10.1071/IB23070
Brain Impairment

Supplementary Material

Experience of mTBI-like symptoms in a sample without brain injury in Aotearoa/New Zealand

Jason Chua[A,*] and *Alice Theadom*[A]

[A]AUT Traumatic Brain Injury Network, School of Clinical Sciences, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand

*Correspondence to: Email: jason.chua@aut.ac.nz

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of ***cross-sectional studies***

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(*a*) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	2
		(*b*) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	2
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	3
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	5
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	5
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	5
Participants	6	(*a*) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	5
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	6-8
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	6-8
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	5-6
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	-
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	8-9
Statistical methods	12	(*a*) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	8-9
		(*b*) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	-
		(*c*) Explain how missing data were addressed	-
		(*d*) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	-
		(*e*) Describe any sensitivity analyses	-
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	Fig.1, p.9
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	Fig.1
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	Fig.1
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	Table 1
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	Table 1
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Table 1
Main results	16	(*a*) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear	Table 3

		which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	
		(*b*) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	-
		(*c*) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	-
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	9
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	14
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	16
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	14-17
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	16
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	1

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

Regression tables for symptom cluster scores as the dependent variable

Table 1
Results of the linear regression model with cognitive symptom cluster score as the dependent variable (N=173)

Characteristic	Unstandardised Beta coefficients (95%CI)	p-value
Age (years)	-0.1 (-0.11 to 0.07)	0.621
Male *(base: Female)*	-1.1 (-3.43 to 1.37)	0.397
European *(base: Not European)*	-0.2 (-2.59 to 2.31)	0.912
Physical or mental health condition *(base: No condition)*	0.8 (-2.12 to 3.72)	0.590
Employed *(base: Unemployed)*	-1.5 (-4.95 to 2.04)	0.411
College or higher education *(base: Secondary or lower education)*	2 (-0.29 to 4.14)	0.088
General health rating	-0.1 (-0.15 to 0.04)	0.232
Illness attitude scale total score	0.2 (-0.02 to 0.25)	0.089
PANAS positive affect score	-0.1 (-0.27 to 0.09)	0.289
PANAS negative affect score	0.3 (0.03 to 0.52)	0.032
PSS total score	0.1 (-0.18 to 0.38)	0.467
(Constant)	4.2 (-7.16 to 15.38)	0.472

R^2= 0.313 (R^2 adjusted= 0.266), $F(170) = 6.589$, $p<.001$. PANAS: Positive And Negative Affect Scale. PSS: Perceived Stress Scale. Breusch-Pagan X^2 (1, N = 170) = 38.95, $p < .001$. Bonferroni-corrected alpha of 0.05 = 0.0167.

Table 2
Results of the linear regression model with vestibular-ocular symptom cluster as the dependent variable (N=173)

Characteristic	Unstandardised Beta coefficients (95%CI)	p-value
Age (years)	0.1 (-0.06 to 0.08)	0.792
Male *(base: Female)*	-0.8 (-2.53 to 1.05)	0.413
European *(base: Not European)*	-1.6 (-3.49 to 0.39)	0.115
Physical or mental health condition *(base: No condition)*	1.8 (-0.25 to 3.8)	0.084
Employed *(base: Unemployed)*	0.9 (-1.77 to 3.49)	0.519
College or higher education *(base: Secondary or lower education)*	0.2 (-1.66 to 1.9)	0.894
General health rating	-0.1 (-0.15 to -0.02)	0.021
Illness attitude scale total score	0.2 (0.1 to 0.3)	**<0.001**
PANAS positive affect score	-0.1 (-0.15 to 0.14)	0.963
PANAS negative affect score	0.2 (-0.02 to 0.38)	0.064
PSS total score	-0.1 (-0.23 to 0.17)	0.76
(Constant)	0.5 (-8.77 to 9.64)	0.926

R^2= 0.399 (R^2 adjusted= 0.356), $F(170) = 9.557$, $p<.001$. PANAS: Positive And Negative Affect Scale. PSS: Perceived Stress Scale. Breusch-Pagan X^2 (1, N = 170) = 52.62, $p < .001$. Bonferroni-corrected alpha of 0.05 = 0.0167.

Table 3
Results of the linear regression model with physical symptom cluster as the dependent variable (N=173)

Characteristic	Unstandardised Beta coefficients (95%CI)	p-value
Age (years)	-0.1 (-0.12 to 0.06)	0.517
Male *(base: Female)*	-1.7 (-4.04 to 0.76)	0.178
European *(base: Not European)*	-0.6 (-3.1 to 1.98)	0.663
Physical or mental health condition *(base: No condition)*	1.5 (-1.52 to 4.38)	0.339
Employed *(base: Unemployed)*	1.5 (-1.67 to 4.64)	0.354
College or higher education *(base: Secondary or lower education)*	0.3 (-2.07 to 2.53)	0.844
General health rating	-0.1 (-0.17 to 0.02)	0.111
Illness attitude scale total score	0.2 (-0.05 to 0.26)	0.161
PANAS positive affect score	-0.1 (-0.21 to 0.15)	0.737
PANAS negative affect score	0.2 (-0.08 to 0.41)	0.188
PSS total score	0.1 (-0.21 to 0.38)	0.553
(Constant)	6.1 (-5.15 to 17.29)	0.287

R^2= 0.257 (R^2 adjusted= 0.205), $F(170) = 4.993$, $p<.001$. PANAS: Positive And Negative Affect Scale. PSS: Perceived Stress Scale. Breusch-Pagan X^2 (1, N = 170) = 16.92, $p < .001$. Bonferroni-corrected alpha of 0.05 = 0.0167.