Albin Roger (Orcid ID: 0000-0002-0629-608X)

Sports Concussion and Category Mistakes

Running Head: Sports Concussion

Roger L. Albin, MD^{1,2}

¹Dept. of Neurology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

²GRECC & Neurology Service, VAAAHS, Ann Arbor, MI, USA

Address correspondence to: Roger L. Albin, MD; 4009 BSRB, 109 Zina Pitcher Place, Ann Arbor, MI, 48109-2200; ph 734-764-1347; fax 734-763-7686; ralbin@med.umich.edu

Title Character #: 39

Running Head Character #: 17

Text Word #: 386

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1002/ana.26625

At the conclusion of their thoughtful discussion of sports concussion and chronic traumatic encephalopathy (CTE), Kelly et al. commit a category mistake. 1.2 They assert that more "neuroscientific evidence" is needed for prevention strategies. Designing prevention measures is a policy issue and the evidentiary standards for policy decisions and establishing scientific certainty are different. Rational policy making is a decision analysis procedure assessing likely benefits and harms of policy choices. Designing a prevention strategy to mitigate the potential consequences of repetitive sports-related head impacts is straightforward. Any sports where recurrent head impacts are unavoidable - boxing, mixed martial arts, American football, rugby – would be abandoned. The rules of sports such as association football can be modified to markedly reduce the risk of head impacts.

As Kelly et al. state, "A wealth of evidence supports the notion that physical trauma to the brain can have deleterious effects on cognition, mood, and motor function, and it is probable that multiple blows to the head are more harmful than one alone." What would our society lose by eliminating sports involving multiple head impacts? These sports provide two social services – entertainment and participation opportunities for the young. Are we justified in exposing even a small number of individuals to the risk of serious injury for entertainment? The answer is surely no. Sports participation has definite health and social benefits for the young. Can we find less risky substitutes? The answer is surely yes. In a decision analysis framework, we have little to lose and may have much to gain with a straightforward prevention strategy.

Kelly et al. propose sophisticated longitudinal studies to explore interesting questions about sports concussions and CTE. Their dedication to scientific rigor is admirable but short-sighted. As they point out, resolving some of questions they discuss could take many years. Evaluating potential interventions derived from these kinds of studies would also take many years. Indeed, given that long-term consequences of recurrent head impacts may occur decades later, truly

rigorous observational and intervention studies are probably impossible. This is a case where the requirements for scientific certainty invite paralysis.

We already have enough data to formulate rational policy. As a community, clinical neuroscientists should advocate an end to boxing, mixed martial arts, American football, and rugby. We should also advocate significant modification of the rules of several other sports.

Potential Conflicts of Interest: None.

References:

- 1) Kelly Jp, Priemer DS, Perl DP, Filley C. Sports concussion and chronic traumatic encephalopathy: finding a path forward. Ann Neurol 2023;93:222-225.
- Magidor O. Category mistakes. Stanford Encyclopedia Phil 2019;
 https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/category-mistakes/
- 3) Bradford Hill A. The environment and disease: association or causation? Proc Royal Soc Med 1965;58:295-300.
- 4) Bermudez JL. Decision theory and rationality. 1st ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.