

Archives of Rehabilitation Research and Clinical Translation

Archives of Rehabilitation Research and Clinical Translation 2023;5:100306 Available online at www.sciencedirect.com



Original Research

Excellent Recanalization and Small Core Volumes Are Associated With Favorable AM-PAC Score in Patients With Acute Ischemic Stroke Secondary to Large Vessel Occlusion

Vivek Yedavalli, MD, MS^a, Manisha Koneru, MS^b, Meisam Hoseinyazdi, MD^a, Karen Copeland, PhD^c, Risheng Xu, MD, PhD^d, Licia Luna, MD, PhD^a, Justin Caplan, MD^d, Adam Dmytriw, MD, MPH, MSc^e, Adrien Guenego, MD, PhD^f, Jeremy Heit, MD, PhD^g, Gregory Albers, MD^h, Max Wintermark, MD, MS, MBAⁱ, Fernando Gonzalez, MD^d, Victor Urrutia, MD^j, Judy Huang, MD^d, Richard Leigh, MD^j, Elisabeth Marsh, MD^j, Rafael Llinas, MD^j, Marlis Gonzalez Hernandez, MD, PhD^j, Argye Hillis, MD^j

^a Department of Radiology and Radiological Sciences, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD

^b Cooper Medical School of Rowan University, Camden, NJ

^c Boulder Statistics, Boulder, CO

^d Department of Neurosurgery, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD

^e Department of Neuroradiology, Massachusetts General Hospital & Harvard Medical School, Cambridge, MA

^f Department of Radiology, Université Libre De Bruxelles Hospital Erasme, Brussels, BE

List of Abbreviations: AIS, acute ischemic stroke; AIS-LVO, acute ischemic stroke caused by large vessel occlusion; AM-PAC, Activity Measure for Post-Acute Care; AUC, area under the curve; CS, collateral status; CT, computed tomography; CTA, computed tomography angiography; CTP, computed tomography profusion; IQR, interquartile range; IV, intravenous; IV tPA, intravenous thrombolysis; LVO, large vessel occlusion; MT, mechanical thrombectomy; mTICI, modified thrombolysis in cerebral infarction; NIHSS, National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale; rCBF, relative cerebral blood flow; Tmax, time to maximum.

Disclosures: Drs Greg Albers, Jeremy Heit, and Vivek Yedavalli are consultants for Rapid (iSchemaView, Menlo Park, CA); all other authors do not have any personal or financial disclosures.

Cite this article as: Arch Rehabil Res Clin Transl. 2023;5:100306

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arrct.2023.100306

2590-1095/Crown Copyright © 2023 Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of American Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



^g Department of Radiology, Stanford University School of Medicine, Palo Alto, CA

^h Department of Neurology, Stanford University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD

ⁱ Department of Radiology, University of Texas MD Anderson Center, Houston, TX

^j Department of Neurology, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD

KEYWORDS Acute ischemic stroke; perfusion imaging; CT; AMPAC; Rehabilitation	Abstract Objective: To assess pretreatment and interventional parameters as predictors of favorable Activity Measure for Post-Acute Care (AM-PAC) scores for optimal discharge planning. Design: In this prospectively collected, retrospectively reviewed multicenter study from 9/1/2017 to 9/22/2022, patients were dichotomized into favorable and unfavorable AM-PAC. Multivariate logistic regression and receiver operator characteristics analyses were performed for the identified significant variables. A P value of \leq .05 was significant. Setting: Hospitalized care. Participants: In total, 229 patients (mean \pm SD 70.65 \pm 15.2 [55.9% women]) met our inclusion criteria. Inclusion criteria were (a) computed tomography (CT) angiography confirmed LVO from 9/1/2017 to 9/22/2022; (b) diagnostic CT perfusion; and (c) available AM-PAC scores. Interventions: None. Main Outcome Measures: Favorable AM-PAC, defined as a daily activity score \geq 19 and basic mobility score of \geq 17. Results: Patients with favorable AM-PAC were younger (61.3 vs 70.7, P<.001), had lower admission glucose (mean, 124 vs 136, P=.042), lower blood urea nitrogen (mean, 15.59 vs 19.11, P<.001), and lower admission National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS) (mean, 10.58 vs 16.15, P<.001). No differences in sex were noted. Multivariate regression analyses revealed age, admission NIHSS, relative cerebral blood flow (rCBF) <30% volume, and modified thrombolysis in cerebral infarction (mTICI) score to be independent predictors of favorable AM-PAC (P<.047 for all predictors). The combined model revealed an area under the curve (AUC) of 0.83 (IQR 0.75-0.86). Conclusion: Excellent recanalization, smaller core volumes, younger age, and lower stroke severity independently predict favorable outcomes as measured by AM-PAC. Crown Copyright © 2023 Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of American Congress of Rehabilitation Medicine. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Large vessel occlusions (LVOs) cause acute ischemic stroke (AIS) in up to 46% of patients¹ and are a leading cause of morbidity across the world.² Patients presenting with AIS caused by LVO (AIS-LVO) have disproportionately increased functional limitations compared with patients with non-LVO AIS,³ underscoring the importance of timely treatment in these patients. Functional limitations, as a result of the hospital stay of a patient with AIS, is an important determinant of discharge location.⁴⁻⁶ Although functional limitations are an important factor, there are several other factors that affect the patient's discharge disposition after acute hospital admission.⁴ The challenges with the discharge location decision making process emphasize the importance of investigating the utility of predictive biomarkers as additional supportive data points for consideration.

The Activity Measure for Post-Acute Care (AM-PAC) score is a reliable and easy to perform validated metric that measures daily activity and basic mobility.^{7,8} AM-PAC scores are predictive of not only discharge location⁴ but 30-day hospital readmission⁷ and functional outcomes⁹ in poststroke care assessments. Furthermore, AM-PAC scores are used to determine the most appropriate type of discharge facility⁴ and minimize hospital readmission when preventable.⁷ For the aforementioned reasons, AM-PAC is now increasingly used to patients with stroke (inclusive of patients with AIS-LVO) as a unique assessment of in-hospital activity for discharge status determination.¹⁰⁻¹²

For patients with AIS-LVO, baseline neuroimaging with CT is an important component within the overall workup. Pretreatment comprehensive CT imaging consisting of noncontrast CT, CT angiography, and CT perfusion (CTP) provides information on the ischemic core, salvageable tissue or penumbra, and collateral status (CS).¹³ The valuable information given by the CT evaluation aids in the decision-making process with administering reperfusion therapies - namely, intravenous thrombolysis (IV tPA), mechanical thrombectomy (MT), or both. Prior landmark trials have validated the use of perfusion imaging in determining MT eligibility, demonstrating improved outcomes for up to 24 hours after symptom onset.^{14,15} Nevertheless, the potential utility of pretreatment comprehensive CT imaging, in conjunction with clinical and demographic factors, in determining postacute care discharge needs for patients with AIS-LVO has not been explored to date.

The purpose of our study is to determine which pretreatment and interventional parameters are predictive of favorable AM-PAC scores in patients presenting with AIS-LVO with a focus on pretreatment CT imaging. We hypothesize that patients with smaller baseline ischemic cores and robust CS are associated with favorable AM-PAC daily activity and basic mobility scores.

Methods

Population

We identified patients with confirmed anterior circulation LVOs on CT angiography (CTA) from 9/1/2017 to 9/22/2022 using baseline comprehensive CT evaluation (which includes noncontrast CT, CTA, CTP) from 3 centers within the Johns Hopkins Medical Enterprise (Johns Hopkins Hospital - East Baltimore, Bayview Medical Campus, and Suburban Hospital). The Johns Hopkins East Baltimore and Bayview campuses are accredited comprehensive stroke centers. This study was approved through the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine institutional review board (JHU-IRB00269637). Informed consent was not applicable. Inclusion criteria were as follows: (a) CTA confirmed LVO; (b) diagnostic CT perfusion; and (c) available AM-PAC scores.

Data collection

Baseline and clinical data collected for each patient included demographics, risk factors for AIS (including diabetes mellitus, hypertension, coronary artery disease, atrial fibrillation), admission glucose, admission National Institutes of Health stroke scale (NIHSS), admission blood urea nitrogen, admission creatinine, admission hemoglobin, Alberta Stroke Program Early CT Score (Barber et al, ¹⁶) scores, site of occlusion, and laterality of occlusion. Additional collected parameters include number of passes, recanalization time, modified thrombolysis in cerebral infarction (mTICI) score; presence of complication such as hemorrhagic transformation of subtype only as defined by the European Cooperative Acute Stroke Study 2 trial.¹ Alberta Stroke Program Early CT Score scores were calculated and baseline CTAs were reviewed for presence and site of LVO by an experienced neuroradiologist (VSY, 6 years of experience). Treatment type including IV tPA, MT, or both were noted. Patients were then dichotomized into favorable (defined as a daily activity score \geq 19 and basic mobility score of ≥ 17)⁷ and unfavorable AM-PAC (defined as a daily activity score <19 and basic mobility score of <17)⁷ for analysis. Patients who have favorable AM-PAC scores in daily activity or basic mobility assessments, but not in both, were categorized as unfavorable.

Imaging analysis

Whole brain pretreatment CTP was performed on the Siemens Somatom Force^a with the following parameters: 70 kVP, 200 Effective mAs, Rotation Time 0.25 s, Average Acquisition Time 60 s, Collimation 48 × 1.2 mm, Pitch Value 0.7, 4D Range 114 mm × 1.5 seconds. CTP images are then post-processed using RAPID commercial software^b for generating quantitative relative cerebral blood flow (rCBF) and time to maximum (Tmax) volumes as well as qualitative Tmax maps. Hypoperfusion index ratio (HIR) was calculated as the ratio of the Tmax >10 seconds and Tmax >6 seconds volumes.¹⁸ An HIR of 0.4 and below is deemed robust CS.¹⁹

Clinical outcomes assessment

AM-PAC scores were determined by the certified physical and occupational therapists providing clinical care at discharge.

Outcome measures

The primary outcomes were favorable AM-PAC, defined as a daily activity score \geq 19 and basic mobility score of \geq 17.⁷

Statistical analysis

The collected data were coded, tabulated, and statistically analyzed using IBM SPSS statistics software version 28.0.^c Quantitative data were tested for normality using Shapiro-Wilk test, described as mean and SD, and compared using the 2-sided Student t test. If data were not normally distributed, they were described as median with interquartile ranges (IQRs), and compared using the Mann Whitney test. Categorical variables were reported as frequencies and compared using the likelihood ratio test. Univariate and multivariate regression analyses for predicting favorable AM-PAC scores were performed. A multivariate logistic regression was built using statistically significant univariate predictors and pre-specified clinical factors. The multivariate model was refined with elimination of non-significant parameters with the lowest effect size, yielding a model with 4 clinical parameters and 3 imaging parameters. Receiver operating characteristics curve with area under the curve (AUC) was used to evaluate model performance. A P value \leq .05 was significant.

Results

In total, 229 patients (mean \pm SD 70.65 \pm 15.2 [55.9% women]) met our inclusion criteria with 79 (79/229, 34.5%) in the favorable and 150 (150/229, 65.5%) in the unfavorable groups, respectively.

Patients with favorable AM-PAC score were younger (61.3 vs 70.7, P<.001), had lower admission glucose (mean, 124.19 vs 136.83, P=.042), lower blood urea nitrogen (mean, 15.59 vs 19.11, P<.001), and lower admission NIHSS (mean, 10.58 vs 16.15, P<.001; table 1).

On pretreatment imaging, patients with favorable AM-PAC had significantly lower rCBF and Tmax volumes (P<.049 for all parameters; table 2).

Multivariate logistic regression analyses revealed age (P<.001), admission NIHSS (P<.001), mTICI score (P=.038), and rCBF <30% volume (P=.047), to be independent predictors of favorable AM-PAC (table 3). Admission glucose (P=.062) and women sex (P=.310) approached significance in favorable AM-PAC prediction. The receiver operator characteristics curve for the combined model revealed an AUC of 0.83 (95% confidence interval 0.75-0.86; fig 1).

Discussion

Our study demonstrates that excellent recanalization, smaller core volumes, lower age, and decreased initial stroke severity are all independent predictors of favorable

 Table 1
 Baseline demographic and clinical characteristics for patients with either favorable or unfavorable AMPAC scores

Demographic Age (pars), man ± 5D 67.43 (15.50) 61.32 (14.42) Or.65 (15.12) <.0001	Characteristics	All (n=229)	Favorable AMPAC Score (n=79)	Unfavorable AMPAC Score (n=150)	P Value
Age (pears), mean ± 5D 67.43 (15.50) 61.32 (14.42) 70.65 (15.12) <<.0001 Wornen 128 (55.90%) 45 (56.96%) 81 (53.33) .8114 Men 101 (44.10%) 34 (43.04%) 66 (44.07%) .7419 Black/African American 107 (52.40%) 44 (55.70%) 76 (56.64%) .8313 Other 7 (3.06%) 31 (39.24%) 66 (44.00%) .8890 Poly Caucasian 120 (52.40%) 44 (55.70%) 76 (56.76%) .7419 Caucasian 120 (52.47%) 31 (39.24%) 66 (44.00%) .8890 Hypertension, no. (%) 179 (75.7%) 37 (72.15%) 172 (81.33%) .1144 Diabetes melitus, no. (%) 39 (25.7%) 16 (20.25%) 43 (26.7%) .1044 Heart disease, no. (%) 29 (38.6%) 25 (31.65%) 44 (26.7%) .1045 Prior stroker transient tschemic attack, no. (%) 29 (38.6%) 25 (31.65%) 26 (36.7%) .1049 BW (mg/d), mean ± 5D 15.22 (27.1) 14.92 (26.51) 15.25 (27.4) .24 (19.37%) .25 (19.1) .1730 (27.5) <td>Demographic</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Demographic				
See, no. (8) Women 128 (55.90%) 45 (55.96%) 35 (55.33%) 67 (44.67%) Men 101 (44.10%) 34 (43.04%) 67 (44.67%) 742.36%) 66 (44.00%) .7419 Black/African American 97 (42.36%) 41 (55.70%) 76 (50.67%) .4314 Caucasian 120 (52.40%) 44 (55.70%) 76 (50.67%) .446.07%) Asian 5 (2.18%) 1 (1.27%) 4 (2.67%) .664 (40.00%) .8890 Other 7 (3.06%) 33.080%) 44 (2.67%) .664 (40.05%) .8890 Uppertension, on, (%) 118 (51.53%) .94 (43.24%) .83 (25.33%) .0765 Trainfibrillation, no, (%) 97 (25.76%) .64 (2.27%) .6449 .83 (25.33%) .0765 Atriai fibrillation, no, (%) 97 (3.277) .29 (2.677) .29 (3.677) .29 (3.677) .29 (3.677) .29 (3.677) .29 (3.678) .63 (20.21) .73 (2.511) .13 (2.273) .26 (2.678) .33 (2.071) .29 (2.671) .13 (2.73) .27 (2.61) .10 (3.21) .10 (3.63) .27 (1.61,77) .20 (1.61)<	Age (years), mean \pm SD	67.43 (15.50)	61.32 (14.42)	70.65 (15.12)	<.0001
Women 128 (55.90%) 45 (56.96%) 83 (43.04%) Race, no. (%) 7 (42.36%) 31 (39.24%) 66 (44.00%) Black Alfrican American 97 (42.36%) 31 (39.24%) 66 (44.00%) Asian 120 (52.40%) 44 (55.70%) 76 (50.67%) Other 7 (3.06%) 3 (3.80%) 42.67%) Other 7 (3.06%) 3 (3.80%) 42.67%) Other 7 (3.06%) 3 (3.80%) 42.67%) Opstiptietma, no. (%) 179 (75.15%) 122 (82.67%) 1643 Poinbetes mellitus, no. (%) 59 (25.76%) 16 (20.25%) 43 (28.67%) 1608 Heard disease, no. (%) 17 (76.10%) 44 (17.2%) 28 (18.67%) .8602 BM (dkg/m ²), mean ± 5D 152.28 (27.11 149 2(28.51) 153.52 (29.43) .3710 DBP (mmHg), mean ± 5D 152.28 (21.91 149.22 (28.11) 173.52 (29.43) .3710 DBV (mg/dL), mean ± 5D 17.09 (0.02) 15.59 (5.69) 19.11 (10.17) .0009 Guicose (mg/dL), mean ± 5D 17.09 (0.02) 15.05 (5.69) 19.110	Sex, no. (%)				
Men 101 (44.10%) 34 (43.0%) 67 (42.36%) Black/African American 97 (42.36%) 31 (39.24%) 66 (44.07%) Caucasian 120 (52.40%) 44 (55.70%) 76 (50.67%) Asian 5 (2.18%) 11 (1.27%) 42.67%) Other 7 (3.06%) 33 (3.80%) 42.67%) Tobacco use, no. (%) 179 (76.17%) 57 (72.15%) 152 (2.67%) 6.6344 Pypertension, no. (%) 59 (25.76%) 16 (20.25%) 43 (28.67%) .6349 Diabetes mellitus, no. (%) 89 (38.86%) 22 (31.65%) 64 (42.67%) .6602 Bill (kg/m), mean ± 5D 152.28 (20.11) 149.22 (7.70) 29.15 (8.04) .5718 SbP (mmHg), mean ± 5D 152.47 (2.54) 124 (19 (33.59) 136.33 (59.21) .7743 BB (mmHg/m), mean ± 5D 132.47 (2.54) 124 (19 (3.59) 136.33 (59.82) .0418 BUN (mm/g/d), mean ± 5D 17.90 (9.02) 15.59 (5.69) 19.11 (10.17) .0009 Cr (motk), mean ± 5D 12.47 (1.54) 14 (19 (13.59) 136.33 (59.82) .0418 <t< td=""><td>Women</td><td>128 (55.90%)</td><td>45 (56.96%)</td><td>83 (55.33%)</td><td>.8134</td></t<>	Women	128 (55.90%)	45 (56.96%)	83 (55.33%)	.8134
$\begin{array}{l c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Men	101 (44.10%)	34 (43.04%)	67 (44.67%)	
Black/African American 97 (42.368) 13 (39.248) 66 (44.008) .7419 Caucasian 120 (22.408) 14 (55.708) 76 (50.678) Other 7 (3.068) 3 (3.808) 4 (2.678) Tobacco use, no. (%) 100 (43.678) 34 (43.048) 66 (44.008) .8890 Hypertension, no. (%) 179 (76.178) 57 (72.15%) 122 (81.333) .0163 Diabetes mellitus, no. (%) 59 (25.768) 16 (20.25%) 43 (28.673) .6309 Diabetes mellitus, no. (%) 87 (38.863) 25 (31.65%) 64 (42.673) .6602 BM (kg/m), mean ± 50 152.28 (29.11) 149.22 (7.70) 29.15 (8.04) .5438 SBP (mmHg), mean ± 50 152.47 (25.4) 144 (17.728) 28 (18.678) .0414 BW (kg/m), mean ± 50 132.47 (52.4) 14 (17.728) 21.6331 .0.714 BV (mmHg), mean ± 50 132.47 (52.4) 14.19 (33.59) 136.33 (59.1) .0.414 BW (mg/dL), mean ± 50 1.247 (15.4) 14.19 (35.9) 13.63 (57.8) .0.414 BW (mg/dL), mean ± 50 1.297 (1.94)	Race, no. (%)				
	Black/African American	97 (42.36%)	31 (39.24%)	66 (44.00%)	.7419
Asian 5 (2.18%) 1 (1.27%) 4 (2.67%) Other 7 (3.06%) 3 (3.80%) 4 (2.67%) Tobacco use, no. (%) 100 (43.67%) 34 (43.04%) 66 (44.00%) .8890 Phypertension, no. (%) 179 (72.17%) 57 (72.15%) 122 (81.33%) .1134 Dystipteemia, no. (%) 18 (51.53%) 39 (49.37%) 79 (52.67%) .6349 Diabetes mellitus, no. (%) 17 (751.09%) 34 (43.04%) 83 (55.33%) .0765 Atrial fibrillation, no. (%) 89 (48.67%) .23 (13.65%) 64 (42.67%) .1014 Prior stroke/transient ischemic attack, no. (%) 42 (18.34%) 14 (17.72%) 28 (18.67%) .8602 BW (48/m7), mean ± 50 152.28 (29.11) 149.92 (28.51) 153.52 (29.43) .3710 DPF (mmHg), mean ± 50 17.90 (9.2) 15.13 (3.10) .0418 .0418 .101.17 .0009 Cr (a/d, l), mean ± 50 1.09 (0.61) 1.01 (0.32) 1.13 (0.72) .0819 .0418 BUN (mg/dL), mean ± 50 1.29 (1.84) 12.04 (1.85) 13.06 (1.99) .4462 </td <td>Caucasian</td> <td>120 (52.40%)</td> <td>44 (55.70%)</td> <td>76 (50.67%)</td> <td></td>	Caucasian	120 (52.40%)	44 (55.70%)	76 (50.67%)	
Utter 1 (3.06%) 3 (3.80%) 4 (2.67%) Tobacco use, no. (%) 100 (43.67%) 34 (43.04%) 66 (44.00%) .8890 hypertension, no. (%) 179 (78.17%) 57 (72.15%) 172 (21.33%) 79 (52.67%) .6349 Diabetes mellitus, no. (%) 59 (25.76%) 16 (20.25%) 34 (28.67%) .1608 Heart disease, no. (%) 117 (51.09%) 34 (43.04%) 83 (55.33%) .0765 Atria fibrillation, no. (%) 89 (38.86%) 25 (31.65%) 46 (42.67%) .1014 Prior stroke/transient ischemic attack, no. (%) 29.38 (7.91) 29.82 (7.70) 29.15 (8.04) .5388 BSP (immHg), mean ± 5D 152.78 (20.31) 149.92 (28.51) 153.52 (29.43) .7413 Diaber (annig), mean ± 5D 152.47 (22.54) 12.47 (12.54) 12.47 (12.53) 12.47 (12.52) 12.47 (12.72) .0812 .0418 BUN (mg/dL), mean ± 5D 10.90 (0.61) 1.01 (0.32) 1.13 (0.72) .0812 Circose (mg/dL), mean ± 5D 1.09 (0.62) 1.05 (6.61) 16.15 (6.20) <.0001	Asian	5 (2.18%)	1 (1.27%)	4 (2.67%)	
Iobacco use, no. (s) IOU (43.67.s) 34 (43.048) 06 (44.005) .8990 Ippertension, no. (s) 179 (76.17%) 57 (72.15%) 122 (61.33%) .1134 Dystipidemia, no. (s) 18 (51.53%) 39 (49.37%) 79 (52.67%) .6349 Diabetes mellitus, no. (s) 17 (51.09%) 34 (43.04%) 83 (55.33%) .0765 Atrial fibrillation, no. (s) 89 (48.07%) 144 (41.7723) 28 (18.67%) .6404 Prior stroke/transferi tischemic attack, no. (%) 42 (18.34%) 14 (17.723) 28 (18.67%) .6404 BWI (kg/m), mean ± 5D 152.28 (29.11) 149.92 (28.51) 153.52 (29.43) .3710 DeP (mmity), mean ± 5D 152.24 (20.30) 87.01 (20.02) 87.93 (20.51) .7443 HR (kg/m), mean ± 5D 132.47 (52.54) 134.83 (59.82) .0418 BUN (mg/dL), mean ± 5D 1.29 (10.61) 1.01 (0.32) 1.13 (0.72) .0812 Stroke characteristics - - - .0612 .01 (10.17) .0009 Cr (g/dL), mean ± 5D 1.29 (10.41 1.01 (0.32) 1.13 (0.72)	Other	/ (3.06%)	3 (3.80%)	4 (2.67%)	
Hypertension, no. (s) 179 (76.173) 57 (72.153) 122 (81.333) 1.134 Dyslipidemia, no. (s) 159 (25.763) 16 (20.253) 79 (52.775) 16 (20.253) 133 (25.675) 16 (20.253) Heart disease, no. (s) 117 (51.098) 34 (33.043) 83 (55.338) 0.765 Atrial fbrillation, no. (s) 89 (38.683) 25 (31.653) 64 (42.678) .640 Prio stroke/transient ischemic attack, no. (%) 42 (18.343) 14 (17.723) 28 (18.678) .8602 BM (mg/m ²), mean ± SD 152.28 (29.11) 149.92 (28.51) 153.52 (29.41) .7736 Glucose (mg/dL), mean ± SD 152.47 (52.54) 124.75 (25.47) 136.33 (59.82) .0418 BUN (mg/dL), mean ± SD 1.09 (9.02) 1.59 (5.69) 19.11 (10.17) .0000 Cr (mg/dL), mean ± SD 1.09 (9.02) 1.59 (5.69) 1.11 (10.17) .0000 Cr (mg/dL), mean ± SD 1.29 (1.94) 12.80 (1.85) 1.305 (1.99) .3462 Stroke dradcreitstics	Iobacco use, no. (%)	100 (43.67%)	34 (43.04%)	66 (44.00%)	.8890
Dysputermia, no. (s) 118 (p1.53) 39 (49. 373) 79 (p2.678) 6.649 Diabetes mellitus, no. (k) 59 (25.768) 16 (20.288) 64 (42.678) 1.1608 Hard toffallituon, no. (k) 89 (38.868) 25 (31.683) 64 (42.678) 1.014 Prior stroke/transient tschemic attack, no. (k) 42 (18.348) 14 (17.728) 28 (18.678) 64 (42.678) 1.014 BM (kg/m), mean ± 50 152.28 (29.11) 149.92 (28.51) 153.52 (29.43) 3.710 DBP (mmHg), mean ± 50 152.78 (16.107) 86.31 (22.61) 1.736 Glucose (mg/dL), mean ± 50 17.90 (9.62) 15.59 (5.69) 19.11 (10.17) 0.0009 Crower draw = 5D 1.09 (0.61) 1.01 (0.32) 1.13 (0.72) 0.812 Hemoglobin (g/L), mean ± 5D 1.09 (0.61) 1.01 (0.32) 1.13 (0.72) 0.812 Premorbid mRS, no. (%) n=228 n=79 n=150 .422 (6.86) 10.58 (6.61) 16.15 (6.20) <.0001	Hypertension, no. (%)	1/9 (/8.1/%)	57 (72.15%)	122 (81.33%)	.1134
Diabetes metititus, no. (s) 39 (25.68) 16 (20.28) 34 (26.678) 1.0005 Heart disease, no. (8) 117 (51.098) 34 (32.048) 83 (55.336) 0.0765 Atrial fbrillation, no. (8) 89 (38.868) 25 (31.65%) 64 (42.67%) .0104 Prior stroke/transient (schemic attack, no. (8) 42 (18.34%) 14 (17.27%) 28 (16.67%) .8602 BM (kg/m ³), mean ± 5D 152.28 (29.11) 149.92 (28.51) 153.22 (29.43) .3710 DBP (mmHg), mean ± 5D 87.62 (20.30) 87.01 (20.02) 87.39 (22.61) .7443 BUN (mg/dL), mean ± 5D 132.47 (52.54) 124.19 (33.59) 136.83 (59.82) .0418 BUN (mg/dL), mean ± 5D 1.09 (0.61) 1.01 (0.22) 1.13 (0.72) .0312 Crew characteristics 21.297 (1.94) 12.80 (1.85) 13.05 (1.99) .3462 Cork characteristics n=79 n=150 .0001 Premobil mRS, no. (%) n=228 n=79 n=150 .0001 .00.005) .000005 .00005 .00005	Dyslipidemia, no. (%)	118 (51.53%)	39 (49.37%)	79 (52.67%)	.6349
Preart disease, no. (%) 11/ (1) (10%) 34 (43.04%) 83 (35.33) 0.059 Atrial Birliation, no. (%) 42 (18.34%) 14 (17.72%) 28 (18.67%) .8602 BMI (kg/m7), mean ± 5D 29.38 (7.91) 29.82 (7.70) 29.15 (8.04) .533 SPP (mmHg), mean ± 5D 152.28 (29.11) 149.92 (28.51) 153.52 (29.43) .3710 DBP (mmHg), mean ± 5D 152.62 (20.30) 87.01 (20.02) 87.93 (20.51) .7443 BUN (mg/dL), mean ± 5D 172.90 (9.02) 15.59 (5.64) 19.11 (10.17) .0000 Clucose (mg/dL), mean ± 5D 17.90 (9.02) 15.59 (5.64) 19.11 (10.17) .0000 Croke characteristics - - 1.09 (0.61) 1.01 (0.32) 1.13 (0.72) .0812 Admission NHSS, mean ± 5D 14.22 (6.86) 10.58 (6.61) 16.15 (6.20) <.0001	Diabetes mellitus, no. (%)	59 (25.76%)	16 (20.25%)	43 (28.67%)	.1608
Atriat Intrilution, no. (%) B9 (38.86%) 25 (31.05%) 64 (42.67%) .1014 Prior stroke/transient ischemic attack, no. (%) 42 (18.34%) 14 (17.72%) 28 (18.67%) .8602 BM (kg/m2), mean ± SD 152.28 (29.11) 149.52 (28.51) 153.52 (29.43) .3710 DBP (mmHg), mean ± SD 85.10 (20.62) 87.70 (20.02) 87.93 (20.51) .77443 HR (bpm), mean ± SD 132.47 (52.54) 124.19 (33.59) 136.83 (59.82) .00418 BUN (mg/dL), mean ± SD 1.09 (0.61) 1.01 (0.32) 1.13 (0.72) .0812 Cr (mg/dL), mean ± SD 1.09 (0.61) 1.01 (0.32) 1.13 (0.72) .0812 Cr (mg/dL), mean ± SD 1.02 (7.194) 1.28 (1.85) 13.05 (1.99) .3462 Stroke characteristics	Heart disease, no. (%)	117 (51.09%)	34 (43.04%)	83 (55.33%)	.0765
Prior stroke/transient ischemic attack, no. (%) 44 (18, 34%) 14 (17, 12%) 28 (18, 67%) 38002 BMI (kg/m), mean ± SD 29, 38 (7, 91) 29, 82 (7, 70) 29, 51 (8, 04) .5333 SPP (mmHg), mean ± SD 87, 62 (20, 30) 87, 01 (20, 02) 87, 93 (20, 51) .7443 HR (bpm), mean ± SD 85, 10 (20, 62) 82, 78 (16, 07) 86, 31 (22, 61) .1744 BUN (mg/dL), mean ± SD 132, 47 (52, 54) 124, 19 (33, 59) 136, 83 (59, 82) .0418 BUN (mg/dL), mean ± SD 1, 09 (0, 61) 1.01 (0, 32) 1.13 (0, 72) .0812 Hemoglobin (g/L), mean ± SD 12, 97 (1, 94) 12.80 (1, 85) 13.05 (1, 99) .3462 Stroke characteristics	Atrial fibrillation, no. (%)	89 (38.86%)	25 (31.65%)	64 (42.67%)	.1014
bbit (kg/m ²), mean ± SD 129.38 (7.47) 129.32 (7.47) 149.52 (26.51) 155.52 (29.43)	Prior stroke/transient ischemic attack, no. (%)	42 (18.34%)	14 (17.72%)	28 (18.67%)	.8602
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	BMI (kg/m ²), mean \pm SD	29.38 (7.91)	29.82 (7.70)	29.15 (8.04)	.5438
DBP (mmmig), mean ± SD 87.05 (20.02) 87.07 (20.02) 87.07 (20.02) 87.07 (20.02) 87.07 (20.02) 87.07 (20.02) 17.36 Glucose (mg/dL), mean ± SD 132.47 (22.54) 124.19 (33.59) 136.83 (59.82) .00418 BUN (mg/dL), mean ± SD 1.790 (9.02) 15.59 (5.69) 19.11 (10.17) .0009 Cr (mg/dL), mean ± SD 1.09 (0.61) 1.01 (0.32) 1.13 (0.72) .0812 Hemoglobin (g/L), mean ± SD 12.97 (1.94) 12.80 (1.85) 13.05 (1.99) .3462 Stroke characteristics Admission NIHSS, mean ± SD 14.22 (6.86) 10.58 (6.61) 16.15 (6.20) <.0001	SBP (mmHg), mean \pm SD	152.28 (29.11)	149.92 (28.51)	153.52 (29.43)	.3/10
HR (ppm), mean ± SD 85.10 (20.62) 82.78 (16.07) 80.31 (22.61) .17.50 Glucose (mg/dL), mean ± SD 17.90 (9.02) 15.59 (5.69) 19.11 (10.17) .0000 Cr (mg/dL), mean ± SD 1.09 (0.61) 1.01 (0.32) 1.13 (0.72) .0812 Hemoglobin (g/L), mean ± SD 12.97 (1.94) 12.80 (1.85) 13.05 (1.99) .3462 Stroke characteristics	DBP (mmHg), mean \pm SD	87.62 (20.30)	87.01 (20.02)	87.93 (20.51)	.7443
Guidose (mg/dL), mean ± 5D 132.4* (32.54) 124.1* (93.53) 130.8* (35.82) .0.91 BUN (mg/dL), mean ± 5D 1.7.90 (9.02) 15.5 (5.69) 19.11 (10.17) .0009 Gr (mg/dL), mean ± 5D 1.2.97 (1.94) 12.80 (1.85) 13.05 (1.99) .3462 Stroke characteristics	HR (bpm), mean \pm SD	85.10 (20.62)	82.78 (16.07)	86.31 (22.61)	.1/36
BUK (mg/dL), mean ± SU 17.90 (9.12) 15.59 (5.89) 19.11 (10.17) JUD00 Cr (mg/dL), mean ± SD 1.09 (0.61) 1.01 (0.32) 1.13 (0.72) .0812 Hemoglobin (g/L), mean ± SD 12.97 (1.94) 12.80 (1.85) 13.05 (1.99) .3462 Stroke characteristics 12.97 (1.94) 12.80 (1.85) 13.05 (1.99) .<0001	Glucose (mg/dL), mean \pm SD	132.47 (52.54)	124.19 (33.59)	136.83 (59.82)	.0418
Cr (mg/dL), mean ± 50 1.09 (0.61) 1.01 (0.22) 1.13 (0.72) 0.812 Hemoglobin (g/L), mean ± 5D 12.97 (1.94) 12.80 (1.85) 13.05 (1.99) .3462 Stroke characteristics 14.22 (6.86) 10.58 (6.61) 16.15 (6.20) <.0001	BUN (mg/dL), mean \pm SD	17.90 (9.02)	15.59 (5.69)	19.11 (10.17)	.0009
Hemoglobin (g/L), mean ± SD 12.97 (1.94) 12.80 (1.85) 13.05 (1.99) .3462 Admission NIHSS, mean ± SD 14.22 (6.86) 10.58 (6.61) 16.15 (6.20) <.0001 Premorbid mRS, no. (%) n=228 n=79 n=150 0 87 (38.16%) 49 (67.12%) 87 (58.00%) .1483 1 19 (8.33%) 14 (19.18%) 19 (12.67%) .1483 2 7 (3.07%) 4 (5.48%) 7 (4.67%) .1483 3 24 (10.53%) 4 (5.48%) 7 (4.67%) .1483 4 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) .1483 5 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) .2693 5 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) .2693 6 ardioembolism 117 (51.54%) 35 (44.87%) 82 (55.03%) .2693 Cardioembolism 117 (51.54%) 35 (44.87%) 73 (48.67%) .2962 Stroke of undetermined etiology 12 (52.99%) 26 (33.33%) 33 (22.15%) .2643 Left 108 (47.16%) 35 (44.30%) 73 (48.67%) .2962 Right	Cr (mg/dL), mean \pm SD	1.09 (0.61)	1.01 (0.32)	1.13 (0.72)	.0812
Stroke Characteristics 14.22 (6.86) 10.58 (6.61) 16.15 (6.20) <.0001 Premorbid mRS, no. (%) n=228 n=79 n=150	Hemoglobin (g/L), mean \pm SD	12.97 (1.94)	12.80 (1.85)	13.05 (1.99)	.3462
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Admission NIHSS, mean \pm SD	14.22 (6.86)	10.58 (6.61)	16.15 (6.20)	<.0001
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Premorbid mRS, no. (%)	n=228	n=79	n=150	
1 19 (8.33%) 14 (19.18%) 19 (12.67%) 1.11 2 7 (3.07%) 4 (5.48%) 7 (4.67%) 3 24 (10.53%) 4 (5.48%) 24 (16.00%) 4 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 5 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 5 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 5 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 5 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 5 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 5 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 5 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 5 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 0 (0.00%) 5 5 5 6.6.41%) 7 (4.70%) Stroke of undetermined etiology 59 (25.99%) 26 (33.33%) 33 (22.15%) Left 108 (47.16%) 35 (44.30%) 73 (48.67%) .2962 Right 120 (52.40%) 43 (54.43%) 77 (51.33%) 16	0	87 (38,16%)	49 (67, 12%)	87 (58,00%)	.1483
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1	19 (8.33%)	14 (19.18%)	19 (12.67%)	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	2	7 (3.07%)	4 (5.48%)	7 (4.67%)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	3	24 (10.53%)	4 (5.48%)	24 (16.00%)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	4	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
Stroke Etiology (TOAST Criteria), no. (%)Larger artery atherosclerosis39 (17.18%)12 (15.38%)27 (18.12%).2693Cardioembolism117 (51.54%)35 (44.87%)82 (55.03%)Small-vessel occlusion0 (0.00%)0 (0.00%)0 (0.00%)Stroke of other determined etiology12 (5.29%)5 (6.41%)7 (4.70%)Stroke of undetermined etiology59 (25.99%)26 (33.33%)33 (22.15%)Laterality, no. (%)120 (52.40%)43 (54.43%)77 (51.33%)Left108 (47.16%)35 (44.30%)73 (48.67%).2962Right120 (52.40%)43 (54.43%)77 (51.33%)Bilateral1 (0.44%)1 (1.27%)0 (0.00%)Occlusion site, no. (%)1163 (71.81%)55 (71.43%)108 (72.00%)M1163 (71.81%)55 (71.43%)108 (72.00%).9943M1163 (25.55%)20 (25.97%)38 (25.33%).4165MT not attempted, no. (%)n=181n=59n=12208 (4.42%)1 (1.69%)7 (5.74%).0773mTICl, no. (%)n=181n=59n=12208 (4.21%)1 (1.69%)6 (4.92%)2A7 (3.87%)1 (1.69%)6 (4.92%)2B42 (23.20%)9 (15.25%)33 (27.05%)2C28 (15.47%)8 (13.56%)20 (016.13%)392 (50.83%)39 (66.10%)53 (43.44%)	5	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Stroke Etiology (TOAST Criteria), no. (%)				
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Larger artery atherosclerosis	39 (17.18%)	12 (15.38%)	27 (18.12%)	.2693
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } Small-vessel occlusion & 0 & (0.00\%) & 0 & (0.00\%) & 0 & (0.00\%) \\ Stroke of other determined etiology & 12 & (5.29\%) & 26 & (33.33\%) & 33 & (22.15\%) \\ \end{tabular}$	Cardioembolism	117 (51.54%)	35 (44.87%)	82 (55.03%)	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Small-vessel occlusion	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	0 (0.00%)	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Stroke of other determined etiology	12 (5.29%)	5 (6.41%)	7 (4.70%)	
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } Laterality, no. (\%) & 108 (47.16\%) & 35 (44.30\%) & 73 (48.67\%) & .2962 \\ Right & 120 (52.40\%) & 43 (54.43\%) & 77 (51.33\%) \\ Bilateral & 1 (0.44\%) & 1 (1.27\%) & 0 (0.00\%) \\ \hline Occlusion site, no. (\%) & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	Stroke of undetermined etiology	59 (25.99%)	26 (33.33%)	33 (22.15%)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Laterality, no. (%)				
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Left	108 (47.16%)	35 (44.30%)	73 (48.67%)	.2962
Bilateral1 (0.44%)1 (1.27%)0 (0.00%)Occlusion site, no. (%) ICA 8 (2.64%)2 (2.60%)6 (2.67%).9943M1163 (71.81%)55 (71.43%)108 (72.00%)M258 (25.55%)20 (25.97%)38 (25.33%).4165M7 no. (%)62 (27.07%)24 (30.38%)38 (25.33%).4165MT not attempted, no. (%) $48 (20.96\%)$ 20 (25.32%)28 (18.67%).0773mTICI, no. (%) $n=181$ $n=59$ $n=122$ 08 (4.42%)1 (1.69%)7 (5.74%)14 (2.21%)1 (1.69%)3 (2.46%)2A7 (3.87%)1 (1.69%)6 (4.92%)2B42 (23.20%)9 (15.25%)33 (27.05%)2C28 (15.47%)8 (13.56%)20 (16.39%)392 (50.83%)39 (66.10%)53 (43.44%)	Right	120 (52.40%)	43 (54.43%)	77 (51.33%)	
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline Occlusion site, no. (%) & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	Bilateral	1 (0.44%)	1 (1.27%)	0 (0.00%)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Occlusion site, no. (%)				
M1163 (71.81%)55 (71.43%)108 (72.00%)M258 (25.55%)20 (25.97%)38 (25.33%)IV tPA, no. (%)62 (27.07%)24 (30.38%)38 (25.33%)MT not attempted, no. (%)48 (20.96%)20 (25.32%)28 (18.67%)mTICI, no. (%)n=181n=59n=12208 (4.42%)1 (1.69%)7 (5.74%)14 (2.21%)1 (1.69%)3 (2.46%)2A7 (3.87%)1 (1.69%)6 (4.92%)2B42 (23.20%)9 (15.25%)33 (27.05%)2C28 (15.47%)8 (13.56%)20 (16.39%)392 (50.83%)39 (66.10%)53 (43.44%)	ICA	8 (2.64%)	2 (2.60%)	6 (2.67%)	.9943
M2 $58 (25.55\%)$ $20 (25.97\%)$ $38 (25.33\%)$ IV tPA, no. (%) $62 (27.07\%)$ $24 (30.38\%)$ $38 (25.33\%)$.4165MT not attempted, no. (%) $48 (20.96\%)$ $20 (25.32\%)$ $28 (18.67\%)$.0773mTICI, no. (%) $n=181$ $n=59$ $n=122$ 0 $8 (4.42\%)$ $1 (1.69\%)$ $7 (5.74\%)$ 1 $4 (2.21\%)$ $1 (1.69\%)$ $3 (2.46\%)$ 2A $7 (3.87\%)$ $1 (1.69\%)$ $6 (4.92\%)$ 2B $42 (23.20\%)$ $9 (15.25\%)$ $33 (27.05\%)$ 2C $28 (15.47\%)$ $8 (13.56\%)$ $20 (16.39\%)$ 3 $92 (50.83\%)$ $39 (66.10\%)$ $53 (43.44\%)$	M1	163 (71.81%)	55 (71.43%)	108 (72.00%)	
IV tPA, no. (%) 62 (27.07%) 24 (30.38%) 38 (25.33%) .4165 MT not attempted, no. (%) 48 (20.96%) 20 (25.32%) 28 (18.67%) .0773 mTICI, no. (%) n=181 n=59 n=122 0 8 (4.42%) 1 (1.69%) 7 (5.74%) 1 4 (2.21%) 1 (1.69%) 3 (2.46%) 2A 7 (3.87%) 1 (1.69%) 6 (4.92%) 2B 42 (23.20%) 9 (15.25%) 33 (27.05%) 2C 28 (15.47%) 8 (13.56%) 20 (16.39%) 3 92 (50.83%) 39 (66.10%) 53 (43.44%)	M2	58 (25.55%)	20 (25.97%)	38 (25.33%)	
MT not attempted, no. (%) 48 (20.96%) 20 (25.32%) 28 (18.67%) .0773 mTICI, no. (%) n=181 n=59 n=122 0 8 (4.42%) 1 (1.69%) 7 (5.74%) 1 4 (2.21%) 1 (1.69%) 3 (2.46%) 2A 7 (3.87%) 1 (1.69%) 6 (4.92%) 2B 42 (23.20%) 9 (15.25%) 33 (27.05%) 2C 28 (15.47%) 8 (13.56%) 20 (16.39%) 3 92 (50.83%) 39 (66.10%) 53 (43.44%)	IV tPA, no. (%)	62 (27.07%)	24 (30.38%)	38 (25.33%)	.4165
mTICI, no. (%) n=181 n=59 n=122 0 8 (4.42%) 1 (1.69%) 7 (5.74%) 1 4 (2.21%) 1 (1.69%) 3 (2.46%) 2A 7 (3.87%) 1 (1.69%) 6 (4.92%) 2B 42 (23.20%) 9 (15.25%) 33 (27.05%) 2C 28 (15.47%) 8 (13.56%) 20 (16.39%) 3 92 (50.83%) 39 (66.10%) 53 (43.44%)	MT not attempted, no. (%)	48 (20.96%)	20 (25.32%)	28 (18.67%)	.0773
08 (4.42%)1 (1.69%)7 (5.74%)14 (2.21%)1 (1.69%)3 (2.46%)2A7 (3.87%)1 (1.69%)6 (4.92%)2B42 (23.20%)9 (15.25%)33 (27.05%)2C28 (15.47%)8 (13.56%)20 (16.39%)392 (50.83%)39 (66.10%)53 (43.44%)	mTICI, no. (%)	n=181	n=59	n=122	
14 (2.21%)1 (1.69%)3 (2.46%)2A7 (3.87%)1 (1.69%)6 (4.92%)2B42 (23.20%)9 (15.25%)33 (27.05%)2C28 (15.47%)8 (13.56%)20 (16.39%)392 (50.83%)39 (66.10%)53 (43.44%)	0	8 (4.42%)	1 (1.69%)	7 (5.74%)	
2A7 (3.87%)1 (1.69%)6 (4.92%)2B42 (23.20%)9 (15.25%)33 (27.05%)2C28 (15.47%)8 (13.56%)20 (16.39%)392 (50.83%)39 (66.10%)53 (43.44%)	1	4 (2.21%)	1 (1.69%)	3 (2.46%)	
2B42 (23.20%)9 (15.25%)33 (27.05%)2C28 (15.47%)8 (13.56%)20 (16.39%)392 (50.83%)39 (66.10%)53 (43.44%)	2A	7 (3.87%)	1 (1.69%)	6 (4.92%)	
2C28 (15.47%)8 (13.56%)20 (16.39%)392 (50.83%)39 (66.10%)53 (43.44%)	2B	42 (23.20%)	9 (15.25%)	33 (27.05%)	
3 92 (50.83%) 39 (66.10%) 53 (43.44%)	2C	28 (15.47%)	8 (13.56%)	20 (16.39%)	
	3	92 (50.83%)	39 (66.10%)	53 (43.44%)	

Abbreviations: BUN, blood urea nitrogen, mRS, modified Rankin score

Characteristics	All (n=229)	Favorable AMPAC Score (n=79)	Unfavorable AMPAC Score (n=150)	P Value
Calculated Tmax >4s volume (mL), median (IQR)	214 (139.75-323.25)	190 (123-247)	214 (139.75-323.25)	.0406
Calculated Tmax >6s volume (mL), median (IQR)	117 (65.25-164.75)	97 (51.5-141)	117 (65.25-164.75)	.0343
Calculated Tmax >8s volume (mL), median (IQR)	69.5 (36-116.75)	54 (20.5-96)	69.5 (36-116.75)	.0279
Calculated Tmax >10s volume (mL), median (IQR)	40 (13.5-95.75)	34 (6.5,-69.5)	40 (13.5-95.75)	.0257
Calculated rCBF <20% (mL), median (IQR)	0 (0-13.75)	0 (0-6)	0 (0-13.75)	.0205
Calculated rCBF <30% (mL), median (IQR)	8.5 (0-41)	0 (0-16.5)	8.5 (0-41)	.0010
Calculated rCBF <34% (mL), median (IQR)	14.5 (0-53.75)	0 (0-23.5)	14.5 (0-53.75)	<.0001
Calculated rCBF <38% (mL), median (IQR)	22.5 (5-62)	5 (0-29.5)	22.5 (5-62)	.0004
Hypoperfusion Intensity Ratio, median (IQR)	0.4 (0.2-0.55)	0.3 (0.15-0.5)	0.4 (0.2-0.6)	.0449
CBV Index, median (IQR)	0.8 (0.7-0.9)	0.8 (0.7-1.0)	0.8 (0.7-0.9)	.0044

 Table 3
 Odds ratio for predictors included in multivariate logistic regression model for predicting favorable over unfavorable AMPAC scores

Characteristic	Odds Ratio (95% CI)	P Value
Age (per year)	0.94 (0.92-0.96)	<.0001
Admission NIHSS (per unit)	0.88 (0.83-0.93)	<.0001
Admission Glucose (per mg/dL)	0.99 (0.98-1.00)	.0618
Sex		
Men	Reference	.3103
Women	1.43 (0.72-2.83)	
rCBF <30% Volume (per mL)	0.99 (0.97-0.99)	.0465
mTICI		
0/1/2A/2B	Reference	.0382
2C/3	3.06 (1.24-7.52)	

outcomes as measured by AM-PAC. Our combined model with the aforementioned factors demonstrated strong performance (AUC 0.83 [95% CI 0.75-0.86]). To our knowledge, this the first study to investigate the potential of pretreatment imaging parameters in predicting favorable AM-PAC scores.

Standard of care guidelines have prioritized the identification of optimal post-acute care for patients with stroke.^{8,20,21} Early discharge planning is essential for patients with AIS-LVO in order to optimally use the finite resources within the hospital and subsequent rehabilitation settings.⁸ Furthermore, predicting whether patients can be discharged home instead of a post-acute care setting (acute rehabilitation, subacute, rehabilitation, etc) has important ramifications for the patients' psychosocial profile including cognition, stroke recurrence prevention, insurance status, availability, and treatment of comorbid conditions.^{4,5,8,20} This complex and nuanced decision-making process can therefore be aided by pretreatment predictors of discharge status for early planning in patients with AIS-LVO.

Our study suggests that pretreatment comprehensive CT imaging may also be useful adjunct tools in this challenging discharge planning process. Although ischemic core volume in AIS-LVO as a predictive biomarker is well established with widely used functional outcome measures such as modified



AUC = 0.83 95%CI: 0.75 - 0.86

Fig 1 Receiver operator curve analysis of the combined multivariate logistic regression model with age, admission NIHSS, rCBF <30% volume, mTICI score, admission glucose, and sex.

Rankin score, 13,14,22 determining the relation between ischemic core with AM-PAC was yet to be performed. Our findings demonstrate that smaller core volumes based on rCBF <30% volumes independently predict favorable AM-PAC scores. Although the association of smaller ischemic core volumes with better outcomes is an expected finding, it also adds significance to the importance of smaller cores, as this result also affects functional ability and early discharge planning.

Another significant parameter predictive of favorable AM-PAC scores is achieving excellent recanalization by MT (defined as mTICI 2c/3 where unfavorable is considered mTICI 0-2a, successful as mTICI 2b/2c/3, and excellent as mTICI 2c/ 3).²³ Several landmark trials in 2015 in the early window²⁴⁻²⁷ and later in 2018 for the late window^{14,22} established MT as the standard of care for AIS-LVO. Additional studies have also demonstrated that achieving excellent recanalization 2^{28-32} further improves outcomes compared with mTICI 2b, despite also being considered successful recanalization. We found a higher likelihood of achieving favorable AM-PAC scores with excellent recanalization (mTICI 2c/3) compared with mTICI 2b or lower (OR 3.06). Our study is concordant with prior trials and subsequent studies, corroborating the efficacy of MT and the need to achieve excellent recanalization to maximize likelihood of favorable functional outcomes. Our work extends these established outcome-related findings by emphasizing the importance of excellent recanalization with discharge planning as well.

Analyses of other baseline characteristics also confirmed some expected findings. Younger patients and patients who presented less severely with AIS were also associated with favorable functional outcomes as measured using AM-PAC. Both of these factors are well known predictors of improved outcomes in patients with AIS-LVO. Younger patients with AIS-LVO, especially those under 50, tend to have fewer post-procedural complications and better outcomes compared with patients 50 years or older.³³ Lower initial stroke severity, similarly, is a well-established independent predictor of better outcomes in AIS-LVO.³³ Our results are therefore concordant with prior studies identifying these factors as long-standing biomarkers of clinical outcomes.

Limitations

We acknowledge some limitations in this study. First, this study is inherently limited by its retrospective approach. Secondly, CTP is not widely available in smaller and rural centers, thus limiting generalizability. Lastly, our time frame includes patients where only IV tPA was administered instead of other newer forms of thrombolysis such as IV tenecteplase. Prospective studies are needed to validate these findings.

Conclusion

Smaller core volumes, younger age, lower initial stroke severity, and excellent recanalization are significantly predictive of favorable functional outcomes as measured using AM-PAC. Our study further emphasizes the significance of minimizing core volume and aiming for excellent recanalization in order to optimize functional outcomes and discharge planning in patients with AIS-LVO.

Suppliers

- a. Siemens Somatom Force; Siemens.
- b. RAPID commercial software; IschemaView.
- c. IBM SPSS statistics software version 28.0; IBM Corp.

Corresponding author

Vivek Yedavalli, MD, MS, Department of Radiology and Radiological Sciences, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Phipps B122-D, Baltimore, MD 21287. *E-mail address*: vyedava1@jhmi.edu.

Acknowledgments

This study is supported by the Johns Hopkins University Department of Radiology Physician Scientist Incubator Program (RAD-PSI).

References

- Rennert RC, Wali AR, Steinberg JA, et al. Epidemiology, natural history, and clinical presentation of large vessel ischemic stroke. Neurosurgery 2019;85:S4-8.
- Benjamin EJ, Virani SS, Callaway CW. Heart disease and stroke statistics—2018 update: a report from the American Heart Association. Circulation 2018;137:e67-492.
- Malhotra K, Gornbein J, Saver JL. Ischemic strokes due to largevessel occlusions contribute disproportionately to strokerelated dependence and death: a review. Front Neurol 2017;8:651.
- Hayes HA, et al. Is the activity measure for postacute care '6-Clicks' Tool associated with discharge destination postacute stroke? Arch Rehabil Res Clin Transl 2022;4:100228.
- Hayes HA, Mor V, Wei G, Presson A, McDonough C. Medicare advantage patterns of poststroke discharge to an inpatient rehabilitation or skilled nursing facility: a consideration of demographic, functional, and payer factors. Phys Ther 2023;103:pzad009.
- Alcusky M, Ulbricht CM, Lapane KL. Postacute care setting, facility characteristics, and poststroke outcomes: a systematic review. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2018;99:. 1124-40.e9.
- Arnold SM, Naessens JM, McVeigh K, White LJ, Atchison JW, Tompkins J. Can AM-PAC '6-Clicks' Inpatient Functional Assessment Scores strengthen hospital 30-day readmission prevention strategies? Cureus 2021;13:e14994.
- Casertano LO, Bassile CC, Pfeffer JS, Morrone TM, Stein J, Willey JZ, Rao AK, et al. Utility of the AM-PAC "6 Clicks" Basic Mobility and Daily Activity Short Forms to determine discharge destination in an acute stroke population. Am J Occup Ther 2022;76. https://doi.org/10.5014/ajot.2022.047381.
- 9. Covert S, Johnson JK, Stilphen M, Passek S, Thompson NR, Katzan I. Use of the activity measure for post-acute care '6 Clicks' Basic Mobility Inpatient Short Form and National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale to predict hospital discharge disposition after stroke. Phys Ther 2020;100:1423-33.
- O'Dell M, Toglia J, Taub M. Predicting participation level six month following inpatient stroke rehabilitation. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2015;96:e56.
- Jaywant A, Toglia J, Gunning FM, O'Dell MW. The clinical utility of a 30-minute neuropsychological assessment battery in inpatient stroke rehabilitation. J Neurol Sci 2018;390:54-62.

- Rakesh N, Boiarsky D, Athar A, Hinds S, Stein J. Post-stroke rehabilitation: factors predicting discharge to acute versus subacute rehabilitation facilities. Medicine 2019;98:e15934.
- Lansberg MG, Christensen S, Kemp S, Mlynash M, Mishra N, Federau C, Tsai JP, et al. Computed tomographic perfusion to Predict Response to Recanalization in ischemic stroke. Ann Neurol 2017;81:849-56.
- 14. Albers GW, Marks MP, Kemp S, Christensen S, Tsai JP, Ortega-Gutierrez S, McTaggart R, et al. Thrombectomy for stroke at 6 to 16 hours with selection by perfusion imaging. N Engl J Med 2018;378:708-18.
- **15.** Christensen S, Mlynash M, Kemp S, Yennu A, Heit JJ, Marks MP, Lansberg MG, et al. Persistent target mismatch profile >24 hours after stroke onset in DEFUSE 3. Stroke 2019;50:754-7.
- Barber PA, Demchuk AM, Zhang J, Buchan AM. Validity and reliability of a quantitative computed tomography score in predicting outcome of hyperacute stroke before thrombolytic therapy. ASPECTS Study Group. Alberta Stroke Programme Early CT Score. Lancet 2000;355:1670-4.
- Hacke W, Kaste M, Fieschi C, von Kummer R, Davalos A, Meier D, Larrue V, et al. Randomised double-blind placebo-controlled trial of thrombolytic therapy with intravenous alteplase in acute ischaemic stroke (ECASS II). Second European-Australasian Acute Stroke Study Investigators. Lancet 1998;352:1245-51.
- **18.** Guenego A, Marcellus DG, Martin BW, Christensen S, Albers GW, Lansberg MG, Marks MP, et al. Hypoperfusion intensity ratio is correlated with patient eligibility for thrombectomy. Stroke 2019;50:917-22.
- 19. Guenego A, Fahed R, Albers GW, Kuraitis G, Sussman ES, Martin BW, Marcellus DG, Olivot JM, Marks MP, Lansberg MG, Wintermark M, Heit JJ. Hypoperfusion intensity ratio correlates with angiographic collaterals in acute ischaemic stroke with M1 occlusion. Eur J Neurol 2020;27:864-70.
- Duncan PW, Zorowitz R, Bates B, Choi JY, Glasberg JJ, Graham GD, Katz RC, et al. Management of Adult Stroke Rehabilitation Care: a clinical practice guideline. Stroke 2005;36:e100-43.
- 21. Thorpe ER, Garrett KB, Smith AM, Reneker JC, Phillips RS. Outcome measure scores predict discharge destination in patients with acute and subacute stroke: a systematic review and series of meta-analyses. J Neurol Phys Ther 2018;42:2-11.
- Nogueira RG, Jadhav AP, Haussen DC, Bonafe A, Budzik RF, Bhuva P, Yavagal D, et al. Thrombectomy 6 to 24 hours after stroke with a mismatch between deficit and infarct. N Engl J Med 2018;378:11-21.

- **23.** Tung EL, McTaggart RA, Baird GL, Yaghi S, Hemendinger M, Dibiasio EL, et al. Rethinking thrombolysis in cerebral infarction 2b: which thrombolysis in cerebral infarction scales best define near complete recanalization in the modern thrombectomy era? Stroke 2017;48:2488-93.
- 24. Berkhemer OA, Fransen PSS, Beumer D, van den Berg LA, Lingsma HF, Yoo AJ, Wouter J, et al. A randomized trial of intraarterial treatment for acute ischemic stroke. N Engl J Med 2015;372:11-20.
- Saver JL, Goyal M, Bonafe A, Diener H-C, Levy EI, Pereira VM, Albers GW, et al. Stent-retriever thrombectomy after intravenous t-PA vs. t-PA alone in stroke. N Engl J Med 2015;372:2285-95.
- 26. Goyal M, Demchuk AM, Menon BK, Eesa M, Rempel JL, Thornton J, Roy D, et al. Randomized assessment of rapid endovascular treatment of ischemic stroke. N Engl J Med 2015;372:1019-30.
- Campbell BCV, Mitchell PJ, Kleinig TJ, Dewey HM, Churilov L, Yassi N, Yan B, et al. Endovascular therapy for ischemic stroke with perfusion-imaging selection. N Engl J Med 2015;372:1009-18.
- 28. Jang KM, Nam TK, Ko MJ, Choi HH, Kwon JT, Park SW, Byun JS. Thrombolysis in cerebral infarction grade 2C or 3 represents a better outcome than 2B for endovascular thrombectomy in acute ischemic stroke: a network meta-analysis. World Neurosurg 2020;136:e419-39.
- 29. LeCouffe NE, Kappelhof M, Treurniet KM, Lingsma HF, Zhang G, van den Wijngaard IR, van Es AC, et al. 2B, 2C, or 3. Stroke 2020;51:1790-6.
- Kleine JF, Wunderlich S, Zimmer C, Kaesmacher J. Time to redefine success? TICI 3 versus TICI 2b recanalization in middle cerebral artery occlusion treated with thrombectomy. J Neurointerv Surg 2017;9:117-21.
- Yoo AJ, Soomro J, Andersson T, Saver JL, Ribo M, Bozorgchami H, Dabus G, et al. Benchmarking the extent and speed of reperfusion: first pass TICI 2c-3 is a preferred endovascular reperfusion endpoint. Front Neurol 2021;12:669934.
- 32. Dargazanli C, Consoli A, Barral M, Labreuche J, Redjem H, Ciccio G, Smajda S, et al. Impact of modified TICI 3 versus modified TICI 2b reperfusion score to predict good outcome following endovascular therapy. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol 2017;38:90-6.
- Brouwer J, Smaal JA, Emmer BJ, de Ridder IR, van den Wijngaard IR, de Leeuw F-E, Hofmeijer J, et al. Endovascular thrombectomy in young patients with stroke: a MR CLEAN Registry Study. Stroke 2022;53:34-42.