The NFL Concussion Litigation: A Multi-faceted Analysis of Ethics, Justice, Law, and Health

Michael Meese[1] **& Miguel Rojas**[2]

Received July 14, 2025
Accepted October 18, 2025
Electronic access October 31, 2025

This qualitative case study examines the landmark NFL concussion litigation through multiple analytical frameworks, focusing on corporate ethics, social justice, legal proceedings, and medical evidence. Through systematic analysis of legal documents, medical studies, and an in-depth interview with lead counsel Christopher Seeger, we investigate the NFL's institutional response to emerging evidence of chronic traumatic encephalopathy (CTE) and its impact on player health. Our document analysis spanned 4 legal filings, 16 medical studies, and 2 NFL policy documents. The interview data were analyzed using Braun and Clarke's[1,2] six-phase framework for thematic analysis, yielding four primary themes. Our findings reveal how the NFL employed a "manufacture of doubt" strategy similar to other corporate cases of institutional denial, characterized by establishing committees with non-specialist leadership, publishing contradictory research, and using deliberately ambiguous language in public statements. Our findings reveal how the NFL employed a "manufacture of doubt" strategy similar to other corporate cases of institutional denial, while medical evidence demonstrated significantly higher rates of neurodegenerative diseases among former players. Medical evidence demonstrated that NFL players face neurodegenerative mortality rates three times higher than the general population, with a fourfold increased risk of developing Alzheimer's Disease or Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis. The research highlights racial disparities in impact, as African American players comprise a majority of NFL rosters, reflecting broader patterns of inequality in American professional sports and healthcare access. Analysis of three prominent cases (Easterling[3], Seau, and Hernandez) provides compelling evidence of CTE's devastating effects across different career lengths and age groups. The resulting settlement, exceeding $1 billion by 2023, established comprehensive player safety protocols and compensation structures, though implementation challenges persist. This case study illuminates broader issues of corporate responsibility, institutional accountability, and the complex relationship between profit motives and player safety in professional sports.

Keywords: Chronic Traumatic Encephalopaty (CTE); Concussions; Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI); Manufacture of Doubt; Social Justice; Alzheimers Disease; Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis (ALS); NFL Mild Traumatic Brain Injury Comittee (MTBI)

The NFL Concussion Litigation: A Multi-faceted Analysis of Ethics, Justice, Law, and Health

The intersection of professional sports, public health, and corporate responsibility came into sharp focus in June 2011 when approximately 4,500 former National Football League (NFL) players filed lawsuits against the league. These legal actions were later consolidated into a single class action lawsuit, alleging that the NFL concealed known risks of chronic traumatic encephalopathy and other brain diseases linked to repeated concussions. The concealed risks included knowledge that repeated head impacts could lead to progressive brain degeneration, memory loss, depression, and increased suicide risk- information the league possessed but failed to share with players for over a decade[4]. This landmark case not only challenged the NFL's institutional practices but also highlighted broader issues of corporate ethics, racial disparities in professional sports, and the complex relationship between profit motives and player safety.

As the litigation unfolded, it revealed deep-rooted concerns about player welfare and institutional accountability. Medical evidence emerged demonstrating specific health outcomes among former players: epidemiological studies showed that NFL players faced neurodegenerative mortality rates three times higher than the general population, with a fourfold increased risk of developing Alzheimer's Disease or Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis[5]. Additionally, surveys of former players revealed that 60% had experienced at least one concussion during their careers, with 26% reporting three or more concussions, leading to ongoing problems including memory loss, concentration difficulties, and chronic headaches[6].

With African American players comprising approximately 70% of NFL rosters while team ownership and league leadership

[1] *Dwight-Englewood School.*
[2] *Evanston Township High School*

© The National High School Journal of Science 2025

remain predominantly white, the impact of brain injuries and the NFL's policies disproportionately affected minority communities [7]. This demographic disparity connects the NFL concussion litigation to broader environmental justice principles, which examine how environmental and health hazards disproportionately affect marginalized communities. In the NFL context, the workplace "environment" of professional football created health hazards (repeated head trauma) that primarily affected African American players, while decision-making power about safety policies remained concentrated among white ownership and management. The league's delayed response to mounting medical evidence meant that the health risks were disproportionately borne by minority players who had limited alternative career opportunities and less access to independent medical care.

Given the complex interplay of medical science, corporate ethics, and social justice revealed by this case, a multidimensional analysis is essential. This study examines NFL concussion litigation through four interconnected lenses: corporate ethics, social justice, legal proceedings, and medical evidence. Through qualitative case study methodology involving systematic analysis of 4 legal documents, 16 medical studies, 2 NFL policy documents, and an in-depth interview with lead counsel Christopher Seeger, we address three central questions:

1. How did the NFL's strategy of manufacturing doubt parallel other corporate cases of institutional denial?

2. How have the legal proceedings influenced corporate accountability in professional sports?

3. What does the medical evidence reveal about football-related head trauma and long-term neurological damage?

Historical Context of Brain Injury in Sports

Brain injuries in contact sports are not a new problem. The medical condition now known as chronic traumatic encephalopathy (CTE) was first discovered in boxers in the 1920s, where it was called "dementia pugilistica" or "punch drunk syndrome" [8]. Boxers who had been hit in the head repeatedly for years began showing symptoms like memory problems, confusion, and difficulty with movement.

By the early 2000s, doctors started noticing similar problems in football players. Just like boxers, football players experience repeated hits to the head during their careers. Medical researchers began studying whether football could cause the same type of brain damage that had been seen in boxing. This was an important discovery because it suggested that CTE wasn't just a boxing problem, it could affect any sport with repeated head impacts.

Medical Evidence of Football-Related Brain Injury

Large studies of former NFL players have provided strong evidence that football can cause serious brain problems. In 2000, researchers surveyed 1,090 former NFL players and found alarming results: 60% had experienced at least one concussion during their careers, while 26% reported three or more concussions. Many of these players were still dealing with ongoing problems like memory loss, trouble concentrating, and chronic headaches [6]

Even more concerning was a 2013 study that looked at the death records of 3,439 NFL players who played between 1959 and 1988. The researchers found that these former players were three times more likely to die from brain diseases than regular people their age. They were also four times more likely to develop Alzheimer's Disease or ALS (Lou Gehrig's Disease) compared to the general population [6].

These studies provided clear statistical proof that playing professional football significantly increases the risk of developing serious brain conditions later in life. This evidence became crucial in the legal case against the NFL because it showed a clear pattern of brain damage among former players.

How Companies Respond to Health Threats: The "Manufacturing Doubt" Strategy

The concept of "manufacturing doubt" emerged from analysis of how corporations respond to scientific evidence that threatens their business interests. This strategy, first documented in tobacco industry responses to cancer research, involves systematically questioning scientific evidence rather than outright denial [9]. The approach typically includes funding contradictory research, emphasizing uncertainty in scientific findings, and using carefully crafted public communications that acknowledge concerns while avoiding admissions of causation.

Comparative analysis of corporate responses across industries reveals consistent patterns: establishment of industry-funded research committees, strategic selection of committee leadership lacking relevant expertise, publication of contradictory studies, and coordinated public messaging designed to cast doubt on independent research findings. These patterns have been documented in cases involving tobacco and cancer, asbestos and mesothelioma, and lead exposure and childhood development, among others.

The manufacturing of doubt strategy proves particularly effective in legal contexts because it creates an appearance of scientific uncertainty that can be exploited in litigation. By funding research that contradicts independent findings, corporations can argue that the science remains "unsettled" and that definitive causal relationships have not been established. This approach allows companies to continue harmful practices while maintain-

© The National High School Journal of Science 2025

ing plausible deniability about their knowledge of associated risks.

Racial Disparities in Professional Sports Health Outcomes

The NFL's player demographics make the concussion issue particularly important from a social justice perspective. Approximately 70% of NFL players are African American, while league leadership and team ownership remain predominantly white [7]. This demographic split means that health policies affecting players disproportionately impact the African American community.

Historical analysis of sports medicine reveals that health advocacy and medical decision-making in professional sports often reflects broader societal inequities. Studies have shown that minority athletes may face additional barriers to healthcare access, including limited resources for independent medical consultation, economic pressures to continue playing despite injury, and cultural factors that influence injury reporting and treatment seeking behavior. Studies show black former NFL players report more cognitive symptoms, chronic pain, and functional limitations than white peers (36% higher risk for cognitive symptom and 90% higher odds of impaired physical functioning), and a separate paper finds Black former players report greater concussion-symptom burden and pain even after adjusting for age, football history, and comorbidities.

The intersection of racial disparities and sports-related health outcomes extends beyond individual player experiences to systemic issues of institutional representation and decision-making. Research indicates that leadership positions in sports medicine, team management, and league governance remain predominantly white, potentially influencing how health policies are developed and implemented. These disparities in representation may contribute to policies that inadequately address the specific needs and vulnerabilities of minority players. Furthermore, the economic significance of professional sports careers for players from lower socioeconomic backgrounds, disproportionately represented among African American NFL players, creates additional complexity in health decision-making. The potential for professional sports to provide economic mobility may influence players' willingness to report injuries or seek medical attention that could jeopardize their careers, particularly when institutional messaging minimizes health risks.

The Evolution of CTE Awareness in Professional Football

The emergence of chronic traumatic encephalopathy (CTE) as a critical concern in professional football gained momentum in the early 2000s, following a series of high-profile cases and mounting medical evidence. Initially known as "dementia pugilistica" in boxing contexts, CTE was found to result from repeated head trauma, with symptoms including cognitive impairment and motor function deterioration. Dementia pugilistica is just a form of CTE in which the injured receives repeated blows to the head, causing impairment of cognitive and motor functioning [10].

By the early 2000s, large-scale medical studies began documenting serious health problems among former NFL players. These studies found that 60% of former players had experienced concussions, and that retired players faced three times higher rates of brain disease deaths compared to the general population. This medical evidence directly challenged the NFL's public position that football was safe.

Direct Connection to NFL's Manufacture of Doubt Strategy

These epidemiological findings directly contradicted the NFL's public position and MTBI Committee publications. The league's manufacture of doubt strategy was specifically designed to counter this mounting statistical evidence. While independent research showed 60% of former players experienced concussions and neurodegenerative mortality rates three times higher than the general population, the MTBI Committee published papers claiming no long-term effects from football-related head trauma. The NFL's committee consistently published studies that contradicted independent medical research, creating confusion about the science even when the evidence was clear that football caused brain damage.

The timing of the NFL's contradictory publications directly coincided with the release of independent epidemiological studies, suggesting a coordinated effort to provide alternative narratives that would undermine public confidence in the scientific consensus emerging from independent research. For example, when major epidemiological studies demonstrated clear correlations between football participation and neurological disease, the MTBI Committee would release competing studies with methodological limitations designed to show no such correlations. The quote, the scientistswho did not identify their NFL connection, and none of whom were neuropathologistscalled Omalus research completely wrong and even claimed that for Webster there is no known history of brain trauma inside professional football shows the almost gaslight-esque behavior that the MTBI committee was applying to make the scientists work seem irrelevant [11]. The NFL used this same strategy in public statements and congressional hearings, where representatives cited their own committee's findings while dismissing independent research as 'preliminary' or 'incomplete,' even though the independent studies were well-designed and reliable.

Corporate Response and Medical Oversight

The role of team doctors emerged as a critical issue in player safety protocols. Research indicated that team physicians, compensated directly by the league, often faced conflicts between player health and team performance demands. Gay Culverhouse, former owner of the Tampa Bay Buccaneers, documented how team doctors were pressured to prioritize game performance over player health, with many lacking specialized expertise in head trauma[12]. This system created inherent conflicts of interest, as doctors risked termination if their medical decisions negatively impacted team performance.

These systemic conflicts were particularly problematic for players from communities with limited access to independent medical care, as they had few alternatives to team-provided medical services when seeking evaluation and treatment for potential brain injuries. The structure of team medical services, where physicians were directly employed by teams rather than serving as independent medical advocates for players, created fundamental tensions between medical ethics and organizational interests.

The lack of independent medical oversight meant that concussion diagnoses and return-to-play decisions were made by individuals whose employment depended on team performance rather than player health outcomes. This arrangement was particularly problematic during playoff seasons or crucial games, when the financial stakes for teams were highest and pressure to return injured players to action was most intense.

Current Study

hile previous research has documented how companies use doubt strategies and how health disparities affect minority athletes, few studies have specifically examined how these patterns played out in the NFL concussion litigation. Most existing research focuses on either the legal aspects of the case or the medical evidence, but not how they connect to broader issues of corporate responsibility and social justice. This research examines NFL concussion litigation through four interconnected lenses: the ethical implications of manufactured doubt, social justice concerns regarding racial disparities, legal proceedings and outcomes, and medical evidence of health impacts. Through analysis of legal documents, medical studies, and an in-depth interview with lead counsel Christopher Seeger, this study aimed to address the following research questions:

1. How did the NFL's strategy of manufacturing doubt about concussion risks parallel other corporate cases of institutional denial?

2. How have the legal proceedings and settlement outcomes influenced corporate accountability in professional sports?

3. What does the medical evidence reveal about the relationship between football-related head trauma and long-term neurological damage?

By examining these questions, this research contributes to our understanding of corporate responsibility in professional sports, the intersection of public health and profit motives, and the broader implications for player safety across all levels of football.

Method

Research Design

The present study employed a qualitative case study design to examine the NFL concussion litigation in depth. A case study approach was selected because it allows for a comprehensive examination of complex social phenomena within real-life contexts[13]. This approach was particularly appropriate given the multifaceted nature of the litigation, which spans legal, medical, social, and institutional dimensions. The case study framework enabled us to analyze multiple data sources to develop a thorough understanding of how the NFL responded to emerging evidence about CTE, the social justice implications of these responses, and their effects on player health and wellbeing.

Participants

The primary participant in this study was Christopher Seeger, lead counsel in the NFL concussion litigation. Seeger was selected through purposive sampling based on his central role in the case and extensive knowledge of both legal proceedings and settlement implementation. No compensation was provided for participation in the interview.

Procedure

Document Collection. We systematically collected four categories of documents: (a) 4 legal filings from the consolidated class action lawsuit, including initial complaints, motions, settlement documents, and judicial opinions; (b) 16 peer-reviewed studies on CTE and football-related brain injuries published between 2000-2024; and (c) 2 NFL policy documents including MTBI Committee reports, rule changes, and safety protocols.

Expert Interview. A semi-structured interview protocol was developed based on preliminary document analysis. A 15-minute interview that consisted of both prepared and spontaneous questions was conducted with Christopher Seeger, one of the lead counsels in the NFL concussion litigation, on July 7, 2024. The interview was conducted via video conference, audio-recorded with permission, and transcribed verbatim. To manage potential interviewer bias, questions were formulated

© The National High School Journal of Science 2025

to be open-ended and non-leading, with prepared follow-up probes to encourage elaboration without suggesting preferred responses. The interview focused on case selection, evidence gathering, settlement structure, legal strategy, and long-term impacts. Questions were designed to elicit both factual information and personal insights into the decision-making process. The format allowed for follow-up questions and deeper exploration of emerging themes. While the 15-minute duration was constrained by scheduling limitations, this focused timeframe allowed for targeted examination of key legal strategy decisions and settlement implementation details that were not available in public documentation. Key interview questions can be found in the Appendix. The participant was informed about the study's purpose and provided written consent before the interview.

Data Verification and Triangulation. We employed a systematic approach to triangulate interview data with documentary evidence where possible. Factual claims made by Seeger regarding settlement amounts, compensation structures, and case timelines were cross-referenced against court documents, official settlement agreements, and NFL communications. His characterizations of the NFL's institutional response strategy were verified against patterns identified in our analysis of congressional testimony, MTBI Committee publications, and public statements. However, many insights regarding internal legal decision-making, strategy discussions, and confidential settlement negotiations could not be independently corroborated due to attorney-client privilege and the proprietary nature of litigation proceedings. Where verification was possible, we noted convergent evidence; where it was not, we clearly identified these statements as representing the perspective of lead counsel rather than independently verified facts. Case Selection. Three cases were purposively selected for in-depth analysis: (a) Charles "Ray" Easterling (lead plaintiff who played 1972-1979), (b) Junior Seau (20-season career with high-profile status), and (c) Aaron Hernandez (early-onset CTE case, died at age 27). These cases were chosen to represent varied career lengths, playing eras, and age groups affected by CTE. The reason why we chose Charles Ray Easterling is that he is known to be one of the first cases brought up in the lawsuit. The reason why we chose Junior Seau is because we thought that his situation was very interesting due to the fact that he had already committed suicide at a young age and was still able to be compensated regardless. The reason we chose Aaron Hernandez was because he is, in our professional opinion, the most famous case related to CTE.

Data Analysis

We employed a multi-stage analysis process integrating findings from all data sources. Document analysis utilized qualitative content analysis[14], involving initial familiarization, development of a coding framework, systematic coding, thematic categorization, and pattern identification. Two researchers independently coded the materials, with regular meetings to resolve discrepancies (initial inter-rater reliability: $\kappa = .83$).

To complement our qualitative thematic analysis, we conducted frequency coding of key themes. Two researchers independently identified instances of doubt-manufacturing rhetoric and racial disparity themes across all documents, achieving inter-rater reliability of = .91. Final frequencies were doubt-manufacturing themes (n = 9, appearing in 41% of analyzed documents) and racial disparity themes (n = 6, appearing in 27% of analyzed documents).

Theme development followed the constant comparative method[15], where initial codes were systematically grouped and regrouped into potential themes. The initial coding generated 47 distinct codes that were then organized into broader thematic categories. Through this iterative process, four primary themes emerged from the combined analysis of interview data and document analysis: (a) legal strategy and outcomes (primarily from interview analysis), (b) medical evidence and health impacts (from both interview and document analysis), (c) the NFL's manufacturing of doubt (exclusively from document analysis), and (d) racial and social justice implications (from document analysis). The interview data specifically contributed insights into settlement structure, legal decision-making, and implementation challenges, while document analysis revealed patterns of institutional response and demographic disparities. These themes were then carefully reviewed and refined using guidelines for qualitative research, ensuring each theme accurately represented both the coded extracts and the entire dataset[16].

To establish trustworthiness in thematic analysis, each theme was clearly defined with detailed descriptions, established boundaries, and explicit connections to the research questions[17]. The final phase involved integrating these themes with findings from document analysis for qualitative inquiry[18]. This integration created a comprehensive narrative that captured both the interview insights and the broader context of the NFL concussion litigation.

Results

Analysis of the interview data, legal documents, and medical literature revealed four themes that illustrate the complex nature of the NFL concussion litigation and its broader implications for sports medicine and corporate accountability.

Legal Outcomes and Settlement Structure

The interview analysis revealed a complex settlement structure designed to address varying degrees of injury and career length. According to lead counsel Seeger, the settlement, which exceeded $1 billion by February 2023, incorporated a tiered compensation system based on three primary factors: age at diagnosis, years played, and severity of condition. Players who

participated in the NFL for five or more seasons received full base awards, while those with shorter careers received proportionally reduced compensation (80% for four years, 60% for three years). As Seeger detailed, It is basically how old the player is, and how many years they played in the NFL. So if you played five years or more, you get the full base award. If you played four years, you get 80% of that, and if you played three years, you get 60%, and so on.

The highest awards, ranging from $3.5 million to $5 million, were allocated to players diagnosed before age 45. The interview revealed specific examples of compensation structure: "A forty-five-year-old player with ALS would get five million dollars. A sixty-year-old player with ALS would get somewhere around three million." This sliding scale reflected the challenge of attributing neurological conditions to football exposure in older players.

There is limited direct evidence that current concussion protocols meaningfully reduce long-term neurological outcomes like chronic traumatic encephalopathy (CTE). Most clinical guidelines are based on expert consensus and shorttomediumterm recovery data, with little randomized controlled trial evidence demonstrating long-term brain protection.

Manufacture of Doubt and Institutional Response

Analysis of NFL documents, congressional testimony, and policy statements revealed a systematic pattern of institutional doubt creation that paralleled strategies documented in other corporate health crises. This theme emerged exclusively from document analysis, as the manufacture of doubt strategy was not discussed during the expert interview with lead counsel.

Document analysis identified four distinct patterns in the NFL's institutional response. First, the NFL established the Mild Traumatic Brain Injury (MTBI) Committee under the leadership of a rheumatologist rather than a neurologist or brain injury specialist. This structural decision enabled the committee to publish findings that contradicted emerging medical evidence about concussion risks while maintaining an appearance of medical authority. As Seeger noted in the interview, "The most important piece was the fact that the NFL created the mild traumatic brain injury committee, and basically, the committee committed fraud and covered up the impact of concussions and the brain damage."

Second, analysis of MTBI Committee publications revealed systematic contradictions of independent research findings. When major epidemiological studies demonstrated clear correlations between football participation and neurological disease, the committee released competing studies with methodological limitations designed to show no such correlations. Third, congressional testimony and media statements employed carefully crafted language that acknowledged concussions as "serious" while avoiding specific commitments to policy changes. During 2009 congressional hearings, NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell's testimony exemplified this strategy, while NFL representatives consistently cited their committee's findings and dismissed independent research as 'preliminary' or 'incomplete.' Dr. Ira Casson, former chair of the NFL-MTBI Committee, further demonstrated this approach by denying correlations between CTE and football despite mounting scientific evidence to the contrary.

Fourth, document analysis revealed the systematic omission of diagnosed concussions from committee datasets. Research by DeLessio (2016) identified over 100 diagnosed concussions excluded from MTBI Committee research, with the NFL publicly defending these omissions despite their impact on study validity. The committee and the NFL publicly pushed back on these findings, reinforcing the "manufacture of doubt" strategy and making those outside the organization believe that concussions were being handled properly. These patterns demonstrate how the NFL created an appearance of scientific uncertainty around well-established medical evidence, effectively delaying policy reforms and legal accountability while maintaining plausible deniability about knowledge of associated risks.

Case Studies and Health Impact Evidence

Analysis of three prominent cases revealed consistent patterns of neurological deterioration among NFL players, providing crucial evidence for the litigation. These cases demonstrated how CTE manifested across different career lengths and age groups, supporting the plaintiffs' claims about football-related brain trauma. Moreover, the evidence of racial disparities, most notably in African American players, contributes to the attribution of CTE throughout the time that the NFL has been around. We recognize that the three examples chosen do not emphasize racial disparities, but they do highlight the racial dynamics of the NFL. The three represent, White, Samoan American, and Latino.

Charles "Ray" Easterling (Lead Plaintiff)

Medical records and family testimonies documented the typical progression of CTE symptoms, beginning with memory lapses and disorientation and progressing to severe mood swings and depression. His eventual diagnosis with multiple conditions (dementia, depression, and insomnia) linked to repeated head trauma, followed by his death by suicide in 2012, strengthened the litigation's claims about the NFL's duty of care.

Junior Seau

Junior Seau's case provided compelling evidence of the impacts of long-term exposure to football-related head trauma over a

© The National High School Journal of Science 2025

20-season career. Analysis of legal documents and family statements revealed a pattern of progressive behavioral deterioration observed by both family members and teammates. The family's wrongful death lawsuit, which cited fraud and negligence, was supported by a posthumous CTE diagnosis. This medical confirmation strengthened the litigation's central argument about the direct link between professional football careers and

Aaron Hernandez

The Aaron Hernandez case proved particularly significant as it demonstrated the early onset of CTE symptoms. Analysis of medical records and teammate testimonies documented dramatic personality changes during his final season, including extreme mood swings from aggressive outbursts to unusual sensitivity. Most notably, his post-mortem diagnosis of Stage 3 CTE at age 27 was unprecedented, as this severity of the condition had never been observed in patients under 46. This finding provided strong evidence of football's potential to cause severe neurological damage even in younger players, challenging the NFL's position on long-term health impacts.

Medical studies conducted during the relevant period provided substantial evidence of widespread neurological impact among former players. A comprehensive survey conducted in 2000 examined 1,090 former NFL players and found that a majority had experienced at least one concussion during their career, with more than a quarter reporting three or more concussive incidents. Another of those studies, in 2013, had to do with 3,439 NFL players who played for at least 5 seasons between 1959 and 1988[5]. it was also found that the neurodegenerative mortality rate is 3 times higher than that of the general population. They also found that the players were four times more likely to get Alzheimer's Disease or Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis than the general population. There continue to be several studies and evidence correlating head trauma with CTE. So, it took this class action lawsuit for the NFL to realize that they need to take the brain injuries of their players more seriously. With all of the hearings and contradictions, the NFL continued to doubt the evidence, mainly stating that there wasnt sufficient evidence to link CTE with brain injuries in football. Taken together, these cases provided compelling evidence supporting the litigation's claims about the NFL's responsibility to protect player health. The consistency of symptom patterns across different career lengths and ages reinforced the connection between football-related head trauma and severe neurological outcomes. This analysis strengthened the plaintiffs' argument that the NFL had a duty to acknowledge and address the risks of repeated head trauma in professional football.

0.1 Racial Disparities and Social Justice Implications

Document analysis revealed significant demographic patterns and health disparities that emerged as contextual findings rather than responses to a dedicated research question. While our interview with lead counsel did not specifically address racial disparities, the documentary evidence highlighted important social justice dimensions of the litigation. Analysis of NFL demographic data confirmed that approximately 70% of NFL players are African American, while team ownership and league leadership remain predominantly white[7]. This demographic disparity created a situation where health policy decisions affecting primarily minority players were made by predominantly white leadership structures.

Document analysis of epidemiological studies revealed differential health impacts among former players by race. Research indicates that Black former NFL players report significantly higher rates of cognitive symptoms, chronic pain, and functional limitations compared to white peers, with approximately 36% higher risk for cognitive symptoms and 90% higher odds of impaired physical functioning. Additional studies found that Black former players report greater concussion-symptom burden and pain even after adjusting for age, football history, and comorbidities[19]. The pattern of health risks disproportionately affecting minority players while decision-making power remained concentrated among white ownership reflects classic environmental justice concerns. In this context, the workplace "environment" of professional football created known health hazards that primarily impacted African American players who had limited alternative career opportunities and less access to independent medical care.

Discussion

This study's findings demonstrate the profound impact of the NFL concussion litigation on player safety, institutional accountability, and sports medicine. Through analysis of legal documents, medical evidence, and expert testimony, several key themes emerged that are worthy of further discussion: the evolution of corporate responsibility in professional sports, the intersection of racial justice and player health, the transformation of safety protocols, and implications for future sports policy.

The NFL's response to mounting evidence of CTE risks paralleled other industries facing health-related litigation, particularly in its use of the "manufacture of doubt" strategy[9]. Like the tobacco industrys response to cancer research, the NFL attempted to make people believe that football did not cause CTE or brain damage in its players, similar to the strategy of tobacco companies that told their customers that smoking did not cause cancer. This institutional response highlights how large organizations may prioritize business interests over public health

when faced with evidence that threatens their operational model. The league's creation of the MTBI Committee, headed by a rheumatologist rather than a neurologist, exemplifies this approach to institutional denial A rheumatologist does not have a direct connection with CTE and brain damage/safety, so this was not the best decision for the NFL and the MTBI Committee, showing that they want to put in minimal effort to make it seem like they are solving this issue, even though they are not.

Our analysis of racial disparities revealed that the NFL's delayed response to CTE evidence disproportionately impacted minority players, as evidenced by significantly higher rates of cognitive symptoms and functional impairment among Black former players. The racial implications of the litigation highlight broader systemic issues in professional sports and healthcare access. As Powers and Faden (2006)[7] argue, health disparities often intersect with other forms of social disadvantage, creating compound effects on marginalized communities. With African American players comprising a majority of NFL rosters, the delayed recognition and response to CTE risks disproportionately impacted this community. The settlement structure, while providing significant compensation, raises questions about long-term healthcare access and support for affected players and their families.

The transformation of safety protocols represents perhaps the most tangible outcome of litigation. The implementation of neurological assessment requirements and return-to-play protocols represents a fundamental shift in approach to player health [4]. These changes extend beyond professional football, influencing policies in college, high school, and youth sports. The ripple effect demonstrates how high-profile litigation can catalyze systemic change in sports safety standards.

The tragic cases of Easterling, Seau, and Hernandez highlight the need for continued research into CTE and related conditions. Hernandez's case, showing severe CTE at an unprecedented young age[20], particularly underscores the urgency of understanding early-onset neurological damage in contact sports. These findings suggest that current safety measures, while improved, may still be insufficient to prevent long-term neurological damage. Even in more recent years, we have seen incidents regarding concussions that are controversial and arguably the wrong decision. One example that comes to mind is in 2022, when Tua Tagovailoa received a concerning head injury in a game, and was allowed to re-enter minutes later. This resulted in the firing of the neurotrauma consultant who had evaluated him[21]. We believe that a public apology for such incidents is warranted from the NFL, and an apology, more than just monetary value, to the victims and their families.

Limitations and Future Directions

Several limitations of this study warrant consideration. First, the reliance on publicly available documents and a single key informant interview, while informative, may not capture the full complexity of the litigation and its impacts. Future research would benefit from broader stakeholder interviews, including medical professionals, players, and family members. The expert interview, while providing valuable insider perspective, was limited to 15 minutes due to scheduling constraints. Future research would benefit from longer interviews with multiple stakeholders including additional legal counsel, medical experts, and affected players. Future studies should examine the impact of rule changes on injury rates. Additionally, it will be beneficial to examine the effectiveness of the settlement in meeting players long-term healthcare needs. Lastly, investigating similar litigations in other sports and how these litigations influence changes in youth participation may be warranted.

The findings suggest several practical implications for sports policy and player protection. First, independent medical oversight appears crucial for protecting player interests, as team-employed physicians may face conflicts of interest [22]. Second, transparent injury reporting and long-term health monitoring systems are essential for early intervention and prevention. Finally, the racial disparities identified suggest a need for targeted outreach and support programs for disproportionately affected communities.

Policy Reforms and Implementation

The litigation catalyzed substantial policy changes within the NFL. The league mandated the presence of neurologists at all games to provide immediate expert assessment of potential head injuries. They also implemented standardized concussion assessment procedures to ensure consistent evaluation of players across all teams. A comprehensive return-to-play protocol was established, requiring multiple medical clearances before injured players could resume participation. The NFL also instituted significant rule changes, most notably prohibiting helmet-to-helmet contact, and introduced enhanced penalties for dangerous play to discourage behaviors that could lead to head injuries. Additionally, the league modified practice regulations to reduce the frequency and intensity of contact during training sessions. As Seeger noted, these changes extended beyond professional football: "Everybody follows the NFL. College, high school, pop warner, pee wee football, so if the NFL is safer, it makes all of those sports below it safer." The implementation of both policy reforms and settlement structure has faced significant challenges. By February 2023, the settlement had grown to exceed $1 billion, with over twenty thousand lawsuits filed by retired players[23]. The qualification criteria for different conditions required careful documentation and medical verification while varying compensation levels based on age, years played, and condition severity created complex administrative challenges. Seeger acknowledged these difficulties during the interview, stating, "It is very hard to make everybody happy,

© The National High School Journal of Science 2025

but I tried to build into the settlement as much fairness as possible so that the players who really needed the help got the money." This approach prioritized support for players with the most severe conditions while maintaining provisions for future claims as conditions develop. Despite these reforms, the NFL's earlier attempts to downplay the issue through industry-funded research supporting the perspective that head impacts don't lead to serious problems highlighted the league's initial reluctance to address the situation. However, the mounting legal pressure and growing evidence of CTE's impact ultimately forced substantial changes in both policy and practice, leading to improved safety measures and compensation for affected players.

Conclusion

The NFL concussion litigation has fundamentally transformed the landscape of professional sports, establishing new standards for player safety and institutional accountability. Our analysis revealed how sustained legal pressure, combined with mounting medical evidence, ultimately compelled one of the most significant reforms in professional sports history. The resulting settlement not only provided crucial support for affected players but also catalyzed systematic changes in how sports organizations approach player safety and health monitoring.

This study addressed three central research questions regarding the NFL concussion litigation. First, our analysis demonstrated that the NFL's strategy of manufacturing doubt about concussion risks directly paralleled other corporate cases of institutional denial, particularly the tobacco industry's response to cancer research. The league employed systematic tactics including establishing committees with non-specialist leadership, publishing contradictory research, and using deliberately ambiguous public communications to create scientific uncertainty around well-established medical evidence. Second, the legal proceedings and settlement outcomes significantly influenced corporate accountability in professional sports through the establishment of comprehensive compensation structures exceeding $1 billion and the implementation of mandatory safety protocols. The litigation forced fundamental changes in medical oversight, return-to-play procedures, and rule modifications that extended beyond professional football to influence policies across all levels of competitive sports. Third, the medical evidence revealed strong associations between football-related head trauma and long-term neurological damage, with former NFL players facing neurodegenerative mortality rates three times higher than the general population and a fourfold increased risk of developing Alzheimer's Disease or Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis. However, our analysis also highlighted the complexity of these relationships, acknowledging that multiple factors including genetics, substance use, and lifestyle variables may contribute to neurological outcomes. The broader implications of this case extend well beyond the immediate context of professional football. The litigation demonstrated how legal action can drive institutional change, particularly when public health concerns intersect with established business practices. The new standards established include mandatory presence of neurologists at games, standardized concussion assessment procedures, comprehensive return-to-play protocols requiring multiple medical clearances, and enhanced penalties for dangerous play. These reforms have created a cascading effect across all levels of competitive sports, potentially protecting future generations of athletes.

As contact sports continue to evolve, the principles established through this litigation provide a framework for balancing athletic competition with player protection. Future success will depend on sustained commitment to independent medical oversight, continued research into sports-related brain injuries, and vigilant monitoring of safety protocols. The NFL concussion litigation thus serves not as an endpoint but as a catalyst for ongoing reform in professional sports, establishing precedents for institutional accountability that extend far beyond the boundaries of any single sport or organization.

1. Were you selected for this case, or were you appointed as the lead counsel representing the retired NFL players?
2. What evidence did you use for this case? What was the most important piece of evidence you used in the case?
3. How did you go about creating the lawsuit for the players? Were there any particular wishes on their end that you had to fulfill? And if you did, which parts did you include your own suggestions and opinions of how to go about the lawsuit?
4. How was that split up between all of the players? Was it like whoever was affected more by it, they received more money in compensation?
5. What were the arguments that you brought up in the case, aside from the head of the committee not being a neurologist?
6. What did you feel was your primary duty in this representation of the players?
7. What would you like to see change in relation to CTE in the future across all levels of football and sports as a whole?

References

1 V. Braun and V. Clarke, *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2006, **3**, 77–101.

2 V. Braun and V. Clarke, *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 2019, **11**, 589–597.

3 Easterling v. National Football League, *United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania*, Court filing, n.d.

4 R. Weinmeyer, *Virtual Mentor: American Medical Association Journal of Ethics*, 2014, **16**, 552–558.

5 E. J. Lehman, M. J. Hein, S. L. Baron and C. M. Gersic, *Neurology*, 2012.

6 M. A. Galgano, R. Cantu and L. N. L. S. Chin, *Cureus*, 2016, **8**, e532.

7 M. Powers and R. R. Faden, *Social Justice: The Moral Foundations of Public Health and Health Policy*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2008.

8 Physiopedia, *Dementia Pugilistica*, n.d., https://www.physiopedia.com/Dementia_Pugilistica.

9 D. S. Goldberg, *Journal of Legal Medicine*, 2013, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01947648.2013.800792, Accessed July 5, 2024.

10 K. M. Guskiewicz, M. McCrea, S. W. Marshall, R. C. Cantu, C. Randolph, W. Barr, J. A. Onate and J. P. Kelly, *JAMA*, 2003.

11 Union of Concerned Scientists, *The NFL Tried to Intimidate Scientists Studying the Link between Pro Football and Traumatic Brain Injury*, n.d., https://www.ucs.org/resources/nfl-tried-intimidate-scientists-studying-link-between-pro-football-and-traumatic-brain, Accessed August 11, 2025.

12 J. Laine, *Former BUCS President Gay Culverhouse, Advocate for Players Safety, Dies at Age of 73*, ESPN, 2025, https://www.espn.com/nfl/story/_/id/29405506/former-tampa-bay-buccaneers-president-gay-culverhouse-dies?utm_source, Accessed August 19, 2025.

13 R. K. Yin, *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, 6th edn, 2018.

14 H.-F. Hsieh and S. E. Shannon, *Qualitative Health Research*, 2005.

15 K. Charmaz, *Constructing Grounded Theory*, Sage Publications, 2nd edn, 2014.

16 J. Saldana, *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Limited, 2021, https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3033069, reference via Scientific Research Publishing.

17 L. S. Nowell, J. M. Norris, D. E. White and N. J. Moules, *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 2017, **16**, 1609406917733847.

18 J. W. Creswell and C. N. Poth, *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*, Sage Publications, 2016.

19 L. Parsons, *Study Points to Health Disparities among Former NFL Players*, Harvard Gazette, 2023, https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2020/08/study-points-to-health-disparities-among-former-nfl-players/.

20 M. Kilgore, H. K. Patel, A. Kielhorn, J. F. Maya and P. Sharma, *Risk Management and Healthcare Policy*, 2017.

21 K. Belson, *Dolphins Tua Tagovailoa Hospitalized after Second Head Hit in Two Games*, The New York Times, 2022, https://www.nytimes.com/2022/09/29/sports/football/tua-tagovailoa-head-injury.html.

22 A. P. DEgidio, *Junior Seau V. The National Football League*, DP Injury Attorneys, 2023, https://dpinjuryattorneys.com/junior-seau-v-the-national-football-league-2/.

23 Seeger Weiss LLP, *NFL Players Concussion Injury Litigation*, 2024, https://www.seegerweiss.com/catastrophic-injury/nfl-concussion-settlement/.

© The National High School Journal of Science 2025