



Neuropsychological test performance of youth football players in different positions: A comparison of high and low contact players

Journal:	<i>Applied Neuropsychology: Child</i>
Manuscript ID	HAPC-2016-0049.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	head impact frequency, football, ImPACT

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Neuropsychological Test Performance of Youth Football Players at Different Positions:

A Comparison of High and Low Contact Players

Applied Neuropsychology: Child

William T. Tsushima*

Clinical psychologist, Psychiatry and Psychology Department, Straub Medical Center
888 South King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813; Tel.: 808-522-4521; fax: 808-522-3526;
wtsushima@straub.net.

Hyeong Jun Ahn

Biostatistician, Office of Biostatistics & Quantitative Health Sciences, University of
Hawaii John A. Burns School of Medicine, Biosciences Building, Suite 211E, 651 Ilalo
Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813; Tel: 808-692-1822; fax: 808-692-1828;
hjahn@hawaii.edu.

Andrea M. Siu

Regulatory Coordinator, Research Institute, Hawaii Pacific Health, 55 Merchant Street,
26th Floor, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813; Tel.: 808-535-7169; fax: 808-535-7229;
andrea.siu@hawaiipacifichealth.org.

Tama Fukuyama

Research assistant, Department of Human Biology, Scripps College, 1030 Columbia
Avenue #322, Claremont, California 91711; Tel: 808-228-4924;
tfukuyama8812@scrippscollege.edu.

Nathan M. Murata

Chair, Department of Kinesiology and Rehabilitation Science, University of Hawaii at
Manoa; 1337 Lower Campus Road, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822; Tel: 808-956-4714; fax:
808-956-7976; nmurata@hawaii.edu.

*Corresponding author at: Psychiatry and Psychology Department, Straub Medical
Center, 888 South King Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813; Tel.: 808-522-4521; fax: 808-
522-3526; wtsushima@straub.net

Abstract

The aim of this study was to examine the effects of head impact frequency on the neuropsychological test results of football players who participate in different positions on the team. Based on the biomechanical measures of head impact frequency reported in high school football, a High Contact group (n=480) consisting of offensive and defensive linemen was compared with a Low Contact group (n=640) comprised of receivers and defensive backs. The results revealed that the High Contact group obtained poorer performances on the Immediate Post-Concussion Assessment and Cognitive Testing (ImPACT) on three Composite scores (Verbal Memory, Visual Motor Speed, Impulse Control) and the Total Symptom score compared to the Low Contact group. The present study is the first, to date, to report differences in the neuropsychological test performances of athletes who participate in high and low contact football positions. The findings raise tentative concerns that youth football players exposed to repetitive head trauma, including subconcussive impacts, may be at risk for lowered neuropsychological functioning and increased symptoms. In view of the preliminary nature of this investigation, more research into the effects of head trauma frequency in youth football is strongly recommended.

Neuropsychological Test Performance of Youth Football Players at Different Positions:
A Comparison of High and Low Contact Players

Introduction

Sports-related concussions have become a magnet for increasing scrutiny by clinicians, researchers, and popular media alike, largely due to the highly publicized cases of concussion damage in National Football League players (Fainaru-Wada & Fainaru, 2013). In recent years, the widespread participation in high school and collegiate sports has also attracted attention due to higher concussion rates in sport, with a significant increase from 23% to 57% from 2005 through 2012 (Rosenthal, Foraker, Collins, & Comstock, 2014). While the frequency of concussion varies from sport to sport, football consistently commands one of the highest rates of concussion at high school and collegiate levels compared to other sport activities (Jinguji, Krabak, & Satchell, 2011; Marar, McIlvain, Fields, & Comstock, 2012; Noble & Hesdorffer, 2013).

Within football, the rate of concussive injuries appears to vary depending on which position the athlete plays. An 8-year (1975-1982) investigation of 49 college teams found that the highest frequency of game-related concussions on defense were reported by defensive backs, while among the offensive players, running backs reported the most game-related concussions (Buckley, 1988). A study of concussions in college football players by Collins and his associates (2005) indicated that quarterbacks and tight ends reported the highest rates of prior concussion. A review of 16 years of National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) injury surveillance data for football found that

1
2
3 (1) offensive players received more concussions than defensive players; and (2)
4
5
6 quarterbacks and running backs had the highest number of concussions, while offensive
7
8 and defensive linemen had the lowest number of concussions (Dick et al., 2007). Among
9
10 high school football players, linebackers sustain the highest proportion of concussion
11
12 injuries among the defensive players, while running backs have the highest proportion of
13
14 concussions of players in offensive positions (Gessel, Fields, Collins, Dick, & Comstock,
15
16 2007; Powell & Barber-Foss, 1999). The concussion rates in high school and college
17
18 football suggest, in general, that offensive skill players (running backs and quarterbacks)
19
20 and linebackers may experience more concussions than players in other positions.
21
22
23

24
25 Recent biomechanical technology has been employed to quantify the magnitude
26
27 and frequency of head impacts sustained by football players in different positions.
28
29 Researchers at the University of Oklahoma placed the Head Impact Telemetry (HIT)
30
31 System in the helmets of 40 college football players and 16 high school football players
32
33 to measure all head impacts from practices and games during the 2005 football season
34
35 (Schnebel, Gwin, Anderson, & Gatlin, 2007). Besides noting that college players
36
37 sustained high-level impacts more frequently than high school players, the investigators
38
39 found that skill position players (quarterbacks, running backs, wide receivers,
40
41 cornerbacks, and safeties) in high school and college received a greater percentage of
42
43 high level impacts (60-98g) than linemen. In contrast, linemen sustained the highest
44
45 number of impacts, but most were of relatively low magnitude (20-30g). A similar HIT
46
47 approach to analyze head impacts incurred by high school football players found that
48
49 offensive skill players (quarterback, receiver, tight end, running back, fullback) sustained
50
51 the greatest magnitude of linear acceleration after an impact (Broglio et al., 2009).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Defensive and offensive linemen, in contrast, sustained the lowest magnitude impacts but
4 had the most impacts during games and practices. A four-year investigation, using the
5 HIT system of helmet-mounted accelerometers with high school football players, found
6 that linemen sustained the highest number of impacts (>15g) per season, while the lowest
7 number of impacts were attained by receivers, corner backs and safeties (Broglia et al.,
8 2011).
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 With accelerometers embedded in the helmets of college football players,
19 Mihalik, Bell, Marshall, and Guskiewicz (2007) reported that offensive linemen had the
20 highest frequency of recorded impacts, while offensive backs sustained the highest
21 magnitude impacts. Crisco and his associates (2010) also used HIT instrumentation with
22 college football players in one season and found that linemen and linebackers had a
23 greater number of impacts per practice and game than players at other positions. Crisco et
24 al. (2012) later reported that running backs consistently sustained the greatest impact
25 magnitudes of head trauma. Similarly, Funk, Rowson, Daniel, and Duma (2012)
26 examined the HIT data of college football players over a 4-year period and reported that
27 linemen sustained the highest number of head impacts, while skill position players had a
28 higher number of more severe head impacts (>100g). In summarizing the research
29 utilizing HIT with high school and collegiate football players, it appears that offensive
30 skill players are likely to sustain more severe head impacts, while linemen have the
31 highest number of head impacts in football.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 Comparing the outcomes of head impact across different football positions in
52 college, Baugh and her associates (2015) found no differences between position groups in
53 the number of diagnosed concussions, but noted that offensive linemen had higher
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 amounts of undiagnosed concussions and “dings” than other position players. Moreover,
4
5 the authors noted that offensive linemen, who experience frequent but low magnitude
6
7 head impacts, develop more post-impact symptoms than other position players. The
8
9 research literature that have compared the head trauma frequencies of football players in
10
11 varied positions is increasing but, thus far, there are no known studies examining the
12
13 neuropsychological test data of youth football athletes playing in different team positions.
14
15 The primary aim of this research was to compare the baseline neuropsychological test
16
17 scores of youth football players in different positions on the team with a focus on the test
18
19 results of players in high and low contact football positions.
20
21
22
23

24 **Materials and Methods**

25
26
27 This study was reviewed by the Hawaii Pacific Health Research Institute and was
28
29 determined to be exempt from Institutional Review Board review.
30
31

32 *Test Instrument*

33
34
35 This study utilized the Immediate Post-Concussion Assessment and Cognitive
36
37 Testing (ImPACT) battery, which has been employed in several studies of concussions
38
39 among high school athletes (Lovell, 2006). ImPACT is a web-based computerized
40
41 neuropsychological test battery developed for the assessment of sports-related concussion
42
43 in youth, collegiate, and professional athletes. The test, which takes about 30 minutes to
44
45 complete, was administered in small groups of about 20 prior to the season, monitored by
46
47 certified athletic trainers trained in the standardized administration of the examination. A
48
49 more complete description of ImPACT can be found elsewhere (Lovell, 2012). ImPACT
50
51 produces five neurocognitive composite scores, including Verbal Memory, Visual
52
53 Memory, Visual Motor Speed, Reaction Time, and Impulse Control. The testing also
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 yields a Total Symptom score, based on the ImPACT Post-Concussion Symptom Scale
4 that consists of 22 commonly reported symptoms, e.g., headache, dizziness. The test
5
6 provides self-reported demographic and health information, such as age, sex, years of
7
8 education, native language, sport played, prior concussion, and history of seizures,
9
10 psychiatric illness, learning disability, attention deficit disorder, psychiatric illness or
11
12 seizures.
13
14
15

16 17 18 *Protocol* 19

20
21 All athletes were administered the ImPACT test prior to the start of their sport
22 season. The baseline testing was conducted in groups of approximately 20 athletes,
23
24 monitored by an athletic trainer trained in the standard administration of this
25
26 computerized neuropsychological test battery. Although the baseline testing was
27
28 conducted before season play, it was assumed that the athletes participated in football in
29
30 the past and experienced varying degrees of contact and head trauma.
31
32
33
34
35

36 37 *Procedure* 38

39
40 This research design was similar to previous investigations of repetitive head impacts that
41
42 compared athletes in contact sports, such as football and soccer, with athletes in non-
43
44 contact sports, like track and tennis (McAllister et al., 2012; Stephens, Rutherford, Potter,
45
46 & Fernie, 2010; Tsushima, Siu, Arnold, & Oshiro, 2016). The present study operationally
47
48 defined a High and a Low Contact group according to the frequency of head impacts
49
50 reported in high school football (Broglia et al., 2009; Schnebel et al., 2004). Similar
51
52 patterns of head impact frequency were noted by Crisco et al. (2010) and Funk et al.
53
54 (2012) in their HIT evaluations of collegiate players in varied football positions.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Participants

The pool of athletes were 4,952 males, ages 13 to 18 years, from 65 schools in Hawaii. Of these, 4,790 athletes met the following inclusionary criteria: native language of English and valid ImpACT baseline test results. Excluded from the study were 162 who indicated that English was not their native language, and 337 who had invalid profiles which were automatically identified by the online ImpACT version that incorporates the following cut-off scores: Impulse Control Composite score ≥ 30 , X's and O's–Total Incorrect > 30 , Word Memory–Learning Percent Correct < 69 , Design Memory–Learning Percent Correct < 50 , and Three Letters–Total Letters Correct < 8 (Lovell, 2012). There were 2,173 athletes who participated in football. Football position data were missing for 423. Additionally, 630 football players were excluded who were not in the High Contact (offensive and defensive linemen) or Low Contact (receivers and defensive backs) groups. The High Contact group was comprised of 212 offensive linemen and 268 defensive linemen, who are known to have the highest frequency of head impacts, while the Low Contact group consisted of 347 receivers and 293 defensive backs, who have the lowest frequency of head impacts.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were summarized by means and standard deviations along with medians and ranges for continuous variables and by frequencies and percentages for categorical variables. The two contact groups were compared in terms of age and six ImpACT scores (Verbal Memory, Visual Memory, Visual Motor Speed, Reaction Time, Impulse Control, and Total Symptom). The normality of age and ImpACT scores was assessed via the Shapiro-Wilk test and Smirnov test. Due to non-normal distributions,

1
2
3 non-parametric statistics, namely, the Wilcoxon Rank Sum tests, were employed to
4
5 compare ages and scores of the High and Low Contact groups. A chi-square test was used
6
7 to compare percentages of prior concussion of the two contact groups. All data analyses
8
9 were performed in SAS 9.3 (SAS Institute Inc., 2011). A two-tailed p -value of less than
10
11 0.05 was regarded as statistically significant.
12
13

14 15 16 **Results**

17
18 Among the High Contact athletes, 69 (14.4%) reported having a prior concussion,
19
20 while 118 (18.4%) of the Low Contact players reported a prior concussion. The
21
22 percentage difference in prior concussions was not statistically significant ($\chi^2[1]=3.25$,
23
24 $p=0.07$). The data pertaining to the age and ImPACT scores of the High and Low Contact
25
26 Groups appear in Table 1. The High Contact group obtained significantly poorer
27
28 ImPACT Composite scores in Verbal Memory ($\chi^2[1]=9.90$, $p=0.002$), Visual Motor
29
30 Speed ($\chi^2[1]=8.97$, $p=0.003$), Impulse Control ($\chi^2[1]=14.05$, $p=0.0002$), and Total
31
32 Symptoms ($\chi^2[1]=11.85$, $p=0.0006$). No significant differences were seen between the
33
34 two groups in age, Visual Memory, and Reaction Time.
35
36
37
38

39 40 **Discussion**

41
42 The present study represents, to our knowledge, the first effort to evaluate the
43
44 consequences of frequent head impacts on youth football players in different positions by
45
46 examining the neuropsychological test scores of a large sample of athletes in different
47
48 positions of the football team. The data analysis focused on two groups of football
49
50 positions, based on the reported frequency of head impacts found at different positions
51
52 (Broglia et al., 2009), with the assumption that more neuropsychological decline occurs
53
54 at positions where more impacts occur. The results revealed that the High Contact group
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of offensive and defensive linemen obtained poorer results on three ImPACT Composite
4 scores (Verbal Memory, Visual Motor Speed, Impulse Control) and reported more
5
6 symptoms than the Low Contact group comprised of receivers and defensive backs. The
7
8 findings are consistent with prior research that revealed an increase in neurological
9
10 symptoms associated with head impact frequency (Baugh et al., 2015), but are at odds
11
12 with a HIT study that found no relation between neuropsychological test results and the
13
14 total number of head impacts of college football players over one season (Gysland,
15
16 Mihalik, Register-Mihalik, Trulock, Shields, & Guskiewicz, 2012).
17
18
19
20
21

22 While high magnitude collisions and concussions capture much of the attention of
23
24 football fans and sports media, frequent lower intensity head trauma cannot be ignored or
25
26 taken lightly. Researchers have noted that high school football players sustain a greater
27
28 number of head impacts compared to other sports, like soccer and ice hockey (Broglia et
29
30 al., 2011). In football, non-concussive hits can occur on nearly every play, especially for
31
32 linemen who encounter constant helmet-to-helmet crashes (Talavage et al., 2013). A high
33
34 school football player may experience over 2,000 subconcussive blows during the course
35
36 of a single season (Broglia et al., 2011). The consequences of repetitive head blows in
37
38 sports are not insignificant. Investigators have found that youth athletes in contact sports,
39
40 like football, display poorer performances in neurocognitive tasks than non-contact
41
42 athletes, such as in basketball, baseball and track (McAllister et al., 2012; Tsushima et al.,
43
44 2016). However, it should be noted that Stephens and his associates (2010) found no
45
46 differences in the neuropsychological test performances of soccer, rugby, and non-contact
47
48 players (e.g., swimming, tennis, cricket). Nonetheless, in recent years the interest in
49
50 repetitive head impacts has grown, with concerns that cumulative head trauma, including
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 subconcussive blows, can seriously affect brain functions (Bailes, Petraglia, Omalu,
4 Nauman, & Talavage, 2013; Graham, Rivara, Ford, & Spicer, 2014).
5
6
7

8 Without quantifiable measures of head trauma as provided by the use of head
9 impact telemetry, it is difficult to directly study repetitive head impacts and their potential
10 effects. The present investigation provided an indirect option by comparing a group of
11 athletes who are known to incur high frequencies of head impacts with athletes who
12 reportedly have a low frequency of head impacts. The findings from this approach could
13 be helpful in assessing the variable risk of repetitive head trauma in football players.
14 Further research on the effects of head impact frequency utilizing the present
15 methodology should be considered.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 *Limitations*

27
28 The methodological flaws of this study should be recognized when interpreting
29 these findings (1) In youth football some athletes play more than one position. We were
30 unable to identify if any of the players played in more than one position or how much
31 time they may have played in different positions. An athlete who played in both offensive
32 and defensive line positions could have increased his exposure to impacts and the risk for
33 injury. (2) The neuropsychological test measures in this research represent only the
34 handful of neurocognitive functions contained in the ImPACT battery, and do not
35 represent the wide range of neuropsychological variables found in a comprehensive test
36 battery. Further investigation employing a broader set of neurocognitive measures is
37 desired. (3) This retrospective study was not able to assess other variables that could
38 affect neuropsychological functioning, such as school aptitude and test effort.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 **Acknowledgments**

1
2
3 The authors wish to acknowledge the support of the Hawaii Concussion
4
5 Awareness and Management Program who provided the data for this study. The second
6
7 author (HJA) was supported by grants U54MD007584 and P20GM103466 from National
8
9 Institutes of Health. The fourth author, TF, participated in the Hawaii Pacific Health
10
11 Summer Student Research Program while she assisted in this research project.
12
13

14 15 **Author Disclosure Statement**

16
17 No competing financial interests exist for any of the five authors.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **References**

- 38
39 Bailes, J.E., Petraglia, A.L., Omalu, B.I., Nauman, E., & Talavage, T. (2013). Role of
40
41 subconcussion in repetitive traumatic brain injury: A review. *Journal of*
42
43 *Neurosurgery*, 119, 1235-1245.
44
45
46 Baugh, C.M., Kiernan, P.T., Kroshus, E., Daneshvar, D.H., Montenigro, P.H., McKee,
47
48 A.C., & Stern, R.A. (2015). Frequency of head-impact-related outcomes by
49
50 position in NCAA Division collegiate football players. *Journal of Neurotrauma*,
51
52 32(5), 314-326.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Broglio, S.P., Eckner, J.T., Martini, D., Sosnoff, J.J., Kutcher, J.S., & Randolph, C.
4
5 (2011). Cumulative head impact burden in high school football. *Journal of*
6
7 *Neurotrauma*, 28, 2069-2078.
8
9
10 Broglio, S.P., Sosnoff, J.J., Shin, S., He, X., Alcaraz, C., & Zimmerman, J. (2009). Head
11
12 impact during high school football: A biomechanical assessment. *Journal of*
13
14 *Athletic Training*, 44(4), 342-349.
15
16
17 Buckley, W.E. (1988). Concussion in college football: A multivariate analysis. *The*
18
19 *American Journal of Sports Medicine*, 16(1), 51-56.
20
21
22 Collins, M.W., Grindel, S.H., Lovell, M.R., Dede, D.E., Moser, D.J., Phalin,
23
24 B.R...McKeag, M.D. (2005). Relationship between concussion and
25
26 neuropsychological performance in college football players. *JAMA*, 282, 964-970.
27
28
29 Crisco, J.J., Fiore, R., Beckwith, J.G., Chu, J.J., Brolinson, P.G., Duma, S...Greenwald,
30
31 R.M. (2010). Frequency and location of head impact exposures in individual
32
33 collegiate football players. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 45 (6), 549-559.
34
35
36 Crisco, J.J., Wilcox, B.J., Machan, J.T., McAllister, T.W., Duhaime, A-C., Duma,
37
38 S.M...Greenwald, R.M. (2012) Magnitude of head impact exposures in individual
39
40 collegiate football players. *Journal of Applied Biomechanics*, 28(2), 174-183.
41
42
43 Dick, R., Ferrara, M.S., Agel, J., Courson, R., Marshall, S.W., Hanley, M.J., & Reifsteck,
44
45 F. (2007). Descriptive epidemiology of collegiate men's football injuries:
46
47 National Collegiate Athletic Association Injury Surveillance System, 1988-1989
48
49 through 2003-2004. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 42(2), 221-233.
50
51
52 Fainaru-Wada, M., & Fainaru, S. (2013). *League of Denial: The NFL, Concussions, and*
53
54 *the Battle for Truth*. New York: Crown Archetype.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Funk, J.R., Rowson, S., Daniel, R.W., & Duma S.M. (2012). Validation of concussion
4 risk curves for collegiate football players derived from HITS data. *Annals of*
5 *Biomedical Engineering*, 40(1), 79-89.
6
7
8
9
10 Gessel, L.M., Fields, S.K., Collins, C.L., Dick R.W., & Comstock, R.D. (2007).
11 Concussions among United States high school and collegiate athletes. *Journal of*
12 *Athletic Training*, 42, 495-503.
13
14
15
16
17 Graham, R., Rivara, F.P., Ford, M.A., & Spicer, C.M. (Eds.). (2014). *Sports-related*
18 *Concussions in Youth: Improving the Science, Changing the Culture*. Washington,
19 D.C.: The National Academies Press.
20
21
22
23
24 Gysland, S.M., Mihalik, J.P., Register-Mihalik, J.K., Trulock, S.C., Shields, E.W., &
25 Guskiewicz, K.M. (2012). The relationship between subconcussive impacts and
26 concussion history on clinical measures of neurologic function in collegiate
27 football players. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering*, 40, 14-22.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 Jinguji, T.M., Krabak, B.J., & Satchell, E.K. (2011). Epidemiology of youth sports
35 concussion. *Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Clinics of North America*, 22,
36 565-575.
37
38
39
40
41 Lovell, M.R. (2006). The ImPACT Neuropsychological Test Battery. In R.J.
42 Echemendia, (ed.) *Sports Neuropsychology: Assessment and Management of*
43 *Traumatic Brain Injury*. New York: Guilford Press;193-215.
44
45
46
47
48 Lovell, M.R. (2012). *Clinical Interpretation Manual*. ImPACT Website
49 <http://www.impacttest.com/interpretation.php>. January 2012. Accessed August
50 30, 2013.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Marar, M., McIlvain, N.M., Fields, S.K., & Comstock, R.D. Epidemiology of
4
5 concussions among United States high school athletes in 20 sports. *The American*
6
7 *Journal of Sports Medicine*, 2012; 40: 747-755.
8
9
- 10 McAllister, T.W., Flashman, L.A., Maerlender, A., Greenwald, R.M., Beckwith, J.G.,
11
12 Tosteson, T.D...Turco, J.H. (2012). Cognitive effects of one season of head
13
14 impacts in a cohort of collegiate contact sport athletes. *Neurology*, 78(22), 1777-
15
16 1784.
17
18
- 19 Mihalik, J.P., Bell, D.R., Marshall, S.W., & Guskiewicz, K.M. (2007). Measurement of
20
21 head impacts in collegiate football players: An investigation of positional and
22
23 event-type differences. *Neurosurgery*, 61(6), 1229-1235.
24
25
- 26 Noble, J.M., & Hesdorffer, D.C. Sport-related concussions: a review of epidemiology,
27
28 challenges in diagnosis, and potential risk factors. *Neuropsychological Review*,
29
30 2013; 23: 273-284. doi 10.1007/s11065-013-9239-0.
31
32
- 33 Powell, J.W., & Barber-Foss, K.D. (1999). Traumatic brain injury in high school athletes.
34
35 *JAMA*, 282(10), 958-963.
36
37
- 38 Rosenthal JA, Foraker RE, Collins CL, Comstock RD. National high school athletic
39
40 concussion rates from 2005-2006 to 2011-2012. *The American Journal of Sports*
41
42 *Medicine*, 2014; 42(7): 1710-1715. doi: 10.1177/0363546514530091.
43
44
- 45 SAS Institute Inc. (2011). *Base SAS 9.3 Procedures Guide: Statistical Procedures*. Cary,
46
47 N.C.: SAS Institute Inc.
48
49
- 50 Schnebel, B., Gwin, J.T., Anderson, S., & Gatlin, R. (2007). *In vivo* study of head
51
52 impacts in football: A comparison of National Collegiate Athletic Association
53
54 Division I versus high school impacts. *Neurosurgery*, 60, 490-496.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Stephens, R., Rutherford, A., Potter, D., & Fernie, G. (2010). Neuropsychological
4 consequence of soccer play in adolescent U.K. school team soccer players.
5
6

7
8 *Journal of Neuropsychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience*, 22(3), 295-303.
9

10 PMID:20686136.
11

12 Talavage, T.M., Nauman, E.A., Breedlove, E.L., Yoruk, U., Dye, A.E., Morigaki,
13

14 K.E...Leverenz, L.J. (2013). Functionally-detected cognitive impairment in high
15 school football players without clinically-diagnosed concussion. *Journal of*
16
17

18 *Neurotrauma*, 30,1-12.
19
20

21 Tsushima, W.T., Geling, O., Arnold, M., & Oshiro, R.S. (2016). Are there subconcussive
22 neuropsychological effects in youth sports? An exploratory study of high and low
23
24

25 contact sports. *Applied Neuropsychology:Child*, 5,149-155. doi:
26
27

28 10.1080/21622965.2015.1
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Age and ImPACT scores of High and Low Contact Groups

Variable	High Contact Group (n=480)	Low Contact Group (n=640)	Chi-square	<i>p</i> value
	mean (SD), median [range]	mean (SD), median [range]		
Age	14.92 (1.17), 15.00 [13.00-18.00]	14.92 (1.18), 15.00 [13.00-18.00]	0.0032	0.96
Impulse Control Composite Score	8.18 (5.21), 7.00 [0.00-29.00]	7.11 (4.88), 6.00 [0.00-27.00]	14.05	0.0002*
Verbal Memory Composite Score	80.97 (10.63), 82.00 [46.00-100.0]	82.95 (10.15), 84.00 [53.00-100.0]	9.90	0.002*
Visual Memory Composite Score	72.66 (13.58), 74.00 [36.00-100.0]	74.27 (12.97), 75.00 [38.00-100.0]	3.63	0.057
Reaction Time Composite Score	0.65 (0.10), 0.64 [0.42-1.46]	0.64 (0.10), 0.63 [0.41-1.37]	2.05	0.16
Total Symptom Score	7.00 (10.65), 3.00 [0.00-74.00]	5.04 (8.44), 2.00 [0.00-87.00]	11.85	0.0006*
Visual Motor Composite Score	33.15 (6.75), 32.83 [12.00-53.50]	34.32 (6.57), 34.09 [12.35-50.63]	8.97	0.003*

*statistically significant ($p < 0.05$)