1 – G3) Estimate ratio, 95% Cl Total (CU Days Median (C1 – G3) Estimate ratio, 95% Cl Discharge location, n (%	Multivariate Co Control (r 17.9 (9) 16 (10 - : Reference 9.8 (6.8 8.5 (4 - ' Reference 9) 7 / 17 00	mparison of Outcome All patients =39) Amantadine (n= 6) 27.8 (12.5) 24) 25 (18.34) 25 1.50 (1.21 - 1.8) 3) 17.0 (11.8) 5) 13.6 (1.22 - 2.2) 5) 4.6 (1.22 - 2.2)	 38) p-va 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 	Propent lue Control (n=2/ 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 14* 18.6 (9.5 - 28 Reference 10.4 ± 6.9 9.7* 8.5 (4 - 15) 11 5 (20.92)	sity Score Matched Pi Amantadine (n=24 27.6 ± 14.0) 25 (18 − 32.5) 1.63 (1.20 − 2.22) 14.3 ± 6.8 13.5 (10 − 16.5) 2.(13 ED)	atients p-value 0.0129* 0.1304
Table 2: Univariate and Total Hospital Days Mean (SD) Median (Q1 – Q3) Estimate ratio, 95% CI Total ICU Days Mean (SD) Median (Q1 – Q3) Median (Q1 – Q3) Estimate ratio, 95% CI Discharge location, n (% Home	Multivariate Co Control (r 17.9 (9) 16 (10 - : Reference 9.8 (6.8 8.5 (4 - ' Reference 9.7 (17.9) 17 (42.8	mparison of Outcome All patients i=39) Amantadine (n= 6) 27.8 (12.5) 24) 25 (18 - 34) 0 1.50 (1.21 - 1.4) 1) 17.0 (11.8) 15) 13.5 (10 - 18) 26 1.66 (1.22 - 2.2) 27) 4 (10.53) 29) 4 (10.68)	 38) p-va 0.000 35) 0.000 0.000 24) 0.355 0.54 	Propens lue Control (n=2: 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 (9.5 - 26 Reference 10.4 ± 6.9 97* 8.5 (4 - 15) 21 5 (20.83) 11.145.83	ity Score Matched Pi 4) Amantadine (n=24 27.6 ± 14.0) 25 (18 - 32.5) 1.63 (1.20 - 2.22) 14.3 ± 6.8 13.5 (10 - 18.5) 3 (12.50) 10 (41.67)	atients p-value 0.0129* 0.1304 0.4386 0.7711
Table 2: Univariate and Mean (SD) Median (CI – Q3) Estimate raito, 95% CI Total ICU Days Mean (SC) Median (CI – Q3) Estimate raito, 95% CI Discharge location, n (% Home Outpatient/Home Rehab Acute Rohab	Multivariate Co Control (r 17.9 (9) 16 (10 - : Reference 9.8 (6.8 8.5 (4 - Reference 6) 7 (17.9) 17 (43.5 12 (30.5)	mparison of Outcome All patients all patients i=39) Amantadine (n= 6) 27.8 (12.5) 24) 25 (18-34) 30) 1.50 (1.21 - 1.6 31) 17.0 (11.8) 35) 1.56 (1.22 - 2.2 30) 4 (10.53) 90) 4 (10.53) 91) 13 (34.21)	38) p-va 35) 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.35; 0.35; 0.54 0.74'	Propensities Lue Control (n=2- (n=2-)) 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 10.4 ± 6.9 8.5 (4 - 15) 21 5 (20.83) 31 11 (45.83) 31 7 (20.17)	sity Score Matched Pi 4) Amantadine (n=24 27.6 ± 14.0) 25 (18 − 32.5) 1.63 (1.20 − 2.22) 14.3 ± 6.8 13.5 (10 − 16.5) 3 (12.50) 10 (41.67) 7 (22.17)	atients) p-value 0.0129* 0.1304 0.4386 0.7711 1
Table 2: Univariate and Mean (SD) Median (SD) Median (C1 – Q3) Estimate raito, 95% CI Total ICU Days Mean (SD) Median (C1 – Q3) Estimate raito, 95% CI Discharge location, n (? Home Actien Rhahu Actien	Multivariate Co Control (r 17.9 (9, 16 (10 - 1) 9.8 (6.8 8.5 (4 - 1) Reference 9.7 (17.9) 17 (13.5) 12 (30.7) 3 (7.69)	mparison of Outcome All patients =339) Amantadine (n= 6) 27.8 (12.5) 22 25 (1834) ce 1.50 (1.21 - 1.3) 3) 17.0 (11.8) 15) 13.5 (10 - 18) 16) 1.66 (1.22 - 2.2) 5) 4 (10.52) 9) 14 (39.84) 7) 13 (34.21) 7 14 (39.24) 7 7 (18.42)	18 18 18 18 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Propens lue Control (n=2- 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 (9.5 - 28 Reference 10.4 ± 6.9 57* 8.5 (4 - 15) 21 5 (20.83) 31 11 (45.83) 31 11 (45.83) 31 11 (45.81) 31 11 (45.81) 31 11 (45.81) 31 11 (45.83) 31 11 (45.81) 31 1 (4.17)	atty Score Matched P. (amartadine (n=24) 27.8 ± 14.0 (b) [Amartadine (n=24) 1.63 (120 - 32.5) 1.63 (120 - 2.22) 14.3 ± 6.8 13.5 (10 - 16.5) 3 (12.50) 10 (41.67) 7 (25.17) 4 (16.67)	tients p-value 0.0129* 0.1304 0.4386 0.7711 1 0.1563
Table 2: Universite and Mean (SD) Median (C1 – Q3) Median (C1 – Q3) Estimate ratio, 95% C1 Total (CU Days Mean (SD) Median (C1 – Q3) Estimate ratio, 95% C1 Discharge location, n (? Homa Acute Rohab Skilled Nursing Discharge RRS	Multivariate Co Control (r 17.9 (9, 16 (10 -) Reference 9,8 (6,1 8,5 (4 -) Reference 9) 7 (17.9) 17 (43.6 12 (30.7) 3 (7.69) 10 (7.5) 12 (30.7) 12 (Imparison of Outcome All patients Impaired patients	s 38) ρ-va 0.000 35) 0.000 24) 0.000 24) 0.000 24) 0.000 0.35; 0.544 0.744 0.744	Propent tue Control (n=2. 18.5±10.4 18.5±10.4 18.5±10.4 18.5±5.28 Reference Reference 10.4±6.9 8.5(4-15) 21 5(20.83) 31<11(45.83)	ity Score Matched Pi b) Amantadine (n=24 27.6 ± 14.0) 25 (18 = 3.2.5) 1.63 (12.0 - 2.22) 14.3 ± 6.8 13.5 (10 - 16.5) 3 (12.50) 10 (41.67) 7 (29.17) 4 (16.67)	atients) p-value 0.0129* 0.1304 0.4386 0.7711 1 0.1563
Table 2: Universite and Total Hospital Days Mean (SD) Mean (SD) Mean (SD) Median (CI - C3) Median (CI - C3) Discharge Costaino, n (? Home Skilled Nursing Discharge DRS Mean (SD) Discharge DRS	Multivariate Co Control (r 17.9 (9. 16 (10) Referen 9.8 (6.6 8.5 (4) Referen 9) 7 (17.9) 17 (43.5 12 (30.7 3 (7.69) 10.2 (5. 10.2 (5. 10.2 (5.)	mparison of Outcome All patients	s 38) p-va 35) 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.355 0.544 0.74 0.16 0.000	Propent tue Control (n=2. 44* 18.5 (± 0.4. 18.5 (± 0.4. 18.6 (0.526. 77* 10.4 ± 6.9 8.5 (4 - 15) 11 (45.83) 21 5 (20.83) 33 11 (45.83) 31 11 (45.87) 15 1 (4.17) 15 1 (2.7.7.3)	ity Score Matched P. (a) Amantadine (n=24 27.6 ± 14.0) 26 (16 = 32) 1.63 (120 - 2.22) 14.3 ± 6.8 13.5 (10 - 16.5) 3 (12.50) 10 (41.67) 7 (26.17) 7 (26.17) 7 (26.17) 15.2 ± 8.6 14.13 - 23)	atients) p-value 0.0129* 0.1304 0.4386 0.771 0.1563 0.128
Table 7: Universite and Total Hoophial Days Mean (3D) Median (C1 – C3) Estimate raiko, 95% C1 Total ICU Days Mean (S0) Median (C1 – C3) Estimate raiko, 95% C1 Discharge location, n (% Discharge location, n (% Discharge Dos Discharge DB Discharge DB Mean (SD) Mean (SD) Discharge CB Estimate raiko (95% C1)	Multivariate Co Control (r 17.9 (9). 16 (10 -) Reference 9) 7 (17.9) 7 (17.9) 7 (13.9) 17 (43.5) 12 (30.7) 3 (7.69) 10.2 (5. 11 (7 - 1) Reference 10.2 (5.	mparison of Outcome All patients	15 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16	Propent tue Control (n=2. 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 18.5 ± 10.4 19.7 ± 10.4 ± 6.9 8.5 (4 - 15) 21 5 (20.83) 21 1 (45.63) 71 7 (29.17) 1 1 (4.7 ± 5.2) 96* 10.2 ± 5.2 11 (7 - 13)	tity Score Matched P. 4) Amantadine (n=24 27.6 ± 14.0 25.(18 → 32.5) 1.63 (1.20 → 2.22) 14.3 ± 6.8 13.5 (10 → 16.5) 3 (12.50) 3 (12.50	atients p-value 0.0129* 0.1304 0.4386 0.7711 1 0.1563 0.139
Table 2: Univariate and Total Hospital Days Maen; (50) – 0.3) Estimate rate, 95% CI Total ICU Days Media: 02) – 0.3) Media: 02) – 0.3) Estimate rate, 95% CI Discharge location, ft (7) Capatient/None Rehab Acute Rehab Acute Rehab Discharge ORS Media: (20) Media: (20) Media: (20) Media: (20) Becharge ORS Media: (20) Media: (Multivariate Co Control (r 17.9 (9, 18.5 (10 - ; Reference 9.8 (6.6 8.5 (4 - ; Reference 9.7 (17.9) 17 (43.5 12 (30.7) 3 (7.69) 10.2 (5, 11 (7 - 1) Reference 10.2 (5, 11 (7 - 1) 10 (7	mparison of Outcome All patients	s 38) p-va 35) 0.000 0.000 0.355 0.355 0.355 0.355 0.544 0.744 0.165 0.000 0.000 0.44	Propent tue Control (n=2: 10 £6.5 18.5 (19.5 - 26: Reference 10.4 ± 6.9 8.5 (4 - 15) 21 5 (20.83) 31 11 (45.63) 31 11 (45.63) 31 11 (45.63) 11 14.729,17) 15 1 (4.17) 10.2 ± 5.2 11 (7 - 13)	ity Score Matched P/ 9) Amantadine (n=24 27.9 ±14.0 28 (10 = 32.5) 1.63 (1.20 = 2.22) 14.3 ± 6.8 13.5 (10 = 16.5) 3.1(25.0) 10 (41.67) 7 (26.17) 4 (16.67) 15.2 ± 6.6 14 (12 - 22)	atients p-value 0.0129* 0.1304 0.4386 0.7711 1 0.1563 0.139
Table 2: Universite and Table 2: Universite and Mean (50) Median (c1 – 03) Estimate ratio, 95% (C1 Total LCU Days Mean (10) – 03) Estimate ratio, 95% (C1 Discharge location, n (1 Home Octpatient/home Rehab Skilled Numing Discharge DR8 Median (2) – 03) Estimate ratio (65% (C1) DR5 attogories, n (%) DR5 attogories, n (%)	Multivariate Co Control (r 17.9 (9) 18.6 (6 8.6 (4 Reference 9.8 (6.6 8.6 (4 Reference 9.7 (17.9) 17 (43.6 12 (30.7 3 (7.69) 10.2 (5. 11 (7 - 1) Reference 9 (23.0)	mparison of Outcome All patients All patients -39) mantadine (n: 0 2.30 1.50 2.51(8-34) 2.51(8-34) 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.50 1.60 1.61 1.70 1.61 1.70 1.61 1.70 1.61 1.70 1.61 1.70 1.70 1.70 1.71 1.71 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 1.72 </td <td>13 38) ρ-να 36) 0.000 0.35; 0.35; 0.35; 0.544 0.74' 0.74' 0.16' 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000</td> <td>Propent Iue Control (n=2; 44 18.5, ±10.4; 18.5, ±10.4; Reference 19.5, ±10.4; Reference 21 5, (20.83) 31 11 (45.83) 71 7 (29.17) 10.4, ±6.9 31 11 (45.83) 71 7 (29.17) 10.4, ±7.7 206* 10.2, ± 5.2 11 (7 - 13) 33 5 (20.83)</td> <td>Hy Score Matched P (1976) 4) Amantadine (n=24 27.6 ± 14.0 25.(18 - 32.5) 1.63.(1.20 - 2.22) 14.3 ± 6.8 13.5.(10 - 16.5) 3.(12.50) 3.(12.50) 3.(12.50)</td> <td>atients p-value 0.0129° 0.1304 0.4386 0.7711 0.1563 0.139 0.4386</td>	13 38) ρ-να 36) 0.000 0.35; 0.35; 0.35; 0.544 0.74' 0.74' 0.16' 0.000 0.000 0.000 0.000	Propent Iue Control (n=2; 44 18.5, ±10.4; 18.5, ±10.4; Reference 19.5, ±10.4; Reference 21 5, (20.83) 31 11 (45.83) 71 7 (29.17) 10.4, ±6.9 31 11 (45.83) 71 7 (29.17) 10.4, ±7.7 206* 10.2, ± 5.2 11 (7 - 13) 33 5 (20.83)	Hy Score Matched P (1976) 4) Amantadine (n=24 27.6 ± 14.0 25.(18 - 32.5) 1.63.(1.20 - 2.22) 14.3 ± 6.8 13.5.(10 - 16.5) 3.(12.50) 3.(12.50) 3.(12.50)	atients p-value 0.0129° 0.1304 0.4386 0.7711 0.1563 0.139 0.4386
Table 2: Initiation and a second seco	Multivariate Cc Control (r 17.9 (8), 16 (10) - 1 Reference 9.8 (6, 1 8.8 (5, (4 - 1 Reference 10, 2 (5, 1) 10, 2 (5, 1)	mparison of Outcome All patients All patients ar39) Amantadine (n* 50) 77.8 (12.5) 1.50 (12.1 - 1.1) 1.50 (12.1 - 1.1) 1.50 (12.1 - 1.1) 1.50 (12.2 - 2.1) 1.51 (12.1 - 1.1) 7.7 (14.2) 1.51 (12.2 - 2.1) 7.7 (14.2) 1.51 (10.2 - 1.1) 7.7 (14.2) 1.51 (10.4 - 1.1) 7.7 (14.2) 1.51 (10.4 - 1.1) 7.7 (14.2 - 2.2) 1.52 (10.6 - 1.1) 1.32 (10.6 - 1.1) 30.1 32 (10.6 - 1.1) 31.33 (7.96) 92.2 (56.79)	s 38) p-va 35) 0.000 0.000 0.355 0.544 0.355 0.544 0.355 0.544 0.461 0.0000 0.00000 0.0000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000	Propent tue Control (n=2: 10 4 (18.5±10.4) 18.5±10.4 18.5±10.4 18.5±10.4 18.5±10.4 19.5±10.4 18.5±10.4 10.4±6.9 8.5(4-15) 21 5 (20.83) 31 11 (45.63) 31 11 (45.63) 31 11 (45.63) 31 10.2±5.2 31 10.2±5.2 31 11 (7-13) 33 5 (20.83) 34 18 (75.00)	Hy Score Matched P/ 4) Amantadine (n=24 27.6 ±14.0 28.0 (n=32.5) 1.63 (1.20 − 2.22) 14.3 ± 6.8 13.5 (10 − 16.5) 3 (12.60) 10 (2.67) 7 (2.67) 15.2 ± 6.6 14 (12 − 22) 3 (12.50) 3 (12.50) 15.2 ± 6.6 14 (12 − 22) 3 (12.50) 15.2 ± 6.7 15.2 ± 6.6 14 (12 − 22) 3 (12.50) 17 (70.83)	atients p-value 0.0129* 0.1304 0.4386 0.7711 1 0.1563 0.139 0.4386 0.7453
Table 2: Inhivariate and Total Hospital Days Maclian (CJ – C3) Maclian (CJ – C3) Estimate ratio, 95% CI Discharge focalism Skilled Hwrang Discharger Rost Maclian (CD) Maclian (CD) Maclian (CD) Maclian (CD) Maclian (CJ) Discharger Rost Maclian (CD) Maclian (CD)	Multivariate Cc Control (r 17.9 (9) 17.9 (9) 16 (10 - 1) Reference 9.8 (6.1 8.5 (4 - 7) Reference 9.7 (17.97) 7 (17.97) 9.7 (17.97) 12 (30.7) 3 (7.69) 10 2 (5.11) 11 (7 - 1) Reference 9 (23.0) (29 (74.3)) 1, (25.56)	$\begin{array}{c} \text{All patients} \\ \hline \text{All patients} \\ a$	is is ρ-value ising ρ-value ising 0.000 ising 0.000 ising 0.000 ising 0.000 ising 0.000 ising 0.000 0.001 0.000 0.002 0.000 0.003 0.000 0.004 0.000	Propent tue Control (n=2; 44 18.5 ±10.4; 18.5 ±10.4; Reference 77 8.5 (4 - 15); 21 5 (20.83); 31 11 (45.83); 71 7 (29.17); 10.4 ± 6.9 8.5 (4 - 15); 11, 11 (7 - 13); 33 5 (20.83); 14 18 (75.00); 14 18 (75.00); 14 18 (74.07); 14 18 (75.00); 14 18 (75.00); 14 18 (75.00); 15 1(4,17);	ity Score Matched P(9) Amantadine (n=24 27.6 ± 14.0) 1.52 (10 − 32.2) 1.63 (1-30 − 22.2) 1.63 (1-30 − 22.2) 1.63 ± 6.8 1.3.5 (10 − 16.5) 10 (41.67) 15.2 ± 6.6 14 (12 − 22.) 3 (12.50) 17 (70.83) 4 (16.67)	atients p-value 0.0129* 0.1304 0.4386 0.4386 0.4386 0.7453 0.1563



Figure 2.

Learning Objectives

Participants should be able to discuss outcomes of acute hospitalization after Amantadine Hydrochloride administration in patients with severe TBI.





Conclusions

Matched for injury severity, GCS, and age, Amantadine administration in the acute hospitalization phase demonstrated no significant difference compared with controls in DRS and was associated with longer hospital stay. In a recent randomized controled study amantadine showed considerable benefit for TBI in the post acute rehabilitation setting. This outcome was not demonstrated in our investigation. Additional investigation into confounding variables such as socioeconomic status effect on hospital length of stay will be valuable to better define the role of AH for TBI in the acute hospitalization. Further prospective studies will be needed to fully evaluate AH use in acute hospitalization.

References

1. Spritzer S D, et al. Amantadine for patients with severe traumatic brain injury: a critically appraised topic. The Neurologist 2015;19(2):61-4.

2. Giacino J T, et al. Placebo-controlled trial of amantadine for severe traumatic brain injury. The New England journal of medicine 2012;366(9):819-26.